

Francis J. Thomson

The Legacy of SS. Cyril and Methodius in the Counterreformation

The council of Trent and the question of Scripture and liturgy in the Vernacular, together with an account of the subsequent consequences for the Slavo-Latin (glagolitic) rite and the Bible in Croatian translation

Nominibus auctorum aut oblivioni aut fabulis traditis, res autem manebat.
Eleutherius Scotus

Summary

At the time of the Reformation the use of modern vernaculars in Scripture and liturgy became one of the hallmarks of Protestantism. When the Old Testament had been translated into Greek and the New into Latin those languages had been vernaculars but their use could be justified by an appeal to the trilingual superscription on the Cross. This, of course, could not be invoked for the use of the Glagolitic rite in Slavonic in Croatia, Dalmatia and Istria but it was widely believed in the 16th century that St. Jerome had translated the Old Testament not only into Latin but also into his native "Dalmatian", viz. Slavonic, a fact first referred to in the Reformation controversies by Hieronymus Emser in 1524 in his rejection of Martin Luther's form of the mass of 1523. This Hieronymian theory of the origin of the Glagolitic rite remained unchallenged at the Council of Trent and meant that a vernacular translation could not *per se* be banned. The debates at the Council and the differences between the draft decrees and the final versions are examined: in the latter there is no longer any reference to Latin as a divine instrument consecrated by its use on the Cross or to the greater reverence for the holy mysteries which its use instilled. Even though the introduction of Slavonic into Scripture and the liturgy by SS. Cyril and Methodius in the ninth century was never mentioned at the Council – there is not even a record that their names were ever mentioned – nevertheless their legacy had influenced the Council's decrees in a positive way, a fact hitherto overlooked. Contemporary theories as to the role which the brothers had played with regard to the use of Slavonic in the liturgy are also examined and it is concluded that even at the time of the Counter-Reformation and the Catholic Reform the brothers' work formed a bridge between East and West and that they hence deserve the epithet of *pontifices*.

Whereas the influence of the Glagolitic rite on the decisions of the Council of Trent had been substantial and beneficial, subsequent events revealed that theory and practice do not always go hand in hand. In the 16th century there had been a

trend towards modernizing the language of the liturgical books of the rite but on 18 December 1626 the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*, which less than three years after its establishment had become responsible for publishing these books, ruled that they should be adapted to the revised Latin missal and breviary on the basis of archaic Croat Slavonic. From 1627 on Ruthenian Uniats, who considered that the Slavonic of the Slavo-Greek rite was superior to the "corrupt" Slavonic of the Slavo-Latin one, became involved in the work of revision, which led to the "East-Slavonicization" of Croat Slavonic and subsequently to a decline in the rite. Efforts to obtain permission to publish a Bible in vernacular Croat failed and it was only in 1831 that the first complete Croat translation of the Bible was published.

The Council of Trent and the Question of Scripture and Liturgy in the Vernacular

How and when the use of Slavonic in the liturgy introduced by SS. Cyril (c. 826/7-869) and Methodius (c. 815-885) first spread to Croatia and Dalmatia is unknown;¹ equally uncertain is whether it arrived in a Western or the Byzantine rite, or possibly in a hybrid rite.² The earliest evidence for the use of Slavonic in the liturgy in Dalmatia dates from only forty years after Methodius' death when Pope John X (914-928) in c. 925 wrote to both Archbishop John of Spalato (fl. 925) and King Tomislav of Croatia (c. 912-c. 928) insisting in no uncertain terms that the liturgy be celebrated in Latin and not in Slavonic.³ Since he did

*The author wishes to thank the University of Antwerp (RUCA) for an annual grant towards his research expenses. He also wishes to thank Academician A. Nazor of Zagreb for kindly supplying photocopies of articles in periodicals unavailable in Belgium. As this paper has been written for both theologians and Slavists, the author apologizes for the inclusion of material well known to scholars of one or other of the two disciplines.

¹ For recent surveys of the theories see Birnbaum, *Writing* 69-79; Hamm, *Pojava* 167-175, and Eggers, *Erzbistum* 90-94. For a historiography of the question see Petrović, *Susreti* 5-54, who rightly concludes, *ibid.* 48:

The first contacts of the Croats with Cyrillomethodian Slav culture nevertheless remain the "most obscure" period of Croat Glagolism.

In view of the fact that well over three hundred historical persons are referred to in this study their People's dates are solely given each time that they are first mentioned.

² The hybrid nature of the 11th-century *Euchologium Sinaiticum* is well known, see, for instance, Pantelić, *Lističina* 17-26; Ratko, *Poenitential* 164-171; Repp, *Kritik* 315-332. It has been estimated that 77.1% of its contents are of Byzantine origin, 11.9% Moravian, 3.7% Latin, 0.9% Old High German and 6.4% uncertain, see Moszyński, *Tradycja* 161-162. For a facsimile edition see Lysaght, *Euchologium* 1^r-106^v, 1^r-3^v (with the Cyrillic opposite and an English translation *ibid.* 1-63), to be supplemented by Tarnanidis, *Manuscripts* 219-247, for the recently discovered folia. It has to be borne in mind, however, that despite earlier reversals Byzantine authority only disappeared from Dalmatia in the mid 11th century, with the exception of Ragusa (Dubrovnik), which only finally came under Venetian authority in 1205, and that the Greek rite survived until the 12th century in places such as Zara, see below note 4. On the end of Byzantine rule see Goldstein, *Disappearance* 129-139. The evidence of the earliest fragments of Slavonic translations of Latin masses such as the Kievan and Vienna folia is too disputed to allow the conclusion:

In essa i "glagoljači" hanno tenuto fede alla formula cirillo-metodiana: lingua slava, rito romano, thus Graciotti, *Episodio* 67, to be accepted as proven. The question of such fragments cannot be dealt with here.

³ The epistles are preserved in the longer version of the *Historia Salonitana* by Thomas of Spalato (1199/1200-1268), ed. Klaić, *Historia* 71-125; in that to John, *ibid.* 95-96, see 96, the pope writes:

not raise the question of the rite the pope can only have been referring to the use of Slavonic in a Western rite.⁴ The synod of Spalato did not, however, ban its use entirely but permitted it in places where there was a lack of clergy who knew Latin, provided that prior papal permission had been sought.⁵ By the 16th century the Glagolitic liturgy⁶ was in use in two patriarchates and three metropolitan archdioceses, viz. the patriarchate of Aquileia, in the see of Trieste (Trst) but above all in Istria in the sees of Capodistria (Koper), Parenzo (Poreč), Pola (Pula), Pedena (Pićan) and Cittanova (Novigrad), but also in Carniola in the see of Laibach (Ljubljana); in the patriarchate of Venice⁷ in the archdiocese of Zara (Zadar) and its suffragan sees of Ossero (Osor), Arbe (Rab) and Veglia (Krk); in the metropolitan archdiocese of Spalato (Split) and its suffragan sees of Segna (Senj), Lesina (Hvar), Knin, Modrussa (Modruš), Macarsca (Makarska), Nona (Nin), Scardona (Skradin), Sebenico (Šibenik) and Traù (Trogir), and in the suffragan sees of Cattaro (Kotor) in the metropolitan archsee of Antibari

Ita ut secundum mores sancte romane ecclesie Sclavinorum terra ministerium sacrificii peragant in latina scilicet lingua, non autem in extranea. Quia nullus filius aliquid loqui debet vel sapere, nisi ut pater ei insinuaverit.

In that to Tomislav, *ibid.* 96-98, see 97, he writes:

*Quis etenim specialis filius sancte romane ecclesie, sicut vos estis, in barbara seu sclavinica lingua deo sacrificium offere delectatur? Non quippe ambigo ut in eis aliud maneat, qui in sclavinica lingua sacrificare contendunt, nisi illud quod scriptum est: Ex vobis exierunt et non sunt ex nobis. * Nam si ex nobis essent, manerent utique nobiscum, id est in nostra conversatione et lingua.*

*1 John 2:19. (The obviously correct readings in the *apparatus criticus* have been inserted into the quotation).

⁴ Too little is known about the rite used at this time in Dalmatia to be able to state with certainty that it was the Aquileian, as was later the case. Neither must it be forgotten that Greek still remained in liturgical use at least in Zara at the end of the 12th century; see the epistle of Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) to the chapter there of 6 February 1198, ed. *PL* ccxiv, 14. The Aquileian rite was only definitively replaced by the Roman when Patriarch Francisco Barbaro of Aquileia (1593-1616) introduced the revised editions of the breviary and missal published at Rome in 1568 and 1570 respectively by order of Pope Pius V (1566-1572), who had been requested to do so by the Council of Trent, at a synod held at Udine in October 1596, see the acts ed. Mansi, *Conciliorum* xxxiv, 1367-1428, see 1378 and 1376 respectively. The synod also decreed that the younger clergy and seminarians should be trained to use Latin, *ibid.* 1378, but that measure did not lead to the extinction of the Glagolitic rite. On Barbaro's attitude towards the Slavo-Latin rite see Fučak, *Stolječa* 101. There can be little doubt but that Barbaro's policies were in part dictated by his discovery during his visitation to the northern Carinthian part of his patriarchate in 1593-1594 that the majority of the population had become Lutheran, see Leeb, *Reformation* 203; Trebbi, *Patriarca* 460-463. On Barbaro see Trebbi, *Francesco passim*; for his visitation see 127-130.

⁵ The synod's fifteen canons, the tenth of which deals with the use of Slavonic, are also found in Thomas' *Historia*, ed. Klaić, *Historia* 98-102; for the tenth see 101. On the difficulties involved in interpreting the first part of the canon dealing with the ordination of Slav clergy see Thomson, *Bible* 152, n. 19 (where *sullpicationem* must, of course, read *supplicationem*). The precise year in which the synod was held cannot be examined here: most scholars consider 924-925, although 935 has been suggested. On the synod and that held three years later confirming the decisions of the first see Waldmüller, *Synoden* 25-48 (who favours 925 and 928, see *ibid.* 37). The claim that the Slavo-Byzantine rite in Croatia was replaced by the Slavo-Latin one between the 10th and 13th century, thus Avenarius, *Kultur* 148-149, reveals a lack of acquaintance with the literature, especially Waldmüller's study of the four synods held at Spalato in c. 925, c. 928 and two in 1060. It is, alas, typical that there are fourteen misprints in the title of Tadin's article which is cited in this connection, *ibid.* 148, n. 502.

⁶ This is the popular term for the Western rite celebrated in Slavonic using books printed in the Glagolitic alphabet; the official term is *ritus slavo-latinus* as used in the constitution *Ex pastoralis munere* of 15 August 1754 of Pope Benedict XIV (1740-1758), ed. Jelić, *Fontes* [18th century] 39-41, see 39. For a recent popular introduction to its use see Hercigonja, *Glagolitisme* 369-398.

⁷ By the bull *Regis aeterni* of 8 October 1451, ed. *BDP* v, 107-109, Pope Nicholas V (1447-1451) abolished the patriarchate of Grado and the see of Castello and the last bishop of Castello, Lorenzo Giustini (1381-1456) became the first patriarch of Venice.

(Bar) and of Agram (Zagreb) in the metropolitan archdiocese of Kalocsa.⁸ This fact was to figure prominently in the debates at the Council of Trent and significantly influenced the texts of the final versions of the decrees relating to the use of the vernacular not only in the liturgy but also in Scripture and hence the introduction of Slavonic in the Bible and the liturgy by SS. Cyril and Methodius became a not insignificant factor in the Counter-Reformation.⁹

* * *

Whether or not Martin Luther (1483-1546) actually did affix his 95 theses against indulgences to the door of All Saints' Church at Wittenberg on 31 October 1517,¹⁰ that date has come to symbolize the beginning of the Reformation. Although the Church authorities had not actively encouraged vernacular translations of the Bible, there were by then at least fourteen editions of the Bible in High German and four in Low German.¹¹ The first Bible in any Slav language had already been printed, viz. the Czech Bible which appeared at Prague in 1488 and which was reprinted at Kuttenberg (Kutná Hora) in 1489¹² with illustrations inspired by those in the German Bible published at Nuremberg in 1483.¹³ The third revised edition of it which appeared at Venice in 1506¹⁴ was one of the sources used by Frantsisk Skorina (c. 1490-1541/51), who published most of the Old Testament in a mixture of Slavonic and vernacular Ruthenian at Prague between 1517 and 1519, the first four books of which, viz. Job, Psalms, Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus, appeared in the very year of Luther's theses.¹⁵

⁸ See the topographical index in Jelić, *Fontes XVI-XXXIV*. It is true that the see of Agram, founded in 1094 by King Ladislas I of Hungary (1077-1095) belonged to the Latin rite, but in the sixteenth century many Glagolitic clergy and their flocks in their flight from the Turks settled in the diocese, see Kniewald, *Kroatische* 56, n. 7. The epigraphic evidence implies that the use of Glagolitic script was never so widespread as in the 16th century, see the maps for its use from the 11th to the 18th century in Fučić, *Epigraphy* 8-11; for the 16th see *ibid.* 10. For the epigraphic evidence for the use of Glagolitic as opposite to Cyrillic in the period to the late twelfth century see *idem*, *Inscriptions* 259-282. Owing to Ottoman conquest no bishops were appointed to Macarsca from the late 15th century until 1615 but Christianity survived there, see Jurić, *Crkva* 31-42, and Pandić, *Izvjestaji* 141-143; for a list of the bishops of the diocese see Gams, *Series* 410. The Latin as opposed to the Croat names of the sees are used here as they were in common usage at the time of the Council of Trent. Whether there were any Glagoljaši in the sees of Duvno or Trebinje in Herzegovina at this time is difficult to say; see on them Jurić, *Crkva* 33-34 and 79-82, respectively.

⁹ By Counter-Reformation is meant the struggle against the rise of Protestantism, not the revival of the Catholic Church, for which the term Catholic Reform[ation] is to be preferred, see Jedin, *Reformation* 35-38, who, *ibid.* 66, pointed out:

Das Tridentinum steht am Schnittpunkt beider Bewegungen und dient beiden.

¹⁰ The actual fact of affixing the theses has been challenged, see Iserloh, *Luther* 65-80. The theses ed. *LW* i, 233-238; their original version ed. Honselmann, *Urfassung* 136-148.

¹¹ See Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* nos. 1-14 (High German) and 15-18 (Low German). In view of the high cost of the editions and the limited spread of literacy it would, however, be misleading to consider that prior to the Reformation reading the Bible in the vernacular was a popular pastime, see Gawthrop, *Protestantism* 40-43.

¹² *KCST* i, nos. 2-3. For a facsimile edition of the second edition see Olesch, *Bibel* [i] 2^f-612^v.

¹³ Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 4184; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* no. *9.

¹⁴ *KCST* i, no. 1097.

¹⁵ Nemirovskij, *Gesamtkatalog* iii, nos. 14-17; for the others see *ibid.* nos. 18-23, 27-36. On Skorina's use of the 1506 edition of the Czech Bible see Florovsky, *Bibliya* 166-186, and Alsekeyev, *Pesn'* 286-287, who gives examples of readings that agree with the revised 1506 edition in the Song of Songs. For a facsimile reprint of Skorina's Bible see Kuz'min, *Bibliya* i, 5-827; ii, 5-806; iii, 5-775.

By the end of 1517 Luther's theses had been published three times¹⁶ and it has been estimated that by the end of 1520 some 30 of his writings were available in about 370 editions with an average print run of 1000 copies.¹⁷ There can be absolutely no doubt but that the rapid spread of the new ideas and their ultimate success in many regions was in no small measure due to the invention of movable type by Johann Gutenberg (c. 1400-1468), marked by the appearance of the first full-length book, the celebrated Gutenberg Bible, at Mainz in c. 1455,¹⁸ and it is little wonder that in 1532 Luther called the invention of printing God's supreme last gift.¹⁹ Since for Luther the sole authority was Scripture, it was imperative that a translation based upon the Greek and Hebrew originals and not upon the Vulgate, as previous German translations had been, should be available to all and so in December 1521 he began translating the New Testament using the second edition of the Greek text published by Desiderius Erasmus (1466/9-1536) with the latter's own parallel Latin translation at Basel in 1519.²⁰ A mere eleven weeks later in March 1522 he had completed the task and his translation was published at Wittenberg on 21 September 1522 with a print run of 3000 copies.²¹ By the time Luther's translation of the complete Bible appeared at Wittenberg in September 1534²² at least 87 editions of his

¹⁶ Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 87-89; see also *LW* i, 230-231.

¹⁷ Clemen, *Reformation* 11; for a bibliography of Luther's printed works down to his death in 1546 see Benzing, *Bibliographie, passim*; for all 16th-century editions published in those regions where German was spoken see *VD16* xvi, L 3307-7641.

¹⁸ Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6076. The most recent reprints are that published at Valencia in 1995 in 2 vols. with a *Kommentarband* ed. D. Briesemeister and that reprinted at Hildesheim in 2000 in 2 vols. with a *Handbuch zur B42. Grundlegende Beiträge zur 42-zeiligen Gutenberg Bibel*, ed. W. Schmidt and F. Schmidt-Kunsemüller, Münster 1995.

¹⁹ *LW.TR* ii, 650, no. 2772 b:

summum et postremum donum, durch welche Gott die sache treibet.

In one version the words *des Evangelii* are found after *sache*, *ibidem*. On the influence of printing on the spread of the Reformation see Clemen, *Reformation* 7-18. This was in no small measure due to the thousands of pamphlets which were published; for a brief survey with bibliography see Moeller, *Flugschriften* 240-246. For an edition of a considerable number see Laube, *Flugschriften passim* (1518-1524), and *idem*, *Reformation passim* (1525-1530).

²⁰ Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 4597; the *editio princeps* had appeared at Basel in 1516, *ibid.* no. 4592; for a reprint of the third edition of 1522 see Le Clerc, *Desiderii* vi, 2-52 [no pagination=], 1-1126. On Luther's principle of *sola scriptura* see below note 70.

²¹ *Das Neue Testament De□tisch*. Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* ii, no. 1522.1; Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 4188; Reinitzer, *Biblia* no. 73; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* no. 19. Although the Greek text had been consulted the translation was made from Latin.

²² *Biblia/das ist/ die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch. Mart. Luth. Wittemberg. Begnadet mit Kurfürstlicher (sic) zu Sachsen Freiheit*. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 4199; Reinitzer, *Biblia* no. 97; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* no. 41. Reprint ed. H. Volz, Munich 1974. Strange to relate, the Low German version of Luther's translation prepared under the supervision of Johannes Bugenhagen (1485-1558) had appeared at Lübeck on 1 April 1534 even before the appearance of Luther's original version:

De Biblie uth der uthlegginge Doctoris Martini Luthers yn dyth d□desche vlitich utgesettet mit sundergen unterrichtingen also men seen mach

Reinitzer, *Biblia* no. 96. The final version of the High German Bible revised by Luther himself was published at Wittenberg in 1545:

Biblia: Das ist: Die gantze Heilige Schrifft/Deudsch/Auffs new zugericht. D. Mart. Luth. Begnadet mit Kurfürstlicher zu Sachsen Freiheit.

Reprint ed. W. Hoffmann, *Biblia germanica*. Stuttgart 1967¹; 1983².

New Testament had appeared as well as 22 of a Low German translation of it²³ and it has been estimated that one in ten German households possessed a copy.²⁴

To counter the influence of Luther's translation Hieronymus Emser (1478-1527) at the instigation of Duke George of Saxony (1500-1539) published his revision of Luther's translation of the New Testament at Dresden in 1527, which by 1587 had gone through at least 17 editions.²⁵ Emser had used the Vulgate as the basis of his revision and in 1530 Luther published a fierce criticism of it, referring to Emser as the scribbler at Dresden,²⁶ although it must be admitted that while it cannot rival Luther's version, Emser's is not without its merits.²⁷ Even before Luther's complete Bible appeared in September 1534 the first edition of its Catholic rival by the Dominican Johannes Dietenberger (c. 1475-1537) had been published at Mainz on 27 June of the same year.²⁸ Thus by 1534 the Bible in the vernacular had become a controversial issue in the religious turmoil in Germany.

Although in Luther's day many Sorbs (Wends) still inhabited the region of Wittenberg only some 120 kilometres from Cottbus, the centre of the Lower Sorbian region, the idea of having the Bible translated into Sorbian, despite the fact that most Sorbs *volens nolens* became Protestants,²⁹ never seems to have occurred to either Luther, who was indubitably prejudiced against this worst of all nations, as he called them,³⁰ or Philipp Melancthon (1495-1560), whose son-in-law, the Cryptocalvinist Caspar Peucer (1525-1602), was a Sorb from

²³ Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* ii, 293-322; Vogel, *Buchdrucke* 27-31, 36-37.

²⁴ Tschirch, *Geschichte* ii, 110. This figure is only approximative as it assumes an average print run of 2000 copies and a population of 15 million in 1525.

²⁵ *Das new Testament nach lawt der Christlichen Kirchen bewerten text, corrigirt, und widerumb zu recht gebracht*. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 4191; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* no. 158. As in the case of Luther's complete Bible the *editio princeps* had been preceded by a Low German version which had appeared at Cologne in 1526, see *VD* 16 ii, B 4506. For later editions of Emser's New Testament see *ibid.* ii, B 4382-4384, 4389-4390, 4392, 4406, 4411, 4424-4425, 4446, 4448, 4465, 4470, 4472, 4478, 4485-4486. On Emser see *KTR* i, 37-46; for a list of his works see Klaiber, *Kontroverstheologen* nos. 957-1002.

²⁶ *Ein sendbrieff D.M. Luthers. Vom Dolmetzchen und Fürbit der heiligen*, ed. *LW* xxx, 2, 632-646, see 634: *den Sudler zu Dresen*. The *editio princeps* of the *Sendbrieff* appeared at Nuremberg in 1530 and there were six more editions in the same year: Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 2840-2846.

²⁷ For example, his rendering of Galatians 1:11, see Bluhm, *Emser's* 388.

²⁸ Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 4200; Vogel, *Buchdrucke* no. 175:

Biblia, beider Allt und Newen Testamenten, fleissig, treulich und Christlich, nach alter inn Christlicher Kirchen gehabter Tradition, mit auszlegung etlicher dunckeler ort, unnd besserung viler verrückter wort und sprüch [...].

For the New Testament he had used Emser's version and had made use of those parts of the Old Testament which Luther had published between 1524 and 1534, on which translations see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* ii, nos. 298-301, 317-322; Reinitzer, *Biblia* nos. 78-84, 88-89, 91-95; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* 28-29. Dietenberger's Bible remained popular and in various revisions went through at least 58 editions down until the 18th century. For a list of his works see Klaiber, *Kontroverstheologen* nos. 828-853; for the Bible see no. 849.

²⁹ For a recent brief survey of the spread of the Reformation among the Sorbs see Blaschke, *Lausitzen* 98-109.

³⁰ This is what he called them in late May or early June 1540: *LW.TR* iv, 606, no. 4997: *pessima omnium natio*; cf. his remarks of late September or early October 1532 about *die untreuen Wenden*, *ibid.* ii, 236, no. 1847. On his prejudice see Hauptmann, *Bibel* 136-138.

Bautzen, and it was not until 1706 that a New Testament and in 1738 a complete Bible, both in Upper Sorbian, were published.³¹

In 1520 Luther asserted that to attend mass without understanding and meditating upon the words spoken was of no avail³² and it is hence scarcely surprising that in the same year he was advocating the use of German in the liturgy.³³ It should not, of course, be considered that calls for the use of the vernacular in liturgy and Scripture were exclusively Protestant in origin. Thus, for instance, it featured most strongly in the appeal for reforms submitted to Pope Leo X (1513-1521) in 1513 by the Camaldolese monks Tommaso (in religion Paulus) Giustiniani (1476-1528) and Vincenzo (in religion Petrus) Quirini (1479-1514).³⁴ However, for Luther as for other Protestants, it was not only the question of the language of the mass which was important: the order of service had to be purged of all later accretions not of apostolic origin and Luther rejected appeals to the Fathers or ecclesiastical decrees to justify later additions.³⁵ The first Evangelical order of service was not in fact published by Luther but by Caspar Kantz († 1544), prior of the Carmelite monastery at Nördlingen (1513-1518, 1519-1523), in that town in 1522.³⁶ A friend of Luther's, Nicolaus Hausmann (1478/9-1538), who had become priest at St. Mary's in Zwickau in 1521, several times urged

³¹ Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 3, nos. 9677-9678. On Caspar Peucer's relations with the Slavs, especially the Czechs, see Benz, *Wittenberg* 129-140.

³² *De captivitate Babylonica ecclesiae praeludium*, ed. *LW* vi, 497-573, see 517:

Recte itaque dixi, totam virtutem Missae consistere in verbis Christi, quibus testatur remissionem peccatorum donari omnibus, qui credunt corpus eius tradi et sanguinem eius fundi pro se. Atque ob hanc rem nulla re magis opus esse auditoris Missam quam ut ipsa verba sedulo et plena fide meditentur, quod nisi fecerint, frustra omnia alia fecerint.

There were five editions of this work in 1520, Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 704-708, as well as five of a German translation, *ibid.* i, nos. 712-716.

³³ *Ein Sermon von dem neuen Testament, das ist von der heyligen Messe*, ed. *LW* vi, 353-378, see 362:

Warumb solten wir Deutschen nit meß leßen auff unser sprach, ßo die Latinischen, Kriechen und vil andere auff yhre sprach meß halten?

There were no fewer than eleven editions of the sermon in 1530, see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 669-679. On Luther's views on the use of the vernacular in the liturgy see Schmidt, *Liturgie* 23-58.

³⁴ *Libellus ad Leonem X, Pontificem Maximum*, ed. Mittarelli, *Annales* ix, 612-719, see 681-683: they challenge the benefit of readings or chants which neither those who recite them nor those who hear them understand, *ibid.* 681-682; they foresee greater attendances at services which are understood, *ibid.* 682, and conclude:

nihil in tota Ecclesia magis necessarium esse, nihil utilius omnino futurum, nihil magis decorum, atque secundum Sanctorum Patrum disciplinam institui posse, quam haec Sanctarum Scripturarum, quae in Ecclesia leguntur, ex Latino in vulgarem sermonem permutatio.

Ibid. 683. On such early Catholic calls for the use of the vernacular in the liturgy see Lentner, *Volkssprache* 212-225.

³⁵ *De abroganda missa privata Martini Lutheri sententia*, ed. *LW* viii, 411-476, see 448: his opponents *solent iactare patres, patres, decreta, decreta, ecclesia, ecclesia, quoties nos a verbis dei in verba hominum trahere conantur [...]. Nos quoque hic dicimus et multo fortius clamamus: Evangelium, Evangelium, Christus, Christus.*

This work was written in 1521 and published in January 1522 at Wittenberg, in which year there were four editions, see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 997-1000.

³⁶ *Von der Evangelischen Messz, wie man sye halten soll*, ed. *EKO* xii, 2, 285-288, and Smend, *Messen* 73-78; a Low German version appeared at Bremen in 1525, ed. *ibid.* 90-93; for a modern German translation see *ibid.* 90-92. It is disputed whether it was intended for a mass in Latin, thus Fendt, *Gottesdienst* 88-89, or in German, thus J. Smend in *EKO* xii, 2, 274.

Luther to complete his new order of service but it was not until 4 December 1523 that Luther sent him a copy which had been published at Wittenberg in that year.³⁷ To Luther's claim that he had expurgated the order of service and retained only that which was pure and holy,³⁸ Emser in the following year rightly replied that the Gospels do not reveal what the earliest order of service was and that the original evangelical rudiments had been completed by the Church with the aid of the Holy Spirit.³⁹

It was at the time commonly believed that the early Church had celebrated the sacraments in Hebrew and so in answer to Luther's claim that it was an error to use a language not understood by the common people,⁴⁰ Emser sarcastically replied that the Apostles must have been wrong to celebrate in Hebrew no matter where they were, which had been the Eastern custom until the time of Emperor Hadrian (117-138), when, as chroniclers record, the use of Greek had been introduced.⁴¹ This reference to chroniclers is probably an allusion to William Durandus the Elder (c. 1231-1296), who asserted precisely this in his celebrated explanation of the offices, ceremonies and feasts of the Church first published at Mainz in 1459.⁴² Emser then continued that only the three langua-

³⁷ *Formula missae et communionis pro Ecclesia Vuittembergensi*, ed. LW xii, 205-220. Three editions appeared in that year, see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 1689, 1698-1699. As all too many of Luther's writings, it was marred by somewhat intemperate language, e.g.

At ubi iam licentia fiebat addendi et mutandi, prout cuius libebat, accedente tum et quaestus et ambitionis sacerdotalis tyrannide, tum ceperunt altaria illa et insignia Baal et omnium deorum poni in templum domini per impios reges nostros, id est, Episcopos et pastores.

Ed. LW xii, 207. The following year a German translation by Paul Speratus (Hoffer, 1484-1551) was published at Wittenberg, six more editions appearing in the same year, see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 1700-1705. A second German translation, possibly by Andreas Osiander, was also published in 1524 at Nuremberg and went through five editions, see *ibid.* i, nos. 1706-1710

³⁸ LW xii, 211:

Proinde omnibus illis repudiatis quae oblationem sonant, cum universo Canone, retineamus, quae pura et sancta sunt, ac sic Missam nostram ordiamur.

Cf. his exclamation in his *De abroganda missa privata*:

Cede, canon, Evangelio et da locum spiritui sancto, cum sis verbum humanum!

Ibid. viii, 448.

³⁹ *Missae Christianorum contra Lutheranam missandi formulam assertio*, ed. Freudenberger, *Hieronymus* 1-37, see 9:

Ad hoc respondemus Luthero frustra eum sive missam sive alios Christianorum ritus ad evangelium revocare. Neque enim evangelium neque Christus ipse exactam mysteriorum suorum formam nobis tradidit, sed prima tantum rudimenta a spiritu sancto et ecclesia deinde absolvenda.

This refutation of Luther's *Formula missae*, which takes the form of a disputation in which Luther's assertions are first printed *in extenso* and then refuted, was first published at Leipzig in 1524; the fifth edition appeared at Cologne in 1532; on the editions see *ibid.* XIII-XXI; on Emser's *Assertatio* see *ibid.* X-XIII, and Iserloh, *Kampf* 20-26.

⁴⁰ See his *Formula missae* ed. LW xii, 207.

⁴¹ Ed. Freudenberger, *Hieronymus* 13:

Ergo vicium fuit, quod apostoli, ad quascumque gentes pervenissent, non nisi Haebraica lingua divina peragebant mysteria? Qui mos etiam in tota orientali ecclesia usque ad Adriani tempora observatus est. Tunc enim, ut dicunt chronographi, primum Graece celebrari ceptum est.

⁴² *Rationale divinatorum officiorum* iv, 1, 10. *Editio princeps*: GKWD vii, no. 9101. There were at least 104 editions down to the 19th century; see the critical edition by Davril, *Guillelmi* i, 3-565; ii, 9-583; iii, 9-195, see i, 242:

ges of the superscription on the Cross, viz. Hebrew, Latin and Greek, had been deemed suitable for celebrating the liturgy although he remembered having read in Blondus Flavius' *Italia illustrata* that St. Jerome (c. 347-420) had not merely devised a Slavonic alphabet but had also translated the mass into that language, which had latterly been confirmed by Pope Eugenius IV (1431-1447).⁴³

Biondo Flavio (1392-1463) had been appointed a notary in the *Camera apostolica* between 16 December 1432 and 11 March 1433⁴⁴ and by 1 March 1434 he had become pontifical secretary to Eugenius IV⁴⁵ and as such was an important official whose duties involved the authentication of pontifical documents, amongst which were the bull of union of the Eastern and Western Churches, *Laetentur coeli*, of 6 July 1439⁴⁶ and the bull *Cantate Domino* of 4 February 1442 establishing union with the Coptic Church.⁴⁷ His various works on archaeology, geography and history earned for him an honourable place among the Christian humanists of his day. His *Italia illustrata*, begun in 1448 and finished in 1453, is a geographical, topographical and historical description of 14 of the 18 regions into which he had divided Italy.⁴⁸ For the earlier period he relied on classical authors such as Strabo (64/3 BC-AD 21), Livy (c. 59 BC-c. AD 17) and Pliny the Elder (23/4-79) but he also used mediaeval chroniclers, contemporary writers and his own observations and although his work contains much inaccurate material it is the first attempt at a systematic description of the country and an important mine of information.⁴⁹

Rursus, in primitiva Ecclesia divina misteria hebraice celebrabantur, sed tempore Adriani I imperatoris, grece in orientali Ecclesia primo celebrari ceperunt.

This was pointed out by Freudenberger, *Hieronymus* 13, n. 80; on the partial Slavonic translation of the *Rationale* see Thomson, *Greek* 174-175.

⁴³Ed. Freudenberger, *Hieronymus* 13-14:

Et id quidem crucis titulus solum his tribus linguis, Hebraica videlicet, Latina et Graeca, inscriptus prae se ferre videtur, ut solum his linguis passionis tractetur mysterium. Quamvis apud Blondum Flavium De Italia illustrata legisse me olim meminerim (eo loci, ubi tam Histriam quam divum nostrum Hieronymum Italiae vendicat) non solum linguam ac litteras Sclavonicas ab eodem Hieronymo primum repertas (unde et Sclavus a quibusdam habitus sit) sed etiam totum missae officium in eandem linguam ab eo traductum, quod Eugenius IV postea huic genti ob veterem ac gentilicium erga divum Hieronymum amorem confirmaverit.

⁴⁴ On him see Nogara, *Scritti* XXI-CXCIII; for his appointment see LVII, n. 84.

⁴⁵ See *ibid.* LXIII, n. 87 bis.

⁴⁶ Ed. *CFLOR* i, 2, 68-79, see 77, nn. 16-18.

⁴⁷ Ed. *CFLOR* i, 3, 46-65, see 63 and 65; for other documents of the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1437-1445) see *ibid.* i, 1, 87; i, 2, 4, 12, 14, 83, 106, 120, 141; i, 3, 35, 45, 91, 105, 108. For unknown reasons he fell into disfavour during the pontificate of Nicholas V (1447-1455) and resigned in 1449 but was reinstated on 30 September 1553, see Nogara, *Scritti* CXIII-CXXI, and remained in office until his death.

⁴⁸ It remained unfinished as he had lent a copy to an unnamed bishop who began to revise it and so Biondo preferred to issue it in an incomplete form rather than see it altered, see Clavuot, *Biondos* 50-51, and Nogara, *Scritti* CXXV.

⁴⁹ As Clavuot in the most detailed study of the work put it:

Die "Italia illustrata" ist insofern summa und Neuschöpfung als sie Vorhandenes zu einer originellen, eine neue Tradition historischer Topographie begründenden Synthese bündelt. Idem, Biondos 306.

The *editio princeps* appeared at Rome in 1474, *GKWD* iv, no. 4421; the second edition bound with two other of his works was published at Verona in 1482, *ibid.* iv, no. 4423. This edition, in which *Italia illustrata* is on the

In the section on Istria, the eleventh of the fourteen regions described, after having pointed out that St. Jerome was born at Strido, Biondo reports that it was widely believed that Jerome was a Dalmatian as he had invented a script different to Latin or Greek which was afterwards called Slavonic by the Slavs who inhabited Germany, viz. those who are now called Bohemians, some of whom had shortly after Jerome's death occupied Dalmatia, which had ever since been called Sclavonia. Indeed Jerome had not merely invented Slavonic letters but had also translated the divine office used by Catholic Christians from Greek into the new idiom, which Pope Eugenius IV had confirmed for them by his, viz. Biondo's, hands.⁵⁰ The first recorded evidence for the theory that Jerome had translated the divine offices into Slavonic using a special script invented for that purpose, viz. Glagolitic, is the permission accorded on 29 March 1248 by Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254) to Bishop Philip of Segna (fl. 1247/8) for the liturgy to be celebrated in Slavonic, although the pope referred to the theory as a claim, not a historical fact.⁵¹ St. Jerome was born at Strido in North Dalmatia in c. 347 and the theory is based upon the erroneous assumption that Dalmatia had been settled by the Slavs in the fourth century, whereas there is no evidence for a Slav presence there before the late sixth century.⁵² When the theory first arose is

third foliation, Ai^f-Mv^f, has been used here. It has no title-page listing all the contents. Its text has been compared with that of the third edition, which appeared at Basel in 1531 with the title:

Blondi Flavii Forliviensis de Roma triumphante libri decem, priscorum scriptorum lectoribus utilissimi, ad totiusque Romanae antiquitatis cognitionem pernecessarij. Romae instauratae libri iii. Italia illustrata. Historiarum ab inclinato Rom. imperio Decades iii. Omnia multo quàm ante castigatiora.

The *Italia illustrata* is on pages 293-422 of the first pagination; on Istria see 386-388. On Biondos' many sources see Clavuot, *Biondos* 138-182, 201-302.

⁵⁰ 2nd edition Jv^{r-v}; 3rd edition 388:

Videmus vero multos in eam de qua diximus opinionem ductos fuisse, ut crederent beatum Hieronymum Dalmatam fuisse, quia litteras illis adinvenerit composueritque à latinis Graecisque diversas: quae sint postea appellatae sclavonicae a sclavonibus germaniae olim populis quos nunc appellant Boëmos, à quibus sicut in historijs ostendimus regio Dalmatiae Histris contermina paulopost functum vita ipsum beatum Hieronymum fuit occupata, et semper postea sicut nunc quosque fit Sclavonia est dicta, et quidem non solum eas praedictis composuit, deditque sclavonicas litteras: sed officium quoque divinum quo catholici utuntur christiani ex Graeco in id novum idioma traduxit: quod gloriosus pontifex Eugenius quartus per nostras manus illis confirmavit. Quo tempore apud Florentiam et Graecorum unio cum ecclesia occidentali est facta, et armenij jacobitae Nestorini et aethiopes acceperunt ab eodem Eugenio catholicae ecclesiae documenta.

Biondo's statement that Eugenius confirmed the privilege was later repeated, firstly by Iacopo Filippo Foresti of Bergamo (1434-1520) in his *Supplementum chronicarum*, which was first published at Venice in 1483, see Hain, *Repertorium* i, no. 2805; see the sixth 1492 Venice edition 142^f, but no such confirmation has been traced and the suggestion that it refers to an attempted reconciliation with Bosnian heretics, thus Runje, *Knjigama* 119-120, is purely hypothetical. On such attempts see Loos, *Heresy* 311-318, and Rački, *Bogomili* 450-470.

⁵¹ Ed. Jelič, *Fontes* [13th century] 9:

Porrecta nobis tua petitio continebat, quod in Sclavonia est littera specialis, quam illius terre clerici se habere a beato Jeronimo asserentes, eam observant in divinis officiis.

The claim that this statement does not imply that Jerome invented the script but merely that the Croats had inherited it from him, thus Čegvič, *Origini* 49, depends on the discredited theory that Glagolitic was invented by Pseudo-Aethicus of Istria, a theory that need not be examined here. The bishop's petition has not survived.

⁵² On their settlement of the region see, for example, Guldescu, *History* 44-71; Katičić, *Literaturgeschichte* 114-152; Klaič, *Povijest* 126-140. The exact location of Strido on the Dalmatian-Pannonian frontier is uncertain.

unknown⁵³ but a century later in his charter of 21 November 1347 for a Benedictine monastery at Prague in which the celebration of the divine office according to the Glagolitic rite had been authorized by Pope Clement VI (1343-1352) on 9 May 1346,⁵⁴ King Charles IV of Bohemia (1346-1378, Emperor in 1355) specifically referred to Jerome as the translator of Scripture from Hebrew into both Latin and Slavonic, from which latter language Czech was derived.⁵⁵ The theory continued its existence down the centuries and was, for instance, referred to by Pope Pius VI (1775-1799) in his bull *Suprema potestas* of 11 March 1791 approving the Glagolitic breviary published at Rome in that year.⁵⁶ As will be seen, this erroneous theory of the Hieronymian origin of the Glagolitic rite was to play a significant part in the debates at the Council of Trent.

Luther never replied to Emser's attack, presumably because he realized that neither he nor Emser was able to establish the apostolic form of the mass and by the time that he published his order for the new German evangelical mass in 1525⁵⁷ German had been introduced in the mass both in cities such as Nuremberg by Andreas Osiander (1496/8-1552) and Strassburg by Martin Bucer (1491-1551) and in towns such as Allstedt by Thomas Münzer (c. 1490-1525)

⁵³ The claim that it is much earlier than the 13th century, thus Graciotti, *Slave* 95, ignores the wise counsel of Slobodan Fomič: *Noli incognoscibilia affirmare*.

⁵⁴ See the papal breve to Ernest of Pardubitz (c. 1305-1364), bishop (1343-1364, archbishop in 1344) of Prague, ed. Helmling, *Registrum* 6-8.

⁵⁵ Ed. *ibid.* 8-12, see 9-10:

Papa Clemens [...] committere voluit, ut ipse in nostra civitate Pragensi monasterium conventuale et claustrale ordinis sancti Benedicti instituere et auctoritate possit apostolica ordinare, institutis ibidem abbate et fratribus, qui domino famulantes divina officia in lingua slavonica dumtaxat ob reverenciam et memoriam gloriosi confessoris beati Jeronimi, Stridonum doctoris egregii et translatoris interpretisque eximii sacre scripture de ebrayca in latinam et slavonicam linguas, de qua siquidem slavonica nostri regni Boemie ydioma sumpsit exordium primordialiter et processit, debeant futuris temporibus celebrare.

The considerable literature devoted to this monastery, which only became known as Emaus in the 17th century, is in inverse proportion to its historical significance. On it see also below note 289.

⁵⁶ Ed. Jelič, *Fontes* [18th century] 67-68, see 67:

accepimus Breviarium, Ritu quidem Romano, sed Idiomate Slavonico et caractere S. Hieronymi vulgo nuncupato conscriptum.

This is the sixth edition of the Glagolitic breviary, the third to be published at Rome: Kruming, *Katalog* no. 52. (with the misprint 1771 for 1791). On the cult of St. Jerome in Croatia see most recently Runje, *Knjigama* 108-115.

⁵⁷ *Deutsche Messe und ordnung Gottis diensts*, ed. LW xix, 72-113. In the preface he advocates the desirability of the retention of celebrating mass in Latin and even of introducing its celebration in Greek and Hebrew not for religious but for educational purposes and attacks the Bohemian "Waldensians", viz. Hussites, for insisting upon Czech alone as it cut them off from other Christians:

Ich halte es gar nichts mit denen, die nur auff eyne sprache sich so gar geben und alle andere verachten. Denn ich wolte gerne solche jugent und leute auffziehen, die auch ynn frembden landen kunden Christo nütze seyn und mit den leuten reden, das nicht uns gienge wie den Waldenser ynn Behemen, die yhren glauben ynn yhre eygene sprach so gefangen haben, das sie mit niemand können verstendlich und deutlich reden, er lerne denn zuvor yhre sprache.

Ibid. 74. There were nine editions of the order of service in 1526, see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* nos. 2239-2243, 2245-2248.

and Reutlingen by Matthäus Alber (1495-1570).⁵⁸ By the time that Jean Calvin (1509-1564) had accepted Protestant beliefs in the early 1530s the use of the vernacular in the liturgy had become so common that it no longer required defending. Thus in his first Protestant publication, which appeared at Basel in 1536, Calvin simply states that any sound which is not understood bears absolutely no fruit and asserts Pauline authority for the use of the vernacular by reference to 1 Corinthians 14, which he claims is unambiguous on the matter.⁵⁹ To quote this Biblical passage in this context is totally inadmissible since Paul's strictures in 1 Corinthians 14 :13-33 do not refer to the use of foreign languages not understood by the faithful in church services but to glossolalia, which is not to be allowed unless there is someone present who can interpret it.⁶⁰ Nevertheless this misinterpretation of the passage as referring to foreign languages goes back at least to the fourth century⁶¹ and was frequently invoked at the dawn of Slav letters, *inter alia* in the bull *Industriae tuae* of June 880, whereby Pope John VIII (872-882) gave permission for the use of Slavonic in the liturgy,⁶² in the preface to the evangeliary often ascribed to St. Cyril himself⁶³ and in the defence of the use of Slavonic in the liturgy put into the mouth of St. Cyril in his *vita*.⁶⁴ This misinterpretation, as will be seen, also featured in the debates at the Council of Trent.

In the defence of his theses of 1517, which Luther published in 1518, the reformer expounded the conciliarist view that in matters of faith a general council is the supreme authority to which the pope is subordinate.⁶⁵ This conciliarist posi-

⁵⁸ On the new Protestant ideas of liturgy see Graff, *Geschichte* i, 1-18; see also below note 164.

⁵⁹ *Christianae religionis institutio totam fere pietatis summam et quidquid est in doctrina salutis cognitu necessarium complectens* [...]. Ed. CREF xxix, 1-252, see 88:

populari sermone concipiendas esse publicas orationes, qui vulgo a toto coetu intellegi possit; quandoquidem in totius ecclesiae aedificationem fieri convenit, ad quam ex sono non intellecto nullus penitus fructus redit. Apud quos vero nulla est caritatis ratio, ii saltem Pauli autoritate moveri debebant, cuius verba minime ambigua sunt (1 Cor. 14).

For the 1536 edition see Peter, *Bibliotheca* i, no. 36/1. The Calvinist catechism compiled in 1541-1545 makes the point even more forcefully and supports it by the same Biblical reference:

Qu'est-ce de prier en langue incongneue? C'est une moquerie de Dieu, et une hypocrisie perverse (1 Cor. 14).

Le catechisme de l'Eglise de Genève: c'est à dire, le Formulaire d'instruire les enfans en la Chrestienté: fait en maniere de dialogue, ou le Ministre interroque, et l'enfant respond, ed. CREF xxxiv, 1-146, see 87; Niesel, *Bekenntnisschriften* 3-41, see 27. The earliest surviving edition of the Catechism is that published at Geneva in 1545, see *ibid.* 1-2. On Calvin's views on the use of the vernacular in the liturgy see Schmidt, *Liturgie* 63-71.

⁶⁰ There is a large literature concerning glossolalia; with regard to this Biblical passage see, for instance, Richardson, *Order* 144-151, with a bibliography 151-153.

⁶¹ The earliest such misinterpretation known to the author is that in the *Commentaria in xii epistolas beati Pauli* by an unknown author at the time of Pope Damasus I (366-384) known as "Ambrosiaster" as the work was frequently falsely ascribed to St. Ambrose (337/9-397), ed. *PL* xvii, 47-536, see 269-270. For another early misinterpretation see below note 217.

⁶² Ed. Grivec, *Constantinus* 72-73, see 73.

⁶³ Ed. Hansack, *Blatt* 342-346, see 346. The ascription cannot be examined here.

⁶⁴ Ed. Grivec, *Constantinus* 95-142, see 135-136. For further examples of this misinterpretation see below notes 169, 174, 217, 223, 227 and 281.

⁶⁵ *Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute*, ed. *LW* i, 525-628, see 568:

on he reiterated in his call on 28 November 1518 for a general council to pass judgement on his views,⁶⁶ in which he insisted that if the pope issued erroneous instructions or decrees he was to be resisted just as St. Paul had censored St. Peter.⁶⁷ However, in 1519 a decisive event occurred, viz. the Leipzig Disputation between the Protestant Andreas Karlstadt (Bodenstein, 1486-1541) and the Catholic Johannes Eck (1486-1543) between 27 June and 3 July and again on July 14 to 15 and between Eck and Luther from 4 to 14 July, in the course of which with specific reference to the Council of Constance (1414-1418) Luther had been forced to concede that general councils had erred.⁶⁸ In their joint letter of 18 August to Elector Frederick III of Saxony (1486-1525) justifying their stance in the Disputation Luther and Karlstadt again repeated that the Council of Constance had shown that general councils can err and insisted that papal primacy is not of divine origin.⁶⁹ This rejection of both papal primacy and the infallibility of oecumenical councils betokens the acceptance of *sola Scriptura* as the formal principle of the Reformation.⁷⁰

It is, of course, true that the decree *Haec sancta*, adopted *apostolica sede vacante* on 6 April 1415 by the Council of Constance, had subordinated the authority of the pope to that of a general council⁷¹ but it had never been recognized by a pope and indeed even before he left Constance Pope Martin V (1417-1431), whose election at Constance on 11 November 1417 had put an end to the Great Schism of 1378-1417, at a general consistory on 10 May 1418 had promulgated the constitution *Ad perpetuam rei memoriam* which prohibited appeals from the pope to a council,⁷² a prohibition repeated by the bull *Execrabilis* of 18 January

Cum enim haec res sit fidei quidam articulus, si fuerit determinatus, adeo non pertinet ad doctores diffinire, quod etiam ad solum concilii universalis iudicium sit suspendendus nec summus Pontifex quid temere in iis habeat statuere quae sunt fidei.

The *editio princeps* appeared at Wittenberg in 1518 and by the end of 1519 there had been four editions, see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 205-208.

⁶⁶*Appellatio F. Martini Luther ad Concilium*, ed. *LW* ii, 36-40, see 36: a council is *in causis fidem concernentibus supra Papam*; also ed. in Fabisch, *Dokumente* ii, 218-227, see 219. There were no fewer than ten editions of this pamphlet in 1518, see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 240-248 (including 244a). On Luther's call for a council see Becker, *Appellation* 244-253; Brockmann, *Konzilsfrage* 49-54; Jedin, *Geschichte* i, 135-158.

⁶⁷Ed. *LW* ii, 37; Fabisch, *Dokumente* ii, 222:

Si quis Summus Pontifex eadem Petri vel simili infirmitate lapsus quid praeceperit vel decreverit, quod contra divina militet mandata, non solum obediendum ei non esse, verum etiam cum Apostolo Pauli in faciem ei resisti posse, immo debere.

The reference is to the incident reported in Galatians 2:11-14.

⁶⁸ See the account taken down by notaries present, ed. *LW* ii, 254-283, see 308, as well as Eck's comments on this admission, *ibid.* 311. On Eck see *KTR* i, 65-71.

⁶⁹ Ed. *LW.BW* i, 465-501, see 471: *Primatus Romanae ecclesiae non est iure divino*. On Luther's attitude towards councils see Stupperich, *Reformatoren* 23-27.

⁷⁰ See the remarks of Stakemeier, *Lehrentscheidungen* 79. There is a large literature on the principle, see, for instance, Ebeling, *Scriptura* 95-127, 172-183, and Liebing, *Scriptura* 81-95.

⁷¹ Ed. Mansi, *Conciliorum* xxvii, 590-591, see 591. The controversy surrounding the validity of this decree cannot be examined here; see the recent literature listed by Frenken, *Erforschung* 365-389.

⁷² As far as is known it was never issued as a bull but its contents were recorded by the celebrated French theologian Jean Charlier of Gerson (1363-1429), who was present, in his brief treatise *An liceat in causis fidei a Papa appellare*, ed. Glorieux, *Jean* vi, 283-290, see 283; cf. also 290. On this constitution, which was recorded

1459 of Pope Pius II (1458-1464).⁷³ Not that such prohibitions put an end to conciliarism: as recently as 16 May 1511 a group of cardinals with the support of King Louis XII of France (1498-1515) and Emperor Maximilian I (1508-1519) had convoked a council at Pisa for 1 September, ordering Pope Julius II (1503-1513) to appear before it on pain of having any act undertaken against it declared null and void.⁷⁴ On 15 June 1520 Pope Leo X (1513-1521) by his bull *Exurge, Domine* condemned Luther's errors and specifically excluded his appeal to a council,⁷⁵ which did not prevent Luther from repeating his appeal to a council on 17 November.⁷⁶ Less than seven weeks later Luther was excommunicated by the bull *Decet Romanum Pontificem* of 3 January 1521.⁷⁷

The Diet of Worms (27 January-26 May 1521) revealed how divided the Empire already was: Luther was heard but refused to recant⁷⁸ and although Emperor Charles V (1519-1556, \perp 1558) signed the Edict of Worms outlawing Luther and condemning his works on 26 May,⁷⁹ it could not be enforced. Girolamo Aleandro (1480-1542), the papal nuntius to the Empire (1520-1521), informed Rome that everyone at the Diet was calling for a general council to be held in Germany to judge the affair⁸⁰ but warned that this call was directed against papal

in Gerson's treatise written between 10 and 18 May 1418, see Bäumer, *Verbot* 187-213, and Becker, *Appellation* 123-129. The motive for the promulgation of this constitution, viz. the Polish protest at Constance about the *Satira contra hereses et cetera nephanda Polonorum et eorum regis Jaghel* by the Dominican Johannes Falkenberg (c. 1365-c. 1435), cannot be described here; for the background see Brandmüller, *Konzil* ii, 411-413; Thomson, *Gregory* 83-84; Posthumus Meyjes, *Jean* 202-204.

⁷³ Ed. *BDP* v, 149-150. On the background see Becker, *Appellation* 162-195.

⁷⁴ The convocation ed. Mansi, *Conciliorum* xxxii, 563-565; on the background see Becker, *Appellation* 231-243. Julius' reply was the bull *Sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae* of 18 July 1511 convoking the Fifth Lateran Council, ed. *BDP* v, 499-508, which met from 3 May 1512 to 16 March 1517. These events, including the "deposition" of Julius II on 21 April 1512, cannot be examined here; on the schism of 1511-1513 caused by these events see Minnich, *Healing* 59-192, with the addenda in *idem*, *Council* 193*-197*. On the failure of the Lateran Council despite its good intentions to reform the Church see *idem*, *Concepts* 163-251, with the addenda in *idem*, *Council* 252*-254*, and *idem*, *Iudicium* 127-142.

⁷⁵ Ed. *BDP* v, 748-757, see 754; Fabisch, *Dokumente* ii, 364-410, see 396:

addens mala malis, de citatione huiusmodi notitiam habens, in vocem temerariae appellationis prorupit ad futurum concilium, contra constitutionem Pii secundi ac Iulii secundi, praedecessorum nostrorum, qua cavetur, taliter appellantes haereticorum poena plectendos. Frustra etiam concilii auxilium imploravit, qui illi se non credere palam profitetur.

There is also a contemporary German translation by Georg Spalatin (1484-1545), ed. Fabisch, *op. cit.* ii, 365-411, see 397. For the bull of Pius II referred to see above note 73, for that of Julius II see above note 74, whose bull repeats that only a pope can summon a council, ed. *BDP* v, 502.

⁷⁶ *Appellatio D. Martini Lutheri ad Concilium a Leone X. denuo repetita et innovata*, ed. *LW* vii, 75-82; a German version was also published, which went through seven editions in 1520, ed. *ibid.* vii, 85-90. On the editions see Benzing, *Lutherbibliographie* i, nos. 770-771 (Latin), 772-778 (German). This act, somewhat exaggeratedly but not without a grain of truth, has been termed the act *sans doute le plus banal de toute la carrière du réformateur*, Tallon, *Concile* 13.

⁷⁷ Ed. *BDP* v, 761-764; Fabisch, *Dokumente* ii, 457-467.

⁷⁸ The acts of the Diet ed. *DRTA.JR* ii, 153-743; for the *causa Lutheri* see 477-661.

⁷⁹ Ed. *ibid.* ii, 643-659; the imperial order of 26 May for its publication ed. *ibid.* 659-661; the Edict is also edited in Walder, *Kaiser* 35-48.

⁸⁰ See his despatch to Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (1478-1534, Clement VII, 1523-1534), ed. Balan, *Monumenta* 97-105, see 98; Brieger, *Alexander* 47-57, see 48; it is undated but is probably of 8 February 1521, see Brieger, *op. cit.* 274-275.

authority,⁸¹ a warning borne out by an anonymous document drawn up for the Diet in late April in which it was claimed that the papal condemnation of Luther was illegal as it contradicted the decree of the Council of Constance which had subordinated the pope to the supreme authority of a general council.⁸² On 5 February 1523 the Diet of Nuremberg (17 November-9 February 1523) called for the convocation of a free general council in Germany within a year,⁸³ which in view of the papal condemnation of Luther's views was yet another appeal from the pope to a general council.

It was obvious that Rome could not surrender to such calls but it was becoming equally obvious that irrespective of the matter of Luther himself there was an urgent need to reform the many abuses which were disfiguring Church life. However, political events prevented a council from being convoked, not the least being the war between Emperor Charles V and King Francis I of France (1515-1547) from 1520 to 1529, in which the French alliance of Pope Clement VII (1523-1534) led to the sack of Rome by imperial troops in 1527 and the incarceration of the pope himself from 5 June to 6 December 1527, as a result of which Clement VII feared lest his own personal position might be endangered. It was not until the election of Alessandro Farnese (1468-1549) as Paul III on 13 October 1534 that papal policy with regard to the convocation of a general council for ecclesiastical reform changed,⁸⁴ but even then political events three times prevented the council from assembling even after it had been convoked and it is hardly surprising that when it was convoked by the bull *Laetare Jerusalem* of 30 November 1544 at Trent for 15 March 1545⁸⁵ the summons was not taken all too seriously and although the papal legates to the Council, Cardinals Giovanni del Monte (1487-1555) and Marcello Cervini (1501-1555),

⁸¹ Balan, *Monumenta* 103; Brieger, *Aleander* 55.

⁸² Ed. *DRTA.JR* ii, 534-535, see 535. For the decree see above note 71.

⁸³ The acts of the Diet ed. *ibid.* iii, 253-759; see the Diet's official reply to Francesco Chiericato (1479-1539), the papal nuntius to the Diet, who had called for Luther's condemnation, ed. *ibid.* iii, 465-443, see 440: *liberum christianum concilium ad locum convenientem in natione Germanica*. By *free* was meant the acceptance of Scripture as the sole authority, see Stupperich, *Reformatoren* 36. On the calls for a general council to be held in Germany see Jedin, *Geschichte* i, 159-175; for a bibliography of the hundreds of contemporary pamphlets on the issue of the council published in German, approximately two thirds of them Protestant and one third Catholic, see Brockmann, *Konzilsfrage* 452-675. Many such pamphlets were probably incomprehensible as they overestimated the learning of most potential readers, e.g. those of Thomas M nzer are less comprehensible in this sense than those of Martin Luther, see Schuster, *Verst ndlichkeit* 436-444.

⁸⁴ The political events of 1520-1534 cannot be described here; for a brief survey from the point of view of the convocation of the Council see Jedin, *Geschichte* i, 176-215. On Jedin's monumental work on the Council of Trent see Ganzer, *Herbert* 339-354.

⁸⁵ Ed. *CT* iv, 385-388. By the bull *Ad Dominici gregis curam* of 2 June 1536 Paul III had convoked it at Mantua for 23 May 1537, ed. *CT* iv, 2-6; then by *Benedictus Deus* of 8 October 1537 at Vicenza for 1 May 1538, ed. *ibid.* iv, 136-137, and then by *Initio nostri huius pontificatus* of 22 May 1542 at Trent for 1 November 1542, ed. *ibid.* iv, 226-231; for a German translation of this last bull see Schreiber, *Weltkonzil* i, 1-10. On the various reasons, including another outbreak of war between Charles and Francis in 1542-1544, see Jedin, *Geschichte* i, 216-231.

arrived in Trent on 13 March 1545,⁸⁶ it was not until 13 December 1545 that the Council was opened in the presence of only 31 fathers eligible to vote – only two of whom were German, viz. Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo (1512-1578), bishop of Trent (1539-1567)⁸⁷, and Michael Holding (1506-1561), suffragan bishop of Mainz (1537-1549), and the latter was recalled by the new archbishop of Mainz Sebastian von Heusenstamm (1545-1555) and left Trent on 8 January 1546,⁸⁸ leaving only Madruzzo. The basic reason was, of course, the German bishops' fear lest prolonged absence lead to a spread of Protestantism in their dioceses⁸⁹ and the majority of the Council fathers, the largest number of whom during the first period was 71 at the seventh session on 3 March 1547,⁹⁰ were Italians. To put it in a nutshell: the long delay in the convocation of the Council had altered its aim, at least with regard to Northern Europe, from the reduction of the Protestants to the preservation of the remaining Catholics.

A. The First Period of the Council, 13 December 1545-11 March 1547 (formally 14 September 1549).

After the third session on 4 February 1546 the Council addressed itself to the question of the relation between Scripture and Tradition. The principal question with regard to Scripture was twofold: which books belonged to the canon of Scripture and what was the relation of a translation to the original text. This latter question was of especial importance since the Western Church had traditionally used the Vulgate, a Latin version made in the main by St. Jerome.⁹¹ The practical problems with regard to the use of the Vulgate were, firstly, that there

⁸⁶ Together with Cardinal Reginald Pole they had been appointed legates on 25 February 1545, see *CT* iv, 393-394, but Pole only arrived later on 4 May, see *CT* i, 183.

⁸⁷ On the German origins of Madruzzo, originally Madrutsch, see below note 128. He had been created a cardinal *in pectore* in the consistory of 2 June 1542 but the precise date on which his election was announced is uncertain, although it was not later than 1545, see Vercruysee, *Kardinäle* 74, n. 152, who is probably correct, *ibidem*, to remark that the election was due to the choice of Trent as the site of the future Council. Not until the consistory of 6 November 1545 did the pope agree to the date of 13 December, see the letter of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520-1589) to the Council legates of 7 November, ed. *CT* x, 231-232.

⁸⁸ On Holding's departure see Brück, *Erzstift* 194-198; on Madruzzo's German origins see below note 128. For a list of Holding's works see Klaiber, *Kontroverstheologen* nos. 1447-1485. On him see C. Brodkorb in Gatz, *Bischöfe* 277-278.

⁸⁹ It should be pointed out, however, that two other German prelates were represented by procurators, viz. Cardinal Otto Truchsess von Waldburg (1514-1573), bishop of Augsburg (1543-1573), by the Jesuit Claude Le Jay (1504-1552), and Archbishop Johann Ludwig von Hagen of Trier (1540-1547) by the Dominican Ambrosius Pelargus (Storch, c. 1493-1561), see Jedin, *Teilnehmer* (cxxii) 241-243. On the German representation at the second and third periods of the Council see *ibid.* (cxxii) 246-253 and 255-261, (cxxiii) 21-22; on the difficulties concerning the voting rights of procurators see *ibid.* (cxxiii) 23-30. On Truchsess von Waldburg see P. Rummel in Gatz, *Bischöfe* 707-710. He was a friend of Madruzzo. On von Hagen see W. Seibrich in *ibid.* 253-254.

⁹⁰ See *CT* v, 1004-1006. Two procurators were also present.

⁹¹ It has to be borne in mind that the term *editio vulgata* originally meant the Septuagint or its *Vetus latina* translation and it was only in the 16th century that it gradually came to mean the Hieronymian version, see Allgeier, *Editio* 355-386, and Sutcliffe, *Name* 345-352. This can lead to confusion as some of the Council fathers used it in its earlier sense, see Allgeier, *Editio* 387-390. The New Testament of the Vulgate is, of course, only Hieronymian in the sense that Jerome revised the *Vetus latina* version of the Gospels, the remainder being an anonymous revision of the same version.

was no authoritative edition of the text and, secondly, that it was well known that there were many corruptions in the extant texts. The editors of the celebrated Complutensian Polyglot published at Alcalá in 1514-1517 had pointed out in the preface addressed to Pope Leo X in the name of the patron of the edition Cardinal Francisco Ximénez de Cisneros (1436-1517) that the corruptions in the Latin manuscripts were so many that it was necessary to revise them on the basis of the original Hebrew and Greek.⁹² Moreover there were various other Latin versions available.⁹³ Neither could the Council ignore the question of vernacular translations as they had become an issue in the controversies of the Reformation. In order to expedite the discussions it was agreed at the general congregation on 26 January 1546 that the fathers would meet in three groups – *classes* – chaired respectively by Cardinals Cervini, del Monte and Reginald Pole (1500-1558).⁹⁴ Unfortunately only the discussions of the group meeting under Cardinal Cervini are known since his secretary, Angelo Massarelli (1510-1566), kept a diary.⁹⁵

⁹² The six volumes of the Complutensian polyglot all have varying titles, that of the first being:

Vetus testamentum multiplici lingua nunc primo impressum. Et imprimis Pentateuchus Hebraico Greco atque Chaldaico idiomate. Adiuncta unicuique sua latina interpretatione.

The preface to Pope Leo X is on f. iii^r:

Ad sanctissimum ac clementissimum dominum nostrum. D. Leonem Decimum divina providentia Pontificem Maximum Reverendissimi in Christo patris et dni. D. F. Francisci Simenii de Cisneros Sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae tituli. S. Balbinae Presbyteri Cardinalis Hispaniae Archiepiscopique Toletani ac regnorum Castellae Archicancellarii etc. in libros veteris ac novi testamenti multiplici lingua impressos. Prologus

The actual passage reads, *ibidem*:

Ubicumque latinorum codicum varietas est: aut depravatae lectionis suspitio (id quod librorum imperitia simul et negligentia frequentissime accidere videmus) ad primam scripturae originem recurrendum est: sicut beatus Hieronymus et Augustinus ac caeteri ecclesiastici tractatores admonent: ita ut librorum Veteris testamenti synceritas ex Hebraica veritate: Novi autem ex Graecis exemplaribus examinetur.

The original was consulted, see Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 1412, and ii, 2, no. 4593. There are also two facsimile editions in 6 volumes: Rome 1983-1984; Valencia 1990-1992. On the contemporary knowledge of corrupt Latin codices see Amann, *Vulgata* 6-8.

⁹³ On these see Maichle, *Dekret* 3-21. Besides Erasmus' translation of the New Testament, see above footnote 20, there was, for example, the Latin translation of the entire Bible by Sanctes Pagnini (1470-1536), first published at Lyons in 1527: Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 1528.

⁹⁴ The acts of the Council ed. *CT* iv, 515-558; v, 3-1051; vi, 3-840; vii, 19-540; viii, 289-981; ix, 5-1122, see iv, 572-573. The fathers did not, however, remain in the same *classis* to discuss every topic, see *ibid.* v, 38, n. 3. On the role which Cardinal Pole played at the Council see most recently Mayer, *Reginald* 143-174. In late June 1546 Cardinal Pole left Trent for reasons of health and thus only the two groups headed by Cervini for dogma and del Monte for reform continued to function.

⁹⁵ Ed. *CT* i, 151-873; ii, 3-362. Massarelli, who had arrived at Trent with Cervini, was on 1 April 1546 appointed secretary to the Council, see *CT* i, 532, which he remained until its final closure on 4 December 1563. From 1557 until his death in 1566 he was bishop of Telesse. On him and his diary see the preface by S. Merkle to *CT* i, XI-CXXIX, see LXVIII-XCII, and Raponi, *Angelo* 197-215. Future references to it will be merely to *CT* without any further specification, as already in footnote 86 above. There can be no doubt but that Cardinal Cervini was one of the most prominent leaders of the reform movement in the Church during the first two periods of the Council. After the death of Julius III on 23 March 1555 Cervini was elected Pope on 9 April 1555 but his intention to continue the reforms was cut short by his death within a month on 1 May, to be succeeded on 23 May by Paul IV, whose attempt to reform the Church without a council was a total failure; on which see below. In his study of Cervini, Hudon, *Marcello* 1, begins by stating:

From a list of the most prominent figures in the Catholic reform movement at the time of the Council of Trent (1545-1563), it is difficult to identify one more significant than Marcello Cervini.

At the very first meeting of the group on 1 March 1546 the use of Slavonic in the liturgy in Dalmatia was raised. The first to speak was Antoine Imbert dit Filhol (or Filheul, c. 1476-1550), archbishop of Aix-en-Provence (1541-1550), who stated that it would be best to forbid vernacular translations of the Bible since Scripture was for theologians and not for simple people, who at the present time were interpreting it incorrectly, but if such translations were to be permitted they would have to be subject to censorship⁹⁶, a point of view shared by several other fathers.⁹⁷ However, Tommaso Campeggi (c. 1483-1564), bishop of Feltre (1520-1564), rejected any idea that the use of vernacular translations could be regarded as an abuse and pointed to the fact that St. Jerome had translated the mass into Illyrian and the Church permitted its use.⁹⁸ Neither could the existence of various Latin versions of the Bible be considered an abuse since they adopted varying approaches to translation, some being literal, others being freer, and hence there was no need for the Council to approve a new edition,⁹⁹ although it was necessary for bishops to ensure that any vernacular translations in use in their dioceses were faithful.¹⁰⁰

Campeggi's appeal to the Hieronymian origin of the Glagolitic rite, which was not challenged during the first period of the Council, was all the more powerful in that Jerome was also responsible for the Latin translation of the Bible.¹⁰¹ Campeggi's knowledge of the Glagolitic rite has been ascribed to the fact that from 1523 to 1526 he had been papal nuntius in Venice,¹⁰² but this ignores two facts: in the first place, his see of Feltre was in the Patriarchate of Aquileia, in which the Slavonic liturgy was in use, and, in the second, its existence was known from literary works.¹⁰³ In the general congregation of 5 March 1546 it was agreed to establish a separate commission to examine abuses concerning Scripture, which would report back to the next general congregation on 17 March.¹⁰⁴ There are no minutes of its meeting but Angelo Massarelli noted in his

On his work at the Council see *ibid.* 43-70; on his brief pontificate see *ibid.* 151-160.

⁹⁶ *CT* v, 22; cf. i, 500-501.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.* v, 24-25; cf. i, 502, 504. On the Council's debates on vernacular translations of Scripture see Revilla, *Controversia* 88-104.

⁹⁸ *CT* v, 25; cf. i, 503:

Nec etiam abusum habendum censeo, quod sacri libri vernacula lingua legantur, cum divus Hieronymus illyrico idiomate missam ediderit, cuius usum permisit ecclesia Illyricis.

Why Alberigo, *Vescovi* 279, claims that he referred to St. Cyril instead of to St. Jerome is a mystery as the former's name was never mentioned at the Council, on which see below.

⁹⁹ *CT* v, 25; cf. i, 503:

Non puto inter abusum habendum, quod tot habeantur sacrorum librorum editiones, cum alii reddiderint verbum verbo, alii sensum sensui, alii diversimode, quod eadem verba plerumque diversum sensum habeant; nec propterea decernendum, fieri novam editionem per concilium approbandam.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.* v, 25; cf. i, 503-504. For a list of Campeggi's works see Klaiber, *Kontroverstheologen* nos. 564-568a.

¹⁰¹ He was not, however, considered at the Council to be the translator of the Vulgate in the modern sense of the word, see Allgeier, *Editio* 389-390, and above note 91.

¹⁰² Thus S. Merkle in *CT* i, 503, n. 3.

¹⁰³ For Emser and Biondo see above notes 43 and 50; for de Castro and Erasmus see below notes 119 and 122.

¹⁰⁴ *CT* v, 27-28; cf. i, 509.

diary that on 9 March the Spanish Franciscan Alfonso de Castro (c. 1495-1558), the theologian, *peritus*, of Pedro Pacheco (1488-1560) bishop of Jaén (1545-1554), made a major contribution to the discussion,¹⁰⁵ which is important since the views of the celebrated Spanish jurist on the use of the vernacular in Scripture are well known from his work in 14 books (sections) against heresies, which was first published at Paris in 1534.¹⁰⁶ While still at Trent de Castro published the twelfth edition at Venice in 1546 with a dedication to Pacheco dated 30 November 1545.¹⁰⁷ The definitive edition is the seventeenth, the last to appear in de Castro's lifetime, which was published at Antwerp in 1556.¹⁰⁸

The first of the fourteen books is devoted to the nature of heresy in general and the means for combating it¹⁰⁹ and in the 11th to 13th of its 14 chapters he deals with the causes of heresy, in the 11th with personal reasons such as vainglory, ambition, egotism and obstinacy;¹¹⁰ the 12th is devoted to two further causes – firstly, persistence in the perusal of profane literature, although, if approached properly, the works of classical antiquity can be read with profit,¹¹¹ and, secondly, excessive zeal in the extirpation of abuses which leads to the total rejection of sacred institutions,¹¹² while the 13th deals with three further causes: the neglect of their pastoral duties by bishops,¹¹³ the failure of the clergy to

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.* i, 510; cf. v. 28.

¹⁰⁶ *Adversus omnes h[er]eses Lib. XIII. In quibus recensentur et revincuntur omnes h[er]eses quarum memoria extat, qu[od] ab Apostolorum tempore ad hoc usque seculum in Ecclesia ortae sunt.* Paris 1534. The first edition was dedicated to Cardinal Juan Tavera (1475-1545), archbishop of Toledo (1534-1545). On this edition see Gonz[alez], *Vida* 41-42.

¹⁰⁷ *Adversus omnes haereses Libri quatuordecim. Opus hoc nunc denuo ab auctore ipso recognitum est, et multis ab eo locis supra omnes ante editiones auctum atque locupletatum. Omnia autem additamenta huiusmodi notis* signata sunt. Ut autem cognoscas librum hunc plus habere in recessu quae sit in fronte promissum, lege nuncupatoriam epistolam.* On the edition see Gonz[alez], *Vida* 50-51; for excerpts of the dedication to Pacheco see Ascensio, *Alfonso* 68, 69.

¹⁰⁸ *Adversus omnes Haereses, Libri XIII. Opus hoc nunc postremo ab autore recognitum est, et tam multis ab eo locis supra omnes priores aeditiones auctum atque locupletatum est, ut merito novum opus censi possit, prout autor ipse in Epistola Nuncupatoria apertè demonstrat: quae addita sunt, pagina septima per brevem epistolam reperies.* The edition used here is the 26th which appeared under the same title (except that *autor* is both times spelled *auctor*) at Antwerp in 1565. Gonz[alez], *Vida* 41-64, lists in all 32 editions in the 16th century, of which van der Vekene, *Bibliotheca* i, only lists 21, viz. nos. 55, 59-64, 66-67, 69, 73-74, 76, 78-81, 84, 98-99, 108. For a bibliography of his other works see Gonz[alez], *Vida* 68-104; for a bibliography of all his works and of works on him see D[íaz D[íaz], *Hombres* ii, 256-257, 257-261. On his participation in the work of the Council see Garcia Centeno, *Alfonso* 166-174, 187-188; Gonz[alez], *Vida* 27-33; Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 36-51; Orom[í], *Franciscanos* 42-69 (on him see also 24-42); Spätling, *Anteil* 515-516, and Varesco, *Fratri* (xli) 94-98.

¹⁰⁹ Ed. 1565, 1^r-38^r. On de Castro's concept of heresy see Arias Gonz[alez], *Herej[ía]* 109-130.

¹¹⁰ *De quibusdam causis, ex quibus haereses oriuntur, ibid.* 26^v-30^f. This chapter includes a justification of the burning of heretical books, see 27^v-28^f. On his views on this subject see Seara Gonz[alez], *Castigo* 296-298.

¹¹¹ *De quibusdam alijs causis, à quibus etiam haereses oriuntur, ibid.* 30^r-33^f, see 30^r-32^f.

¹¹² *Ibid.* 32^f-33^f. One example given is that of Luther, who was at first disgusted by the scandalous life of many monks and then went on to abolish monasticism. In asserting this de Castro is in fact correct; as Eduard Stakemeier (1904-1970) put it in 1951:

Luther ist nicht aus der Kirche herausgekommen, weil er gegen Mißbräuche und Mißstände leidenschaftlich eiferte, sondern deshalb, weil er ihre objektive dogmatische Grundlage verlassen hat.

Stakemeier, *Lehrentscheidungen* 82.

¹¹³ *De alijs tribus causis, ijsque externis, unde haereses oriuntur, ibid.* 33^r-36^f, see 33^r-34^f.

preach the word of God¹¹⁴ and the perusal of vernacular translations of Scripture by the laity.¹¹⁵ Heresy does not arise from reading Scripture but from misunderstanding it.¹¹⁶ It is difficult to believe that the uneducated (*idiotae*) will correctly comprehend what learned scholars have difficulty in interpreting even after much study. St. Peter himself warns that there are passages in St. Paul's epistles which are obscure and which the ignorant misinterpret to their ruin,¹¹⁷ and if learned men such as Arius, Macedonius and Nestorius have misused Scripture to support their views, how much more so will those who are ignorant: are not contemporary Protestants divided among themselves over its interpretation? As the Lord said :

Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet and turn again and rend you (Matthew 7:6).

For this reason King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Spain are to be praised for having banned vernacular translations of the Bible¹¹⁸ and for the same reason Erasmus is to be censured not merely for having advocated vernacular translations in all languages but above all for having refused to recant when the Faculty of Theology at Paris had condemned the practice, indeed, he had defended it, one of his arguments being that St. Jerome had translated Scripture into Dalmatian. However, it has to be borne in mind that some things that are at first profitable turn out later to be harmful and have subsequently to be banned.¹¹⁹ Experience has shown that many uneducated people have lapsed into grievous errors

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.* 34^{r-v}.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.* 34^v-36^r. It begins:

Tertia demum haeresium parens et origo est sacrarum literarum in linguam vulgarem translatio, 34^v.

¹¹⁶ *Ibidem*:

in primis statuere oportet, haeresim nunquam ex sacris literis sed ex illarum perversa intelligentia oriri.

¹¹⁷ See 2 Peter 3:16. The fact that the epistle does not antedate the second century AD and is not by St. Peter is obviously irrelevant in this context. For a refutation of this argument see below note 140.

¹¹⁸ Viz. Ferdinand II of Aragon (1479-1516) and Queen Isabella I of Castile (1474-1504). It should be pointed out that the Spanish Inquisition, established in Castile in 1478 by Pope Sixtus IV (1471-1484) at the request of Isabella, was at first active in suppressing vernacular Spanish versions not so much out of intrinsic hostility towards the use of the vernacular but because it was widely believed that the versions were being used to induce the *marranos*, converted Jews, to return to their old ways, and the use of vernacular versions in Spain in the 16th century was not as rare as is sometimes considered, see Amigo Vallejo, *Erasmus* 261; Morreale, *Scriptures* 473-474, 490-491, and *eadem*, *Considerazioni* 266-267, 271-272. On the three Spanish prohibitions of vernacular versions prior to the Council of Trent see Enciso, *Prohibiciones* 531-554; Garcia Centeno, *Alfonso* 178-181.

¹¹⁹ Ed. 1565, 35^v:

Primū dicit (viz. Erasmus) olim sacras literas in linguam vulgarem fuisse versas, et Chrysostomum commendare laicis studium divinarum voluminum, et Hieronymum laudare idem in foeminis: de quo etiam refert quod Dalmatica lingua sacros verterit libros. Quod si tunc factum est cum tanta laude, videtur Erasmo idem etiam nunc fieri debere. Haec autem collectio satis aperte convincitur esse mala, e quod saepenumquā contingere videmus, ut de aliqua re aliquid statuatur ad mores hominum corrigendos, quod cōm postea experientia docente cognoscatur illud alia ex parte posse multū magis nocere, et iam saepē nocuisse, abrogatur lex in totum.

On the changes in de Castro's attitude towards Erasmus' advocacy of vernacular translations in the various editions of his *Adversus omnes haereses* see Amigo Vallejo, *Erasmus* 260-266; on his attitude towards other errors in Erasmus' works see *ibid.* 266-278. For other appeals to the argument that what had once been permitted could later be banned see below notes 132 and 218.

by reading Scripture in the vernacular and hence it should no longer be allowed.¹²⁰

This reference to Erasmus requires some elucidation. In 1522 he had published his paraphrase of the Gospel of Matthew, in the preface to which he stated that the laity and the uneducated should not be deprived of Holy Scripture, which is for all. Those whom the world considers most wise are for Christ simple, as St. Paul said to the Romans:

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools (Romans 1:22).¹²¹

Some consider it a crime if Scripture is translated into French or English but the Evangelists were not afraid to write down in Greek what Christ had said in Syriac, nor had the Latins been afraid to translate the Apostles' message into their vernacular language for the benefit of all. Nor had St. Jerome had any scruples about translating Scripture into Dalmatian. It should be translated into all languages so that the teachings of Christ can be propagated everywhere, as He Himself wishes.¹²² There is basically a choice: either the Bible is to be translated into all languages or else rulers must ensure that all people learn the three languages to which the divine teaching has above all others been committed.¹²³

Noël Bédier (c. 1470-1537), syndic of the Faculty of Theology of Paris (1520-1533), was one of Erasmus' bitterest adversaries and in July 1526 the Faculty censured 96 propositions which they had found in Erasmus' works. These were

¹²⁰ Ed. 1565, 36^r:

Fatemur ergo olim sacros libros in linguam vulgarem fuisse translatos, nec tamen ide□ simile fieri expedit, quoniam experientia docente didicimus hac de causa plures idiotas fuisse lapsos in multos execrandos errores.

On de Castro and the question of vernacular Biblical translations see Asensio, *Alfonso* 63-103; Coletti, *Éloquence* 191-193; Duncker, *Chiesa* 150; Garcia Centeno, *Alfonso* 182-187, who reproduces his epitaph, *ibid.* 165.

¹²¹ *In evangelium Matthaei paraphrasis*, ed. Le Clerc, *Desiderii* vii, 2^v-4^v, 1-146, see 2^v. The *editio princeps* appeared at Basel in 1522, in which year there were six more editions, see Bezzel, *Erasmusdrucke* nos. 1467-1473.

¹²² Ed. Le Clerc, *Desiderii* vii, 3^v:

Quidam piaculum arbitrantur, si sacri Libri vertantur in linguam Gallicam, aut Britannicam. Sed Evangelistae non veriti sunt Graece scribere, quod Christus Syriace loquutus est. Neque Latini veriti sunt Apostolorum sermonem in Romanam linguam vertere, hoc est, promiscuae multitudini prodere. Neque Hieronymo religio fuit sacras Literas Dalmatice vertere. Equidem cupiam in omnes verti linguas. Cupit Christus suam Philosophiam quam latissime propagari.

Syriac, of course, means Aramaic.

¹²³ *Ibidem*:

Ad id conducet, si aut illius libri vertantur in omnes omnium gentium linguas: aut Principum opera fiat, ut tres linguae, quibus potissimum credita est divina Philosophia, discantur à populis omnibus.

For Erasmus this privileged position of the three languages was partly due to their use in the superscription on the Cross, see his comment on Luke 23:38 in his *Annotationes Novi Testamenti* accompanying his own Latin translation of the New Testament:

Quae sane tres Linguae vel hoc nomine Christianis omnibus debere esse commendatae, quod in Cruce Domini nostri Jesu Christi sint solae omnium dedicatae.

Ed. Le Clerc, *Desiderii* vi, 325, n. 23. On this see Schwering, *Idee* 8-9. On Erasmus' translation of the New Testament see above note 20. In her work on Erasmus' linguistic views Carrington, *Erasmus* 182-200, deals with the *Paraphrases* but unfortunately not with his views on the vernacular.

ordered systematically into 32 sections, the 12th of which contains five propositions, viz. nos. xxxvii-xli, referring to the translation of Scripture into the vernacular.¹²⁴ The first of these concerns Erasmus' desire expressed in the preface to his paraphrase of Matthew that Scripture should be translated into all languages: such translations without any commentary were dangerous as they would lead people into error.¹²⁵ To this Erasmus replied that the reading of Scripture by the people would bring more fruit than danger and that their ignorance of Scripture was more dangerous than their reading of it, but he agreed that commentaries should also be published in the vernacular. The tumult of the present time was not due to the uneducated but to scholars such as John Wycliffe (c. 1330-1384), Jan Hus (c. 1372-1415), Luther and Johannes Oecolampadius (1482-1531). Jerome had translated Scripture into Dalmatian and for many years there had been vernacular translations in many languages, *connivente ad id Ecclesia*.¹²⁶

The commission of the Council of Trent appointed to examine abuses with regard to Scripture was unable to agree whether or not the translation of Scripture into the vernacular was an abuse and it was thus not included among the four abuses requiring reform listed in its report submitted to the general congregation on 17 March 1546.¹²⁷ At the congregation Pacheco, who had been raised to the cardinalate on 16 December 1545, protested that this omission implied that vernacular translations were authorized and the ensuing debates reveal not only that the Council participants, both fathers and *periti*, were fully conversant with both de Castro's and Erasmus' arguments but that they were also divided into two opposing camps on the issue. Pacheco was immediately challenged by Cardinal Cristoforo Madruzzo, who as bishop of Trent was not merely host to the Council but also knew more about the situation with regard to the use of the vernacular than the Italian or Spanish bishops: not only was his diocese in the patriarchate of Aquileia, it was also in the Empire and inhabited by both Italian and German

¹²⁴ Erasmus included the full text of the censures in his rejection of them which was published at Basel in 1532 under the title:

Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas sub nomine Facultatis Theologiae Parisiensis.

Ed. Le Clerc, *Desiderii* ix, 813-928; for section xii see 870-875:

De traductione sanctorum Scripturarum in Linguam vulgarem.

For the 1532 edition see Bezzel, *Erasmusdrucke* no. 700. On the controversies between Erasmus and the Sorbonne see Reusch, *Index* i, 351-353, and Rummel, *Erasmus* ii, 29-59, especially 50-55. For a list of which of Erasmus' works were included in which indices see De Bujanda, *Index* x, 168-172; see also Reusch, *Index* i, 347-355. For a blanket ban on all his works see below note 185, and for its removal see note 272. For a list of Bédier's works see Klaiber, *Kontroversstheologen* nos. 243-251.

¹²⁵ Le Clerc, *Desiderii* ix, 871.

¹²⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹²⁷ See the report ed. *CT* v, 29-30; cf. *CT* i, 436, and ii, 36-37. The four abuses listed are: 1. various Latin versions in circulation; 2. corrupt MSS; 3. the incorrect interpretation of Scripture; 4. the publication of editions, often annotated, without the permission of the ecclesiastical authorities. The remedies proposed are: 1. the *vetus et vulgata editio* should be declared authentic; 2. MSS should be emended; 3. none should be permitted to interpret Scripture in any way not sanctioned by the Church; 4. no editions should be printed or sold prior to examination by the relevant authorities.

speakers, indeed, he himself was bilingual.¹²⁸ He pointed out that if the Council deprived the laity of the possibility of reading the Bible this would be exploited by the Protestants. Moreover, he denied that translations into the vernacular could be considered an abuse,¹²⁹ to which Pacheco retorted that he had not asserted that it was an abuse, merely that the Council had to examine the question: in Spain vernacular translations had been forbidden and Pope Paul II (1464-1471) had confirmed the ban,¹³⁰ this last assertion being historically incorrect.¹³¹ The general congregation broke up without any agreement having been reached.

Before the next general congregation on 22 March 1546 several papers which were either entirely devoted to the question of the licitness of vernacular translations of Scripture or dealt with it among other issues were circulated at the Council. In his the Spanish Franciscan Vicente Lunel († 1549) reiterated the proposition that because something had originally been permitted it did not mean that it could not subsequently be banned as harmful, which was the case with the translation of Scripture into the vernacular.¹³² The author of an anonymous paper supported the condemnation of Erasmus by the Faculty of Theology at Paris¹³³ and invoked yet another reason for banning vernacular translations: the superscription on the Cross was in Hebrew, Greek and Latin to remind people that Scripture is handed down only in these three languages.¹³⁴ This argu-

¹²⁸ See his statement to the general congregation on 17 March 1546, ed. *CT* v, 30. His mother Euphemia von Sporenberg was German and his father an Italian of German descent. The original family name was Madrutsch, see Jedin, *Teilnehmer* (cxxxii) 241; on his work at the Council see *idem*, *Geschichte* i, 451-456; Alberigo, *Vescovi* 284-287, and S. Vareschi in Gatz, *Bischöfe* 443-446.

¹²⁹ *CT* v, 30-31. He also reiterated the argument that heresies originated with scholars, not simple people, *ibid.* v, 31.

¹³⁰ *CT* v, 31; cf. ii, 381; see also the diary of Ercole Severoli (c. 1510-1571), adviser to the Council on legal affairs, ed. *CT* i, 1-147, see 37-38. On Severoli and his diary see S. Merkle in *CT* i, XL-XLVIII. Further references will be simply to *CT*. On de Castro's influence on Pacheco's views see Asensio, *Alfonso* 86-87, and González, *Vida* 30.

¹³¹ As has often been pointed out, e.g. by S. Eheses in *CT* v, 30, n. 2; Revilla, *Controversia* 96, n. 1. On this and subsequent exchanges between Pacheco and Madruzzo see Alberigo, *Vescovi* 279, 281, 284; Coletti, *Éloquence* 201, 214-215; Duncker, *Chiesa* 154-157; Enciso, *Prohibiciones* 522-529; Garcia Centeno, *Alfonso* 171-173; McNally, *Council* 214-222, and Revilla, *Controversia* 95-101.

¹³² *De scripturarum germano usu et earum abusibus epitome*, ed. *CT* xii, 514-517, see 517. This had been de Castro's argument, see above note 119; see also below note 220. On Lunel's views on the vernacular see Coletti, *Éloquence* 204-205; on other issues dealt with in his paper see Koch, *Charakter* (xcvi) 565-566. On Lunel's participation in the work of the Council see Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 1024-1029; Oromí, *Franciscanos* 70-87; Varesco, *Fratri* (xli) 154-158.

¹³³ *De sacrae scripturae abusibus et eorum remedia*, ed. *CT* xii, 509-512, see 512. The paper has been ascribed to Alfonso de Castro, thus S. Eheses in *CT* v, 28, n. 2, but he is mentioned in the text, ed. *ibid.* xii, 511. Others, e.g. Cavallera, *Bible* 39-40; Duncker, *Chiesa* 150, and Koch, *Charakter* (xcvi) 562, n. 6, ascribed it to the Italian Franciscan Giovanni Battista Castiglione (fl. 16th century), but he is the author of another paper against the use of the vernacular, *Sex abusos in scripturis*, ed. *CT* xii, 512-514, on which see Coletti, *Éloquence* 203-204; on Castiglione's role at the Council see Varesco, *Fratri* (xli) 126, and it is now generally considered that the author is Nicolas Audet (1481-1562), general of the Carmelites (1524-1562), see Allgeier, *Editio* 387; Coletti, *Éloquence* 202; Jedin, *Geshichte* ii, 459, n. 28; Schmidt, *Liturgie* 85, and V. Schweitzer in *CT* xii, 509, n. 4; see also Asensio, *Alfonso* 87-91.

¹³⁴ Ed. *CT* xii, 511:

ment was immediately rejected by the French theologian Gentien Hervet (1499-1584) in his paper: the fact that the superscription was in Greek, Latin and Hebrew in no way implied that other languages could not be used for Scripture, a fact that St. Jerome had well understood as he had translated the Old Testament into both Latin and Dalmatian, and if ever there had been a time when it was right to make vernacular translations in the West, that time was now.¹³⁵ That even pagans could read Scripture to their profit was proved by the Ethiopian eunuch who had been reading Isaiah and was converted when the Apostle Philip explained it.¹³⁶ If the simple were seduced into heresy it was because bishops were neglecting their duties and if the Council reformed the Church there was nothing to fear. He also most strenuously objected to the use of Matthew 7:6 as an argument against vernacular translations: those who have been redeemed by Christ's blood and reborn by baptism could not be likened to swine before whom pearls might not be cast.¹³⁷ In his paper in support of vernacular translations Cardinal Madruzzo also objected to the servants of God being likened to dogs and swine.¹³⁸ In the present circumstances any ban on Scripture in the vernacular would only benefit Protestantism.¹³⁹ It was true that St. Peter had foreseen that heresies would arise from reading the Pauline epistles but that scarcely meant that their perusal should be banned.¹⁴⁰ Contemporary heretics such as Luther, Huldrych Zwingli (1484-1531), Oecolampadius, Melanchthon and Bucer were experts in Hebrew, Greek and Latin - were Bibles in these languages to be banned?¹⁴¹ History showed that more heresies had arisen from

Providentia Dei actum esset, ut titulus in cruce, quam Christus suo sanguine consecravit, esset hebraice, graece et latine conscriptus in memoriam, quod his tantum tribus linguis sacre literae tradi discerent.

On the trilinguist theory of the sacredness of the three languages of the superscription on the Cross see Thomson, *Cyril* 80-87.

¹³⁵ *Oratio, qua suadet, ut libri sacri in linguam vulgarem transferantur*, ed. *CT* xii, 530-536, see 534:

Nihil tam vetat, quominus scriptura in alias quoque linguas vulgares transferatur. Quod pulchre intellexerunt Indi, Aethiopes et Armeni, qui sacram scripturam in proprio idiomate legunt. Pulchre intellexit et D[ivus] Hieronymus, qui, quamvis Vetus Testamentum ad Hebraeam veritatem latine vertisset, suae tamen patriae rationem habens sacram scripturam Dalmatice quoque transtulit. Quodsi unquam in suam cuiusque nationis linguam sacros libros traduci oportuit, id nunc certe in occidentis regionibus est prope necessarium.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.* xii, 535; cf. Acts 8:26-39. The quotation of Isaiah 53:7-8 in Acts 8:32-33 is not taken from the Hebrew but from the LXX, viz. from a translation. On this see below note 148.

¹³⁷ *CT* xii, 535:

*Dicunt, non esse margaritas porcis obiciendas; quasi vero porci dici debeant, qui Christi sanguine redempti in sanctissimo regenerationis lavacro renati sunt, quos cum Petrus regale sacerdotium et gentem sanctam appellet.**

*1 Peter 2:9. On de Castro's use of Matthew 7:6 see above just before footnote 118. On Hervet's paper see Cavallera, *Bible* 51-52; Coletti, *Éloquence* 211-214. It should not be forgotten that Hervet himself was a translator of the Classics and the Fathers.

¹³⁸ *De vertendis libris sacris in linguam vulgarem*, ed. *CT* xii, 528-530, see 529. It has also been edited by Ehses, *Konzil* 47-50, and Coletti, *Éloquence* 206-207, with a French translation, *ibid.* 207-210. For a more accurate French translation see Tallon, *Concile* 105-109.

¹³⁹ *CT* xii, 528.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.* 529; cf. 2 Peter 3:16. On de Castro's use of this text see above note 117.

¹⁴¹ *Ibidem*:

erudition and learning than from simplicity and ignorance but erudition and learning had never been banned.¹⁴² A vernacular itself was a gift of the Holy Spirit and Jesus Christ¹⁴³ and the Council fathers' elders and betters of blessed memory had permitted the Dalmatians to use their native Illyrian in all their rites and ceremonies.¹⁴⁴

In view of the obvious deadlock with regard to whether or not vernacular translations represented an abuse, the Council legates decided that the question should be removed from the agenda and sent Angelo Massarelli to Cardinal Pacheco to point out that before voting a decree the Council had to be certain that it would be observed but the debates had made it clear that even if a decree permitted them, Spain and France would continue to ban them, while if the Council banned them, Germany and Italy would not enforce the ban – it was thus best to allow each country to retain its own customs. However, Pacheco was only willing to compromise to the extent that the translation of the simpler books of the Bible such as Acts could be permitted but not that of the more difficult ones such as the Pauline Epistles¹⁴⁵ and when the list of abuses with regard to Scripture without the question of vernacular translations was submitted to the general congregation on 1 April 1546 Pacheco again attacked them, to which Madruzzo responded with a defence and the Council legate presiding, Cardinal del Monte, had to close the congregation without any decision having been reached.¹⁴⁶

The four abuses with their proposed remedies which were submitted to the general congregation two days later on 3 April again made no mention of vernacular translations and only proposed to declare the *editio vulgata* the authoritative Latin translation of those Latin versions currently in circulation. At the very start of the meeting Pacheco asserted that to declare the Vulgate authoritative but to say nothing about any other versions was to do nothing and he thus proposed

Nostra etiam aetate Lutherus, Zwinglius, Oecolampadius, Melanchthon, Bucerus et alii huius farinae harum trium linguarum egregie sunt periti. Suntne ob id abolenda Biblia hebraica, graeca et latina?

For Zwingli's views of the use of the vernacular in the liturgy see Schmidt, *Liturgie* 58-62.

¹⁴² *CT*, xii, 529:

Plures haereses (ut ex historiis et conciliis compertum habemus et ipsa etiam tempora nostra loquuntur) peperit nobis eruditio et doctrina quam simplicitas et ignorantia idiotarum; nunquam tamen aut interdicta est eruditio, aut damnata doctrina.

¹⁴³ *Ibidem*:

Vulgaris etenim lingua et ipsa est donum Spiritus sancti et Iesu Christi.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibidem*:

Maiores nostri, quorum memoria semper in benedictione erit, permiserunt Dalmatis, ut in ceremoniis, ritibus et in omnibus sacris suis lingua patria et nativa, id est illyrica, uterentur.*

*Ecclesiasticus 46:14. He did, however, advocate the provision of notes and scholia in vernacular editions of the Bible to point out the difficulties and ambiguities of certain passages, *ibidem*.

¹⁴⁵ *CT* i, 518-520.

¹⁴⁶ *CT* v, 51; cf. i, 42. Jedin, *Geschichte* ii, 461, n. 34, considered that Madruzzo's paper on the question, see above note 138, was in fact his intervention on 1 April but in view of Massarelli's meeting with Pacheco on 22 March it is inherently more likely that he had prepared it in a written form prior to 1 April, see Schmidt, *Liturgie* 92, n. 19.

that all other translations including the Septuagint be rejected,¹⁴⁷ a proposal which in effect dismissed the entire work of the commission, which had stressed in its report to the general congregation on 17 March that the proposed decree on the Vulgate was in no way intended to detract from the authority of the Septuagint, which had been used by the Apostles themselves.¹⁴⁸ Some of the Council fathers, including Cardinal Pole, wanted the decree to specify the authoritative versions of the Greek and Hebrew texts as well but this was opposed by others on the grounds that they could not approve of texts with which they were unacquainted and the proposal was not retained.¹⁴⁹ When the vote was taken ten fathers, including Bishop Joannes Staphyleus of Sebenico (1528-1557), were in favour of vernacular translations, fourteen opposed them but no less than twenty-seven expressed no opinion¹⁵⁰ so that there was no majority either for or against and they were thus not mentioned in the decrees.

Two decrees on Scripture and Tradition were adopted at the fourth session of the Council on 8 April 1546. The first defines the canon of the Bible and inseparably links Scripture and Tradition as the twin sources of the faith.¹⁵¹ The second decree states that of all the Latin versions in circulation the Vulgate because of its centuries-old use by the Church in public services, sermons, exegesis and disputations is to be considered the authoritative one and specifically insists that future editions should be corrected.¹⁵² It also makes it clear that the

¹⁴⁷ CT i, 42; cf. i, 59:

Mihi videtur, quod recipere hanc vulgatam editionem pro autentica (sic) et non reicere alias sit nihil agere. Propterea desidero, ut omnes alie editiones et translationes, etiam illa LXX interpretum, reiciantur omnino.

For the four abuses and the proposed remedies see above note 127.

¹⁴⁸ The report ed. CT v, 29-39, see 29:

Non detrahendo tamen auctoritati purae et verae interpretationis septuaginta interpretum, quae nonnumquam usi sunt apostoli.

This refers to quotations of the Old Testament in the New, some of which are obviously taken from the LXX, e.g. Isaiah 6:10 quoted in Matthew 13:15 and Acts 28:27; Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17; see the bibliography on such quotations in Dorival, *Bible* 279-280, to which must be added Steyn, *Septuagint* 61-63, 127-128, 155-156, 200, 210 and 224-236. On the case of Isaiah 53:7-8 in Acts 8:32-33 see above n. 136.

¹⁴⁹ CT v, 65; cf. i, 84. Pacheco expressed the opinion that the proposal might be interpreted as an approval of vernacular versions (!). However, in a letter of 26 April 1546 to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520-1589) the Council legates reported that the Council had requested that the work of correcting all three versions, Latin Greek and Hebrew, be entrusted to the pope, ed. CT x, 470-472, see 471, cf. *ibid.* v, 128. In his reply of 29 May 1546 the cardinal referred to the enormous difficulties involved in correcting a Latin text, ed. *ibid.* x, 506-507, see 507. The result with regard to the Latin text was the disastrous *Vulgata Sixtina* of 1590, hastily replaced by the *Vulgata Clementina* of 1592. On this see below.

¹⁵⁰ CT v, 66; of the 27 five mentioned other minor matters but not the main issue.

¹⁵¹ *Sacrosancta oecumenica et generalis Tridentina synodus*, ed. CT, v, 91. It states of the faith *inter alia*:
hanc veritatem et disciplinam contineri in libris scriptis et sine scripto traditionibus, quae ab ipsis Christi ore ab apostolis acceptae, aut ab ipsis apostolis Spiritu Sancto dictante quasi per manus traditae ad nos usque pervenerunt.

For the Council debates on the canon of Scripture see Koch, *Charakter* (xcvi) 401-422, 542-554, and Maichle, *Kanon* 9-76; for those on Tradition see Holstein, *Tradition* 367-390. On the Protestant reaction to these and the other decrees of the first period of the Council see Stupperich, *Reformatoren* 39-52.

¹⁵² *Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus*, ed. CT v, 91-92. It begins:

Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus considerans, non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiae Dei, si ex omnibus latinis editionibus, quae circumferentur sacrorum librorum, quaedam pro authentica

task of defining the true sense and interpretation of Scripture belongs not to the individual but to the Church as a whole.¹⁵³ The adoption of this decree led to a long controversy within the Church as to whether this decision concerning the Vulgate had doctrinal or only disciplinary force but it is now generally agreed that a decision which does not prohibit the private use of other Latin versions and only deals with the version to be used for official purposes only has disciplinary force.¹⁵⁴ As for the relation of the Vulgate to the Greek and Hebrew texts, already Cardinal Roberto Bellarmino (1542-1621) in his short treatise on the meaning of the authentic nature of the Vulgate as specified in the Council decree pointed out that the Greek and Hebrew texts are more authoritative than the Latin one as they are the sources but the latter is only a stream.¹⁵⁵ As for Catholic vernacular versions, they continued to be made and only two years after the adoption of the decree a Flemish translation of the entire Bible by Nicolaus van Winghe (c.1495-1552) was published at Louvain in 1548.¹⁵⁶ There can be no doubt but that the use of Slavonic in the liturgy in Istria, Carniola and Dalmatia had played a significant role in preventing the adoption of a decree prohibiting vernacular translations of the Bible and that Cardinal Madruzzo's contribution to the debates had been of great importance.¹⁵⁷

B. The Second Period of the Council, 1 May 1551-28 April 1552.

In July 1546 war between Emperor Charles V and the Protestant Schmalkaldic League broke out and the increase in imperial power which resulted from the Emperor's successful campaigns, which were eventually to culminate in the Pro-

habenda sit, innotescat: statuit et declarat, ut haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot saecularum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur, et quod nemo illam reiicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat...ut posthac sacra scriptura potissimum vero haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio quam emendatissime imprimatur.

CT v, 91-92.

¹⁵³ None may contradict

eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de verso sensu et interpretatione scripturarum sanctorum.

Ibid. 92. It also lays down that no Bibles or Biblical commentaries may be published or sold without the permission of the relevant ecclesiastical authorities, *ibidem*.

¹⁵⁴ See, for instance, Maichle, *Dekret* 112; Sutcliffe, *Council* 37; Vosté, *Vulgata* 310-311. On the long controversy see Emmi, *Decreto* 107-130, 228-272; *idem*, *Senso* 347-374; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 19-43; Koch, *Charakter* (xcvii) 534-549; (xcviii) 313-354; Maichle, *Dekret* 98-111. On the use of the term *authenticus* in the Council debates see Allgeier, *Autentisch* 145-149.

¹⁵⁵ *De editione Latina vulgata, quo sensu a Concilio Tridentino definitum sit, ut pro authentica habeatur*, ed. Le Bachelet, *Bellarmin* 107-125, see 114:

Editio hebraica et graeca in iis, quae ab ipsis sacris scriptoribus hebraice vel graece scripta sunt, non minus sunt authentica, quam vulgata latina editio, imo magis, cum illae sunt fontes, ista rivus.

The claim that the Council had decreed the Vulgate to be equal to the originals, thus Gotsiridze, *Ocherki* 23, is nonsense.

¹⁵⁶ Darlow *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 3287. Over the period from the 16th to the 18th century no fewer than 189 Catholic Biblical editions in German translation were published; on them see Köster, *Studien* 357-465; for Emser's version see 7-10, 17-27, and nos. 1-71; for Dietenberger's see 10-11, 27-32, and nos. 72-117.

¹⁵⁷ On Madruzzo's role see the remarks of Ehses, *Konzil* 46-47, and Schmidt, *Liturgie* 94. Needless to say, the Protestants rejected the decrees of the first period of the Council, see Stupperich, *Reformatoren* 34-52.

testant defeat at Mühlberg on 24 April 1547, worried Pope Paul III and when in early March 1547 cases of typhus were reported at Trent the Council legates took advantage of the situation to transfer the Council from the imperial city of Trent to the papal city of Bologna, a decision which divided the Council as the pro-imperial bishops refused to move. After Charles' protests Paul III prorogued the Council on 1 February 1548.¹⁵⁸ The pope died on 10 November 1549 and after a lengthy conclave on the basis of an electoral pact that the next pope would reconvene the Council¹⁵⁹ Cardinal del Monte, the principal Council legate during the first period, was elected pope on 8 February 1550, taking the name of Julius III. By the bull *Cum ad tollenda* of 14 November 1550 the Council was reconvened at Trent for 1 May 1551¹⁶⁰ and on 4 May Cardinal Marcello Crescenzo (1500-1552), Archbishop Sebastiano Pighini of Siponto (1550-1553) and Bishop Luigi Lippomani of Verona (1548-1558, \pm 1559) were appointed legates.¹⁶¹

The question of the use of the vernacular in the liturgy arose when a series of ten articles summarizing Protestant errors with regard to the mass were discussed in a commission from 7 to 29 December 1551. The ninth article lists three errors, the second being the proposition that mass may not be celebrated other than in a vernacular language which all understand.¹⁶² Although an important topic, this was in fact less of a burning issue than that of the Bible in the vernacular since popular Catholic piety had evolved in many ways outside of the liturgy.¹⁶³ On 11 December Josse Ravesteyn (c. 1506-1570), professor of theology at the University of Louvain, went straight to the basic theological issue: if communion is a purely subjective act as Protestants think, then it follows that the communicant must understand the service, but if there is an objective element, as in Catholic teaching, then the words with regard to the effective act only have to be understood by the priest accomplishing the act in the name of and on behalf of the people, who need only understand his intention, although they clearly have to be exhorted and edified in an intelligible language.¹⁶⁴ On the previous day the Spanish theologian Juan de Arze (1510-1564) had

¹⁵⁸ For the Emperor's protests see *CT* vi, 687-696; the prorogation ed. *ibid.* vi, 727-728. It was announced to the Council on 3 February 1548, see *ibid.* i, 742.

¹⁵⁹ For an edition of the relevant clauses of the electoral pact of 2 December 1549 see *ibid.* vii, 3.

¹⁶⁰ The bull ed. *ibid.* vii, 6-8.

¹⁶¹ For their appointment see *ibid.* vii, 11. The political events of 1547-1551 cannot be examined here.

¹⁶² The articles ed. *ibid.* vii, 375-377, see 377 for the ninth:

Ecclesiae Romanae ritum, quo secreto et submissa voce verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; missamque non nisi in lingua vulgari, quam omnes intelligant, celebrari debere, imposturamque esse certas missas certis sanctis attribuere. Asseritur a Calvino in lib. de coena Domini.

In fairness it should be pointed out that the reference to Calvin's work is inaccurate. On the debates on the mass in 1551-1552 see Jedin, *Geschichte* iii, 338-358.

¹⁶³ As pointed out by Lentner, *Volkssprache* 226; cf. Schreiber, *Einführung* LXVIII-LXIX, and Jungmann, *Konzil* 330-332; the Council decisions encouraged the further development of such piety, see *ibid.* 332-336, and Schrott, *Reform* 350-357.

¹⁶⁴ His address ed. Le Plat, *Monumentorum* iv, 350-359, see especially 357-358; in *CT* there is only a summary, see vii, 397-398. This involves in a nutshell the difference between *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis*, on

pointed out that whereas it might not be expedient for the Latin Church to use the vernacular in the liturgy at the present time, it could not prohibit it since Greeks, Ethiopians and Muscovites all used their own languages and, moreover, Latin itself had once been a vernacular.¹⁶⁵

The report of the commission submitted to the Council fathers on 4 January 1552 states that it is not expedient to condemn the use of the vernacular in principle because Greeks, Ethiopians and others use it but that its use in the Roman and Latin Church could be banned.¹⁶⁶ The fathers discussed the report from 7 to 13 January and on the very first day Paul de Gregorianczi († 1565/70), bishop of Agram (Zagreb, 1550-1560, then Raab (Győr), 1560-1565/70) stated that the use of the vernacular could not be condemned in principle since in many places, as was the case also in his own diocese, mass was celebrated in a language said to be that of St. Jerome.¹⁶⁷ This statement differs from those made during the first period of the Council in that for the first time the ascription of the introduction of the use of Slavonic to Jerome is asserted as a theory and not as a fact. Other bishops too agreed that the use of the vernacular could not be condemned as other Churches used it.¹⁶⁸ The first recorded instance at the Council of the misuse of 1 Corinthians 14 to support the use of the vernacular in the liturgy was made on 11 January 1552 by Martín Pérez de Ayala (1503/4-1566), bishop of Cadiz (1548-1560), in his opposition to the condemnation of the use of the vernacular.¹⁶⁹ In the final version of the articles there are thirteen in all but the former ninth, now the eleventh, had been left virtually unchanged.¹⁷⁰ The

which with particular reference to Orthodox views on the subject see Thomson, *Economy* 394-400. On Ravesteyn's address see Coletti, *Éloquence* 219-220; for a list of his works see Klaiber, *Kontrovers theologen* nos. 2652-2656.

¹⁶⁵ CT vii, 393:

Nam et Graeci in eorum lingua celebrant, idem Aethiopes faciunt et Moschovitae, ut latina ecclesia latina lingua, quam omnes olim intellegebant, celebrat. Ideo non usque adeo generaliter haec pars damnanda est. Semper enim apud omnes gentes propria eorum lingua missae celebratae fuerunt. Nunc autem non expedit, ut vulgari lingua celebretur; id tamen prohibitum non est.

On Arze's role at Trent see Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 574-581.

¹⁶⁶ The report ed. CT vii, 440-441, see 441:

Quidam non putat expedire damnare hunc articulum generaliter, sed tantum quoad ecclesiam Romanam et latinam; cum Graeci, Aethiopes et quaedam aliae nationes contrarium observent.

¹⁶⁷ CT vii, 443:

non videtur generaliter damnandum de lingua vulgari, quia in multis locis, ut est in sua diocesi, missae eorum lingua celebrantur, quam dicunt esse B. Hieronymi.

The original form of his name was Gregorijane□ki.

¹⁶⁸ E.g. Bishops Cesare de Giacomelli of Belcastro (1553-1577) and Francisco Manrique de Lara of Orense (1542-1556, † 1560), CT vii, 449 and 450. On the latter's role at the Council see Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 410-415.

¹⁶⁹ CT vii, 455. On his participation in the Council see Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 774-793. For a list of his works see Klaiber, *Kontrovers theologen* nos. 2450-2454. For other misinterpretations of 1 Corinthians 14 see above notes 59-64 and below notes 174, 217, 223 and 227.

¹⁷⁰ The text ed. CT vii, 460. Former articles 1, 3 and 10 have each been divided into two. The eleventh reads:

Si quis dixerit, ecclesiae Romanae ritum, quo secreto et submissa voce verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse, missamque non nisi in lingua vulgari celebrari debere, ac imposturam esse certas missas certis sanctis, sicut ecclesia intendit, attribuere: anathema sit.

For the draft version see above note 162. The adjectival clause referring to *lingua vulgari*, viz. *quam omnes intelligant*, had clearly been omitted as tautological.

articles are accompanied by a short treatise in which *inter alia* the retention of the use of Latin in the Western Church is justified by three arguments: 1. its use in the superscription of the Cross has consecrated it as a divine instrument; 2. it is a common means of communication for many peoples with different languages living in a confined area; 3. the use of a variety of translations could bring disadvantages. However, it does urge that Scriptural readings be explained to the faithful especially on feast days.¹⁷¹

However, in the event neither the canons nor the treatise were ever approved by the Council. After his victory over the Schmalkaldic League in 1547 Charles V had forced the Diet of Augsburg (1 September 1547-30 June 1548) to accept the Augsburg Interim, a doctrinal formula accepted as the provisional basis of a settlement between Catholics and Protestants until the issues had been resolved by the Council of Trent, whose decisions would be binding upon all.¹⁷² The Protestant princes were to send their envoys to the Council and the first to arrive had been the envoy of Elector Joachim II of Brandenburg (1535-1571), who was admitted to the Council on 11 October 1551 after having promised that the Elector would accept the decisions of the Council, which was the condition of the envoys' admittance.¹⁷³ More envoys arrived between October 1551 and January 1552 and on 24 January 1552 the envoys of Duke Christopher of Württemberg (1550-1568) were at the insistence of the Emperor permitted to address the Council in the morning and those of Duke (since 1547 Elector) Maurice of Saxony (1541-1553) in the afternoon. The former laid down three conditions for the Council's deliberations: 1. all contentious issues were to be resolved by impartial judges, which the pope and the bishops were not; 2. the decrees already adopted by the Council were to be rediscussed; 3. all controversies were to be decided on the basis of Scripture; they also submitted the *Confessio Virtembergica* which had been drawn up for that purpose by Johannes Brenz (1499-1570) in 1551.¹⁷⁴ Maurice's envoys went even further:

¹⁷¹ *Doctrina de sacrificio missae*, ed. Le Plat, *Monumentorum* iv, 385-397, see 394:

Lingua enim Latina, quae in titulo crucis Domini tanquam quoddam divinum instrumentum est consecrata, mysteriis missae in occidentali ecclesia celebrandis, maxime convenit, quae cum tot gentes magna diversitate sermonis distinctas et frequentissime inter se communicantes brevi terrae spatio complectatur, uno hoc profecto sermone, qui omnibus communis est, in peragendo hoc communionis sacrificio uti debuit: praesertim cum hac ratione plurimis incommodis obviam eatur, quae ex tanta evulgatione et tam varia translationum in mysteriis fidei diversitate nasci possent. Quod si quae intersit, omnibus esse nota (ut veteris et novi testamenti lectiones quae in missa recitantur) et per concionatores debent saltem diebus festis populo declarari, quemadmodum in illis omnibus ecclesiis fit, quarum pastores officii suis non desunt.

¹⁷² Interim ed. Pfeilschifter, *Acta* vi, 310-348. The background to the interim cannot be described here. On Protestant preparations for the council see Stupperich, *Reformatoren* 52-59; Meinhold, *Protestanten* 287-294.

¹⁷³ *CT* vii, 197-200; on the Elector's purely political reasons for accepting the condition see Jedin, *Geschichte* iii, 309; Meinhold, *Protestanten* 296-297; Meyer, *Protestanten* 177-181. On the Protestant delegations at the Council see Bizer, *Confessio* 32-63.

¹⁷⁴ *CT* vii, 465-469; the Latin original of the *Confessio* ed. Le Plat, *Monumentorum* iv, 421-460; the contemporary German translation ed. Bizer, *Confessio* 137-190. For a recent bilingual edition see Brecht, *Confessio* 36-198 (Latin), 37-199 (German). The *editio princeps* of the Latin was published at Tübingen in 1552, see Köhler, *Bibliographia* no. 219, and the German version also there in the same year, *ibid.* no. 222; there are

the Council was not a general council as not all the nations of Christendom were represented, neither was it free as the bishops were bound by an oath of obedience to the pope and hence the Council would have to declare its supremacy over the pope.¹⁷⁵ The following day at the 15th session on 25 January 1552 the Council approved the text of a safe-conduct for all Protestant envoys in which the sources of the faith on which the debates were to be based were specified as Scripture and Tradition.¹⁷⁶

Electeur Maurice had, however, been using the negotiations to cover his preparations for a military alliance of the German Protestant princes with King Henry II of France (1547-1559). Already in February the Emperor had learned of Maurice's plans and on 5 March wrote to his envoys at Trent that in the new circumstances negotiations with the Protestants were pointless and the Council should be suspended.¹⁷⁷ On 4 April 1552 the Protestant army marched into Augsburg and on 10 April Henry seized Metz. On 19 April Maurice almost captured Charles V at Innsbruck and the latter had to flee through the Brenner Pass to Carinthia. In view of the imminent danger many of the fathers had already left Trent even before the Council was suspended at the sixteenth session on 28 April.¹⁷⁸ Thus ended the first and only attempt to heal the schism by the Council. Even without the political events it was clear that no council could ever have accepted the Protestant conditions for participation in its activity and three years later by the Peace of Augsburg of 25 September 1555

also Slovene (1562), *ibid.* no. 409, Croat (1562), *ibid.* no. 410, French (1552), *ibid.* no. 228, Italian (1553), *ibid.* no. 241, and English (1586), *ibid.* no. 563, versions. It was the sole Protestant *confessio fidei* to be submitted to the Council and as such can be seen as a real attempt at dialogue, see on this Brecht, *Abgrenzung* 161-195. It has thirty-two articles and in the twenty-fourth calls for the use of the vernacular in the liturgy, referring to 1 Corinthians 14 in support of this, see Le Plat, *Monumentorum* iv, 449; Bizer, *Confessio* 174; Brecht, *Confessio* 150-151. For other misuses of this passage see notes 59-64, 169, 217, 223 and 227. On the background of the compilation of the *Confessio* see Bizer, *Confessio* 9-32; Brecht, *Confessio* 8-24. It was not discussed at the Council but the Spanish Dominican Pedro de Soto (c. 1500-1563) published a refutation of it, the *editio princeps* of which appeared at Cologne in 1555 under the title:

Assertio catholicae fidei circa articulos confessionis nomine Illustrissimi Ducis Wirtenbergensis oblatae per Legatos eius Concilio Tridentino, XXIII. Ianuarij anni M.D.LII.

For the two 1555 Cologne editions see *VD* 16, xix, S 7071-7072. [The 1552 Antwerp edition sometimes listed would appear to be a confusion with the 1557 Antwerp edition, on which see Cockx-Indestege, *Belgica* i, no. 4389]. On de Soto's role at the Council see Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 994-1005, and Meersseman, *Tipo* 32-36, 39-41. On his controversy with Brenz over the *Confessio* see Bizer, *Confessio* 64-93; Brecht, *Confessio* 24-27. For a list of de Soto's works see Klaiber, *Kontroversetheologen* nos. 2922-2931.

¹⁷⁵ *CT* vii, 469-475. They did not, however, submit the *Confessio Saxonica*, which Melancthon had drawn up for this purpose in 1551; ed. Stupperich, *Melancthons* vi, 81-167; *CREF* xxviii, 369-461. This was partly because it was felt that its submission would be considered as an admission of the Council's authority to judge in the matter, see Bizer, *Confessio* 26. The claim that they had no instructions to submit it, thus Brecht, *Confessio* 12, is an oversimplification.

¹⁷⁶ *CT* vii, 494-496, see 495:

causae controversae secundum sacram scripturam et apostolorum traditiones, probata concilia et catholicae ecclesiae consensum et sanctorum patrum auctoritates in praedicto concilio Tridentino tractentur.

¹⁷⁷ Ed. *CT* xi, 839-840; see also his fresh instructions to them of 29 March, ed. *ibid.* 854-856.

¹⁷⁸ *CT* vii, 529-532. On the events of early 1552 and the Council see Meyer, *Protestanten* 203-206. The Protestant envoys had left already on 8 April.

the existence of Lutheranism on the basis of the *Confessio Augustana* was recognized on the basis of *cuius regio, eius religio*.¹⁷⁹

C. The Third Period of the Council, 18 January 1562-4 December 1563.

When elected pope with the name of Paul IV on 23 May 1555 Gian Pietro Carafa (1476-1559) was already 78. He had been one of the moving forces behind the establishment of the *Congregatio Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis* by the bull *Licet ab initio* of Pope Paul III of 21 July 1542¹⁸⁰ and during his pontificate his fear of heresy bordering almost on the pathological meant that not even the leading personalities in the Church were safe, as illustrated by the case against Cardinal Giovanni Morone (1509-1580), who was arrested on 31 May 1557 and only released on 21 August 1559 three days after the pope's death on 18 August.¹⁸¹ Deeply suspicious of Habsburg policy – Pope Paul IV neither recognized the validity of the Peace of Augsburg nor did he approve of Charles V's abdication on 12 September 1556, about which he had not been consulted – he determined to attempt a reform of the Church by his own authority. One of his measures was the compilation of the first Roman index which was printed at Rome in 1557,¹⁸² but for uncertain reasons the Pope was dissatisfied with it¹⁸³ and it was not published in that form but in a revised one which appeared at Rome in January 1559.¹⁸⁴ The index was stricter than previous ones published elsewhere in that in addition to the prohibition of specific works the number of authors all of whose works irrespective of their contents were banned had been drastically increased and a list of 61 publishers had been added all of whose

¹⁷⁹ This phrase is not found in the text of the Peace, ed. Walder, *Religionsvergleiche* i, 41-68, but is nevertheless an apt description; the text of the Confession of Augsburg ed. Lietzmann, *Bekennnisschriften* 44-137.

¹⁸⁰ Ed. *BDP* vi, 344-346. For brief surveys of the beginnings of the Inquisition see Hroch, *Inquisition* 55-66, and Reusch, *Index* i, 169-179. On the continuity and discontinuity with previous practice and on early episcopal reactions see Brambilla, *Origini* 347-379. Within a few years it became known as the *Sacrum Officium Sanctae Romanae et Universalis Inquisitionis*, see below note 188. It should not be forgotten, however, that Paul IV had been a true reformer as is shown by the fact that he was one of the founders at Rome on 14 September 1524 of the order of clerks regular known as the Theatines, whose main aim was to reform the grave abuses and scandals affecting the Church and who made a significant contribution by their austerity of life, zeal and piety to the Counter-Reformation.

¹⁸¹ On Morone and the Inquisition see Firpo, *Inquisitione* 177-358. On his trial and acquittal with the edition of the documents see *idem*, *Processo passim*. There is a considerable literature on Morone, who was appointed Council legate on 7 March 1563 immediately after the news of the demise of the legate Cardinal Gonzaga on 2 March had reached Rome on 6 March. He was largely responsible for resolving the impasse in the Council debates; for brief appreciations see Lutz, *Kardinal* 363-381; Pastor, *Geschichte* vii, 242-278.

¹⁸² *Index auctorum et librorum, qui tanquam haeretici, aut suspecti, aut perniciosi, ab officio S. Ro. Inquisitionis reprobantur, et in universa Christiana republica interdicuntur*. Facsimile reprint in De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 717-751; on its contents see *ibid.* viii, 211-260; on the work of the Commission see *ibid.* viii, 31-35.

¹⁸³ On possible reasons for his dissatisfaction see Reusch, *Index* i, 258-259.

¹⁸⁴ *Index Auctorum, et Librorum, qui ab Officio Sanctae Rom. et Universalis Inquisitionis caveri ab omnibus et singulis in universa Christiana Republica mandantur, sub censuris contra legentes, vel tenentes libros prohibitos in Bulla, quae lecta est in Coena Dni. expressis, et sub alijs poenis in Decreto ejusdem Sacri officij contentis*. Reprinted in Reusch, *Librorum* 176-208; facsimile reprint in De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 752-787. On the other editions in the same year see *ibid.* viii, 713-716, and Reusch, *Index* i, 260. On the work of the commission entrusted with its compilation see *ibid.* i, 267-269, and De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 35-39.

editions were also banned.¹⁸⁵ The index specifically forbade vernacular translations of the Bible to be printed, read or possessed without the permission of the Sacred Office of the Holy Inquisition.¹⁸⁶ Even the Pope realized that the terms of this index were too drastic¹⁸⁷ and in February 1559 at Rome a circular to all inquisitors modifying the instructions was published: basically it accepted that once heretical books had been expurgated their possession could be permitted.¹⁸⁸

Paul IV's attempt to reform the Church without a Council was a failure and his nepotism and harsh suppression of anything remotely suspected of heresy had made him so unpopular that on his death on 18 August 1559 rioting broke out in Rome, which included the storming and burning of the Inquisition's building and the release of the prisoners.¹⁸⁹ One of the agreements in the electoral pact of 8 September 1559 of the long conclave leading to the election of Gian Angelo de' Medici (1499-1565) as Pius IV on 25 December 1559 was the reconvoation of the Council and this was done by the bull *Ad ecclesiae regimen* of 29 November 1560 at Trent for the following Easter (6 April).¹⁹⁰ The Pope was determined that this should be a more representative council but all his efforts to invite Armenian, Coptic and Ethiopian representatives were in vain.¹⁹¹ One of the attempts to invite Greek hierarchs to attend indirectly involved the Slavs: in a letter of 2 July 1561 Stanislas Hosius (1504-1579), nuntius at the imperial court in Vienna (1560-1561), reported to Cardinal Carlo Borromeo (1538-1584), in charge of foreign relations at Rome, that he had received word from Poland that the archbishop of Galatia had been in Lemberg (Lviv) and was going on to the King of Poland, Sigismund II Augustus (1548-1572), to inform him in the

¹⁸⁵ On its contents see Reusch, *Index* i, 269-294, and De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 261-346, who also gives a brief comparison of its contents with those of the index of 1557, *ibid.* viii, 114-116. Amongst the list of authors all of whose works are banned is the name of Erasmus with a note explaining that this ban applies equally to his works which contain nothing against or even about religion:

Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus cum universis Commentarijs, Annotationibus, Scholijs, Dialogis, Epistolis, Censuris, Versionibus, Libris et scriptis suis, etiam si nil penitus contra Religionem, vel de Religione contineant.

Ed. De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 760. See also above note 124. For the removal of this ban see below note 272. For the list of the 61 editors see *ibid.* viii, 786.

¹⁸⁶Ed. Reusch, *Librorum* 206; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 785:

Biblia omnia vulgari idiomate, Germanico, Gallico, Hispanico, Italico, Anglico, sive Flandrico, etc. conscripta nullatenus vel imprimi, vel legi, vel teneri possint absque licentia sacri Officii S. Ro. Inquisitionis.

The statement that all vernacular translations were placed on the index, thus Tallon, *Concile* 634, is somewhat misleading since the index does make provision for specific ones to be allowed.

¹⁸⁷ On the negative attitude which greeted its publication see De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 39-46.

¹⁸⁸ *Instructio circa Indicem librorum prohibitorum ad omnes Inquisitores et ministros Sacri Officii S. Ro. et Universalis Inquisitionis.* Reprinted in De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 100-101, 104, with a facsimile, *ibid.* 102-103; on it see *ibid.* viii, 46-49.

¹⁸⁹ On this see Hroch, *Inquisition* 58-59; Jedin, *Geschichte* iv, 1, 18; Pastor, *Geschichte* vi, 620; Reusch, *Index* i, 173. For a lampoon on the deceased pope see Sickel, *Geschichte* 14.

¹⁹⁰ Ed. *CT* viii, 104-105. For the electoral pact see *ibid.* viii, 1-2. The political difficulties which delayed the convocation, not the least of them being whether it was to be considered a new Council or a continuation of the previous one, cannot be examined here.

¹⁹¹ On them see Freudenberger, *Konzil* 153-157, 163-165; Jedin, *Geschichte* iv, 1, 61-62; Peri, *Concilio* 429.

name of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Joasaph II (1556-1565), that the Orthodox Church had condemned Lutheran heresies and that the archbishop would then proceed to Trent to recognize the primacy of the Apostolic See.¹⁹² In his letter of 22 July to the Council legates at Trent Hosius revealed that his source about the archbishop of Galatia had been Bernardo Bongiovanni (c. 1512-1574), the papal nuntius in Poland (1560-1563).¹⁹³ Already on 12 July Borromeo had written to the Council legates that Bongiovanni had informed him that the Patriarch of Constantinople was sending his representative to the Council and the Pope was anxious that he should be properly received,¹⁹⁴ to which the legates replied on 17 July that this would pose a problem as there already was a Patriarch of Constantinople, viz. Ranuccio Farnese (1530-1565, patriarch 1546-1549, 1554-1565).¹⁹⁵ On 26 July Borromeo replied to the Council legates that it was a little premature to decide how the archbishop should be received at Trent but he should be urged to proceed to Rome as the question was of the utmost importance¹⁹⁶ and on the same day he wrote to Zaccaria Dolfin (1527-1583), bishop of Lesina (Hvar, 1553-1574), who together with Giovanni Commendone (1525-1584, both cardinals in 1565) had been sent to the Empire to announce the Council, instructing him that if the archbishop arrived in Vienna Dolfin was to establish what his intentions were and he was to be encouraged to go to Rome.¹⁹⁷ However, on 25 August 1561 the legates at Trent informed Borromeo that the archbishop had with the permission of the King of Poland gone to Moscow,¹⁹⁸ and thus ended this attempt to invite a representative of the Greek Orthodox Church to the Council.¹⁹⁹

In early 1561 it was also decided at Rome to invite Grand Duke Ivan IV (the Terrible, 1533-1584) of Muscovy to send representatives to the Council.²⁰⁰ The

¹⁹² Ed. *NBD* II, i, 288: *agnoscens sanctae sedis primatum*. On Hosius, whose father was Ulrich Hose of Pforzheim, see *KTR* v, 137-168; for a list of his works see Klaiber, *Kontroverstheologen* nos. 1598-1615.

¹⁹³ Ed. Theiner, *Monumenta* ii, 626-627.

¹⁹⁴ Ed. □usta, *Curie* i, 58-59, see 59.

¹⁹⁵ Ed. *ibid.* i, 61. Ranuccio Farnese was the favourite grandson of Pope Paul III and had already been made a cardinal at the age of fifteen at the consistory of 16 December 1545.

¹⁹⁶ Ed. *ibid.* i, 64-66, see 64-65: *di grandissima importantia*.

¹⁹⁷ Ed. *NBD* II, i, 286-287, see 287. Cardinal Dolfin is frequently but incorrectly called Delfino.

¹⁹⁸ Ed. □usta, *Curie* i, 66.

¹⁹⁹ On the incident see Freudenberger, *Konzil* 157-158; Jedin, *Geschichte* iv, 1, 62; Peri, *Concilio* 436-438. The "archbishop of Galatia" presumably means the metropolitan of Ancyra, who in 1560 was a certain Gerasimus, whose name features among the alleged subscribers to the document falsely drawn up in the form of a synodal decision by Patriarch Joasaph of Constantinople granting recognition of Ivan IV's imperial title, ed. Tachiaos, *Pèges* i, 161-164, see 162. The document is dated 7069 but this means 1590 not 1591 as it was drawn up in November or December, see Fonkich, *Gramoty* 247-248. The arrival of a metropolitan of Ancyra (or archbishop of Galatia) is not recorded by Kapterev, *Kharakter passim*, in his study of Russian relations with the Orthodox Near East at this time and the suspicion must arise that the "archbishop of Galatia" was one of the many imposters visiting Europe for alms at this time, on whom see *ibid.* 221-247. On another Roman attempt to obtain Greek participation in the Council of Trent see Peri, *Concilio* 439-440.

²⁰⁰ There can be little doubt but that the idea of inviting him had been inspired by the hopes of reconciling Ivan with the Catholic Church which had been aroused by the adventurer Hans Schlitte of Goslar (⊥ after 1557) in 1547, whose machinations had led to a scheme whereby in return for his reconciliation with Rome Pope Julius III would confer a royal title upon Ivan, a scheme which had foundered in early 1553 upon the implacable

invitation dated 13 April 1561 was entrusted to the papal camerarius Gian Francesco Mazza de Canobio († 1589), who was due to leave Rome for Vienna on 16 April to bestow the decoration of the Golden Rose on Maria (1528-1603), daughter of Charles V and wife of King Maximilian II of Bohemia (1548-1564, Emperor 1564-1576).²⁰¹ He arrived in Vienna on 30 April and left for Poland on 19 May. Despite a letter from Pius IV to King Sigismund II Augustus of Poland asking the latter to assist the papal envoy,²⁰² the King, hostile to any rapprochement between Muscovy and the West which might endanger the Eastern Polish provinces, did not permit him to continue on to Moscow and in his letter of 13 August to Cardinal Morone Canobio informed the Cardinal of this and stated that he would return via Prussia so that he could deliver an invitation to the Council to Duke Albert I of Prussia (1525-1568).²⁰³ Undiscouraged by this failure a new envoy was sent, Giovanni Giraldi († after 1581), a Venetian who knew German and Polish. According to his instructions dated 29 September 1561, in which Ivan is surprisingly already called *Serenissimo Ré*, Giraldi was also to invite Ivan to send gifted youths to Rome to study and was to remind Ivan of the great advantages which reunion would bring in the struggle against the Turks.²⁰⁴ Giraldi was, however, intercepted in Poland and incarcerated for over two years²⁰⁵ and thus ended any hopes for Muscovite representation at the Council.

hostility of King Sigismund III Augustus of Poland, who feared that any increase in Muscovite influence would be a threat to Poland's eastern provinces. On this most bizarre of episodes see above all Fiedler, *Versuch* 46-73, with an edition of most of the relevant documents, *ibid.* 74-123; for brief accounts see Amberger, *Anwerbung* 18-19; Pierling, *Papes* 33-68 [reprinted in *idem*, *Russie i*, 325-360]; Uebersberger, *Österreich i*, 282-307, and Winter, *Russland i*, 208-214.

²⁰¹ Letter for Ivan ed. *CT* viii, 190; Theiner, *Monumenta* ii, 635-636; on it see De Simone, *Invito* 344-345.

²⁰² The letter ed. Theiner, *Monumenta* ii, 636. Since at Rome it had been decided to send either Canobio or Cardinal Dolfin, the letter had been drawn up in duplicate and the copy edited is that for Dolfin; that for Canobio is in the Vatican Archives, *Concilium 120*, f. 26^r. In the event Dolfin was absent when Canobio arrived in Vienna and only returned to Vienna on 18 June, a month after Canobio had left, see *NBD* II, i, 262. See also the documents ed. *CT* vii, 204-205; *NBD* II, i, 243-258; Sickel, *Geschichte* 191-197, and Theiner, *Monumenta* ii, 664-672.

²⁰³ Ed. Theiner, *Monumenta* ii, 641. Sigismund's excuse for not allowing the papal envoy to proceed to Moscow was that all routes were blocked because of the Livonian War (1558-1583), see Hosius' letter of 17 June 1561 to Commendone, ed. *CT* viii, 227. On Canobio's fruitless mission see De Simone, *Invito* 343-355; Freudenberger, *Konzil* 158-162; Pierling, *Papes* 69-82 [reprinted in *idem*, *Russie i*, 361-372]. Pius IV's breve of 20 May 1561 inviting Duke Albert I to the Council ed. Wermter, *Kardinal* 24-25; Hosius' letter recommending Canobio to Albert ed. *ibid.* 19-21; the latter's letter of 5 September to Hosius refusing the invitation ed. *ibid.* 22-24. Albert (1490-1568), Margrave of Brandenburg-Ansbach, had been elected Grand Master of the Teutonic Order in 1511 but, after having met Luther in 1523, he in 1525 secularized the Order and transformed Prussia into a hereditary duchy under Polish suzerainty. His brother William (1498-1563) was the last archbishop of Riga (1539-1563). On Albert as Grand Master of the Teutonic Order see Thielen, *Albrecht* 160-165.

²⁰⁴ Ed. Turgeniev, *Russiae i*, 181-184. In the invitation of 13 April 1561 Ivan had simply been called *Magnus Moschoviae Dux*, see above note 201. In his study of foreign reactions to the Muscovite ruler's assumption of the ambiguous title of tsar, see Uspensky, *Tsar'* 46, the author unfortunately fails to note this extraordinary use of the title *Ré*.

²⁰⁵ His release was reported in a letter of 3 January 1564 to Borromeo from Commendone, at the time nuntius in Poland (1563-1565), ed. Turgeniev, *Russiae i*, 199. On this episode see De Simone, *Invito* 355-357; Freudenberger, *Konzil* 162-163; Jedin, *Geschichte* iv, 1, 63; Pierling, *Papes* 82-88 [reprinted in *idem*, *Russie i*, 372-379]. Later in April 1581 on his way to meet Ivan IV on behalf of Pope Gregory XIII (1572-1585) the

On 10 March 1561 Pius IV appointed the Council legates, Cardinals Ercole Gonzaga (1505-1563), Girolamo Seripando (1492-1563), Ludovico Simonetta (c. 1500-1568) and Hosius,²⁰⁶ and the Council reopened at Trent on 18 January 1562.²⁰⁷ Since the decree on the sacrifice of the mass which included the decision on the use of the vernacular which had been drawn up in 1552 had not been voted,²⁰⁸ the whole matter had to be dealt with once more, but even before it was discussed from 19 July to 7 September it was raised in a memorandum on reform of 20 May 1561 sent by Emperor Ferdinand I (1558-1564) to the Council legates, who received it on 6 June.²⁰⁹ The Emperor's basic premise was that it was first necessary to reform the abuses in the Church which had led to the schism before proceeding to discuss doctrine and the memorandum included fifteen articles dealing with the reform of abuses, the thirteenth of which advocates the use of the vernacular in services and makes specific reference to Croatia as an example.²¹⁰ The legates' immediate reaction to the memorandum included the statement with regard to the use of the vernacular that it did not seem advisable to them to alter the ancient custom of the Church but if the Council deemed otherwise the change could be made.²¹¹ The memorandum placed the legates in an awkward quandary: the Emperor had the right to make proposals but did he have the right to propose a complete programme of reform and the manner in which it should be implemented? If the memorandum was accepted, what would be the reaction of King Charles IX of France (1560-1574)? Dolfin, now nuntius at the imperial court (1561-1565), was instructed to warn the Emperor of the dangers involved and after his interviews with Ferdinand on 18-19 June²¹² the latter by letter of 22 June informed the legates that he was not instructing the Council what to do but merely making suggestions and the legates were free to

celebrated Jesuit Antonio Possevino (1533/4-1611) visited Giraldi in Venice, who recounted what had happened, see *idem*, *Papes* 85.

²⁰⁶ *CT* viii, 176-177. Seripando, Simonetta and Hosius were all raised to the cardinalate in that year. On the active role that Seripando as general of the Augustinian Hermits (1538-1551) had played in the first period of the Council see Zumkeller, *Augustiner-Eremiten* 523-531; on him see also *KTR* ii, 115-123. On Hosius see above note 192.

²⁰⁷ See the acts of the 21st session ed. *CT* viii, 289-303. The German Protestant princes refused to attend and submitted a document giving their reasons to the Emperor at the Diet of Frankfurt on 25 November 1562, ed. *CT* xiii, 2, 84-103.

²⁰⁸ See above notes 170-171.

²⁰⁹ Ed. *CT* xiii, 1, 661-685. The first draft by the Emperor's secretary Marcus Singkhmoser (fl. 16th century) had been revised by the theologian Friedrich Staphylus (Stapellage, 1512-1564) and the final version prepared by the Emperor's Vice-Chancellor Georg Sigmund Seld (1516-1565). On the composition of the memorandum see Sickel, *Reformations-Libell* 1-96. For a list of Staphylus' works see Klaiber, *Kontroverstheologen* nos. 2935-2950.

²¹⁰ The *Articuli de reformatione* ed. *CT* xiii, 1, 666-672, for the 13th see *ibid.* 671. Other concessions proposed included the chalice for the laity, the marriage of priests and the abolition of the plurality of benefices. It also advised that the restitution of impropriated ecclesiastical property should not be demanded.

²¹¹ Ed. Le Plat, *Monumentorum* v, 385-388, see 387:

Si tamen ita synodo videbitur, ut ista, quae pertinent ad res sacras, possint lingua vulgari componi.

²¹² See his report ed. *NBD* II, iii 69-73, see 69-70.

use the memorandum as they saw fit, although he insisted upon his imperial right to act on behalf of the Church.²¹³

The imperial suggestion that the abuses be reformed before doctrinal questions were dealt with was not accepted and both aspects were dealt with simultaneously and so on 19 July 1563 thirteen articles drawn up in the form of questions about the sacrifice of the mass were submitted to the fathers. The eleventh canon of 1552 had been split into its three constituent parts as articles 8-10, the ninth being devoted to the question whether mass should be celebrated in the vernacular.²¹⁴ In order to proceed more expeditiously it was decided to set up two commissions, one to deal with the first seven articles and the other with the final six.²¹⁵ At the meeting of the second commission on 30 July the Italian theologian Cesare Ferrante of Sessa Aurunca (fl. 16th century) stated that although it was not in principle wrong to translate the mass into the vernacular it could lead to inconsistencies and for that reason Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085) had forbidden it in his epistle to the duke of Hungary.²¹⁶ Ferrante allowed that according to novel CXXXVII of the civil law code drawn up by command of Emperor Justinian (527-565) a language understood by the people should be used but claimed that this only applied to the Greeks.²¹⁷ The somewhat garbled reference to Gregory VII and the duke of Hungary refers to that fact that on 2 January 1080 the Pope wrote to Duke Vratislav II of Bohemia (1061-1092) to reject the latter's petition that permission be given for the divine office to be celebrated in Slavonic on the grounds that it had pleased God that parts of Scripture be recondite lest it be cheapened and despised or lead the simple into error. The Duke should not cite the fact that pious men had previously tolerated what simple people asked for since once Christianity had become firmly established the Fathers had corrected things which the primitive Church had tolerated.²¹⁸

²¹³ Ed. Le Plat, *Monumentorum* v, 351-360.

²¹⁴ All thirteen ed. *CT* viii, 719. The ninth reads:

An missa nonnisi in lingua vulgari, quam omnes intellegant, celebrari debeat.

The eighth deals with the secret recitation of the Words of Institution and the tenth with the celebration of mass in honour of a saint; for the text of the eleventh canon of 1522 see above note 170; for the draft version of that canon see note 162.

²¹⁵ *CT* viii, 719.

²¹⁶ *CT* viii, 742:

Missam lingua vernacula traduci non est simpliciter malum, sed ob inconvenientia, quae inde evenire possunt, Gregorius VII epistola ad ducem Hungariae id vetat.

By *inconvenientia* he apparently means textual inconsistencies between the various versions which could lead to doctrinal disagreements.

²¹⁷ *CT* vii, 742: *Justinian loqui de more graeco*. He is referring to *Novella cxxxvii. De creatione episcoporum et clericorum*, vi, ed. *CIC* iii: *Novellae*, 695-699, see 699:

Praeterea iubemus omnes et episcopos et presbyteros non tacite, sed ea voce quae a fidei populo exauditur sacram oblationem precesque in sancto baptisate adhibitas faciant, ut inde quoque audientium animi ad maiorem contritionem et de domino deo praedicationem excitentur.

The novel then goes on to cite 1 Corinthians 14:16-17, one of the earliest misinterpretations of the Biblical passage on glossolalia as though it referred to foreign languages. See on this above notes 59-64, 169, 174 and below notes 223 and 227.

²¹⁸ Ed. *PL* cxlviii. 554-555, see 555:

Vratislav's request referred to the fact that the Roman rite in Slavonic had been celebrated at the Benedictine monastery at Sázava founded with the support of Duke Udalrich of Bohemia (1012-1034) and his successor Břetislav I (1034-1055) by St. Procopius (± 1053). There is no evidence that Vratislav actually enforced the papal ban and the use of Slavonic only ceased at the time of Břetislav II (1092-1100) and Bishop Cosmas of Prague (1091-1098).²¹⁹ Had de Castro and Lunel been acquainted with Gregory VII's epistle they would undoubtedly have quoted it in support of the idea that what had once been tolerated could later be banned.²²⁰

On the following day, 31 July 1562, the Spanish theologian Francisco Sancho (c. 1500-1578), *peritus* of Bishop Pedro González de Mendoza of Salamanca (1560-1574), delivered the most blistering attack on the use of the vernacular of the entire Council: the only languages suitable for the celebration of mass were Latin, Greek and Hebrew, the languages of the superscription on the Cross, in which the Gospel had originally been propagated,²²¹ and ever since Gaul and Germany had been converted a thousand years previously Latin had been used in the liturgy. To change now would be to cast pearls before swine and risk the mysteries of God being mocked.²²² Sancho then proposed yet another misinterpretation of 1 Corinthians 14:16: the heretics quote this verse to justify the use of the vernacular in the mass:

how shall he who occupies the place of the uninstructed (idiotae) say Amen at thy giving of thanks since he knows not what you are saying?

But here Paul was either referring to preaching, which, of course, has to be in the vernacular, or else at that time all were pious but now charity had grown

Quia vero nobilitas tua postulavit, quod secundum Sclavonicam linguam apud vos divinum celebrari annueremus Officium, scias nos huic petitioni tuae nequaquam posse favere. Ex hoc nempe saepe volentibus liquet non immerito sacram Scripturam omnipotenti Deo placuisse quibusdam locis esse occultam, ne, si ad liquidum cunctis pateret, forte vilesceret et subjaceret despectui, aut prave intellecta a mediocribus in errorem induceret. Neque enim ad excusationem juvat, quod quidam religiosi viri hoc quod simpliciter populus quaerit patienter tulerunt, seu incorrectum dimiserunt, cum primitiva Ecclesia multa dissimulaverit quae a sanctis Patribus, postmodum firmata Christianitate, et religione crescente, subtili examinatione correctae sunt. Unde ne id fiat quod a vestris imprudenter exposcitur auctoritate beati Petri inhibemus, teque ad honorem omnipotentis Dei huic vanae temeritati viribus totis resistere praecipimus

²¹⁹ For brief survey of the period when the Slavo-Latin rite was used at Sázava see Reichertov, *Klášter* 70-103; for a bibliography on the monastery down to 1988 see *eadem*, *Sázava* 405-415. Works by Clifton-Everest, Iwańczuk, Kadlec, Sommer, Tóth *et al.* published since then cannot be listed here.

²²⁰ See above notes 119 and 132.

²²¹ *CT* viii, 743-744:

Missam lingua vulgari non esse celebrandam, sed aut latina, aut graeca, aut hebraea, ut sunt tres linguae in titulo crucis, quibus Evangelium Dei propagandum erat.

²²² *Ibid*, viii, 744:

ne margaritae dentur porcis, ne vulgo arcana Dei publicentur et ludibrio habeantur.

On this appeal to Matthew 7:6 see above notes 137-138.

cold.²²³ Sancho did, however, allow that the pope had the authority to permit the use of the vernacular should he deem it expedient.²²⁴

In late July or early June Cristoforo of Padua (1500-1569), the general of the Augustinian Hermits (1555-1569), wrote a paper on the thirteen articles, in which with regard to the ninth he made the usual point that a literary language was more suitable for the divine mysteries than a vernacular, adding that Moses had had to write Scripture in his mother tongue (*materna lingua*) since there was no other language at the time.²²⁵ He too cites Gregory VII's epistle, although he correctly states that it was addressed to the Duke of the Bohemians,²²⁶ and then gives yet another misinterpretation of 1 Corinthians 14:16: Paul was referring either to the sermon or the Biblical reading but not to the divine office as such.²²⁷ Cristoforo, however, did make one valid point not hitherto recorded in the acts of the Council: mass had been said in a mother tongue in places where there was only one language, as had been the case with the Greeks before Greek had been corrupted and hence the use of a vernacular was not intrinsically wrong.²²⁸ When the draft doctrinal treatise on the sacrifice of the mass and the twelve canons accompanying it which had been drawn up for submission to the Council fathers was distributed on 6 August 1562, it became clear that the more extreme views of theologians such as Sancho had not been taken into account. The use of the vernacular is dealt with in c. iv on rites and ceremonies: unlike in the doctrinal treatise of 1552 there is no reference to the superscription on the Cross, no description of Latin as a divine instrument, merely the statement that if mass were celebrated in the vernacular of every people there would be less reverence for the divine mysteries. Moreover, if there were errors in the many translations it might appear that there were differing mysteries, not common ones. However, there were certain parts of the mass which all must understand, such as the scriptural readings, which must be explained to the people especially on feast days.²²⁹ The wording of the tenth canon

²²³ On such misinterpretations of 1 Corinthians 14 see above notes 59-64, 169; 174, 217 and below 227.

²²⁴ *Ibidem*:

Possit tamen Pontifex Maximus statuere contrarium, sicut judicaverit expedire.

On Sancho and the Council see Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 436-439.

²²⁵ *Super praedictis articulis explicatio et decisio*, ed. CT, xiii, 1, 708-714, see 713. His paper must antedate 6 August when the draft doctrinal treatise and 13 canons were distributed.

²²⁶ *Ibidem*: *duci Bohemorum*.

²²⁷ *Ibidem*. On similar misinterpretations of 1 Corinthians 14 see above notes 59-64, 169, 174, 217 and 223.

²²⁸ *Ibidem*:

Non est dubium, quod dicta sit aliquando missa materna lingua, ubi non est nisi una lingua, ut apud Graecos, antequam corrupta esset. Ex suo igitur genere non est malum.

Schmidt, *Liturgie* 132, stated that not one of Cristoforo's arguments against the use of the vernacular was valid, which, however, ignores this final point. On the role which Cristoforo played at the Council see Zumkeller, *Augustiner-Eremiten* 532-533.

²²⁹ *Doctrina de sacrificio missae*, ed. CT viii, 751-754, see c. iv: *De ritibus et caeremoniis, quae in missae celebratione adhibentur*, *ibid.* 753-754, see 753:

Lingua etiam latina, qua missae in occidentali ecclesia celebrantur, maxime congruit; si quidem ea pluribus nationibus communis est, neque videtur esse dubitandum, quin, si missae vulgari cuiusque gentis idiomate peragerentur, divina mysteria minori reverentia colerentur. Esset etiam magnopere

on the use of the vernacular is the same as that part of the eleventh of 1552 dealing with it, viz. anyone who claims that mass cannot be celebrated other than in the vernacular is anathema.²³⁰

The treatise and the canons were discussed in nine general congregations from 11 to 27 August and once again those bishops in whose dioceses the Slavonic liturgy was in use took an active part in the debates. On the first day Antonio Elio († 1576), bishop of Pola (1548-1572), objected to the wording of the tenth canon and wished to have it replaced by one in which specific reference was made to ecclesiastical permission for the use of the vernacular.²³¹ Muzio Calini (1525-1570), archbishop of Zara (1555-1566), objected on principle to any condemnation of the use of the vernacular and pointed out that in Dalmatia even in those churches in which Latin was used the Gospel was read twice, first in Latin and then in Dalmatian.²³² On 18 August Bishop Giovanni Alberto Duimio de Gliricis (=Gliričič) of Veglia (Krk, 1550-1564) bluntly stated that the reason given in the treatise for the retention of Latin was not good²³³ and that the sole reason for its retention was habit.²³⁴ The debates revealed, however, that for

periculosum, ne varii in multis translationibus errores nascerentur, qui facerent, ut fidei nostrae mysteria, quae simplicia sunt, viderentur esse diversa. Cum autem in missa quaedam sint, quae ab omnibus debeant intellegi, veluti lectiones et evangelia: ea per illos, qui curam animarum exercent, saltem dominicis aliisque festis diebus populo declarentur, ut in illis omnibus ecclesiis fieri consuevit, in quibus earum pastores officio suo non desunt.

For the draft of 1552 see above note 171.

²³⁰ The canons ed. *CT* viii, 754-755, see 755:

Si quis dixerit, missam non nisi in lingua vulgari celebrari debere: anathema sit.

For the canon of 1552 see above note 170.

²³¹ He therefore proposed:

Si quis dixerit, absque catholicae ecclesiae auctoritate in uno vel alio idiomate missas celebrari debere: anathema sit. CT viii, 755.

On his work at the Council see Sopta, *Teilnehmer* 48-49. From 1572 until his death in 1576 he was bishop of Capodistria. He was also titular Patriarch of Jerusalem from 1558 to 1576.

²³² This is recorded by Gabriele Paleotti (1522-1597) in his diary, ed. *CT* iii, 233-762, see 385. Paleotti was adviser to the Council legates on legal affairs and was raised to the cardinalate in 1565. On him and his diary see Merkle, *Kardinal* 333-430. Future references will be simply to *CT* without further specification. On Calini's participation in the Council see Marani, *Muzio* 9-32, and Sopta, *Teilnehmer* 44-47. In his letters to Cardinal Alvise Corner (1517-1584) from Trent of August to September 1562, ed. *ibid* 321-378, Muzio unfortunately does not refer to the question of the vernacular. That the gospels and epistles were indeed read twice in Dalmatia is proven by the three editions of the *Lectionarium plenum Romanum* in Štokavian Croatian by the Franciscan Bernardin Drivodili of Spalato († c. 1497) published first in Gothic script at Venice in 1495 and reprinted in revised forms at Venice in 1543 and in Latin script in 1586, see Badali, *Jugoslavica* nos. 7, 48 and 191; for the latter two editions see Schmitz, *Buchdruck* nos. 32 and 108. For a reprint of the first edition see Bratuli, *Lekcionar* 3-208. The fourth edition was completely revised in Štokavian-ikavian Croatian by the Franciscan Ivan Bandulavi († after 1625) and printed in Latin script at Venice in 1613, facsimile reprint ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Pisciole* i, 1-352, and reprinted until 1857²⁰. For a list of the editions see Babi, *Jezik* 95, n. 2, who has omitted the 1639 and 1794 Venice editions; the list in Fušak, *Stoljeća* 219, is incomplete, while that in Kniewald, *Kroatische* 59 n. 15, is both incomplete and inaccurate. On Bandulavi (with bibliography) see Frange, *Geschichte* 598. On Bernardin's and Bandulavi's lectionaries see Fušak, *Stoljeća* 203-212 and 219-226. On the version by Bartolomeo Kašić see below. On other versions see Kniewald, *Kroatische* 58-60.

²³³ *CT* viii, 766:

Ratio, quare missa latina lingua celebranda sit, non videtur bona, neque damnandi qui vulgari lingua celebrant.

²³⁴ *CT* iii, 387:

many of the fathers the use of the vernacular was not *per se* to be condemned but that its introduction in the Western Church would be seen not only as a concession to Protestants but as the acceptance of the latter's heretical view that only a mass understood by all was efficacious.²³⁵ On 24 August Bishop Bernard Del Bene of Nîmes (1561-1569) urged that Latin alone should be used above all in Italy, Spain and France²³⁶ and it is known that in his diocese he had consistently rejected the Protestant offer to return churches which they had seized provided that they could celebrate in French.²³⁷

After the debates a new version of the treatise and the canons was drawn up and submitted to the general congregation on 7 September 1562. The victory of those who had time and time again referred to the existence of the Glagolitic liturgy in defence of the vernacular was clear: in c. viii of the doctrinal treatise in which the question of liturgical language is dealt with, it is specifically stated that it is not appropriate for the vernacular to be used everywhere but that each church should retain its own approved rite and that everywhere the readings should be expounded and the mystery of the sacrifice explained to the faithful, especially on Sundays and feast days.²³⁸ No longer is there any reference to the sacred nature of Latin or to greater reverence for the mysteries because of its use

Id esse tantum ex consuetudine.

He further claimed that in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem mass was celebrated in all languages:

in ecclesia Hierosolymitana sancti sepulchri celebrant missam qualibet lingua quae est sub coelo.

CT viii, 766. On his work at the Council see Sopta, *Teilnehmer* 71-75. Unfortunately the only two works devoted to the work of the Croatian bishops at the council do not address the question of the use of Glagolitic but deal with the question of the chalice for the laity, Sopta, *Teilnehmer passim*, and that of episcopal residence, Tylner, *Episcoporum passim*.

²³⁵ Viz. the point made by Josse Ravesteyn on 11 December 1551, which involves the acceptance of the Protestant *ex opere operantis* instead of the Catholic *ex opere operato*, see above note 164 and the remarks of Martimort, *Discipline* 47, who, *ibid.* 51, correctly states:

le latin apparaissait comme la preuve de touche de l'Orthodoxie, la langue vulgaire était signe de reconnaissance des Réformés.

See also the remarks of Korolevsky, *Languages* 107; Schmidt, *Liturgie* 171-172, 185-186, and *idem*, *Volkstaal* 24-25.

²³⁶ CT viii, 780:

Canon 10, non est anathemate damnandus, et exprimatur, quod missa sola lingua latina celebranda sit, praesertim in Italia, Gallia, Hispania.

²³⁷ This is recorded in his diary by Paleotti, ed. CT iii, 393. See also the remarks by Tallon, *France* 728-730.

²³⁸ *Doctrina et canones de sacrificio missae*, ed. CT viii, 909-912, see 911:

*Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est patribus, ut vulgari passim lingua celebraretur. Quamobrem, retento ubique cuiusque ecclesiae antiquo et a sancta Romana ecclesia probato ritu, ne oves Christi esuriant, ne parvuli panem petant et non sit qui frangat eis: * mandat sacrosancta synodus pastoribus et singulis curam animarum gerentibus, ut frequenter inter missarum celebrationem vel per se vel per alios, ex his, quae in missa leguntur, aliquod exponant atque inter cetera sanctissimi sacrificii mysterium aliquod declarent, diebus praesertim Dominicis et festis.*

*Lamentations 4:4. It has been claimed that the phrase *non tamen expedire visum est patribus* refers to the Church Fathers, not the fathers of the Council, thus Schmidt, *Liturgie* 148. While it is true that the word *patres* is used in both senses in the treatise, e.g. in c. ix:

In sacrosancto Evangelio sanctorumque patrum translationibus [...] sacrosancta synodus, post multos gravesque his de rebus mature habitos tractatus, unanimi patrum omnium consensu [...] hos canones constituit, ibidem

Nevertheless the very nature of the issue being dealt with militates against such an interpretation.

or to its utility as a barrier to errors which might occur if a multitude of translations were used. There is not even a reference to its usefulness as an international means of communication. The number of canons had been reduced from 13 to 9 and articles 6, 8 and 9 combined to form one canon, the ninth. The sole inconsequential alteration in the text referring to the use of the vernacular was that *save (nonnisi)* had become *only (tantum)*.²³⁹ In the final version approved by the Council in the 22nd session on 17 September 1562 a few minor alterations had been made to c. viii of the doctrinal treatise and to the ninth canon but none of them affected the wording of the decision on the vernacular.²⁴⁰

The only other time that the use of the vernacular in the liturgy was an issue at the Council was after the arrival of the French delegation led by Cardinal Charles de Guise (1525-1574) on 13 November 1562.²⁴¹ On 4 January 1563 a petition with 34 proposals for reform was presented to the Council legates in the name of King Charles IX of France, the seventeenth of which called for the use of the vernacular in the mass except in the canon.²⁴² This placed the legates in the same quandary as had Emperor Ferdinand I's memorandum of 20 May 1561, indeed, even more so as article 34 of the petition called for a general council every ten years.²⁴³ The French position was strengthened by the news of the

²³⁹ The canons ed. CT viii, 911-912, see 912:

Si quis dixerit, ecclesiae Romanae ritum, quo submissa voce verba consecrationis proferuntur, damnandum esse; aut lingua tantum vulgari missam celebrari debere; aut acquam non miscendam esse vino in calice, eo quod sit contra Christi institutionem: anathema sit.

Cf. the draft version of August 1562 in note 230 and that of 1552 in note 170.

²⁴⁰ Ed. CT viii, 959-962. The alterations are in c. viii of the treatise: 1. After *a sancta romana ecclesia* has been added *omnium ecclesiarum matre et magistra*; 2. *ne parvuli* has been altered to *neve parvuli*; 3. *sanctissimi sacrificii* now reads *sanctissimi huius sacrificii*, see *ibid.* 961; in canon ix the alterations are: 1. after *submissa voce* has been added *pars canonis et*; 2. After *calice* has been added *offerendo*, see *ibid.* 962; cf. the previous versions of the treatise in note 238 and of the canon in note 239. For a French translation of canons viii-ix see Coletti, *Éloquence* 223-224. On the debates about the decree of the sacrifice of the mass see Iserloh, *Meßopferdekret* 401-439, who does not, however, deal with the question of the vernacular.

²⁴¹ See CT iii, 467-468. de Guise was accompanied by twelve bishops, eight abbots and eighteen theologians, see the letter of the Council legates of 16 November 1562 to Borromeo, ed. □usta, *Curie* iii, 66-72, see 67.

²⁴² Ed. Le Plat, *Monumentorum* v, 631-643, see 637; CT xiii, 2, 106-108, see 107; also ed. Tallon, *France* 842-866, see 855:

In missis parochialibus evangelium aperte et dilucide, et pro populi captu copiose in suggestu exponatur: quo in loco, quae praeunte plebano a populo fiunt preces, lingua fiant vernacula: peracto autem sacrificio Latine et mysticis precibus, lingua etiam vernacula publice ad Deum fiant orationes: eo autem tempore et aliis statutis horis cantari poterunt pia et spiritualia cantica, vel Psalmi Davidici, prius ab episcopo diligenter examinati, si id e re suae ecclesiae esse censebit episcopus

²⁴³ Le Plat, *Monumentorum* v, 643; CT xiii, 2, 108; Tallon, *France* 866:

Decernat sancta synodus, ut non solum synodi episcopales quotannis semel ad minimum, sed etiam tertio quoque anno provinciales congregentur...et ut concilia generalia, nisi aliquod obsistat impedimentum, decimo quoque anno celebrentur.

On Emperor Ferdinand's memorandum see above notes 209-210. There can be no doubt but that the French petition for reforms had been greatly influenced by the proposals of reform made by the French clergy at the Synod of Poissy, 31 July-14 October 1561, ed. CT xiii, 1, 501-517. There is a considerable literature on this synod at which an attempt at reconciliation with the Protestants led by Théodore de Bèze (1519-1605) had been made; for brief surveys see Jedin, *Geschichte* iv, 1, 51-55; Manetsch, *Theodore* 20-22, and Tallon, *France* 301-315. The Roman position with regard to the French proposals for reform was communicated to the legates in a memorandum sent from Rome on 3 October 1562, ed. CT xiii, 2, 14-15.

defeat of the Huguenot army at Dreux on 19 December 1562 by the Cardinal's brother, Duke François de Guise (1519-1563) and the capture of the Huguenot commander Prince Louis de Condé (1530-1569). On 12 February 1563 Cardinal de Guise left Trent to meet Emperor Ferdinand at Innsbruck and on his arrival informed the nuntius to the imperial court, Dolfin, that if the Council did not deal with the reforms the French delegation would leave in late April.²⁴⁴ The Emperor, who was exasperated by the Council's lengthy deliberations, after his discussions with the Cardinal, wrote two letters to Pope Pius IV, both dated 3 March 1563: in the first he proposed that both he and the Pope should go to Trent and also that rulers should have the right – so far reserved to the pope and the Council legates – to submit proposals to the Council,²⁴⁵ while in the second, intended for the pope's eyes only, he again urged the pope to go to the Council and to reform both the Curia and the episcopate and argued that the right for rulers to submit proposals would not derogate from papal authority as the Council would retain the right to make decisions regarding such proposals.²⁴⁶

The French petition together with the Council legates' comments had been sent to Rome on 3 February 1563, where it was carefully studied. The suggestion that a general council should meet every ten years was rejected as impracticable since the Council of Trent had already lasted seventeen years and if councils were to be held at regular intervals it would have to be at least every twenty to twenty-five years,²⁴⁷ but the principal Roman objection was that the right to convoke general councils belonged to the pope alone.²⁴⁸ In the event Cardinal de Guise' position was weakened by the assassination of his brother Duke François by the Protestant Jean Poltrot de Méré (1535-1563) on 18 February 1563 and by the policy of reconciliation pursued by Catherine de' Medici (1519-1589), which led to the Huguenots being given limited tolerance by the Edict of Amboise of 19 May 1563, and in the event the petition was never formally submitted to the Council,²⁴⁹ so that after the adoption of the decree on the sacrifice of the mass on 17 September 1562 no other decree of the Council dealt with the question of the use of the vernacular in Scripture or in the liturgy, although it was stressed in

²⁴⁴ See Dolfin's letter to the Council legates of 18 February 1563, ed. *NBD* II, iii, 195-197, see 196.

²⁴⁵ Ed. Le Plat, *Monumentorum* v, 690-694; *CT* xiii, 2, 293-295.

²⁴⁶ Ed. *NBD* II, iii, 224-234, and *CT* xiii, 2, 295-300; the edition in Le Plat, *Monumentorum* v, 694-703, has been abridged.

²⁴⁷ The legates' and Roman comments ed. *CT* xiii, 2, 119-123, 124-126. Le Plat's and Tallon's editions of the French petition, see note 242, include these comments, although in the former's in an abridged form and the missing passages were edited by □usta, *Curie* iii, 202-203, 228-229. The impracticability of a general council every ten years is a Roman comment, ed. Tallon, *France* 866; Le Plat, *Monumentorum* v, 643; *CT* xiii, 2, 126.

²⁴⁸ All three editions *ibidem*:

De concilio generali relinquendum est arbitrio pontificis, ad quem solum spectat concilium indicere.

²⁴⁹ Charles IX was born on 27 June 1550 and after the death of his elder brother Francis II (1559-1560) on 5 December 1560 the regency was exercised by their mother, Catherine de' Medici, who continued to dominate policy even after Charles aged thirteen was declared to have come of age on 17 August 1563. The political events cannot be examined here. On the activities of the French delegation at Trent see most recently Tallon, *France* 356-417, 559-811.

canon vii of the canons of general reform approved in the 24th session on 11 November 1563 that when the sacraments are celebrated their efficacy and benefit should be explained in the vernacular whenever necessary.²⁵⁰

The index of prohibited books issued at Rome only seven months before Paul IV's death on 18 August 1559, despite the modifying instructions,²⁵¹ had been so draconian that apart from in the States of the Church it had remained largely unenforced²⁵² and so work upon a revised version began under his successor Pius IV. On 14 June 1561 Cardinal Michele Ghislieri (1504-1572, elected as Pius V in 1566), who had been appointed Grand Inquisitor on 14 December 1558, issued a further modification of the instructions regarding the index, which *inter alia* removed the prohibition on all the books published by the 61 editors.²⁵³ In a letter of 18 December 1561 to Cardinal Borromeo the Council legates stressed the importance of a revised index²⁵⁴ and on 14 January 1562 the Pope sent the legates a breve requesting that the Council take over the revision of the index.²⁵⁵ The necessity of this revision was announced at the general congregation of 27 January²⁵⁶ and the papal breve read out at the next one on 30 January, after which debates on the issue began.²⁵⁷ On 12 February it was agreed that the Council legates would appoint a commission to draft a decree on the index.²⁵⁸ The draft was submitted to the general congregation on 17 February,²⁵⁹ at which the names of the members of the commission under Anton Brus von Müglitz (1518-1580), archbishop of Prague (1561-1580), which would actually revise the index, were announced.²⁶⁰ The final version of the decree stating that the commission would examine how the influence of heretical books could be curbed and would examine all books submitted to it was approved at the 18th session of the Council on 26 February 1562.²⁶¹

²⁵⁰ *Canones reformationis generalis*, ed. CT ix, 978-988, see 981-982.

²⁵¹ See above notes 184 and 188.

²⁵² See Reusch, *Index* i, 297-299.

²⁵³ *Moderatio indicis librorum prohibitorum*, ed. De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 105-106; on it see *ibid.* viii, 54 and 141-142; Ehses, *Vorgeschichte* 69; *idem* in CT viii, 334, n. 3; Fragnito, *Ritorno* 397; Reusch, *Index* i, 299.

²⁵⁴ Ed. □usta, *Curie* i, 129-130.

²⁵⁵ Ed. CT viii, 279. On the work already undertaken at Rome in 1560-1561 see De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 51-54.

²⁵⁶ Ed. CT viii, 304-305.

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 306-311. On the debates about the index, the revision of which by the Council itself was not supported by all the fathers, see De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 56-78; Jedin, *Geschichte* iv, 1, 94-109.

²⁵⁸ CT viii, 323-325. It consisted of Muzio Calini, Egidio Foscarari (1512-1564), bishop of Modena (1550-1564), Antonio Augustin (1517-1586), bishop of Lérida (1561-1576) and Bishop Jacques-Marie Sala of Viviers (1554-1564).

²⁵⁹ Ed. CT viii, 329; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 66-67.

²⁶⁰ See CT viii, 328-329; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 74. Anton Brus was a Sudeten German, who had been bishop at Vienna (1568-1561); on his role at Trent see Jedin, *Teilnehmer* 256-258. The composition of the commission varied from time to time, see the alterations listed in De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 76.

²⁶¹ Ed. CT viii, 358; de Bujanda, *Index* viii, 73.

Little is known of the activity of the commission as its work was not discussed at the general congregations²⁶² and indeed such an undertaking was scarcely a suitable task for a council.²⁶³ It was thus decided on 4 December 1563, the second and last day of the final 25th session of the Council, that although the Commission had completed its task of compiling the rules for ecclesiastical censorship, the number and variety of individual books to be examined surpassed the capabilities of the Council to judge them all properly and it was thus decided to submit what had already been achieved to the pope's judgement and to leave the rest to be finished under his authority at Rome.²⁶⁴ The final touches were put to the revision at Rome and the index was published there in late March 1564.²⁶⁵ The index is prefaced by Pope Pius IV's bull *Dominicis gregis custodias* of 24 March 1564, in which the reasons for the compilation are explained and the penalties for those who read or possess prohibited books are outlined.²⁶⁶ This is followed by a preface by the secretary of the commission of the Council, the Portuguese Dominican Francisco Foreiro (1523-1581),²⁶⁷ in which he explains how the revision has been compiled on the basis of the 1559 index.²⁶⁸ This is then followed by the ten rules drawn up by the Council commission for ecclesiastical censorship, which are without doubt the most lasting achievement of the commission's work as they remained, despite some subsequent revision, the basis for ecclesiastical censorship down to the 20th century.²⁶⁹ The fourth of the ten rules concerns vernacular translations of Scripture: whereas formerly no such translation could be read without the express permission of the Holy Office at Rome,²⁷⁰ now the rule had been relaxed to allow all those who would profit by reading Catholic vernacular translations to do so provided that their parish priest or confessor had obtained written permission from the diocesan bishop or inquisitor.²⁷¹ Although the new index was still strict, it was a vast improvement

²⁶² On its work see De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 78-94; Ehses, *Vorgeschichte* 71-77; *idem* in *CT* ix, 1104, n. 1; Pastor, *Geschichte* vii, 300-302; Reusch, *Index* i, 312-321.

²⁶³ As Ehses, *Vorgeschichte* 77, rightly pointed out.

²⁶⁴ Ed. *CT* ix, 1106; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 96:

Audiens nunc, huic operi ab eis extremam manum impositam esse, nec tamen ob librorum varietatem et multitudinem distincte et commode possit a sancta synodo diiudicare: praecepit, ut, quidquid ab illis praestitum est, Sanctissimo Romano Pontifici exhibeatur, ut eius iudicio atque auctoritate terminetur et evulgetur.

This decree had been drawn up by Francisco Foreiro, on whom see below note 267.

²⁶⁵ *Index Librorum prohibitorum cum regulis confectis per Patres a Tridentina Synodo delectos, auctoritate Sanctiss. D.N. Pii IIII, Pont. Max. comprobatus.* Facsimile in De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 802-872; reprint in Reusch, *Librorum* 243-281; on the contents see *idem*, *Index* i, 326-329, and De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 347-707, who also describes the final work on it at Rome, *ibid.* viii, 97-99.

²⁶⁶ Ed. Reusch, *Librorum* 243-245; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 803-808.

²⁶⁷ On his participation in the Council see Gutiérrez, *Españoles* 402-406.

²⁶⁸ Ed. De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 809-812; Reusch, *Librorum* 245-247; on his preface see *idem*, *Index* i, 321-330.

²⁶⁹ *Regulae indicis*, ed. Reusch, *Librorum* 247-251; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 813-822 (facsimile reprint); Chédozeau, *Bible* 25-29, with a French translation, *ibid.* 30-35. On the rules see Reusch, *Index* i, 330-341; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 92-94 and 150-153. That they had been drawn up by the commission is revealed by Foreiro's letter of 3 December 1593, ed. *CT* ix, 1104, n. 1, on which see De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 95-96.

²⁷⁰ See above note 186.

²⁷¹ Ed. Reusch, *Librorum* 248; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 815-816; Chédozeau, *Bible* 26-27:

on the 1559 index and the number of authors all of whose works were banned had been drastically reduced to a few heresiarchs.²⁷²

It is true that as a result of the creation of the *Congregatio librorum prohibitorum* as a separate body from the Holy Office by Pope Pius V (the former Grand Inquisitor), which first met on 27 March 1571,²⁷³ disagreements between the two bodies led to variations with regard to the rules governing the reading and publishing of vernacular Bibles,²⁷⁴ but such restrictions were enforced mainly in countries with an overwhelmingly Catholic population such as Italy,²⁷⁵ whereas in countries with a largely Protestant population such as England it was clearly necessary for Catholics to have their vernacular translations.²⁷⁶ But no matter what the subsequent disciplinary vagaries were with regard to the fourth rule regarding Bibles in the vernacular, the final conciliar decisions regarding the use of the vernacular in both liturgy and Scripture, influenced by the existence of the Glagolitic liturgy, when compared to the original drafts, are liberal indeed and to interpret the fourth rule of the index of 1564 as the triumphant vindication of Cardinal Pacheco's anti-vernacular stance²⁷⁷ is a travesty of history.

The Council of Trent was not merely the last council of mediaeval Christendom in that representatives of Catholic rulers were present, it was also the first of modern times in that it had to confront a situation of confessional plurality in the

Cum experimento manifestum sit, si sacra Biblia vulgari lingua passim sine discrimine permittantur, plus inde, ob hominum temeritatem, detrimenti, quam utilitatis oriri; hac in parte iudicio Episcopi, aut Inquisitoris stetur; ut cum consilio Parochi, vel Confessarii Bibliorum, a Catholicis auctoribus versorum, lectione in vulgari lingua eis concedere possint, quos intellexerint ex huiusmodi lectione non damnum, sed fidei, atque pietatis augmentum capere posse: quam facultatem in scriptis habeant.

²⁷² The complete ban on all Erasmus' works in the 1559 index, see above note 185, was lifted and only some of his writings were now banned, see ed. Reusch, *Librorum* 259; De Bujanda, *Index* viii, 833-834. See also above note 124.

²⁷³ On its establishment see Reusch, *Index* i, 429-434; Pastor, *Geschichte* viii, 149. As Godman, *Saint* 29, has pointed out, the Church now had two authorities responsible for censorship, neither of whose spheres of competence had been clearly defined:

The results were inconsistency and conflict.

²⁷⁴ On later revisions of the fourth of the ten rules see Reusch, *Index* i, 333-334. As Chézozeau, *Bible* 23, remarked:

L'attitude ouverte de Trente ne sera pas celle de ses héritiers.

On later indices and instructions of the 17th and 18th centuries with more stringent regulations see *ibid.* 35-72, and Duncker, *Chiesa* 159-164. With particular attention to the period 1571-1596 see Frajese, *Politica* 269-356; for the discussions on Scripture in the vernacular see *ibid.* 284-288; on the latter over this period see also *idem*, *Riforma* 23-40.

²⁷⁵ Thus in the 16th century only three editions of an Italian translation of the Bible appeared after 1564, two in 1566 and one in 1567, see Sicco, *Edizioni* ii, nos. 1957-1959, although lectionaries in the vernacular continued to be published, see Garavaglia, *Lezionari* 383-384.

²⁷⁶ See the remarks of Fragnito, *Ritorno* 405, and Frajese, *Riforma* 24-25. Thus a Catholic English version of the New Testament by William Allen (1532-1594) and Gregory Martin (∓ 1582) was published at Rheims in 1582, to be followed by one of the Old Testament in two volumes at Douai in 1609-1610, see below notes 528-529. For some vernacular translations in other countries see Reusch, *Index* i, 334-336.

²⁷⁷ As Revilla, *Controversia* 104, claims:

al fin y al cabo el parecer del Cardenal español fué coronado por el mas completo triunfo.

On Pacheco's role at the Council see Mart□n Gonz□lez, *Cardenal passim*.

West. At the same time it also marked the decisive victory of papal primacy over conciliarism: on the second and final day of the last session on 4 December 1563 the presiding Council legate, Cardinal Morone, proposed that the decrees of the Council should be confirmed by the pope, to which nobody disagreed,²⁷⁸ and which Pius IV did by the bull *Benedictus Deus* of 26 January 1564.²⁷⁹

*

*

*

A striking feature of the debates at the Council of Trent is the fact that it was not so much the theologians, the *periti*, who had advocated the use of the vernacular: for them Latin was not merely a shared medium of communication but was also virtually a second mother tongue in which all learned works on religion, culture and even science were written. For them the introduction of a multitude of vernaculars must have appeared to represent a retrograde step which would inevitably lead to intellectual difficulties, if not impoverishment. The greatest advocates of the use of the vernacular had been the bishops in whose patriarchates or dioceses the use of Slavonic had been, as they believed, introduced by St. Jerome: it was they who defended the use of the vernacular in the liturgy and who ultimately prevented the adoption of any decree which accorded an inherently more sacred character to Latin.²⁸⁰ The decree on Scripture of 1546 merely declared the Vulgate to be the authoritative version among extant Latin translations as far as the Western Church was concerned as its use had been hallowed by centuries of public worship and its quotation in theology. The decree on the liturgy of 1562 merely stated that it was not appropriate for the vernacular to be introduced everywhere but that each Church should retain its own approved rite. Not that this decree put an end to occasional Catholic appeals for the introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy: as early as in 1564 the eirenic Flemish theologian Georg Cassander (van Cadsant, 1513-1566) called for its introduction and made the specific point that its concession to the Slavs could apply equally to all other Christian nations.²⁸¹

²⁷⁸ *CT* ix, 1104.

²⁷⁹ Ed. *ibid.* ix, 1152-1156. Because of some opposition from the Curia it was only promulgated on 30 June 1564, see *ibid.* iv, 1155, n. 2. Of this bull it has been commented:

cette bulle marque la victoire définitive de la papauté sur le conciliarisme, qu'elle n'avait pu obtenir à Trente même.

Tallon, *Concile* 81.

²⁸⁰ As Martimort, *Essai* 96, put it:

au Concile de Trente, les évêques de Dalmatie qui en avaient l'expérience, s'opposèrent de façon décisive à ce que l'on portât la question de la langue liturgique au plan doctrinal et que l'on condamnât le principe de traduction.

²⁸¹ *Traditionum veteris Ecclesiae et sanctorum Patrum defensio, adversus Io. Calvini importunas criminationes* [...], published at Cologne in 1565, see 141-142, especially 142:

*Pontifex Romanus, cum senatu Cardinalium, Sclavorum genti concessisse dicitur, ut patria lingua in sacris operandis uterentur, ad omnes gentes Christiani nominis pertinere videtur. Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum et omnis lingua confiteatur ei.**

However, the point has to be made that the bishops in whose dioceses Slavonic was used were not advocating the use of the vernacular because Slavonic was in their day a vernacular but because it had been a vernacular at the time when St. Jerome had introduced it. That Latin and Greek had been vernaculars when they were introduced in the liturgy and used for Scripture had been pointed out by Erasmus in 1522²⁸² and with regard to Greek at the Council itself by Cristoforo of Padua in 1562.²⁸³ But these languages had the prestige of being those of the superscription of the Cross, a fact often pointed out,²⁸⁴ a prestige to which Dalmatian, viz. Slavonic, had no claim. Thus at the time of the Counter-Reformation the introduction of Slavonic as a liturgical language at a time when it was still a vernacular, even though the historical background of its introduction remained unknown and despite the fact that its use had survived in the Western Church only in an attenuated form, played a not insignificant role in the conciliar decisions which led to the Catholic Reform.

That Slavonic was not considered a vernacular by the bishops in whose dioceses it was in use is borne out by contemporary evidence. Thus in 1563 Archbishop Muzio Calini of Zara, who the previous year had defended the use of the vernacular at the Council, invoking *inter alia* its use in Dalmatia,²⁸⁵ wrote to Cardinal Alvise Corner (1517-1584) that the use of Slavonic could not be affected by the provisions of the index of 1559 regarding the use of vernaculars since Slavonic was not a vernacular.²⁸⁶ This fact was equally well known to some bishops

*Cf. Psalm 150:6 and Romans 14:11. There are also two marginal notes, *ibid.* 141, to Erasmus' advocacy of the vernacular, on which see above notes 122-123, and yet another reference to 1 Corinthians 14 in justification of the use of the vernacular, see above notes 59-64, 169, 174, 217, 223 and 227, while, *ibid.* 142, there is a third marginal note which reads: *Aen. Sylvius hist. Bohemicae lib. i, ca. 13*, a reference to Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini's *Historia bohemica*, on which see below note 307. The passage occurs in Cassander's *Defensio insontis libelli, de officio pii viri, adversus iniquum et importunum castigatorem*, in his *Traditionum* 18-170, written in answer to Calvin's attack on his views published in 1561:

Responsio ad versipellem quendam mediatorem, qui pacificandi specie rectum Evangelii cursum in Gallia abrumpere molitus est.

Ed. *CREF* xxxvii, 529-560. For the 1561 edition see Peters, *Bibliotheca* ii, 61/22. On Cassander's book see Nolte, *Georgius* 23-26, 195-200. For the 1565 (not 1564) edition of it see *VD 16* iv, C 1390 and Klaiber, *Kontrovers theologen* no. 612; for his other works see *ibid.* nos. 598-611, 613-616. Later Catholic calls for the use of the vernacular in the liturgy include the publication of a French translation of the missal by Joseph de Voisin († 1685) at Paris in 1660, which was condemned by Pope Alexander VII (1655-1667) in his breve *Ad aures nostras* of 12 January 1661, and the 66th of the 85 propositions of the reforming Jansenist Synod of Pistoia of 1786, condemned in the bull *Auctorem fidei* of 28 August 1794 by Pope Pius VI (1775-1799). Even the first Catholic hierarch of the USA, John Carroll (1735-1815), bishop (1789-1808) then archbishop (1808-1815) of Baltimore, made a plea in favour of the use of English in the liturgy in 1787, see Ellis, *Archbishop* 547-548, although his ardour somewhat cooled after his elevation to the episcopate, see *ibid.* 548-552. These and other cases cannot be examined here.

²⁸² See above note 122.

²⁸³ See above note 228.

²⁸⁴ See above notes 43, 134, 171 and 221.

²⁸⁵ See above note 232.

²⁸⁶ Ed. Jeli□, *Fontes* [16th century] 28, who, as many others, gives the Cardinal's name as Luigi Cornaro:

whose sees were populated by Slavs who did not use Slavonic. Thus in 1558, the year in which Bishop Stanislas Hosius of Ermland (Warmia, 1551-1579) was summoned to Rome by Pope Paul IV to give advice on how to stop the spread of Protestantism and later became one of the Council legates during the third session,²⁸⁷ the bishop published at Dillingen a book in dialogue form between *Arator*, Cultivator, a Catholic protagonist, and *Harpago*, Curmudgeon, his Protestant antagonist, about whether the chalice should be given to the laity, whether women should be admitted to the priesthood and whether the vernacular should be used in the liturgy,²⁸⁸ in which he pointed out that over six hundred years had passed since Cyril and Methodius had obtained permission from the Apostolic See to use Slavonic in the liturgy and there might still be some who remembered that it had been used in the Monastery of the Holy Cross at Kleparz in Poland,²⁸⁹ but probably because more people understood Latin than Slavonic and for other reasons it had ceased to be used as a liturgical language. It was well known that Cyril and Methodius had obtained permission to use it since it was they who had converted the Moravians to the faith but the use of Slavonic, to which the Moravians' language had been closer than Polish was, had not lasted long either in Moravia or Poland as its use had been seen to be more detrimental than advantageous and had thus been replaced by Latin. There was scarcely any language under the sun more widely used than Slav: Bohemians, Moravians, Cashubians, Russians (viz. Ruthenians), Muscovites, Dalmatians,

L'Indice de' Libri Proibiti non valesse alterare questa comune consuetudine, il che sarebbe impossibile, si ancora perchè detta lingua schiava antica non è la volgare, e materna di quei populi, anzi è loro cos□ oscura, come quasi a nostri idioti Italiani la Latina.

²⁸⁷ On him see above notes 192 and 206.

²⁸⁸ *Dialogus de eo, num calicem laicis, et uxores sacerdotibus permitti, ac divina officia vulgari lingua peragi fas sit.* For the editio princeps at Dillingen in 1558 see *VD 16*, ix, H 5148, and Klaiber, *Kontroversstheologen* no. 1602 (where later editions are also listed). The *editio princeps* was here consulted.

²⁸⁹ Inspired by the establishment of the Benedictine monastery of the Glagolitic rite at Prague in 1347, on which see above notes 54-55, King Ladislas II (1386-1434) and Queen Hedwig (Jadwiga, 1384-1399) of Poland by a charter of 28 July 1390 established a similar foundation for 30 Benedictine monks at Kleparz on the outskirts of Cracow with an annual endowment of 20 Polish marks (1 mark=88 groschen), for which establishment the first monks were to come from the monastery at Prague, see the accounts of its foundation by Jan D□ugosz (1415-1480) in his *Historiae Polonicae libri xii*, ed. Prze□dziecki, *Joannis* xii, 487-488, and *Liber beneficiorum dioecesis Cracoviensis*, ed. *ibid.* ix, 225-226, with an edition of Ladislas' charter *ibid.* ix, 226-227. His accounts make it abundantly clear that it was Hedwig's initiative, by the time of whose death in 1399 a modest chapel had been built. There is, however, no record of any further great interest in the foundation: the Glagolitic rite in Slavonic lasted less than a hundred years and disappeared between 1457 and 1480 since D□ugosz (1480) reports that for lack of a priest of the rite Georgius Lithvos now celebrated in Latin, ed. *ibid.* ix, 226, while the *terminus post quem non* is given by the Polish historian Matthias of Michau (Miechów, 1457-1525), who records in his *Chronica polonorum*, i, 13, l, ed. Pistorius, *Historiae* ii, 1-259, see 15:

Qui mos ad tempora mea circa Cracoviam in Ecclesia sanctae Crucis in Clepardia observatus, sed iam extinctus est.

The many hypotheses advanced regarding Hedwig's motivation need not be examined here, *nec alibi, quoniam testimonia desunt*, as Slobodan Fomi□ was wont to say. The *editio princeps* of Matthias' *Chronica* appeared at Cracow in 1519 but was confiscated and a revised version published there in 1521. It first became available in Western Europe when published by Johannes Pistorius (1546-1608) in his collection of works on Poland at Basel in 1582. The Italian translation of the *Chronica* which is sometimes listed as having been published at Venice in 1562 is a ghost work and is probably a confusion with the Italian translation of another of Matthias' works, *Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis*, which appeared at Venice in 1561, see Ciampi, *Bibliographia* i, 346, no. 68. For Matthias' account of Cyril and Methodius see below note 308.

Bosnians, Croatians, Bulgarians, Serbs and several other peoples including ours, viz. Poles. However, Slav dialects varied so greatly that it was more difficult for a Pole to understand a Dalmatian than for a Swiss to understand a Dutchman. Whatever we might like, it had to be acknowledged that Slavonic, the Dalmatian language into which St. Jerome had translated the Scriptures, was far more elegant than later dialects and so if prayers and sacred readings were to be translated into a vernacular, it would be far better to use the original one which was superior in elegance to the dialects derived from it and Jerome's example had revealed that its use would be less dangerous. But since it had once been used in the liturgy who could doubt that the reason for ceasing to use it was not even greater for us than for the Bohemians and Moravians?²⁹⁰ In answer to his Protestant adversary's enquiry why every people should not use their own dialect for such prayers and readings²⁹¹ Hosius replied that not even the Russians who were known to be so conscientious in the divine offices in their traditional Slavonic would do so as they feared lest they would be guilty of a great sin should they alter something in it.²⁹²

²⁹⁰*Dialogus o4^v-o6^v:*

Sexcenti iam et amplius anni intercesserunt, cum Cyrullus, (sic) et Methodius, à sede Apostolica impetrarunt ut, eis rem divinam facientibus, lingua Sclavorum uti liceret. Ac ne nunc quidem fortasse desunt, qui meminisse queant, etiam in templo sanctae crucis, quod est in Clepardia, Sclavorum lingua, sacerdotes sacris operantes, usos fuisse, sed verisimile est, quod plures fuerint, qui latinam, quam qui Sclavorum linguam intelligerent. Itaque, cum eam ob rem, tum alijs ex causis factum est, ut ea lingua, rem divinam facientes, uti desinerent. Constat autem, in Moravorum gratiam id potissimum impetrasse Cyrillum et Methodium, quod ea gens ipsis authoribus in Christum credere caepisset, sed nec apud Moravos, quorum tamen lingua propius ad Sclavorum dialecton accedit, nec apud nos diu mos ille duravit, quod plus adferre detrimenti, quam emolumenti visus est. Quamobrem et apud Moravos etiam illos, qui Catholicae sunt communionis, eadem, qua apud nos, hoc est, latina lingua, rem divinam facientes, utuntur. Ac vix est ulla lingua sub sole, quae latius, quam nostra pateat, cum plus etiam, quam quartam Europae partem complecti videatur. Hac enim utuntur, et Bohemi, et Moravi, et Cassubi, et Russi, et Moschi, et unde nos originem duxisse putamus, Sclavi, Suetij, Dalmatae, Boznenses, Croatae, Bulgari, Rasciani, Serbi, et aliae gentes nonnullae. Caeterum sic inter se nationes hae dialectis variant, ut minus etiam Sclavum, aut Dalmatum Polonus intelligat, quam Holandum, aut Burgundum, Suevus aut Helvetius. Quamlibet autem vos ipsos amemus, tamen illud fateamur necesse est, Sclavorum, aut Dalmatarum linguam esse multo elegantiore, quam sit nostra, ita, ut si preces, et sacras lectiones, in vernaculam transferre linguam oporteret, in eam potissimum transferendae sint, à qua nostra duxit originem, quae praestat etiam caeteris elegantia. Cum praesertim Dalmatica lingua sacros libros Hieronymum vertisse constet, ut in eius usu minus esse periculi videatur. Cum autem et illud manifestum sit, quod in divinis officijs usus illius aliquando fuerit, quis est, qui dubitare queat, non sine causa eum non apud nos magis, quam apud ipsos etiam Bohemos, et Moravos, qui modò Catholici sint, intermissum fuisse?

The theory that in this passage Hosius is not advocating the use of the liturgical language introduced by Jerome into Dalmatia but is proposing the introduction of contemporary vernacular Dalmatian as a new Pan-Slavic liturgical language, thus Graciotti, *Pensiero* 229-231, 235-236, is in the historical context untenable. The passage: *Tamen illud fateamur... Hieronymum vertisse constet, ibid. o6^{r-v}*, was quoted with minor variants by the Dalmatian priest Jerko Pastrinac of Spalato (c. 1515-after 1564) in his minor treatise of 18 February 1562: *De situ Carniolae, ac Lubianae eius Metropolis*, ed. Crnčić, *Prilozi* 90-102, see 101. On this treatise see *idem, Imena* 52, 56.

²⁹¹*Dialogus o6^v:*

Quid autem impediret, quo minus sua, quaeque gens dialecto uteretur in eiusmodi sacris lectionibus, et preces convertendis?

²⁹²*Ibid. o6^v-o7^r:*

With the sole exception of Bishop Paul de Gregorianczi of Agram, who in 1552 had carefully stated that the language used in his diocese was said to be that of Jerome,²⁹³ the Hieronymian origin of the introduction of Slavonic into the liturgy in Croatia, Dalmatia and Istria had not been challenged at the Council and the names of Cyril and Methodius are nowhere reported as having been even mentioned. The above passage from Hosius' book makes it clear why: it was Jerome who had introduced the living Dalmatian, allegedly Slavonic, vernacular into the liturgy in the late 4th or early 5th century and Cyril and Methodius had merely made an unsuccessful attempt to reintroduce it in the ninth century when they converted the Moravians. Although Moravian was a Slav dialect it was not the same as the original Dalmato-Slavonic and the latter had therefore not remained long in use. An experiment to introduce it in Poland had also failed.

At the time of the Council of Trent not every contemporary scholar knew as much about Cyril and Methodius as Hosius did: during the Council of Trent the great humanist and polymath of Zurich, Conrad Gesner (1516-1565), celebrated for his pioneering work as a naturalist, bibliographer, lexicographer and linguist,²⁹⁴ published at Zurich in 1555 his *Mithridates*, the first major work on comparative linguistics.²⁹⁵ He begins his study by asserting that the confusion of languages, viz. Babel, had been a great disadvantage for humanity but that the use of the three languages of the Cross could again unite mankind since Latin and Greek are used in Europe, and Hebrew or rather Arabic in Africa and Asia,

Atqui hoc nec Russi faciunt, quos tanta constat esse religione in divinis officijs, ea dialecto peragendis, quam à maioribus suis traditam acceperunt: ut, si quid ab illa variarent, grandi se piaculo obstrictos iri persuasum haberent.

On Hosius' views on the use of Slav vernaculars in the liturgy see Graciotti, *Pensiero* 217-236.

²⁹³ See above note 167.

²⁹⁴ For brief biographies see Serrai, *Conrad* 9-51; and Wellisch, *Conrad* 1-25; both spellings Gesner and Gessner are found, see Wellisch, *op. cit.* XIII, as are the spellings Conrad and Konrad, see the bibliography in Peters, *Gessner* 78-84; for bibliographies of his works see *VD* 16 vii, G 1693-1810; Serrai, *Conrad* 373-402; Wellisch, *Conrad* 31-114; for works on him see *ibid.* 115-129, and Peters, *Gessner* 79-84.

²⁹⁵ *Mithridates. De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quae hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt, Conradi Gesneri Tigurini Observationes.* A second edition edited by the theologian and Orientalist Kasper Waser (1565-1625) appeared at Zurich in 1610. A reprint of the first edition was published by Peters, *Gessner* 87-245, with a long introduction, *ibid.* 7-77, which is mainly a slightly enlarged version of *idem, Conrad* 115-145, although the introduction includes a useful list of works cited by Gesner, often at second hand, *idem, Gessner* 54-64. It is true that Gesner's *Mithridates* had been preceded by a work on the same subject also published at Zurich seven years earlier in 1548 by his friend Theodor Bibliander (Buchmann, 1504/9-1564):

De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum commentarius Theodori Bibliandri. Cui adnexa est compendiaria explicatio doctrinae recte beateque vivendi, et religionis omnium gentium atque populorum, quam argumentum hoc postulare videbatur.

There can be no doubts about the latter's accomplishments as a linguist, especially as an Orientalist, cf. his Hebrew grammar of 1535 and his Latin translation of the Koran in 1543, but his *Commentarius* is far surpassed by Gesner's *Mithridates*. Peters rightly calls the latter work *das bedeutendste komparatistische Werk am Anfang der Linguistik, idem, Conrad* 145, and *Gessner* 67. The title of the work is due to the fact that King Mithridates VI Eupator of Pontus (120-63 BC) was reputed to have known twenty-two languages. On Bibliander's and Gesner's works see Zwoliński, *Szkice* 7-13, 128-134.

where Greek is also partly used.²⁹⁶ Of all languages Hebrew as the earliest is the purest,²⁹⁷ to which Arabic is close.²⁹⁸ After Hebrew comes Greek in which the New Testament was written and then Latin into which the religious books had been translated.²⁹⁹ He then goes on to make the same point as Cristoforo of Padua: contemporary vernacular Greek is not the same as early Greek.³⁰⁰ In his section on Illyrian or Sarmatian, his terms for Slavonic, he makes the same point as Hosius: it is very widely used³⁰¹ and for him all Slav languages are dialects of

²⁹⁶Mithridates 1^r:

Quemadmodum autem magna infelicitatis humanae pars fuit sermonis confusio: ita nostris temporibus donum verè divinum et praeclaræ felicitatis loco iudicare debemus, totum ferè orbem terrarum tribus illis in cruce consecratis linguis, quas passim homines studiosi exercent, denuq̄ coniungi: atque harum cognitione non ea modo quae ad hominum commercia, quaeque ad sapientiam humanam pertinent, sed pietatem et Deum innotescere. Quis enim nescit per universam Europam Latinae ac Graecae linguarum usum esse: Hebraicae verq̄, sive potius Arabicae, in Africa Asiaque totis ferè, Graecae etiam in parte earundem?

²⁹⁷Ibid. 2^v:

Ex linguis Hebraica, ut prima et antiquissima omnium est, ita sola videtur pura et syncera: reliquae mixtae sunt pleraeque omnes, nulla enim est quae non ab Hebraica derivata quaedam et corrupta vocabula habeat.

²⁹⁸Ibid. 9^v:

Arabica vel Punica lingua est, qua omnes Muhamedicae religionis cultores in grammaticis utuntur, affinis Hebraicae.

²⁹⁹De Graeca lingua vetere, *ibid.* 44^v-46^v, see 45^v:

Vetustissima enim est Hebraica, et literarum monumentis religionem sacram prodidit ea primum, hanc sequitur Graeca, in qua novum Testamentum conscriptum est. Post Graecos Latini et acceptarunt religionem, et suis tradidère literis.

³⁰⁰De lingua Graeca vulgari hodie, *ibid.* 46^v-47^r, see 46^v:

Lingua Graeca hodie vulgaris non minus ferè multis in locis à vetere Graeca recessit tum vocabulis barbaris admixtis, tum Graecorum depravatione literis et terminationibus immutatis, quàm Italica et Hispanica, à vetere Latina.

For Cristoforo's comments see above note 228.

³⁰¹De Illyrica sive Sarmatica lingua, *ibid.* 52^r-56^r, see 52^r:

Moscovitae Illyrica lingua Illyricisque literis utuntur, sicuti et Sclavi, Dalmatae, Bohemi, Poloni et Lithuani, ea lingua longè omnium latissima esse perhibetur.

This passage is a literal quotation taken from one of his sources, viz. the account of the talks of the eminent Italian humanist and historian Paolo Giovio (1483-1552) with Demetrius Gerasimov (c. 1465-after 1536), envoy of Grand Prince Basil III (1505-1533) of Muscovy to Pope Clement VII (1523-1534) in 1525-1526, which Giovio first published at Rome in 1525:

Libellus de legatione Basilii Magni Principis Moscoviae ad Clementem VII. Pont. Max., in quo situs regionis antiquis incognitus, religio gentis, mores et causae legationis fidelissime referuntur. [...].

The account was reprinted many times, e.g. de Marne, *Rerum* 118-130, see 128.

This section on the "Illyrian" language in Gesner's work illustrates one of the book's weaknesses: the author uses different terms for the same language since he has not attempted to unify the terminology of his sources; for another example see above note 298. On this see the remarks by Peters, *Gessner* 20 and 65. Nevertheless, in dwelling on the wide use of Slavonic he rightly claims that the term "Sclavonic" is an incorrect one to denominate the language:

Slavonica lingua, quae hodie corrupto nonnihil vocabulo Sclavonica appellatur, latissimè patet.

Mithridates 52^v. On the various forms of the word see Fuq̄ak, *Stoljeq̄a* 114-116. The principal source for both Bibliander's and Gesner's knowledge of the Slav peoples and languages was the work

Tractatus de duabus Sarmatiis, Asiana et Europiana, et de contentis in eis

by Matthias of Michau, on whom see above note 289. This work was first published at Cracow in 1517 but, as has been pointed out, e.g. by Kq̄delska, *Poczq̄tki* 66, the two Zurich scholars probably used either the first (1532) or second (1537) of the editions published at Basel of the

Novus orbis regionum ac insularum veteribus incognitarum, unà cum tabula cosmographica, et aliquot alijs consimilis argumenti libellis [...].

the same tongue, the most elegant being Bohemian.³⁰² He states that he had read that St. Jerome translated the Old Testament into Dalmatian,³⁰³ which is for him the alternative name for Illyrian,³⁰⁴ but also asserts that mainly by the assiduity of Jerome and Cyril an enormous number of sacred works had been translated into Slavonic,³⁰⁵ but who Cyril was or when he lived is not stated, neither is the name of Methodius even mentioned.

To give but one more fanciful description current at this time about the origins of Slavonic letters in which both Cyril and Methodius but not Jerome feature: Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini (1405-1464, Pius II, 1458-1464), without any doubt one of the leading humanists of the Renaissance, whose works in an elegant style include histories of individual countries,³⁰⁶ in his history of Bohemia, which for the first time gives a picture of Slav East Europe from a humanistic point of view, relates the following account: having been in Bohemia for some time Archbishop Methodius – of whose origins nothing is said – betook himself to Rome, where he met his brother Cyril, who had converted the Moravians and many other Slav nations. While at Rome Cyril requested the pope to permit the use of Slavonic in the liturgy for those whom he had converted. Many had objected to this until a voice was heard from heaven:

Every spirit should praise the Lord and every tongue confess Him.

[Cf. Psalm 150:6 and Romans 14:11]

a collection of various works including Matthias' compiled by Simon Grynaeus (1493-1541) and Johann Huttich (1490-1544), see the *editio princeps* 483-531. Matthias' work is also found in Pistorius, *Historiae* i, 121-150. On Bibliander's and Gesner's use of this work see K□delska, *Pocz□tki* 54-67. The celebrated Polish lexicographer Jan M□czy□ski (c. 1515-before 1584) stayed at Zurich from July 1545 to December 1546 and Bibliander calls him his *praeceptor in lingua Polonica, idem, Ratione* (see above note 295) 15, but whether Gesner also knew him, as is sometimes claimed, e.g. Barycz, *Epoki* 120, 129, is uncertain. On Bibliander's and Gesner's sources with regard to the Baltic languages see Dini, *Biblianders* 231-237, and *idem, Auffassungsvarietät* 41-48.

³⁰² On 55^v he gives the *Oratio Dominica sermone Bohenico* (sic), *qui prae caeteris huius linguae dialectis cultior existimatur*. On the other hand Muscovites speak a language so influenced by other languages that other Slavs do not comprehend it, *ibid.* 60^v. On this see Peters, *Gessner* 30. For a list of 67 peoples who use Slavonic see 54^v-55^r; on the list see K□delska, *Pocz□tki* 59-64.

³⁰³ *Mithridates*, 55^r:

D[ivum] Hieronymum legimus libros veteris Testamenti in Dalmaticam sive patriam linguam transtulisse. Dalmatae autem Illyricè loquuntur.

³⁰⁴ See above note 303.

³⁰⁵ *Ibid.* 52^r:

In hanc linguam ingens multitudino sacrorum librorum, industria maximè divi Hieronymi et Cyrilli translata est.

This too is a literal quotation from Giovio's *Libellus*, on which see above note 301, ed. de Marne, *Rerum* 128. Gerasimov also told Giovio that the Muscovites had the works of Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome translated *in linguam Illyricam, ibid.* 127. Gerasimov would obviously have agreed with the definition of diplomacy given by Ambrose Bierce (1842-c. 1914): *The patriotic art of lying for one's country*, as it was not until the late 18th century that a few of the works of these three Latin Fathers were translated into Russian and all of them only in the second half of the 19th century.

Seven years previously Bibliander had reported that Jerome had invented a Slavonic script but made no mention of Cyril with regard to the translations:

Hieronymus vetus et novum instrumentum cum sacrificio et precationibus traducta eo idiomate reliquit. Idem, Ratione (see above note 295) 15.

³⁰⁶ They have earned for him the title of *erster Landeshistoriker im modernen Sinne*, see Meuthen, *Pius* 651.

Upon this Cyril was granted an indult for its use.³⁰⁷

In view of the extremely vague and frequently fanciful ideas about the historical role of SS. Cyril and Methodius circulating in Western Europe in the 16th century, it is scarcely surprising that there is no record of any mention of their names at the Council of Trent. It was only in 1582 that the more sober account of their mission by the Polish historian Matthias of Michau became available in the West,³⁰⁸ but even in the mid 17th century the myth that the Slavonic transla-

³⁰⁷ *Historia bohemica*. The *editio princeps* appeared posthumously at Rome in 1475, see Hain, *Repertorium* i, no. 255. The edition listed *ibid.* i, no. 254, with no indication of place or date was probably published at Basel in 1489/90, see Copinger, *Supplement* ii, 2, no. 254* (p. 236); Sheehan, *Bibliothecae* iii, no. P-341. The edition quoted here is that which appeared at Cologne in 1524 under the title: *Aeneae Silvii Senensis de Bohemorum origine ac gestis historia, variarum rerum narrationem complectens*. [...]. The most recent edition of the *Historica bohemica* is that by Martinkov, *Aeneae*, 2-256. The passage occurs in c. xiii:

De situ Moraviae, et Svatocopio, penultimo Rege eiusdem. Qui et primus Christianus inter Reges Moraviae fuit.

Ed. Cologne 1524, 29-32, see 32:

Methodius in Bohemia aliquandiu moram traxit, deinde Roman se contulit, ubi fratrem suum Cyrillum comperit: qui baptizato quondam Svatocopio, Moravis Christiana sacra crediderat, multasque alias Sclavorum gentes ad fidem Christi converterat. Referunt Cyrillum cum Romae ageret, Romano Pontifici supplicasse, ut Sclavorum lingua, eius gentis hominibus quam baptizaverat, rem divinam faciens uti posset. De qua re dum in sacro senatu disceptaretur, essentque non pauci contradictores, auditam vocem tanquam de coelo in haec verba missam: Omnis spiritus laudet dominum: et omnis lingua confiteatur ei. Indeque datum Cyrillo indultum.

Ed. Martinkov, *Aeneae* 42. [The minor differences in orthography and punctuation have here been ignored. The sole variant is *Ferunt* instead of *Referunt*, which is immaterial as both forms mean in idiomatic English: *It is reported*]. A short excerpt from the work is reproduced in *MMFH* i, 321-324, which includes this passage, *ibid.*, 323-324. There is still no critical edition of the work, see Rothe, *Ausgabe* 29-48, especially, *ibid.* 46-48, for the principles which should be at the basis of a future critical edition. On the *Historia bohemica* see Rothe, *Enea* 141-156, and Mahel, *Enea* LXIII-XCVII. The convoluted nature of this humanist Latin is obvious. Although the *editio princeps* appeared in 1475 this account is here called current as there were many 16th-century editions of the work, for a list of which see *VD 16* xvi, P 3039-3096, 3101-3106. Piccolomini probably collected most of the material for his history during his thirteen years (1442-1455) at the court of Frederick III (King of the Romans 1440-1452, Emperor 1452-1493) and since it goes down to 1458 he probably finished it at Viterbo in 1458 just prior to his election as pope on 19 August 1458, see Mahel, *Enea* LXXXIV, n. 168. His work is frequently inaccurate, biased and, as this account shows, uncritical. The source of this particular fable about Cyril and Methodius remains untraced but was probably oral. The fable was taken over virtually literally with a reference to Pius II as his source by Ćimun Košić (Begnja, c. 1460-1536), bishop of Modruša (Modruš, 1509-1536) in the archdiocese of Spalato, in his history of popes and emperors which he published at his own press in Fiume (Rijeka) in 1531: *Knižice od' itih rimskih' arhierov' i cesarov': od' Petra i Julij: da do sadanih' Klimenta sedmoga i Karla petoga*. See 19'. The book has been reprinted in Latin transliteration by Tutschke, *Druckerei* 38-240, see 88. On the edition, which is incidentally the sole historical work published in Glagolitic, see Kruming, *Katalog* no. 16. On Košić (with bibliography) see Frange, *Geschichte* 758-759. The combined quotation of Psalm 150:6 and Romans 14:11 *Omnes spiritus laudet dominum et omnis lingua confiteatur ei* with a reference to its source, the *Historia bohemica*, was quoted by Cassander, see above note 281, to whose credit the fact redounds that he did not repeat the fable itself.

³⁰⁸ On him and the publication of his *Chronica Polonorum* by Johannes Pistorius see above note 289. His version of the events of the ninth century reads:

... sub imperatore Romanorum Arnulpho, Graecorum vero Imperatore Michaële, advenerunt Cirullus Doctor, et Apostolus omnium Slavorum, et Methudius, lingua Graeca, et Slavonica prompti missi a praefato Imperatore Michaële Graeco, ad postulationem principum Slavorum in Moraviam, et iacientem fundamenta Christianae fidei, erexerunt Ecclesiam cathedralem in Vielagrad Moraviae. Evocati tandem Romam, et inquisti, quare in lingua Slavica celebrarent, et non in Latina. Responderunt eo, quod scriptum esset: Omnis spiritus laudet Dominum. Post altercationes ergo Romanus Pontifex permisit, ut lingua Slavica celebrando laudaretur Deus, perindè atque Latina et Græca.

Ed. Pistorius, *Historiae* ii, 15.

tion of Scripture had been made by the Bible translator St. Jerome was being repeated by none other than Brian Walton (c. 1600-1661) in 1653 in his preface to his edition of the greatest of all the polyglots, the London Polyglot of 1654-1657.³⁰⁹ The myth was finally laid to rest in the 18th century by scholars such as Jacques Le Long (1665-1721), Joseph Simon Assemani (1687-1768) and Johann Peter Kohl (1698-1778).³¹⁰ Nevertheless, the epigraph of this article remains true: at the time of the Council of Trent the names of Cyril and Methodius may have been relegated to the realm of fables or even entirely forgotten but their legacy of the introduction of a living vernacular, Slavonic, into the liturgy in the West in the ninth century had a very positive influence on the decrees of that Council regarding the use of the vernacular in liturgy and Scripture: even in the Counter-Reformation and the Catholic Reform the brothers' work formed a bridge between East and West and hence they deserve the epithet of *pontifices*.³¹¹

³⁰⁹ *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, complectentia Textus Originales, Hebraicum, cum Pentateucho Samaritano, Chaldaicum, Graecum; Versionumque antiquarum, Samaritanae, Graecae LXXII Interp., Chaldaicae, Syriacae, Arabicae, Aethiopicae, Persicae, Vulg. Lat., Quicquid comparari poterat.* [...], 6 vols. London 1654-1657. See the *Prolegomena* in vol. i, 1-102, see 9 and 13. For the edition see Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 1446.

³¹⁰ See the references in Thomson, *Testament* 611 and 632. To the bibliography on the Slavonic version of the Bible given there, *ibid.* 882-918, should be added with regard to Assemani's contribution Kiskinova, *Yosif* 9-59.

³¹¹ On the Glagolitic rite as a bridge between East and West see the remarks of Fuřak, *Stoljeŕa* 191-192. All claims that the Council of Trent did prohibit the use of the vernacular in the Bible and the liturgy, sometimes made even by Catholic scholars, e.g. Stojkovič, *Bartuo* 256, are simply erroneous.

The Consequences of the Decisions of the Council of Trent for the Slavo-Latin (Glagolitic) Rite

A. The Liturgy

Already on 1 March 1546 at the very first meeting of the group chaired by Cardinal Cervini, the same meeting at which the issue of the use of Slavonic in the liturgy in Dalmatia was raised during the first period of the Council,³¹² Bishop Marco Vigerio de Ruvere of Senigallia (1513-1560) complained about the many improper elements which had made their way into the missal and the breviary³¹³ and Bishop Tommaso Campeggio called for the introduction of a common revised missal.³¹⁴ In his summary of the discussions at the end of the meeting Cardini Cervini expanded Campeggio's request for a common revised missal to include the breviary.³¹⁵ During the second period of the Council the question of a revision of liturgical books was not addressed but even before the third period began in 1562 calls for a revision were becoming more vociferous. Thus in 1559 Bishop Stanislas Hosius of Ermland, who had in the previous year been summoned to Rome to advise on how to stop the spread of Protestantism,³¹⁶ wrote a short treatise on the thirteen subjects which in his opinion the Council should address, the sixth being a reform of liturgical books.³¹⁷ The 49th of the 67 *petitiones communes* of the Spanish delegation to the third period of the Council was a call for a uniform breviary and missal except in certain dioceses in which different ones might be permitted,³¹⁸ while the 13th of the 15 articles on reform contained in Emperor Ferdinand I's memorandum of 20 May 1561, which caused the Council legates some anxiety when it was presented to them on 6 June 1561,³¹⁹ was also a call for the revision of liturgical books.³²⁰

The question was first dealt with during the debates on the sacrifice of the mass and at the general congregation on 20 July 1562 it was decided to form a commission chaired by Archbishop Ludovico Beccadelli of Ragusa (1555-1564,

³¹² See above notes 94-97.

³¹³ *CT* v, 24; cf. i, 502:

ut in missali, et horario quamplurima indecentissima obreperint.

³¹⁴ *Ibid.* v, 25; cf. i, 503:

Idem censerem de missali, qui omnibus ecclesiis foret communis, superfluis reiectis et maxime sententiis pluribus, quae ineptae plures continent.

³¹⁵ The full text is only in Massarelli's diary, ed. *CT* i, 506; for an abridgement see *ibid.* v, 27. On this diary see above note 95.

³¹⁶ See above note 287.

³¹⁷ *Articuli, de quibus in proxima sinodo deliberandum et consultandum erit*, ed. *CT* xiii, 424-426, see 425.

³¹⁸ Ed. *ibid.* xiii, 624-628, see 627:

49. Videatur, an expediret unum breviarium et unum missale fieri, quod ad omnes ecclesias deserviret, exceptis sanctis cuiusque dioceseos, de quibus in brevi libello posset notari varietas.

³¹⁹ See above notes 211-213.

³²⁰ See above note 210.

1572) to deal with abuses.³²¹ In its report of 8 August 1562 the commission called for a common revised missal at least for all secular clergy, although it allowed that certain provinces could retain their legitimate customs.³²² The legates sent the report back to the commission on 19 August on the grounds that it was too involved to be discussed at the 22nd session of the Council on 17 September and so the commission submitted a second shorter version, which contained an even more strident call for a common missal.³²³ It was not in the event included in the decree of the 22nd session.³²⁴ However, Bishop Pedro Augustín of Huesca (1545-1572) wrote a treatise on the subject of the reform of the breviary³²⁵ which came to the notice of Pope Pius IV, who sent it via Cardinal Charles Borromeo to the legates on 7 November 1562 with a request for the Council to take the necessary action.³²⁶ The Council was so occupied that it was not until 25 June 1563 that the legates informed the cardinal that a commission for the revision of both missal and breviary would be established.³²⁷ Nothing is recorded in the acts of the Council about the establishment of the commission but from the diary kept by Bishop Pedro González de Mendoza of Salamanca (1560-1574) it is known that it had come into existence by 26 or 27 October 1563.³²⁸ Nothing is known about its work and on 4 December 1563, the second and last day of the final 25th session of the Council, by the same decision that entrusted the final revision of the index to Pope Pius IV,³²⁹ the task of revising both missal and breviary was committed to him.³³⁰

The revised *Breviarium Romanum* was first published by order of Pius V at Rome in 1568 prefaced by the bull *Quod a nobis* of 9 July 1568, which laid

³²¹ CT viii, 721. On Beccadelli and the Council see Sopta, *Teilnehmer* 56-59.

³²² *Abusus, qui circa venerandum missae sacrificium evenire solent, partim a patribus deputatis animadversi, partim ex multorum praelatorum dictis et scriptis excerpti*, ed. *ibid.* viii, 916-921, see 917:

ut missalia omnia a superstitionis et apocryphis orationibus repurgata, omni ex parte pura, nitida, integra, omnibus proponantur et eadem sint, saltem inter omnes presbyteros saeculares, salvis consuetudinibus legitimis et non abusivis provinciarum.

³²³ *Compendium abusum circa sacrificium missae*, ed. *ibid.* viii, 921-924, see 922:

statuit similiter eadem sacrosancta synodus, ut cum eodem missali caeremonium ordo et institutio praescribatur, quibus omnes itidem celebrantes utantur.

³²⁴ *Decretum de observandis et evitandis in celebratione missarum*, ed. *ibid.* viii, 962-963.

³²⁵ Excerpt ed. *□usta*, *Curie* iii, 73.

³²⁶ See the cardinal's message to the legates ed. Jedin, *Konzil* 34, n. 105. The bitter controversy over the revision of the breviary by Francisco de Quiñonez (1475-1540), first published at Rome in 1535, Bohatta, *Bibliographie* no. 101, and often known as the *Breviarium S. Crucis* after the church of which he became cardinal in 1527, cannot be examined here; on it see Batiffol, *Histoire* 275-288; Bäumer-Biron, *Histoire* ii, 126-149; Jungmann, *Reformbrevier* 98-107; Schmid, *Studien* 458-483; Sodi, *Breviarium* XII-XIV.

³²⁷ On their message see Jedin, *Konzil* 35; *□usta*, *Curie* iv, 95.

³²⁸ Ed. CT ii, 635-719, see 706. On the bishop and his diary see the preface by S. Merkle to CT ii, XV-CLXXXVII, see CXXI-CXLVII.

³²⁹ See above note 264.

³³⁰ CT ix, 1106. On the Council's work with regard to liturgical reform see Jedin, *Konzil* 5-38, whose suggestion, *ibid.* 36, that the work may have been entrusted to either the commission on the catechism or the commission on the index is unlikely since it is named separately in the decision of 4 December 1563. In all probability the period between October and early December had been too short to allow it to undertake any serious work. On the Council's work with regard to the missal see *idem*, *Messbuches* 30-66, who, *ibid.* 51, for the first time expressed his view that the liturgical reform may have been entrusted to the commission on the catechism.

down that the breviary was to replace all others except those which had been in use for two hundred years,³³¹ a condition which clearly met the wishes expressed at the Council with regard to the revision.³³² The first revised *Missale Romanum* was also published by order of Pius V and appeared at Rome in 1570 accompanied by the bull *Quo primum* of 14 July 1570, which similarly allowed missals which had been in use for two hundred years to be retained.³³³ Prior to the first editions of the revised Glagolitic breviary in 1648 and missal in 1631 no fewer than 226 editions of the revised Roman breviary³³⁴ and 164 of the revised Roman missal³³⁵ had been published. Pope Clement VIII (1592-1614) had some minor improvements made to the 168th edition of the breviary published at Rome in 1602³³⁶ and to the 159th edition of the missal published at Rome in 1604,³³⁷ while Pope Urban VIII (1623-1644) had some more improvements made to the breviary first published at Rome in 1632³³⁸ and it was on the basis of the 1604 missal and 1632 breviary that the Glagolitic missal and breviary were revised.

Despite the permission for special rites which had been in existence for two hundred years, there was a trend towards uniformity and in 1596 the Aquilean rite in use in Dalmatia was replaced by the Roman rite.³³⁹ The Glagolitic rite had

³³¹ *Breviarium Romanum Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum*, Bohatta, *Bibliographie* no. 271. Facsimile edition: Sodi, *Breviarium* 1-1044. The bull is to be found prefaced to most pre-1971 breviaries; it is also in *BPD* vii, 685-688, see 686:

abolemus quaecumque alia Breviaria, vel antiquiora, vel quovis privilegio munita [...], illis tamen exceptis, quae ab ipsa prima institutione, a Sede Apostolica approbata, vel consuetudine, vel quae ipsa institutio ducentos annos antecedit, aliis certis Breviariis usa fuisse constiterit.

On this revised breviary see Batiffol, *Histoire* 294-314; Bäumer-Biron, *Histoire* ii, 168-233; Schmid, *Studien* 621-657; Sodi, *Breviarium* XIV-XVII.

³³² See above notes 318 and 322.

³³³ *Missale Romanum Ex Decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Pii v. Pont. Max. iussu editum*, Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1160. Facsimile edition: Sodi, *Missale* 1-666. The bull is to be found in most pre-1970 missals; it is also in *BDP* vii, 839-841, see 839-840:

nisi ab ipsa prima institutione a Sede Apostolica approbata, vel consuetudine, quae vel ipsa institutio super ducentos annos missarum celebrandarum in eisdem ecclesiis assidue observata sit.

On the revised missal see Baudot, *Missel* ii, 113-127; Baumstark, *Missale* 149-152; Schmid, *Studien* 657-663; Sodi, *Missale* VII-XLVI.

³³⁴ Bohatta, *Bibliographie* nos. 271-496.

³³⁵ Weale, *Bibliographia* nos. 1160-1323.

³³⁶ Bohatta, *Bibliographie* no. 388; on this edition see Batiffol, *Histoire* 316-330; Bäumer-Biron, *Histoire* ii, 270-276.

³³⁷ *Missale Romanum, ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Pii V. pontificis maximi iussu editum, et Clementis VIII. auctoritate recognitum*, Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1319. It is prefaced by the bull *Cum sanctissimum* of 7 July 1604 found in most pre-1970 missals and also in *BDP* xi, 88-90. On this edition see Baudot, *Missel* ii, 127-128; Baumstark, *Missale* 152-153.

³³⁸ *Breviarium Romanum ex decreto sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum, Pii V. Pont. Max. iussu editum, et Clementis VIII. primum, nunc denuo Urbani VIII. PP. auctoritate recognitum*, Bohatta, *Bibliographie* no. 465. The bull *Divinam psalmodiam* dated 25 January 1631 is prefaced to it. (The date is probably a misprint for 1632). On the edition, see Batiffol, *Histoire* 330-339; Bäumer-Biron, *Histoire* ii, 285-294. Urban VIII also had some amendments made to the missal first published at Rome in 1634, Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1324, on which see Baudot, *Missel* ii, 128-129, and Baumstark, *Missale* 153-154, but this appeared too late to influence the revised Glagolitic missal of 1631.

³³⁹ See above note 4.

also been in use for well over two hundred years but there was no standard text of either the missal or the breviary. The contents of the first three editions of the missal which appeared in 1483,³⁴⁰ at Segna in 1494³⁴¹ and at Venice in 1528³⁴² all vary slightly.³⁴³ The fourth edition published at Fiume in 1531 by Bishop Šimun Kožičić is entitled *Missale Croaticum*³⁴⁴ since the bishop had not merely revised the text on the basis of the Latin text but had also revised the Slavonic to make it more comprehensible,³⁴⁵ although since he was not systematic in removing archaisms the result is a confused mixture of Slavonic and vernacular Croat.³⁴⁶ In his letter of 4 May 1531 to Tommaso Niger, former bishop of Traù (1524-1525, ⊥ after 1531), which the bishop prefaced to his history of popes and emperors, Kožičić complained that missals and breviaries had been corrupted by incompetent scribes and bad translators and expressed the hope that he would not be censured for having corrected the missal.³⁴⁷ The contents of the first two editions of the Glagolitic breviary, that of c. 1491³⁴⁸ and that printed at Venice in 1493, also vary, the latter having clearly been influenced by a Franciscan breviary.³⁴⁹ The third edition which appeared at Venice in 1561 was based upon the second edition but not only contains additional offices and an enlarged kalendar but in addition the language has been revised by the replacement of Slavonic archaisms by vernacular Croat terms.³⁵⁰ No further editions of these books appeared before the 17th century.³⁵¹

³⁴⁰ *Missal po zakonu rimskoga dvora*; Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 1; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 1; Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1330. Reprint ed. Goldstein, *Missal* I-XII, 1-426. The question whether it was printed at Venice, Modrussa or Kosinj cannot be addressed here. On the edition see the articles by M. Bo□njak, Z. Kulund□i□, A. Nazor, M. Panteli□, J. Tandari□ *et al.* which accompany the reprint. It is the first book ever to be printed in Slavonic and precedes the first Cyrillic book by eight years.

³⁴¹ Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 6; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 4; Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1331. Reprint ed. Mogu□, *Misal* 1^r-215^v.

³⁴² Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 34; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 14; Schmitz, *Buchdruck* no. 38; Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1333.

³⁴³ For a brief survey of the contents of the missals see Vajs, *Misal* 44-50.

³⁴⁴ *Misal Xruacki po rimski obi□ai i □in'*; *sa vsimi □□e v di□□kih' misaleh' sut': v nem□e nei□tena m□sta popravljena sut': mnoga o□□te znova stlma□ena i pridana sut'* [...]; Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 38; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 14; Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1334. For a brief description of the contents see Vajs, *Misal* 51-52.

³⁴⁵ See on this Benvin, *Zamisao* 203-218. Since he was born at Zara his language is the □akavian variety of Croat.

³⁴⁶ See the remarks by Graciotti, *Probleme* 147.

³⁴⁷ *Kni□ice*, ed. Tutschke, *Druckerei* 39-40; on this history see above note 307.

³⁴⁸ *Brv□l po zakonu rimskoga dvora*; Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 2; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 2. Reprint ed. Nazor, *Brevijar* I-VIII, 1^r-380^v. Only one copy has been traced, the last quire of which with the colophon is missing so that it is uncertain whether it was published at Venice or Kosinj but it must have been in c. 1491 as the kalendar of movable feasts is for 1492-1522. On the edition see the studies by I. Bakmaz, A. Nazor and J. Tandari□ which accompany the reprint.

³⁴⁹ Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 3; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 3. It also contains six masses and some prayers and blessings from a *rituale*. On it see Grabar, *Brevijar* 159-180, and Vajs, *Brevi□□* XCIII-CI. It was edited by canon Bla□ Baromi□ of Segna (⊥ after 1496). The expansion of the *Serenissima Repubblica* in Dalmatia and the Adriatic islands in the fifteenth century led to the formation of a Croat community at Venice already by the end of the century, see □orali□, *Gradu* 75-80, and from then on until the nineteenth century it became a centre for the printing of Slav books in the Glagolitic, Cyrillic, Bosan□ica and Latin scripts, see Schmitz, *Buchdruck* 233-350.

³⁵⁰ Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 76; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 21; Schmitz, *Buchdruck* no. 71; Bohatta, *Bibliographie* no. 2286. On it see Vajs, *Brevi□□* LV-LXI, and *idem*, *Misal* 52-55. It has the same prayers from the *rituale* as

In the second half of 1619 Bishop Giovanni Battista Agatić of Segna (1617-1649) convened a diocesan synod at Bribir to discuss the necessity of reforms. One of the problems was a lack of liturgical books since the last edition of the missal was that of 1531 and of the breviary that of 1561, so it was decided that new editions should be prepared and that the task should be entrusted to Francesco (Franjo) Glavinić (1585-1652), who had in May been elected provincial of the Franciscans of *Bosna Croatiae* for the third time.³⁵² Glavinić was summoned from the Franciscan monastery at Tersatto (Trsat) to the synod, agreed to undertake the task of revision and began to collect early codices on which to base it.³⁵³ In 1621 he took advantage of his journey to the Franciscan commissary to the Empire at Vienna, Hieronymus Strasser († after 1624), on the order's business to discuss the project with the papal nuncio at Graz from 1613 to 1622, Erasmo Paravicino († 1640), and the latter on 12 March requested Strasser to recommend the project to Emperor Ferdinand II (1619-1637).³⁵⁴ On 20 June 1621 Paravicino wrote to Glavinić that the latter had approved the project and was willing to finance it.³⁵⁵

in the second edition and six of its seven masses are also taken from there. The editor was Mikula (Nicholas) Brozi, priest at Castelmuschio (Omišalj) on Veglia.

³⁵¹ Other editions of the missal and breviary which are sometimes listed are either mistaken references to one of the editions given here or are ghost editions, see Kruming, *Katalog* app. ii, nos. 8-10, 12, 14, 17-21, 26, 33-34, 43, 51 and 53.

³⁵² Glavinić himself wrote an account of the preparations entitled *Relatione da chi, come, ove, e quando fu ritrovata la Stampa con la quale si stampano hoggi i Messali e Breviari Illirici, overo Slavi in Roma*, which he appended to his account of the miraculous moves of Our Lady's house at Nazareth to a site between Tersatto and Fiume in May 1291, thence to Recanati in December 1294, then on to nearby Loreto in August 1295 and to its final resting place there on 7 September 1295, which he published at Udine in 1648 under the title: *Historia Tersattana, Ove se contiene la vera relatione della translatione della Santa Casa hereditaria della Vergine Gloriosa da Nazareth à Tersatto, e da Tersatto à Loreto; quando, come, perche, e da chi fosse trasportata; con alcune cose più particolari pertinenti alla Chiesa, e Monasterio Tersattano*. [...]. See 66-70. For a facsimile reprint see Butorac, *Historia* I-XIV, 1-73, see *ibidem*; the reprint is accompanied by a Croat translation by D. Klen, *ibid.* 75-137, see 134-137. On Our Lady's house at Loreto see Santarelli, *Casa passim*; on Glavinić's account see *ibid.* 213-215. In the *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 66, he dates the synod of Bribir to 1624 but this is contradicted by the evidence. Thus he states that he was provincial at the time but his three terms of office were 1610-1613, 1616-1619 and 1619 to 1622. The date has been considered a misprint for 1620, thus Pandžić, *Franjo* 85, accepted by others, e.g. Putanec, *Franjo* 312, and Čagar, *Čivotu* 58, or for 1621, thus Filić, *Franjo* 443, or even 1622, thus Pandžić, *Opera* 293 (who later changed his mind, see above). Holjevac, *Djelatnost* 141, thinks either 1620 or 1621. However, Bishop Agatić's letter recommending Glavinić as the reviser to the papal nuncio at Graz, Erasmo Paravicino, is dated 12 January 1620, see the excerpt ed. Pandžić, *Franjo* 86, n. 7, and so the date of 1619, as proposed by Rački, *Franjo* 8, is the most probable. A dating to 1621 if not earlier, thus Kukuljević Saksinski (hereafter only Kukuljević), *Književnici* 119, and Pavić, *Ivan* 75, is too vague. On Glavinić, who came from Kanfanar in Istria and spoke the čakavian form of Croatian, see the above-mentioned articles by Filić, Holjevac, Pandžić, Rački and Čagar as well as Hercigonja, *Franjo* 139-150. On his two historical works, viz. the above-mentioned *Historia Tersattana* and his *Origine della Provincia di Bosna Croatia dell'Ordine de M(i)n(o)ri Osser(vanti) di San Francesco* [...] published at Udine in 1648 see Hočko, *Glavinić* 213-223; on the *Historia* see also Holjevac, *Djelatnost* 138-140, and Margetić, *Loreto* 104-106; on the *Origine* see Gavran, *Djelu* 143-154.

³⁵³ *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 66; see also Farlati, *Illyrici* iv, 138-139.

³⁵⁴ His letter ed. Fermeđin, *Listovi* 2, who wrongly calls the nuncio Cardinal Borghese, a mistake frequently repeated, e.g. Bućar, *Povijest* 228; Filić, *Franjo* 443; Hercigonja, *Franjo* 142; Holjevac, *Djelatnost* 141; Putanec, *Franjo* 312; Rački, *Franjo* 8. Which Borghese Fermeđin had in mind is unclear.

³⁵⁵ His letter ed. Fermeđin, *Listovi* 3.

It was during his stay at Graz that Glavinić learned that the Glagolitic and Cyrillic fonts which had been used to print books at the Protestant press established by Hans Ungnad von Weissenwolf, Freiherr von Sonnegg (1493-1564), at Urach near Tübingen, which functioned from 1561 to 1564, were stored at Graz in twenty-four cases and he enlisted the support of Paravicino and Bishop Carlo Carafa (⊥ 1644), papal nuncio at Vienna (1621-1628), to obtain them. On 10 October 1621 Paravicino informed Glavinić that he had had the fonts sent to Fiume via Laibach.³⁵⁶ These fonts were later transferred from Fiume to Rome and it was generally assumed that they had been used to print the liturgical and other books which were published at Rome by the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*. In 1807, however, the "father of Slav philology", Joseph Dobrowsky (1753-1829), having compared the types of the Glagolitic editions published at Tübingen and Rome, denied that the same font had been used and suggested that the Roman font had perhaps been obtained at Venice.³⁵⁷ There can, however, be no doubt but that the fonts despatched from Graz were those used at Urach.³⁵⁸

Despite considerable contributions, especially from German Protestant cities, by the time of his death on 27 December 1564 Ungnad had spent such a considerable amount of his resources on the press that already on 1 January 1565 his widow, Magdalena, Countess of Barby (1530-1566), wrote to Duke Christopher of Württemberg to request aid in maintaining it and on 12 January he promised to do so and donated 300 florins.³⁵⁹ This was, however, insufficient and so on 15 March she wrote to Landgrave Philip of Hessen (1518-1567), one of the co-

³⁵⁶ Ed. Fermendin, *Listovi* 3. Glavinić himself related how he discovered the fonts at Graz, see his *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 67. The suggestion, thus Pandić, *Franjo* 87, that Glavinić took the fonts with him on his return journey from Vienna is based upon a misinterpretation of Glavinić's own statement that he had had the fonts sent to Fiume and stored there in the castle, see his *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 68:

la feci riporre sopra certi carri, e condurre nella Città di Fiume, et salvare nel Castello della Città.

See also Filić, *Franjo* 444, and Ćagar, *ivotu* 58.

³⁵⁷ His denial was published as the first section in his *Glagolitica*, 1-7, under the title: *Kamen die Glagolitischen Typen von Urach in die Typographie der Propaganda nach Rom?* It begins with the words: *Antwort: Nein*. See *ibid.* 1. For the suggestion that they may have been obtained in Venice see *ibid.* 4; for the results of the comparison see *ibid.* 5. He further suggested, *ibid.* 7, that Ungnad's fonts had probably been melted down, an idea accepted by a few scholars, e.g. Ehmer, *Buchdruck* 450. On various suppositions as to the fate of Ungnad's press see Schreiner, *Druckerei* 218-219. Surprisingly few scholars accepted Dobrowsky's denial that the two fonts were the same, one of the exceptions being Ginzl, *Geschichte* 158, n. 9. With regard to the Cyrillic font it has recently been suggested that the similarity between the Tübingen and Roman editions is due to deliberate imitation at Rome, see Pejčev, *Buchdruck* 489-491. On this see below, especially note 364.

³⁵⁸ See note 363. On the activity of the press see Benz, *Wittenberg* 141-246. On the works printed see Schnurrer, *Bücherdruck* 82-110, and Vorndran, *Reformationsdrucke 19-80*; for simple lists see Bućar, *Povijest* 240-242, and Vorndran, *Überblick* 294-295. Much of the printing was done not at Urach but at the press of Magdalena Morhart (⊥ 1574), the widow of the printer Ulrich Morhart (⊥ 1554) at Tübingen; on her press see Benzing, *Buchdruck* 465, and Widmann, *Tübingen* 58-61; on that at Urach see Benzing, *op. cit.* 473-474 and Widmann, *op. cit.* 63-64.

³⁵⁹ See the MS references to her letter, his reply and the amount donated in Schreiner, *Druckerei* 231, nn. 46, 48 and 49; Zimmermann, *Hans* 52, nn. 83, 84 and 86. For the contributions of the German Protestant cities see the lists in Schnurrer, *Bücherdruck* 60-61, and Benz, *Wittenberg* 207; see also Bućar, *Povijest* 143-153.

signatories to the Confession of Augsburg in 1530, with a request for an allowance for the press, which was her husband's sole legacy and which he had left in trust to all Christian, viz. Protestant, princes.³⁶⁰ Since, however, no further donations were forthcoming, the press had to close. When in 1579 plans were being made to print the translation of the Bible into Slovene by Jurij Dalmatin (1547-1589) at Laibach it was assumed that the press had remained in the possession of the Ungnad family and been transferred to the family castle at Waldenstein in Carinthia, so on 10 April Ungnad's son Ludwig was requested to send the ornamentation which had been used in the Bibles printed by his father, an assumption which has often been made since.³⁶¹ However, Ludwig Ungnad apparently never replied and there is no evidence that the press was transferred to Waldenstein.

The papal nuncio at Vienna, Carlo Carafa, stated that Emperor Ferdinand I (1558-1564) had had the press transferred to Graz and that he himself had arranged for it to be sent to Fiume and thence via Ancona to Rome,³⁶² while Glavinić himself in a letter to Carafa of 11 January 1626 stated that the fonts, which had been taken from the heretics at Tübingen, had been all muddled up during the transfer to Fiume.³⁶³ Clearly the fonts dispatched from Graz via Fiume to Rome were those of Ungnad's press and should a detailed examination of the Urach-Tübingen and Roman editions reveal that despite the very considerable similarity the fonts used were not the same, the reason must be sought

³⁶⁰ Letter ed. Benz, *Wittenberg* 237-239, see 238.

³⁶¹ For the MS reference to this request see Schreiner. *Druckerei* 227, n. 35. On 23 April 1580 Johann Hans Mannel (Janez Mandelcz, † after 1605), who was to print the Bible at Laibach, wrote to the Carinthian authorities requesting assistance in obtaining the ornamentation, see the excerpt of his letter ed. *ibid.* 227. The fonts were not required as the Bible was to be printed in Latin script. In the event Archduke Charles II of Inner Austria (1564-1590) closed Mannel's press in 1581 and the translation was printed at Wittenberg in 1584; on it see below note 534. Those to assume that the press had been transferred to Waldenstein include Vodnik, *Povijest* i, 203, and Holjevac, *Djelatnost* 142.

³⁶² Carafa, *Commentaria* 124:

Interim cum mihi à Sacra Congregatione de propaganda Fide fuisset significatum in regnis Slavoniae, Croatiae, Bosniae, et Dalmatiae, quae sunt unita regno Ungariae, multum praepediri verum ritum Catholicum, imo ipsam Catholicam religionem, ex eo, quod in dictis regnis non essent Breviaria, nec Missalia juxta Catholicam reformationem, eaque nec Romae, nec alibi imprimi posse, cum non reperirentur Illiricarum litterarum typi, eos obtinui gratiosissime a Caesare dono dandos sacrae Congregationi, quos Ferdinandus primus posuerat Gretzii, ex qua civitate ad castrum Fluminis in Dalmatia, inde per mare Adriaticum ad Anconam transmittendos curavi, qui integri Romam pervenerunt.

That the press had been removed from Urach was reported by Primus Truber (c. 1508-1586), who in January 1561 had agreed to collaborate with Ungnad, in a letter of 5 February 1580 to Duke Ludwig of Württemberg (1568-1593), see the excerpt of his letter ed. Ehmer, *Buchdruck* 450, n. 25. The dating of the seizure of the press to 1525 by Iovine, *Language* 17, must be a misprint. Carafa's name is often incorrectly spelled Caraffa.

³⁶³ Ed. Fermandin, *Listovi* 10-11, see 11:

Et mentre li nostri la levarono dalle mani delli heretici nella città di Tubbinge, ove fù fatta, l'hanno mescolata tutta assieme così confussamente, che volendola discernere presupone pratica et pazienza grande.

In his *Relatione* of 1648 Glavinić claimed that the heretics themselves had transferred the press to Graz as it was closer to the region where the Bibles were to be sold, *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 70. How precisely the fonts arrived in Graz remains as yet unexplained.

elsewhere: on 12 January 1565 Stjepan Konzul (1521-after 1568), one of Ungnad's collaborators, whose joint translation with Anton Dalmatin († 1579) of the New Testament into Croatian had been published by Ungnad, also wrote to Duke Christopher of Württemberg with a request for financial aid for the press and pointed out that the Glagolitic font had become so worn from use that it needed to be recast.³⁶⁴ If the two sets of fonts are different, this recasting was done at Rome, which would then explain the very close similarity of the two.

On 29 November Paravicino assured Glavinić that he was doing all that he could to obtain financial support for the project. On 3 March 1622 he thanked Glavinić for his letter of 15 February and expressed his pleasure that work on the revision of the missal and breviary was progressing, adding that in a few weeks he was returning to Italy where he would continue to support the project.³⁶⁵ However, at this juncture events took another turn. On 6 January 1622 Pope Gregory XV (1621-1623) decided to establish the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* with the dual aim of spreading the faith and reuniting the Church and its first general congregation was held on 14 January 1622.³⁶⁶ The zeal and knowledge of its first secretary, Francesco Ingoli (1578-1649), who was appointed to the office on 6 January 1622 and remained in it until his death on 24 April 1649, were proverbial³⁶⁷ and he was actively involved in the establishment of the Propaganda's own printing-office, which already by 1627 possessed fourteen fonts including Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac and both Glagolitic and Cyrillic for Slavonic.³⁶⁸ From November 1624 to June 1625 Archbishop Ottaviano Garzadoro of Zara (1624-1639) on the instructions of Pope Urban VIII carried out an apostolic visitation in Venetian Dalmatia and in his report of 10 August 1625 he referred to the great necessity of providing new editions of the Glagolitic missal and breviary in view of both their scarcity and the lack of a knowledge of Latin among the clergy, adding that he had contacted various printers at Venice but that none was prepared to undertake the task even with the German press, viz. Ungnad's, because of the financial risk involved.³⁶⁹ His report was discussed at the Propaganda in the presence of the Pope on 19 September 1625 and it was decided to instruct the nuncio at Vienna to ask the Emperor whether he would finance a Slavonic press at Fiume and, if not,

³⁶⁴ See the excerpt of his letter ed. Schreiner, *Druckerei* 232:

mit der Croatischen Schrift an Unterlaß gedruckt und dieselben sehr abgönitz mit dem täglichen Druckh und Waschen, das man solche Schrift widerumb giessen muß.

³⁶⁵ His letter of 29 November ed. Fermendić, *Listovi* 4; see also his letter of 29 December 1621 ed. *ibid.* 4-5; his letter of 3 March ed. *ibid.* 5.

³⁶⁶ The document of 6 January 1622 ed. Metzler, *Congregationis* iii, 2, 655. The actual act of its establishment, *Inscrutabili divinae providentiae arcano*, is dated 22 June 1622, ed. *ibid.* iii, 2, 662-664; the minutes of the first general congregation of 14 January ed. *ibid.* iii, 2, 655-656. On its establishment see *idem*, *Foundation* 79-111, and *idem*, *Zeit* 115-130. For the sake of brevity the Congregation will hereafter be referred to as the Propaganda.

³⁶⁷ On him see *idem*, *Francesco* 197-243. Among his accomplishments was a knowledge of Italian, French, Spanish, Latin, Greek and Arabic.

³⁶⁸ On the press see Henkel, *Printing-Office* 335-350; on Ingoli's role see Metzler, *Francesco* 211-213.

³⁶⁹ See the excerpt ed. Pandić, *Franjo* 88, n. 15, and von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 100-101.

whether he would allow the fonts to be transferred to Rome.³⁷⁰ It has frequently been claimed that the suggestion that the fonts be sent to Rome was made by Giovanni Tonco (Ivan Tomko) Mrnavić (1578-1637 or 1639), a Bosnian Barnabite from Sebenico, who had studied at Rome and had resided there since 1614 and who wanted to supervise the revision himself.³⁷¹ While not impossible, the claim has still to be substantiated.

Since all efforts to induce the Emperor to finance a press had been fruitless, it is scarcely surprising that he agreed to the transfer of the fonts to Rome and on 29 November 1625 Ingoli asked Carafa at Vienna to thank the Emperor on behalf of the Propaganda, while on 2 December Carafa informed the Propaganda that the fonts at Fiume, had been entrusted to the Capuchin guardian, viz. abbot, at Fiume, Michael of Fermo (fl. 17th century), and that some fragments of the fonts which had been left behind at Graz were also being sent to the guardian.³⁷² On 11 January Glavinić wrote to the nuncio at Vienna explaining what he had done: the extant editions of the Glagolitic missal and breviary contained basic errors and lacked some rubrics so he had revised and rewritten the missal and had consulted with experts of the region about his work but his efforts to obtain financial support had remained fruitless. He then outlined four conditions if the revision was to be successfully completed: 1. the revisers must be experts in Latin, Italian and Illyrian; 2. some people wished St. Jerome's language to be abandoned but that should not be allowed as it was ancient and thus mysterious;³⁷³ 3. the new additions which would have to be made in accordance with the revised Latin versions must be in the same style as the earlier texts so as to avoid incongruity and diversity, which would detract from the harmony of divine worship; 4. there are in Illyrian two scripts, *Zurilica* invented by St. Cyril and *Glagoliza* invented by St. Jerome, the latter being used in the Catholic Church, while the former is used in Bosnia, Bulgaria and the Ottoman Empire as well as for non-liturgical works such as catechisms. He specifically warned that Cyrillic

³⁷⁰ Excerpt of the minutes ed. Pandić, *Franjo* 88, n. 16, and 101.

³⁷¹ This is what Glavinić, writing twenty-three years later, suspected, see his *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 68. However, the Propaganda's letter of 19 September 1625 left the decision about the location of the press to the Emperor, see note 370. That Mrnavić at Rome was urging that the press be sent to Rome is often asserted, see, for instance, the various remarks by Filić, *Franjo* 445; Hercigonja, *Franjo* 144; Jagić, *Književnost* 46; Kukuljević, *Književnici* 118-119; Pandić, *Opera* 293; Pavić, *Ivan* 79; Radonić, *tamparije* 12; Ćagar, *ivotu* 58. On him see Kukuljević, *Književnici* 93-116; Pavić, *Ivan* 58-127 and (with bibliography) Frangeš, *Geschichte* 827-828. The date of his death is disputed, see, for instance, Golub, *Quellen*, 189, n. 52. His literary and historical activity includes plagiarism and forgeries, the most celebrated being his Glagolitic psalter, allegedly a 1222 copy of an early seventh-century codex, which he made to "prove" that St. Jerome had translated his *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* into Slavonic; on this psalter see Jagić, *Tomko* 111-134.

³⁷² See Carafa's letter ed. Fermeđić in, *Listovi* 5.

³⁷³ His letter ed. *ibid.* 10-11, see 10:

Secondo, che quel parlare di S. Girolamo totalmente non si butti via come alcuni vogliono, poichè se bene egli è antico, è pero misterioso.

Fermeđić in, *ibidem*, wrongly stated that this letter had been sent to the Propaganda, which has misled other scholars, e.g. Juraj, *Pokućaj* 147, and Ćagar, *ivotu* 59. However, in his letter to the Propaganda of 28 January 1626 Carafa specifically stated that he was forwarding the Franciscan's letter, ed. Fermeđić in, *Listovi* 6; cf. his letter to the Propaganda of 4 February, ed. *ibid.* 6-7, see 6, where he calls the Franciscan Glavinić.

should not be substituted for Glagolitic, as some Bosnians at Rome were requesting, as this would lead to confusion in the Church.³⁷⁴

He then goes on to deal with the fonts: when they had been taken from the heretics at Tübingen they had all been muddled and one of the 24 cases in eight large containers had been damaged in transit. Moreover, the fonts contained no means of spacing between words or lines, neither did they have any ornamentation, which was required for the printing of missals and breviaries. If things had gone as he had wished the missal would already have been printed as the translation was ready. He also expressed the opinion that it would be better to print at Fiume as it was at the centre of the region where Illyrian was used and it would avoid the expense of transport to Rome. This last wish was a vain one: on 11 February 1626 Carafa informed the Propaganda that the Capuchin guardian in addition to the eight containers already in his possession had received two more from Laibach, which he believed to be the remainder which had been left at Graz,³⁷⁵ and on 1 April he wrote that the guardian had been instructed to send the containers to Rome via Ancona.³⁷⁶

At the meeting of the Propaganda on 3 March 1626 when Glavinić' letter to Carafa of 11 January was discussed it was decided to request him to come to Rome with his revisions and in his letter of 1 April to the Propaganda Carafa reported that he had informed Glavinić of this decision but had also told him not to leave until he had received instructions directly from the Propaganda.³⁷⁷ In response to this Glavinić on 10 April wrote to the nuncio with an entirely different proposal for the revision to that which he had advocated in his letter of 11 January: Illyrian did not have all the words required for theological terms and also had obscure archaic terms which were no longer used. Since the revised texts would have to be accessible to all, a commission of four or five experts from the various regions, Croatia, Dalmatia, Liburnia and Bosnia, should be established. Whereas the missal published by Kožičić was only in Dalmatian,³⁷⁸

³⁷⁴ Ed. *ibid.* 11:

Hora VS. Illma. et Rma. non permetta, che in detto caratere Cirilo si faccia questa reforma altramente, come alcuni Bosnesi supplicano a Roma, poiche si corrumperà la opera cosi miseramente, che non reformatione ma confusione nella chiesa di Dio si genererà.

Pand□i□, *Franjo* 94, considers that the Bosnians at Rome were advocating Bosnian Cyrillic, *bosan□ica*, which differs from the script used in Orthodox liturgical books, which must, however, for lack of evidence remain a hypothesis. On Glavini□' ideas about Jerome as the inventor of Glagolitic see Kurelac, *Koncepcije* 260-261.

³⁷⁵ Ed. Fermand□in, *Listovi* 7. A few days previously on 4 February Carafa had informed the Propaganda that the bishop of Trieste, viz. Rinaldo Scarlicchi (1621-1630, then Laibach 1630-1641), had recommended Athanasio Giorgiceo, viz. Ge(o)rgi□evi□ (c. 1590-c. 1640), to help with the revision as he had an excellent knowledge of the languages required, ed. *ibid.* 6-7. It has been claimed that this is a sign of Carafa's insincerity towards Glavini□, thus Putanec, *Franjo* 313, but it is rather a sign that he was only trying to help the project. On Gergi□evi□ as a writer see Kukuljevi□, *Knji□evnici* 49-53; for a list of his works see *idem*, *Bibliografia* i, nos. 467-471.

³⁷⁶ Ed. Fermand□in, *Listovi* 7-8, see 7.

³⁷⁷ *Ibidem.*

³⁷⁸ Viz. □akavian Croat, see above note 345.

the Croat lectionary of gospels and epistles by the Bosnian Franciscan Gio(vanni), viz. Ivan Bandulavić, which he had seen being printed while at Venice in the previous year,³⁷⁹ had been revised by Bandulavić in the common pronunciation.³⁸⁰ The heretics at Tübingen had also succeeded in producing a Bible translation comprehensible to all. The only expert in Illyrian at Rome was Tonco the Dalmatian, viz. Mrnavić, and it would be difficult for himself and Mrnavić alone to sort out the muddled fonts and supervise the printing by Italian printers unused to the alphabet. The expense involved in dispatching the commission to Rome would not be great as five people could do as much in one year as two in five. Once the revised editions had been published the pre-Tridentine editions would have to be withdrawn, which would cause problems if the revised editions were in one particular dialect. For this reason he would be willing to go to Rome if he could take with him an Istrian, a Liburnian and a Croat.³⁸¹ It must at once be said that since he had met Bandulavić at Venice in 1625 it is somewhat strange that in his letter to Carafa of 11 January 1626 he had advocated Slavonic, whereas in that of 10 April he was advocating the vernacular.³⁸² On 6 May Carafa informed the Propaganda that he had instructed Glavini□ and his companion to proceed to Rome.³⁸³ The companion is unnamed but it must have been Glavinić' pupil and fellow Croatian Franciscan Raffaele (Rafo) Levaković (c. 1597-1649), who went alone to Rome in 1626 to work on the revision and spent most of the rest of his life in the service of the Propaganda.³⁸⁴ Why Glavini□ did not go is unknown and speculation as to the reason, e.g. that he did not wish to work under Mrnavić,³⁸⁵ is completely pointless.³⁸⁶ Equally

³⁷⁹ He is referring to the second (Venice 1626) edition of Bandulavić' revision, the first edition of which had appeared at Venice in 1613; on the first edition see above note 232; for the 1626 edition see Jeli□, *Fontes* [17th century] 82; Kukuljevi□, *Bibliografija* i, 18 (under no. 151), and Horvat, *Bartol* 11, n. 34.

³⁸⁰ Ed. Fermend□in, *Listovi* 12-13, see 12. It is in Bosnian □tokavian with some Dalmatian □akavian traits. Turkish conquests in the Balkans had led to large migrations of □tokavian speakers northwards and westwards thus reducing the area in which □akavian was spoken to Istria and Dalmatia as far south as Spalato, see Banac, *Trends* 207-209.

³⁸¹ Fermend□in, *Listovi* 12. By Liburnia Northern Dalmatia is meant.

³⁸² The importance of his meeting with Bandulavi□ at Venice in 1625 has been commented upon, e.g. by Horvat, *Bartol* 11, and von Erdmann-Pandzi□, *Drucklegungsversuch* 101, but this discrepancy remains unexplained.

³⁸³ Excerpt of his letter ed. Pand□i□, *Franjo* 91, n. 34.

³⁸⁴ Glavini□, *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 68, describes Levakovi□ as:

un Sacerdote novello, mio allievo, il quale oltre l'altre virtù, possedeva tre linguaggi, cioè, Latino, Italiano, et Illirico, ovvero Slavo suo naturale.

He also states that it was he himself who had proposed that Levakovi□ be sent to Rome, *ibidem*. On Levakovi□ and Glavini□ see Pand□i□, *Franjo* 85-112; on Levakovi□' work as a missionary among the Serb refugees at Sichelberg (□umberek) see Fermend□in, *Rafo* 22-32. Since he came from Jastrebarsko his native dialect was kajkavian.

³⁸⁵ Thus Pand□i□, *Franjo* 91.

³⁸⁶ Glavini□ later claimed that his duties as provincial prevented his going, see his *Relatione*, ed. Butorac, *Historia* 69, which has been accepted, e.g. by Bu□ar, *Povijest* 229, and Pavi□, *Ivan* 75, but is impossible as he was last provincial in 1622, see above note 352. Other reasons have been suggested which also contradict the facts, e.g. Mrnavi□ prevented his arrival, thus Jagi□, *Knji□evnost* 46, which is impossible since from Carafa's letter of 6 May it is known that the Propaganda wished him to go, see above note 383; Glavini□ could not agree with the Propaganda's intention of revising the language of the missal and breviary on the basis of the language of the liturgical books of Ruthenian Uniats, thus Holjevac, *Djelatnost* 143, and Fili□, *Franjo* 447, cf.

unknown is whether Levaković took Glavinić' revision of the missal with him to Rome and no trace of it has as yet been discovered.³⁸⁷

Even before the fonts arrived at Rome from Fiume in late June or early July 1626³⁸⁸ the Propaganda had begun to collect information about the Slavo-Latin rite. Thus on 24 May Bishop Rinaldo Scarlicchi of Trieste informed the Propaganda about the situation in Istria: in Trieste itself a third of the clergy celebrated in Slavonic, which also applied to the sees of Pola, Parenzo and Capodistria, but in the see of Cittanova half of the clergy used it. He also added that he was slowly Latinizing his see by never ordaining any cleric to celebrate in Slavonic.³⁸⁹ Precisely when Levaković arrived in Rome is unknown but at a meeting of the Propaganda on 9 November 1626 proposals by Levaković and Mrnavić were discussed. The former made seven points; 1. no Illyrian missals or breviaries had been printed for eighty years and hence there was a great shortage, which was to the advantage of the Lutheran heretics, who had the Bible and homilies printed in the vernacular; 2. the books should be printed in both Glagolitic and Cyrillic since the schismatics, viz. Orthodox, also suffered from a lack of books and would make use of Catholic editions and thus gradually be gained for the faith; 3. the books should be printed in Latin script for priests who could read neither Glagolitic nor Cyrillic;³⁹⁰ 4. the new editions would have to be based on the revised missal of Pius V and breviary of Clement VIII; 5. archaisms had to be eliminated as the clergy did not understand them and hence could not explain them to their flocks; 6. the Propaganda would not suffer financial loss as it now had the fonts and hence the books could be sold cheaply; 7. the editions would be used in Dalmatia, Bosnia, Croatia, Carniola, Bulgaria, Serbia, part of Macedonia, Ruthenia, Muscovy, Slavonia and elsewhere. He added that in the opinion of the archbishop of Spalato, viz. Sforza Ponzoni (1616-1640), the missal and breviary could not be properly revised by one person alone.³⁹¹

Hercigonja, *Franjo* 144, which is anachronistic as no Ruthenians were included in the project prior to June 1627, see below.

³⁸⁷ To claim that Levaković did use Glavinić' revision, thus Filić, *Franjo* 447, and Hercigonja, *Franjo* 145, is to assert the unknown.

³⁸⁸ On 4 July Ingoli asked Carafa at Vienna to thank the Emperor once again for the fonts, which had arrived at Rome, see Pandić, *Franjo* 89, n. 24.

³⁸⁹ See the excerpt of his report ed. *ibid.* 93, n. 43:

Non ordinando io mai sacerdote illirico pian pian me li faccio latini.

Not without some justification it has been concluded that his report reveals:

not merely indifference but rather disdain and hatred of the Slav element,

thus Radonić, *□ tamparije* 23.

³⁹⁰ This suggestion was clearly intended to halt creeping Latinization.

³⁹¹ His proposals ed. von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 102, and König, *Ka□i□* 2, n. 8. Ponzoni had made his views known to the Propaganda in a letter of 1626 in which he suggested that the revision should be undertaken by a commission and that in addition to the missal and breviary the *rituale romano* should also be published for the benefit of the 200 clergy in his diocese who celebrated in Slavonic, see the summary of his letter made for the Propaganda ed. Fermeđin, *Listovi* 9-10.

From Mrnavić' proposals it is clear that he had read Glavinić' letter of 10 April 1626 to Carafa: the revision could only be carried out by a person who knew the common language as well as its dialects and who would have to be assisted by at least four advisers, a Dalmatian, a Croat, a Bosnian and a Macedonian or Serb, and in order for it to succeed the head of the commission should be a well-known person with authority. Since the heretics had printed the Bible and other books, the Propaganda should do the same.³⁹² A decision was postponed until the meeting on 18 December 1626 at which it was decided to print the revised books in Glagolitic, to adapt the translation in accordance with the revised Latin missal and breviary, to translate the additions in as far as possible into the same language as that of the early translations and to ask the Illyrian bishops whether the missal and breviary should also be printed in Cyrillic or whether it would be more useful to have the liturgy of the Slavo-Greek rite published.³⁹³ This decision to reverse the trend towards a more vernacular translation in favour of a return to the archaic form of Slavonic was to have fateful consequences and remained in force until the late 19th century.

On 6 February 1627 Ingoli requested Archbishop Garzadoro of Zara to ascertain how many copies of the new revised missals and breviaries would be required and to his reply of 15 March the archbishop appended a list of the number of parishes in Dalmatia where Slavonic was used, in all 113, the largest number being 34 in the archdiocese of Zara and the smallest in its suffragan see of Arbe, two, adding that he had also written to some of the other bishops to ascertain their requirements.³⁹⁴ In view of the positive replies received from the Dalmatian bishops³⁹⁵ it was decided at a meeting of the Propaganda on 5 June 1627 to establish a commission for the revision to be headed by Bishop Nicolò Brautti

³⁹² His proposals ed. *ibid.* 8-9. They also include the means of funding the project from the incomes of Dalmatian sees and monasteries, an idea which he had already had in mind before it was known that the press would be moved from Fiume to Rome, see the excerpt of Archbishop Garzadoro's report on his visitation of 1625, ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 101. It is obvious that he had a revised form of Slavonic in mind and the claim that his forgery of the psalter of "1222" reveals that he favoured the archaic language, thus Sgambati, *Ruolo* 434, is incorrect; see also note 393. For the reason for the forgery see above note 371.

³⁹³ The decision ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 102-103, see 102:

P°. Censuit huiusmodi libros non esse imprimendos caractere latino sed glagolitico, hoc est Sancti Hieronymi. 2°. Eorum translationem illyricam antiquam non esse immutandam sed solum corrigendam ubi opus erit, ad formam missalis et breviarii Romanorum ex decreto Sacri Concilii Tridentini editorum et auctoritate Clementis Octavi recognitorum. 3°. Transferenda esse in eandem linguam illyricam antiquam quae desunt antiquis missali et breviario illyricis ex praedictis missali et breviario Romanis ut supra editis et recognitis, ita ut additamenta sint, quantum fieri poterit, conformia translationi antiquae.

The idea that this decision was in keeping with Mrnavić' ideas, thus von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 103, is in view of his proposals, see above note 392, untenable. Only later did both he and Levaković oppose a vernacular Bible on account of this decision.

³⁹⁴ His letter ed. Jurić, *Pokušaj* 159-160. The requirement for his diocese was 100 missals and 200 breviaries. The list of the number of parishes using Slavonic ed. *ibid.* 158.

³⁹⁵ Their replies to Garzadoro ed. *ibid.* 161-63. He forwarded them to the Propaganda on 23 April, see his accompanying letter ed. *ibid.* 163.

of Sarsina (1602-1632), a native of Ragusa.³⁹⁶ However, at the same meeting a decision was taken which was to have momentous consequences for the further history of the Glagolitic rite: it was considered advisable to appoint Nicholas Novak († 1633), a Ruthenian Basilian monk, who had been nominated *Procurator Negotiorum Ecclesiae Ruthenae* at Rome by Metropolitan Joseph Rutsky of Kiev (1613-1637) in 1626, to the commission.³⁹⁷ This appointment was the result of the mistaken notion that the language of the Slavo-Latin rite was identical to that of the Slavo-Greek rite except that in the case of the former it had been corrupted whereas in the case of the latter the pristine purity of the language had been preserved and hence the former should be revised on the basis of the latter.

Another consideration which played a role was the notion that the schismatics viz. Orthodox, could be gained for the Union by the use of the same language in both rites. In a memorandum of 1622 to the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, Ludovicus Ludovisi (1575-1632, prefect 1622-1632), Metropolitan Rutsky had pointed out that the easiest way to win the disunited Ruthenians for the Union was the use of the same rite, the same liturgical language and the same books and ceremonies.³⁹⁸ However, Levaković had gone one stage further: according to his second proposal, since there was a scarcity of liturgical books of the Slavo-Greek rite, the schismatics could be gained not only for the Union but also for the Slavo-Latin rite by the publication of breviaries and missals in Cyrillic script. This fanciful notion was reiterated by the author of an anonymous report to the Propaganda of 5 June 1627, the same day as Novak was appointed to the commission. In welcoming the decision to reform the missal and the breviary the writer points out that the language of the liturgical books of the Slavo-Latin rite has over the centuries become obscure, barbarous and so incomprehensible to all that recourse had to be had to the Latin originals in order to understand the texts.³⁹⁹ The language is used by many nations, Bohemians, Muscovites, Poles, Ruthenians, Thracians, viz. Bulgarians, Serbs, Croats, Dalmatians, Ragusans and many others and many words used in one region are not understood in an-

³⁹⁶ See the minutes ed. *ibid.* 160. On Brautti (Brauti□) see Buri□, *Kanonici* 99-100.

³⁹⁷ See Pandzi□, *Franjo* 94, n. 49, for the MS reference. Novak remained at Rome until his death in 1633; on him see Welykyj, *Procuratores* 62-78. For a list of Ruthenian procurators at Rome from 1626 to 1674 see *idem*, *Acta* i, 366. At the same meeting the Franciscan priest Pietro Benessa (Petar Bene□a, 1586-1642) was also appointed to the commission, see Welykyj, *Acta* i, 54, but he does not seem to have played an active part in its work.

³⁹⁸ See the memorandum ed. Shmurlo, *Kuriya* app. 24-25, see 25:

per nessuno mezzo nel rito Romano con tanta facilità possono tradursi alla santa fede, come per li Ruteni uniti: affinché nel medesimo rito greco, usano il medesimo linguaggio, medesimi libri e sacre ceremonie medesime a tutti li Ruteni.

³⁹⁹ See the report ed. Fermend□in, *Listovi* 17-19, see 17:

essendo per la lunghezza di tempo e centinaia d'anni diventato di poca edificatione et intelligenza, contenendo parole obsolete et inintelligibili, ridicole et contrarie allo senso della sacra scrittura, con tanta oscurità e barbarismi, che in molti luochi non è inteso da nessuno; e quelli, che fanno professione di savii in quella lingua, per intenderlo sono astretti a ricorrere alla Biblia latina e per discretione intenderlo.

other. Since it is necessary that the revised texts be understood by all it is necessary to print the revised texts in Cyrillic which is understood by the vast majority, whereas Glagolitic is only used in a restricted area. This would not be an innovation as Pope Gregory XIII had permitted the publication of the catechism of Peter Canisius in Cyrillic script.⁴⁰⁰

The idea that printing the liturgical books of the Slavo-Latin rite would gain schismatics for the Union clearly interested the Propaganda and so even before the meeting of the Propaganda on 5 June Ingoli had on 28 May written to Archbishop Garzadoro requesting him to ascertain the views of the Dalmatian bishops on the issue.⁴⁰¹ The archbishop very sensibly replied on 19 June 1627 that it seemed to him hazardous to replace a script which had been in use for centuries by Cyrillic with very little hope that the clergy of Bulgaria, Serbia, Bosnia, Moldavia, Wallachia and Ruthenia would accept the liturgical books of the Slavo-Latin rite but that he would nevertheless ask his fellow bishops.⁴⁰² In the event the bishops were divided over the issue: Archbishop Ponzoni of Spalato considered that in view of the widespread use of Cyrillic, which was easy to learn, its introduction would be an advantage,⁴⁰³ an opinion shared by Bishop Ottaviano Garzadoro of Ossero (1614-1633),⁴⁰⁴ whereas Bishop Biagio Mandevi of Nona (1602-1640) considered that whereas young priests of the provinces of Dalmatia, Istria, Carinthia, Styria and Carniola could easily learn Cyrillic, older clergy would be confused by the change and thus the books should be published in both scripts,⁴⁰⁵ a view with which Bishop Teodoro Georgii of Arbe (1621-1636) concurred.⁴⁰⁶ However, bishop Luigi Lipomanni of Veglia (1623-1640) forthrightly replied that the Propaganda could publish the books in Cyrillic if it so wished but they would not be used in his diocese.⁴⁰⁷ On

⁴⁰⁰ He is referring to the translation by the Jesuit Simeone (Šimun) Budinić of Zara (1530-1600) of the *Summa doctrinae christianae* by Peter Canisius (Kanijs, 1521-1597) published at Rome in 1583. The language is basically Šakavian Croat but with so many Slavonicisms, Polisms and Czechisms that it has been called the first attempt to make *una lingua letteraria croata-panslava*, see Graciotti, *Problema* 142. There were two editions, both in 1583, one in Cyrillic script, the other in Latin script, see Badalić, *Jugoslavica* nos. 178-179; Kukuljević, *Bibliografija* i, nos. 62 and 273. On Budinić see (with bibliography) Frangeš, *Geschichte* 631-632.

⁴⁰¹ See the MS reference in Pandurić, *Franjo* 95, n. 52.

⁴⁰² His reply ed. Jurić, *Pokušaj* 164:

mi fa reputare pericoloso il mutare à questi (viz. the Dalmatian clergy) il carattere usato per tanti secoli affatigandogli nel dover' imparare il Cirilliano con pochissima speranza, che sia accettato da quelli Ecclesiastici ch'usano il carattere e lingua Illirica in Bulgaria, Servia, Bosna, Moldavia, Vallachia, et Russia.

⁴⁰³ His reply of 28 June 1627 ed. *ibid.* 165.

⁴⁰⁴ His reply of 29 June ed. *ibidem*. Despite having the same name as the archbishop of Zara he is a different person.

⁴⁰⁵ His reply of 29 June ed. *ibid.* 165-166.

⁴⁰⁶ His reply of 7 July ed. *ibid.* 166.

⁴⁰⁷ His reply of 12 July ed. *ibid.* 167:

Per riverente risposta di quelle di V.S. Ill.ma di 22 del passato, le dico che mentre da Nostro Signore e dalla sacra Congregazione di Propaganda Fide venghino fatti stampare li Messali, e Breviarij Illirici con il Carattere Cirilliano, non potranno servir à proposito sopra questa mia Diocese, per non esser stato mai adoperato ne in uso, sicome vengo benissimo informato, essendo frequentatissimo solamente quello di S. Girolamo, con che al solito della mia riverenza le baccio le mani.

14 July Archbishop Garzadoro forwarded the replies to Rome and in his covering letter again properly pointed out that there was a danger that neither the Catholics nor the schismatics would accept editions in Cyrillic script.⁴⁰⁸

The archbishop also did all that he could to promote the project. He learned that Mattheo Alberti of Spalato (1561-1623) had made a translation of the breviary and missal and requested the Dominican provincial Ambrogio Luciceo (Lučić, fl. 17th century) to examine it. On 24 August 1627 the latter reported that it was mainly in Glagolitic but some was in Latin script⁴⁰⁹ and on 25 August Alberti's son Giorgio (Juraj) wrote to the archbishop that he would willingly surrender the translation if he could be given a place to study in Italy.⁴¹⁰ The archbishop informed the Propaganda of this on 3 September⁴¹¹ and on 9 October the Propaganda decided to offer Giorgio a place at the Illyrian College at Loreto.⁴¹² The archbishop was also collecting early MSS and sending them to Rome: on 30 August he sent a breviary of 1366 and a missal of 1402,⁴¹³ while on 18 September he dispatched three missals of 1387, 1402 and 1435 and three breviaries of 1387, 1443, and 1460.⁴¹⁴ Ingoli thanked him on 21 October and requested him not to send any more MSS as the experts considered them sufficient for their purposes.⁴¹⁵

As Slobodan Fomić admirably remarked: *Paucis expeditis, ad rem pervenit*. On the replies see Lacko, *Problema* 389-390; Pandić, *Franjo* 95.

⁴⁰⁸ Excerpt ed. Jurić, *Pokućaj* 167-168, see 167:

Gl'altri sono quasi tutti Scismatici e governati da Preti Greci pur Scismatici inimicissimi della Chiesa Roma(na), in tanto che si correria evidente pericolo, che quelli non gl'accettassero, ne meno gli Cattolici, non essendo del Carattere, nel quale sono sempre versati.

The archbishop also lists the names of the persons most capable of assisting in the work of revision, concluding that for various reasons Glavinić is the best choice, *ibid.* 167-168.

⁴⁰⁹ See his reply ed. *ibid.* 168-169. In 1617 Alberti had published a Croat translation at Venice of the *Officium S. Mariae in Sabato* introduced by Pope Paul V (1605-1621): *Oficij B.D. Marie* [...]; Kukuljević Saksinski, *Bibliografija* i, 1, no. 105; Schmitz, *Buchdruck* no. 180; see also Čafarčić, *Geschichte* ii, 143.

⁴¹⁰ See his letter ed. *ibid.* 169-170. It has been claimed that Alberti had been archdeacon of Spalato, e.g. Čafačić, *Geschichte* ii, 27, but there is no evidence that he had been a priest and his son Giorgio would not have been awarded a place at the Illyrian College at Loreto if he had been illegitimate, as Jurić *Pokućaj* 151, n. 33a, pointed out.

⁴¹¹ See the excerpt of his letter ed. *ibid.* 171.

⁴¹² See the decision ed. *ibid.* 170. The *Collegium Illyricum Lauretanum* had been established by Pope Gregory XIII to train missionaries for the Balkans in 1580 but in view of the cost it was closed in 1593 and twelve of the students transferred to the Jesuit *Collegium Romanum*, where in 1599 Clement VIII established the *Academia linguae illyricae* especially for Croat students and missionaries to the Balkans, which survived until the *Societas Jesu* was dissolved in 1773. However, in 1627 the Illyrian College at Loreto had just been reestablished by Urban VIII's bull *Zelo Domus Dei* of 1 June, ed. *BDP* xiii, 541-547. It survived until 1797. On the College see Jurić, *Collegium passim*; on its beginnings see Radonić, *tamparije* 92-106. See also below note 582.

⁴¹³ See his letter ed. Jurić, *Pokućaj* 170. The breviary of 1366 is now *codex Borgianus Illiricus* 5-6, on which see Durova, *Catalogo* 152-156; Vajs, *Brevia* XLV-XLIX; the 1402 missal is now *codex Hamilton* 444 in the German State Library, Berlin, see Pantelić, *Kodeksi* 17-29.

⁴¹⁴ See his letter ed. Jurić, *Pokućaj* 171. The missal of 1435 is now *codex Borgianus Illiricus* 8, on which see Durova, *Catalogo* 158-160; Vajs, *Misal* 23-28; the breviary of 1443 is *codex* 51 in the collection of Petr Sevast'yanov (1811-1867) in the State Library of Russia, Moscow, see Viktorov, *Sobraniye* 75-77, while the 1460 breviary is in the private collection of Umberto Pezzoli in Rome, see Bakmaz, *Pisar* 9-13. The locations of the missal and breviary of 1387 and the second missal of 1402 are unknown.

⁴¹⁵ See Ingoli's note ed. Jurić, *Pokućaj* 172.

On 1 December 1627 a special congregation of the Propaganda was held under Cardinal Guido Bentivoglio (1579-1644) to discuss the issue of which script or scripts the liturgical books should be printed in. The Dalmatian bishops' replies were read and discussed. Mrnavić, Levaković and Novak were all in favour of editions in both scripts but the former two both stated that if this was too expensive then the choice would have to be Glagolitic for three reasons: 1. in the provinces listed by the bishop of Nona only Glagolitic was used; 2. the new script would cause a scandal; 3. the schismatics would never accept the Roman rite even if its liturgical books were printed in Cyrillic.⁴¹⁶ However, Novak in that case favoured Cyrillic on the grounds that Glagolitic was only used by a few and Cyrillic by many and besides it was easier to read and since it would only take one month for the clergy to learn to read Cyrillic, whereas two years would be needed to print the books, they would have learned it by then. He also took up Levaković' argument of 9 November 1626 that since the schismatics suffered from a lack of liturgical books they would of necessity have to obtain Catholic editions and hence would easily become Catholics,⁴¹⁷ an unrealistic theory which Levaković himself had obviously already abandoned. Novak then added that the liturgy of the Greek rite was very long and tedious as well as being full of errors and was greatly inferior to the Roman rite in both beauty and arrangement so that it would not be difficult for schismatics to accept the Roman rite. Indeed, for this very reason Ruthenian Uniats had emended and abridged the liturgy of the Greek rite on the basis of the Roman one,⁴¹⁸ a very candid admission of the Latinization of the Greek rite after the Union of Brest in 1596. As no agreement was reached the decision was left to the Pope in a general congregation on 17 December 1627 at which it was decided to print editions in both scripts, beginning with the missal.⁴¹⁹ In the event no liturgical books of the Slavo-Latin rite were published in Cyrillic by the Propaganda.

⁴¹⁶ The minutes of the congregation ed. *ibid.* 172-174, see 173, and Welykyj, *Acta* i, 59-61, see 60:

1°. quia provinciae ab episcopo Nonensi recensitae non utuntur alio caractere. 2°. novitas characteris cyrilliani acerrime ab illis antiquitatis sibi traditae tenacissimis oppugnaretur, et hac in re coactio scandala plurima pareret. 3°. [...] schismatici ritus graeci, qui nulla ratione a ritu suo recedent, ut libros latini ritus, etiam in eorum lingua impressos, recipiant.

⁴¹⁷ *Ibid.* 174, and 60:

quia schismatici huius linguae, librorum liturgiae ritus graeci extrema laborantes penuria, impressa latini ritus breviaria et missalia ab ipsa compulsi necessitate recipient, eoque modo facile fient catholici.

For Levaković' advocacy of this on 9 November 1626 see above note 391.

⁴¹⁸ *Ibid.* 174, and 60-61:

quia liturgiae graeci ritus longissimae et tediosae, erroribus plurimis refertae, et fere semper eaedem, ordinique romano comparatae pulchritudine, dispositioneque longe inferiores, unde non erit difficile schismaticos ordinem recipere purgatum, ut varietate insigni pulchriorem et brevitate minus onerosum, et ab omni errore purgatum. Quam ob causam Rutheni uniti in multis locis ex romano ordine suas lyturgias graeci ritus emendarunt et abbreviarunt.

⁴¹⁹ The minutes ed. Welykyj, *Acta* i, 59. Radonić, *□tamparije* 31, is probably correct in considering that financial reasons played a considerable part in the failure to print books in both alphabets.

The person entrusted with the actual revision was Levaković, which seems to have annoyed Mrnavić since already in September or early October he had sought permission to leave Rome, which was refused by the Propaganda on 9 October 1627⁴²⁰ and he was at least in theory placed in charge of the revision.⁴²¹ At first Levaković was to be assisted by Francesco (Franjo) of Cattaro (fl. 17th century), who taught theology at the Franciscan monastery of S. Maria in Aracoeli in Rome,⁴²² and then by the Franciscan Peter Bogdan Bakšić (1600/1-1674), the future archbishop of Sofia (1642-1674), but the latter was summoned back to Bulgaria by Bishop Elias Marinić of Sofia (1623-1642) in 1630, and Daniel Grozdek (c. 1600-1667), a Franciscan of the province of Bosna Croatiae, was summoned to Rome to assist him.⁴²³ However, none of them seems to have been of much assistance since later in a letter of 30 July 1633 he stated that the defects in his translation were due to the fact that he had been working alone and, given time, he could have done better.⁴²⁴ That Levaković had indeed been working swiftly is revealed by the fact that on 14 August 1628 the Propaganda informed Archbishop Garzadoro that eight sheets had been printed.⁴²⁵ The revised missal was published in December 1631.⁴²⁶ It is prefaced by Urban VIII's breve *Ecclesia catholica* of 29 April 1631 in Latin with a Slavonic translation, which lays down that as from eight months from the date of publication no earlier printed edition or manuscript of the missal may be used.⁴²⁷

An examination of the language reveals that the additional texts have been translated into the traditional language of Croat missals and a comparison with the previous editions of 1528 and 1531 shows that many but not all of the more

⁴²⁰ See the Propaganda's decision ed. Fermentić in, *Listovi* 19.

⁴²¹ See Pandić, *Franjo* 96, n. 62, for the MS reference.

⁴²² See *ibid.* 96, n. 63.

⁴²³ The summons ed. Fermentić in, *Listovi* 22. On Grozdek see Kukuljević, *Književnici* 54. On Bakšić (or Bakšev) see most recently Dimitrov, *Petâr passim*; on his collaboration with Levaković see *ibid.* 26-29. Bakšić studied at the Franciscan monastery at Ancona from 1620-1623 and then the *Collegium Clementinum* at Rome until 1630, see *ibid.* 25-29. He was appointed bishop of Sofia in 1641 but archbishop only in 1642.

⁴²⁴ See the excerpt of the letter ed. Pandić, *Franjo* 97, n. 72:

Nel missale ho advertito alcuni mancamenti, ma finalmente son stato solo, et non si può veder et osservare il tutto in un tempo. Non son però cose che necessitassero la renovatione, ma solo che molte cose potevo far meglio.

⁴²⁵ See *ibid.* 96, n. 67.

⁴²⁶ The order to publish Urban VIII's breve of 29 April 1631, on which see note 427, is dated 29 November 1631, see +++2 of the edition, and the Propaganda informed Archbishop Garzadoro on 27 December that printing had been completed, for the MS reference see Pandić, *Franjo* 97, n. 68, and von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 103, n. 26. The edition has a bilingual title: *Missale Romanum Slavonico idiomate iussu S.D.N. Urbani octavi editum. Missal Rimskij va ezik Slovenskij sazdan povelieniem P.G.N. pape Urbana osmago*; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 35; Kukuljević, *Bibliografija* i, no. 35; Weale, *Bibliographia* no. 1336. On the edition see Ilijić, *Missale passim*. It is the first Glagolitic book to contain musical notation, viz. Gregorian chant.

⁴²⁷ Ed. +++1-+++2; the Latin text reprinted by Ginzler, *Geschichte* app. 97-98; Jelić, *Fontes* [17th century] 26-27, and partially by von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 103; the Slavonic text by Kukuljević, *Književnici* 140-141. The two texts in the reprints vary and the originals were unavailable to the author. This period of eight months was later extended to twelve, see Burić, *Libri* 829. The edition also contains the Latin originals and Slavonic translations of Pius V's *Quo primum* of 14 July 1570, +2-++1, and Clement VIII's *Cum sanctissimum* of 7 July 1604, ++1-++4. On these bulls see above notes 333 and 337.

vernacular features of the 1531 edition have been edited out in favour of the more archaic readings of that of 1528, e.g. in the canon of the mass *quorum tibi fides cognita est* was *ihže tebě vĕra znana est* in 1528, altered to *kih vera poznana est tebi* in 1531 and back to *ihže tebi vera znana est* in 1631; *toto orbe terrarum: vseju selenuju zemaal'* (1528), *po vsĕm okruglu zemaal'* (1531), *vseju vseleuju zemaal'* (1631). Not all of the more vernacular forms of 1531 have, however, been removed, e.g. *petimus: prosim'* (1528), *proximo* (1531 and 1631); *cultoribus: ĉestiteli* (1528), *ĉastiteli* (1532 and 1631). Some 1631 readings are completely new, e.g. *orthodoxis: redovniki* (1528), *pravoverujućimi* (1531) but *pravoslavitoli* (1631).⁴²⁸ Since there was no grammar or dictionary of Croat Slavonic it was inevitable that in some places Levaković' translation should be uneven in style, as he himself admitted.⁴²⁹ One alteration that particularly incensed Bishop Giulio Saraceni of Pola (1627-1640) was the alteration of *kral'* for *rex* to *car'* since in his opinion the latter term designated the sultan. His objection was discussed at a meeting of the Propaganda on 30 July 1635 but the change was defended by Mrnavić and the Ruthenian bishop of Pinsk, Raphael Korsak (1652-1637; metropolitan of Kiev 1637-1640), who attended the meeting, and the Propaganda agreed with them.⁴³⁰ Levaković defended himself against criticism of the text on the grounds that he had been instructed to revise the missal on the basis of the language of the early missals and not on the basis of the vernacular.⁴³¹ It is an irony that the first liturgical book published after the Council of Trent for the Glagolitic rite, which had to such effect been quoted at the Council in defence of the vernacular, should have on Roman instructions been revised in a deliberately archaizing manner. However, worse was to come.

The decision of 18 December 1626 that the language of the revised liturgical books was to remain the archaic form of Slavonic meant that the language of the 1631 missal was basically the Croat redaction of Old Slavonic. As soon as Levaković finished work on the missal he began work on the revision of the breviary. From a letter of Mrnavić to the Propaganda of 5 December 1631 it is known that he had been instructed to aid with the revision⁴³² but in 1632 he was sent on an apostolic visitation to the Pauline (Barnabite) monasteries in Hungary and Poland and only returned in 1634. Levaković' work on the revision was

⁴²⁸ For a juxtaposition of the beginning of the canon of the mass in the 1528, 1531 and 1631 editions see Kukuljević, *Knjiĉevnici* 142.

⁴²⁹ See above note 424. It is true that there are a few East-Slavonicisms in the primer which Levaković had already published at Rome in 1629, on them see Horvat, *Bartol* 14, and König, *Azbukividnĉk* 258, some of which made their way into the missal, see Jagić, *Istoriya* 38, but this in no way justifies the claim by Holjevac, *Djelatnost* 143, that the language of the missal had been "Russified". The primer appeared under the title: *Azbukividnĉk slovinskij, iĉe opĉennim naĉinom psalteriĉ nazivaetse*. [...]. Kruming, *Katalog* no. 34; Kukuljević, *Bibliografija* i, no. 1. For a facsimile reprint see König, *Azbukividnĉk* app. 1-31, with a transliteration in Latin script *ibid.* 264-277.

⁴³⁰ See the excerpt of the minutes ed. Vanino, *Stjepan* 136.

⁴³¹ See Pandić, *Franjo* 97, n. 72, and von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 104, n. 29, for the MS reference.

⁴³² Ed. Fermeđin, *Listovi* 24.

interrupted by his attending the general chapter of the Franciscan order held at Toledo in May 1633 but from a letter of the Propaganda to Archbishop Garzadoro of Zara of 11 August 1635 it is known that the revision of the breviary had been completed and that enquiries were being made to ascertain whether it would be cheaper to have it printed at Venice.⁴³³ The revision was submitted for examination to two Ruthenian Basilian monks studying at the Greek College of St. Athanasius at Rome, Philip Borovyk and Josaphat Isakovych, who on 24 August 1635 signed a declaration that it was in full agreement with the latest breviary, viz. that of 1632.⁴³⁴ The printing could not be carried out at Venice as the printer requested that the Glagolitic press at Rome be transferred thither and that Levaković supervise the printing,⁴³⁵ whereas Levaković was supervising the printing at that press of his revision in Glagolitic script of the translation of the guide for confessors by Juan de Polanco (1516-1576), which had been made by Simeone Budinić and first published at Rome in Latin script in 1582.⁴³⁶

Between March 1637 and late October or early November 1641 Levaković was largely absent from Rome on various missions which took him to Austria, Croatia, Wallachia, Bulgaria, Ruthenia and Poland⁴³⁷ and when in 1642 he was able to return to the work of revision he discovered that none of the various Croat Slavonic redactions of the Psalms in the breviary agreed with the Latin text in the revised Sixto-Clementine Vulgate of 1592⁴³⁸ and in a secret consistory on 10 November 1642 Pope Urban VIII ordered that the Slavonic redaction closest to the revised Vulgate text should be taken as the basis and adapted to

⁴³³ See the excerpt ed. Pandžić, *Franjo* 100, n. 86.

⁴³⁴ Their declaration ed. Ginzel, *Geschichte* 162, n. 5:

Quod quia fideliter translatum atque in omnibus concordans cum novissimo Breviario a SS. D.N. nuperrime correcto invenimus, ideo his nostris superinde testimonium propriis manibus subscriptum dare volumus.

As will emerge, this declaration is not entirely accurate. Both Philip Borovyk and Josaphat Isakovych studied at Rome from 1633 to 1638, see Blažejovskij, *Rite* 83.

⁴³⁵ See the MSS references in Pandžić, *Franjo* 101, nn. 88-89.

⁴³⁶ Budinić' edition of 1582 is entitled *Ispravnik za erei ispovednici i za pokornici. Prenesen iz latinskoga jazika u slovinjski*. Levaković' revision, which appeared in 1635, has the title: *Izpravnik za erei ispovednici i za pokornih. Prenesen negda s' latinskoga jazika u slovinjskij po popu imunu Budineu a sada pis'meni glagolskimi ispisan i napečatjen' O. Rafailom Levakovićem*; for the 1582 edition see Badalić, *Jugoslavica* no. 172; Kukuljević, *Bibliografija* i, no. 274; for that of 1635 see Kruming, *Katalog* no. 36; Kukuljević, *Bibliografija* i, no. 4. The original first appeared at Rome in 1554 under the title: *Breve directorium ad Confessarii ac Confitentis munus ritè obeundum concinnatum*. On Budinić see above note 400.

⁴³⁷ For accounts of his various missions see Dujčev, *Cattolicesimo* 47-50, and Pandžić, *Franjo* 101-106. On 2 May 1637 Emperor Ferdinand nominated him bishop of Samandria (Smederovo), which Rome refused to confirm on the grounds that the Emperor had no right to nominate to sees outside the Empire, but the suggestion that the printing of the Glagolitic breviary was long delayed because the Propaganda doubted whether they could trust Levaković to supervise it, thus Pandžić, *Franjo* 102, requires substantiation. There can be no doubt, however, that Rome was fully aware of the need for a breviary. On 31 March 1639 Archbishop Sforza Ponzoni of Spalato complained to the Propaganda:

che un breviario serve per doi o tre prete a bisogno andare da un loco all'altro per ritrovarlo.

See the excerpt of his letter ed. Radonić, *□tamparije* 63.

⁴³⁸ On the *Vulgata Sixto-Clementina* see below.

the Vulgate text.⁴³⁹ Unfortunately since the death of Mrnavić in 1637 or 1639⁴⁴⁰ there was no other theologian at Rome who was expert in Croat Slavonic in Glagolitic script, but early in 1643 Bishop Methodius Terletsky of Kholm (1630-1649) arrived in Rome⁴⁴¹ and on 1 September he was instructed by the Propaganda to assist Levaković with checking the Slavonic text against the Vulgate and making as literal a rendering as linguistically possible.⁴⁴²

The two must have worked at incredible speed since Terletsky's Latin attestation that the revision had been completed is dated 16 September 1643.⁴⁴³ In it Terletsky stated that they had not only checked the earlier Illyrian editions and MSS of the breviary against the revised Vulgate but that they had in addition consulted some early codices used by the Ruthenian Church as well as by all the Slav Church since its very origins and on their basis they had removed vernacular terms which had entered Levaković' translation via early Illyrian breviaries and had replaced them by the pure Slavonic terms found in the uncorrupted codices.⁴⁴⁴ It would be difficult to find a more accurate formulation of the misguided view that the language of the liturgical books being printed in Ruthenia

⁴³⁹ The decision ed. Ginzl, *Geschichte* 162, n. 6:

Sanctitas Sua jussit, ex praefati Psalterii translationibus illam, quae magis concordat cum Vulgata editione, corrigi et emendari juxta eandem Vulgatam in Congregatione particulari pro emendatione Bibliorum Arabicorum instituta coram Emo D. Card. Paleotto, vocatis ad eam aliis Theologis linguam Illyricam callentibus, eandemque translationem juxta Vulgatam editionem Latinam emendatam in dicto Breviario imprimi.

On the Arabic translation of the Bible referred to in this decision see below note 564.

⁴⁴⁰ The vexed question of the year cannot be dealt with here as it is in this context irrelevant, see above note 371.

⁴⁴¹ Precisely when he arrived is uncertain but the nuncio at Warsaw, Marius Filonardi (1635-1643), reported that he had left Warsaw for Rome on 2 January 1643, see his report ed. Welykyj, *Litterae* vi, 162. Anthony Sielawa (c. 1583-1655) had been confirmed as metropolitan of Kiev by Urban VIII on 18 March 1641, see the breve ed. *idem*, *Documenta* i, 519-521, but for reasons of ill health was granted an indult to allow Terletsky to make his *visitatio ad limina*, see Urban's breve of 3 November 1643, ed. *ibid.* i, 523-524, see 524. On his visit, which lasted over a year, see Senyk, *Methodius* 354-363. It was to Meletius Terletsky that Pope Urban VIII is alleged to have said:

O mei Rutheni, per vos ego Orientem spero convertendum.

See Petrushevich, *Yeparkhiya* 41, although in recording his visit to Rome, *ibid.* 44-46 and 246, he does not mention the revision of the breviary.

⁴⁴² The decision of the Propaganda ed. Welykyj, *Acta* i, 196, and Pandić, *Franjo* 107, n. 126:

cum eo (sc. Levaković) quam primum facere dignetur confrontationem Psalterii praedicti cum Vulgata et, ubi translatio illyrica non concordabit cum Vulgata, illam ambo corrigant et ad Vulgatam translationem accommodent de verbo ad verbum, nisi ob phrasim illyricam necesse sit translationem illyricam accommodare cum Vulgata ad sensum.

⁴⁴³ It is on f. *8^{r-v} of the 1648 edition of the breviary; for a reprint see Ginzl, *Geschichte* app. 99-101: *Testimonium de Psalterio, in Breviario Illyrico imprimendo, ad Vulgatam, quantum phrasim Illyricae linguae pateretur, accommodato.* The date is given as:

die 16. Sept. anno a creatione Mundi secundum nostrum computum 7151., a Nativitate vero Christi Domini 1643.

Kruming, *Katalog* 75, correctly points out that the former date is incorrect and should read 7152 (= 1 September 1643-31 August 1644).

⁴⁴⁴ Ed. Ginzl, *Geschichte* app. 100:

adhibitis etiam antiquissimis, quibus ab ipso suo exordio Ruthena et cuncta Slavonica usa est et utitur Ecclesia, codicibus [...]. Nam explosis nonnullis vulgatis Sermonis Dalmatici vocabulis, quae scriptorum licentia in vetusta Illyrica Breviaria intrusa fuerant, quaeque R.P. Raphaël suae translationi inseruerat, pura, quae in incorruptis apud me habebantur, Slavonica, eorum loco reposuimus.

vremě, dan – den', esam – esm',⁴⁵¹ and the lexical changes in the Lord's Prayer had led to the replacement of the earliest terms for temptation and evil, *napast'* and *neprijazn'*, preserved in Croat Slavonic, by the later terms *iskušenije* and *lukavij*,⁴⁵² which was the object of a sarcastic comment by Joseph Dobrowsky already in 1807.⁴⁵³ This process is often referred to as the "Russification" of Croat Slavonic,⁴⁵⁴ although it has been suggested that in view of the Ruthenian input the term "East-Slavonicization" is more appropriate.⁴⁵⁵ Be that as it may, this process, which affected only liturgical books, effectively ended the prospects for a more modern form of Croat Slavonic becoming a literary medium.⁴⁵⁶ By the 16th century a vernacular Croat literature using the Latin script had emerged,⁴⁵⁷ which by the time that the breviary was published in 1648 was flourishing.⁴⁵⁸ The archaizing process continued in later editions of the missal and the breviary in the 18th century, inspired by the dual delusion that the East Slav variety of Slavonic was the original one and that the use of the same language in both the Slavo-Latin and Slavo-Greek rites would help to gain schismatics for the Union, whereas it in fact led to a decline of the Slavo-Latin rite.⁴⁵⁹ It is little wonder that Dobrowsky's disciple Jernej Kopitar (1780-1844) writing in 1836 spoke about *the remains, unless you would prefer to say ruins*,⁴⁶⁰ of the Slavo-Latin rite.

upovaet', skrbi - pe□alej and *blag'* for *bonus* is thrice replaced by *dobr'*; morphological alterations include *usli□et' krotci - usli□at' krotcii; na tvore□tee – na tvor□□ta□*.

⁴⁵¹ On the orthographic changes see Babi□, *Vzhodnoslovanizacija* 270-278.

⁴⁵² For the juxtaposition of the Lord's Prayer in the 1528 missal and the 1648 breviary see Ginzel, *Geschichte* 163, n. 8.

⁴⁵³ Dobrowsky, *Vaterunser* 55:

Wie würde sich Terlecki gewundert haben, wenn man ihm aus der Ostroger Bibel vom J. 1581 gezeigt hätte, daß für das neuere isku□enije wirklich das Dalmatische napast darin stehe.

In actual fact the Ostrog Bible has in Matthew 6:13 *napast'* (4^t) and in Luke 11:4 *isku□enie* (34^v). The question whether Terletsy could actually read Glagolitic script, raised by Senyk, *Methodius* 360, is irrelevant since Levakovi□ could have read the text aloud.

⁴⁵⁴ E.g. by Hamm, *Redakcija* 219, and von Erdmann-Pand□i□, *Drucklegungsversuch* 104.

⁴⁵⁵ Babi□, *Vzhodnoslovanizacija* 255, n. 1, and *eadem*, *Vpliv* 17. On the linguistic revision see *ibid.* 79-93, 196-201, 227-229, 245-246, 266-269, 292-295, 319-320, 339-340, 398-400. There is, however, no evidence to substantiate her claim, *ibid.* 40, that Methodius Terletsy was called to Rome to help Levakovi□ with the revision and that he played a major role in it.

⁴⁵⁶ Of the 1648 edition of the breviary Pand□i□, *Franjo* 108, correctly said:

This edition of the breviary is of great significance for Croat Glagolitic literature since with it the Croat Glagolitic tradition comes to an end and up until the 19th century it develops under the influence of Ukrainian liturgical books.

Cf. the remarks by Babi□, *Vpliv* 41. It has also been pointed out that the publication of this breviary with the psalms in a different version to that which many knew virtually by heart contributed not a little to the decline of the Glagolitic rite, see Buri□, *Libri* 833.

⁴⁵⁷ Suffice it to mention the name of Marko Maruli□ (1450-1524), whose epic poem *Judita* was first published at Venice in 1521.

⁴⁵⁸ Again to name but one author, Ivan Gunduli□ (1588-1638), whose Baroque epic poem *Suze sina razmetnoga* (Tears of the Prodigal Son) was published at Venice in 1622. Sgambati, *Ruolo* 488, rightly points to the fact that whereas in Ruthenia in the 16th to 17th centuries the *prosta mova* was considered to be inferior to a literary language, in Croatia the vernacular had become a literary language.

⁴⁵⁹ See, for instance, the various remarks by Hamm, *Redakcija* 219; Pand□i□, *Franjo* 108; Sgambati, *Ruolo* 443-450; □velec, *Pitanja* 56.

⁴⁶⁰ Kopitar, *Glagolita* XVII:

In view of the fate of the Glagolitic missal and breviary, all the more astonishing is the fate of the *rituale*. Prior to the introduction of printing there had been no official *Rituale Romanum* and dioceses and monasteries had compiled their own, such unofficial compilations being known as *Libri sacerdotales* or *Sacerdotalia*. Pope Leo X requested the Dominican Alberto de Castello (Castellini, c. 1470-after 1523) to compile a Roman one, which appeared at Venice in 1523 after the Pope's death in 1521 and which was thus dedicated to his successor Pope Adrian VI (1522-1523).⁴⁶¹ This collection had a great influence on further developments but it was not until 1614 that the first official *Rituale Romanum* was published at Rome accompanied by the bull *Apostolicae Sedi* of 20 June 1614 of Pope Paul V.⁴⁶² Its adoption was not compulsory although its use became fairly common.

The first Glagolitic ritual was published at Segna in c. 1507/8⁴⁶³ It had been compiled on the basis of Glagolitic sources, missals and breviaries for the most part, and was thus not directly related to Latin *Libri sacerdotales*.⁴⁶⁴ A peculiarity of the edition is that it is accompanied by a vernacular čakavian

Operae esset pretium scire, quot hodie animarum catholicarum ritus hic Slavolatinus curam gerat; aliis verbis, quae ejus olim latissime per Illyricum dominati adhuc manserint reliquiae, nisi ruinas malis dicere.

Fine, Jerome 108, claims that the rite became extinct in the 19th century but the documents published by Jelić, *Fontes* [19th century] 3-175, do not bear this out, e.g. the statistics of the dioceses of Veglia, Sebenico, Spalato and Zara for 1857, ed. *ibid.* 45-55, taken from Ginzel, *Geschichte* app. 125-132. The restoration of Croat Slavonic in the revision of the missal by Carolus (Dragutin) Parčić (1832-1902), *canonicus S. Hieronymi Slavonorum de Urbe*, published at Rome in 1893 came too late to remedy the situation and in any case only substituted one poorly comprehended language for another: *Missale Romanum Slavonico idiomate ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum S. Pii V. Pontificis Maximi jussu editum, Clementis VIII., Urbani VIII. et Leonis XIII. auctoritate recognitum*; on it see the review by Jagić, 210-216, who greeted it as *einen Triumph der slavischen Philologie gegenüber der Ignoranz der letzten zwei Jahrhunderte*, *ibid.* 211. The decline in Glagolitic is well illustrated by the fact that the new revision of the missal by Josef Vajs (1865-1959) printed at Rome in 1927 is in Latin script except for the canon of the mass, which is printed in parallel columns in Glagolitic and Latin script: *Rimski misal slovenskim jezikom Priloga. G.N. Urbana Papi VIII. poveljenjem izdan. Missale Romanum slavonico idiomate ex decreto Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini restitutum S. Pii V. Pontificis Maximi jussu editum a Pio X. reformatum et Ssmi D.N. Pii XI. auctoritate vulgatum*. On it see Vajs, *Vydání* 329-332, 438-442. The reforms of the second Vatican Council (1962-1965) put an end to the existence of the ancient Glagolitic rite, much to regret of some of its admirers, see Tandarić, *Književnost* 157-160. On the echo of the Cyrillomethodian legacy at the second Vatican Council see Hrynioch, *Widerhall* 196-202. There have been attempts to revive the use of Glagolitic, e.g. Zubrinić, *Glagoljica passim*, but Croatia is now an independent state in the West and Glagolitic no longer serves as a bridge to the East, but it will remain – as Gothic script in Germany – an integral part of the traditional history of the Croatian people.

⁴⁶¹ *Liber sacerdotalis nuperrime ex libris Sancte Romane Ecclesie et quarundam aliarum ecclesiarum et ex antiquis codicibus Apostolice Bibliothecae et ex iurium sanctionibus et ex doctorum ecclesiasticorum scriptis ad Reverendorum patrum sacerdotum parochialium et animarum curam habentium commodum collectus atque compositus ac auctoritate Sanctissimi D. Nri nostri Leonis decimi approbatus*. Venice 1523.

⁴⁶² *Rituale Romanum Pauli V. Pontificis Maximi jussu editum*. Rome 1614. The bull is also in *BDP* xii, 266-267. On the first edition of the *Rituale Romanum* see Löwenberg, *Erstausgabe* 141-147.

⁴⁶³ Badalić, *Jugoslavica* no. 15 a; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 7. Only two defective copies have been traced, neither of which have preserved the colophon, but the type is the same as that used at Segna in 1507-1508 by Archdeacon Silvester Bedričić († 1512).

⁴⁶⁴ For lists of the rites in the first two editions of the Glagolitic missal of 1483 and 1494 and the second edition of the Glagolitic breviary of 1493 and in the Segna *rituale* see Tandarić, *Mjesto* 216-217, who admits that the comparison is incomplete since the ending of the *rituale* has been lost.

translation of the *Tractatus brevis ac valde utilis de arte et scientia bene moriendi faciliter incepit* published at Venice in 1478,⁴⁶⁵ whereas the rest of the contents are, of course, in Croat Slavonic. The first edition of a Glagolitic *rituale* as a completely separate work was published by Bishop Šimun Kožičić at his press in Fiume in 1531.⁴⁶⁶ The bishop revised the language, which thus has čakavian traits. No further edition appeared in the 16th century and it is thus scarcely surprising that when in 1626 the Propaganda began collecting information with regard to the opportuneness of publishing Glagolitic missals and breviaries Archbishop Sforza Ponzoni of Spalato also called for the publication of the *Rituale Romanum*, viz. the revised version of 1614, in Illyrian and repeated this request during a *visitatio ad limina* in late 1633 or early 1634.⁴⁶⁷

On 13 Feb 1634 the Propaganda decided to instruct the Jesuit Bartol Kašić (Bartolomeo Cassio, 1575-1650) to revise the *rituale* on the basis of the new *Rituale Romanum*, not in Croat Slavonic but in the vernacular.⁴⁶⁸ The probable reason for this surprising decision,⁴⁶⁹ all the more unexpected as Kašić was at this time vainly petitioning Rome to allow his vernacular translation of the Bible to be published,⁴⁷⁰ was that it was not intended simply for the use of the clergy of the Slavo-Latin rite but also for those of the clergy of the Latin rite whose knowledge of that language was poor. It is noteworthy that at the beginning of his dedication to Pope Urban VIII in the *rituale* Kašić specifically states that it is for all the nation and does not speak of the Slavo-Latin rite but of the poor knowledge of Latin among the clergy in general.⁴⁷¹ Whereas the decision to

⁴⁶⁵ GKWD ii, no. 2601; Hain, *Repertorium* i, 2, no. 4392; on this see Kolendi□, *Ars* 330.

⁴⁶⁶ *Kni□ice krsta: blagoslova prstena: pri□□□□□eni□ i poslednago ma□anie: pr□poru□eni□ du□e: pogr□ba mladenac' i stariih': po rimski obi□ai. Stlma□en' □astnym' otcem' gospodinom' □imunom', biskupom' Modru□kim': na slavu i □ast' Boga vsemogu□□ago.* Fiume 1531. Badali□, *Jugoslavica* no. 36; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 15. For a facsimile reprint see Nazor, □*imun* i, a1^r-v4^v, with a transliteration, *ibid.* ii, 1^r-20^v. For a list of its contents see Tandari□, *Ritual* 239 and 245.

⁴⁶⁷ It was dealt with at the congregation of the Propaganda on 13 February 1634, see the MS reference in von Erdmann-Pand□i□, *Drucklegungsversuch* 119. On his call for it in 1626 see above note 391. See also his letter to the Propaganda which was discussed there on 19 June 1634, ed. *ibid.* 119-120.

⁴⁶⁸ The decision ed. von Erdmann-Pand□i□, *Drucklegungsversuch* 119, and Vanino, *Ritual* 100-101:

Quoad Rituale Romanum iusserunt illud transferri in idioma slavonicum usitatum et imprimi.

⁴⁶⁹ Buri□, *Libri* 834, called it:

un evento straordinario, perché non esiste il caso che la Chiesa abbia concesso un simile privilegio a qualsiasi altro popolo.

Cf. the similar remark by Vanino, *Ritual* 98.

⁴⁷⁰ On this see below. In this context Horvat, *Bartol* 8, considers the decision a moral victory for Ka□i□.

⁴⁷¹ *Rituale Romanum Urbani VIII. Pont. Max. iussi editum illyrica lingua. Ritual Rimski istomaccen slovinski po Bartolomeu Kassichiu Popu Bogoslov□u od Druxbae Yesusovae Peniten□iru Apostolskomu.* Rome 1640. Kukuljevi□, *Bibliografija* i, no. 748; Djuri□, *Katalog* no. 1150. For a facsimile reprint see Horvat, *Ritual* +1^r-+++++3^f, 1-82, 1-450. The dedication to Urban VIII is on +2^{f-v} and begins:

Prudenti, ac pijssimo consilio factum est, B. pater, ut Rituale Latinum fieret Illyricum, Te praecipiente, et expetium à tota Natione in lucem ederetur. Perdifficile enim erat Illyricis Sacerdotibus non paucis Sacros Ritus Latino eloquio scriptos intelligere, eosque in praxi exercere, apud quos non ea Latinae lingu□ viget eruditio, ut possint, exequi praescripta ritè, rectèque, sicut oportet.

It is in □tokavian in its ikavian form, viz. as in his grammar of 1604.

publish the *Rituale* in the vernacular is surprising, the choice of the person to translate it is not.

Bartol Kašić was born on Pago so that his native dialect was čakavian of the ikavian variety. He left his native island on 30 September 1590 and studied at the Jesuit College at Rome where he was already appointed to teach grammar in 1595. In late 1599 Jesuit General Claudio Aquaviva (1581-1615) requested him to compile a grammar of vernacular Croatian intended for the use of missionaries to the Balkans. This he did and the very first grammar of Croat appeared at Rome in 1604,⁴⁷² which has earned for him the title of "Father of Croatian Grammar".⁴⁷³ The Society of Jesus had laid down that it should be of the most widespread form of the language⁴⁷⁴ and he had been at pains to give the forms which would be understood by all.⁴⁷⁵ He thus did not choose his native čakavian but the more widely spoken štokavian in its ikavian variety, although there are some čakavian traits in his grammar. In this he was prescient since it was only in the mid nineteenth century that štokavian was finally accepted as the basis for the Serbian and Croatian languages.⁴⁷⁶ He also refers to his grammar in his dedication to the Pope in the *Rituale*: out of the almost infinite number of Illyrian dialects he had attempted to produce a common language for Illyrians so as to be able to render for them what the Latin language prescribed for Latins.⁴⁷⁷ At the beginning of his preface to the reader he pointed out that everyone praised his own dialect, be he Croat, Dalmatian, Bosnian, Ragusan or Serb, but a writer had to write in a language which was so common that it was easy for all to understand.⁴⁷⁸

⁴⁷² A.M.D.G. *Institutionum Linguae Illyricae libri duo*. For a facsimile reprint see Olesch, *Institutiones* 1-191.

⁴⁷³ Olesch, *Institutiones* XIV.

⁴⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 4:

Quarè sapienter est a nostrae Societatis Moderatoribus constitutum, ut eius nationis lingua vernacula, quae apud plurimos populos latissime patet, addiscatur ab ijs, qui ad eos erudiendos idonei censeantur.

⁴⁷⁵ Thus in mentioning the various dialects, he says, *ibid.* 19:

In illud autem seriò incumbam, ut si minus optimam Idiomatis nostri rationem tradere potuero, certè optimae proximam pro mea virili loquendi formam, quae ab hominibus Illyricis intelligatur, cupidus auxilio harum Institutionum linguae Illyricae addiscendae proponam.

⁴⁷⁶ Murko, *Bedeutung* (v) 70, quite rightly stated that his work:

legt die Grundlage zur gemeinsamen Schriftsprache der Kroaten und Serben.

More recent studies of his grammar include Kravar, *Grammatika* 83-94; Stolac, *Sintaksa* 129-136, and Despot, *Litteris* 84-100. He also compiled at least one Croatian-Italian dictionary, which was not, however, published until 1990: Horvat, *Kašić* 1-260 (facsimile), 261-346 (transliteration and Croat transcription). Whether two other dictionaries, one Croatian-Italian, the other the reverse, are also by Kašić is a matter of some controversy, which cannot be dealt with here, see von Erdmann-Pandorf, *Wörterbücher passim*, and *eadem*, *Rječnik* 107-128, on the one hand and Horvat, Review of von Erdmann-Pandorf, *Wörterbücher* 143-145, and *idem*, *Djelovanje* 61-82, on the other.

⁴⁷⁷ *Rituale* +2^r:

Meum itaque fuit Sacra iubente Congregatione, cum adhuc essem in Basilica Vaticana Paenitentarius Illyricus, diuturno labore in paenè infinita idiomatis Illyrici varietate perscribere communiore dialecto Illyricis, quod Latinis sermo Latinus praescripsit.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.* ++3^v:

mnjim, dà onij Pijsala, koyi hochie, sctogod upijsati nascki, imma nàstoyati, koliko nàyboglie moxe onim govorom upijsati, koga on visct ù mnozih pozna, dàye nayopchienij, i koga moxe sfak lascgne razumitti, i s' koristyu proctitti.

The translation took him two years as his preface is dated 15 August 1636. The *imprimatur* is dated 25 March 1637⁴⁷⁹ but the book did not appear until 1640 and it is known from a letter of 25 August 1638 which Giacomo Micaglia (Jakov Mikalja, 1600/1-1654) sent to Ingoli that there had been complaints that the language was Ragusan, since Kašić had lived there from 1620 to 1633, and not Bosnian.⁴⁸⁰ In actual fact the book had a great influence on the development of standard literary Croatian, which is shown not only by the orthographically revised reprints at Segna in 1824, Venice in 1827, Agram in 1859 and 1878, Sarajevo in 1887 and Rome in 1893⁴⁸¹ but also by the fact that even when compared to the revised *Rituale*, which replaced it in 1929,⁴⁸² apart from the orthography the prayers are very close to those in the 1640 edition.⁴⁸³ Indeed it has been claimed that the publication of the *Rituale* marks the beginning of the standardization of the Croat literary language.⁴⁸⁴

B. The Bible

The second of the two decrees on Scripture and Tradition adopted by the Council of Trent on 8 April 1546 declared the Vulgate to be the authentic Latin version and insisted that future editions should be corrected.⁴⁸⁵ Later that month the task of revision was entrusted to the Pope.⁴⁸⁶ There were no illusions at Rome about the difficulties involved and in a letter of 29 May 1546 to the Council legates Cardinal Alessandro Farnese spoke of *too great and too indetermi-*

⁴⁷⁹ *Rituale* +++1^v and ++1^r respectively.

⁴⁸⁰ The letter ed. Vanino, *Leksikograf* 29; cf. *idem*, *Ritual* 107. Micaglia himself fully realised the necessity for a standard literary Croatian language. In the introduction to his Croato-Italo-Latin dictionary he wrote:

Si come nella lingua italiana benché vi sia grandissima varietà nel parlare, nulla di meno, quando si scrive, ogn'un affetta la lingua Toscana o Romana, conoscendo che quella fra tutte sia la più bella, e che convenghi, che i libri si scrivano in quella. Cos' anco sono molti e varii li modi di parlare in lingua illirica, ma ogn'un dice, che la lingua Bosnese sia la più bella; perciò tutti gli scrittori illirici dovrebbero affettarla nel scrivere, il che ho procurato di fare io in questo Dittionario.

Blago jezika slovinskoga illi Slovník u komu izgorarajuse rjeci slovinske latinski i diacki. Thesaurus linguae Illyricae sive Dictionarium Illyricum in quo verba Illyrica Italice et Latine redduntur, labore P. Jacobi Micalia S.J. collectum. Loreto 1649-Ancona 1651; see the first two unnumbered pages of the preface.

⁴⁸¹ See Jelić, *Fontes* [19th century] nos. 36, 40, 62, 81, 101 and 107. That the first reprint was not until 1824 is probably due to a print run of 2500 and good quality paper. The 1893 Rome edition for the archsee at Zara had been revised in accordance with the 1884 *editio typica* of Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) by Dragutin Parčić.

⁴⁸² *Rimski obrednik. Izdan po naredbi Pape Pavla V. i pregledan bričivo u drugih papa, a oblačeno svetoga G.N. Papa Pija XI. ude en prema zbornika kanonskog prava.* Agram 1929. By decree of Pope Pius XI (1922-1939) of 19 February 1930 it was declared to be the *editio authentica: Sacra Congregatio Rituum* no. Z2/29. (It was not published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*).

⁴⁸³ See the comparison of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer in the 1640, 1827 and 1929 editions in Babić, *Jezik* 98-99.

⁴⁸⁴ Čvelec, *Pitanja* 58. Whether it also contributed to the decline of the Glagolitic rite, which Jagić, *Istoriya* 50, considers *indubitable*, is a moot point but it certainly made a contribution to the creation of Croatian theological terminology, see Golub, *Termini* 331-357. On the *Rituale* see also Nazor, *Ritual* 101-106, and Bratulić, *Bartol* 231-236.

⁴⁸⁵ See above notes 151-155.

⁴⁸⁶ See above note 149.

nate a task.⁴⁸⁷ Was it necessary to eliminate metaphrastic errors on the basis of the Hebrew or the Greek or was the intention simply to restore the Hieronymian text by removing later scribal errors? On 8 June 1546 the Council legates replied to Farnese that it was necessary to remove scribal errors and that only when obscure passages remained would it be necessary to consult the originals and retranslate them.⁴⁸⁸

Emperor Charles V instructed the Faculty of Theology of the University of Louvain to publish a Vulgate *quam emendatissime* as the Council wanted and the work was entrusted to the Dominican Jan Henten (1499/1500-1566), who in 1547 published the result at Louvain.⁴⁸⁹ As its basis Henten had taken the second revision of the Vulgate published by Robert Estienne (1503-1559) at Paris in 1540,⁴⁹⁰ which he had collated with 28 MSS and two other printed editions. Since Estienne's text had been based upon the 1492 Mainz edition,⁴⁹¹ which he had collated with the Complutensian Polyglot,⁴⁹² the edition published by Johann Froben (c. 1460-1527) at Basel in 1495⁴⁹³ and 17 MSS, the textual base of Henten's edition was fairly broad. On 25 July 1562 Cardinal Seripando, one of the Council legates, wrote to Cardinal Marcantonio Amulio (1505-1572) suggesting that the Louvain Bible should form the basis of the planned Roman revision and be collated with more MSS and patristic quotations.⁴⁹⁴ The celebrated Biblical scholar Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (1514-1585), who had begun in 1549 to make annotations on the text of the New Testament, also began glossing his copy of the 1547 Louvain Bible with variants⁴⁹⁵ and in 1563 or 1564 he drew up guidelines for the revision.⁴⁹⁶

An ad hoc commission was formed in 1569 by Pope Pius V, which included Cardinals Marcantonio Colonna (c. 1523-1597), Sirleto, Ludovico Madruzzo (1532-1600),⁴⁹⁷ Antonio Carafa (1538-1591) and Jérôme Souchier († 1571). The work of collating continued but it soon became clear that for the Old Testament both the Hebrew and the Greek would have to be consulted⁴⁹⁸ and work almost ground to a halt as the result of differences between members of the

⁴⁸⁷ Ed. *CT*, x, 506-507, see 507:

una impresa troppo larga et troppo indeterminata.

⁴⁸⁸ See the excerpt of their letter ed. Höpfl, *Beiträge* 48, n. 1.

⁴⁸⁹ *Biblia ad vetustissima exemplaria nunc recens castigata* [...]. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6129. On this edition see Stummer, *Einführung* 175-176.

⁴⁹⁰ *Biblia*. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6117. Printing took over three years but it was published in 1540.

⁴⁹¹ *Ibid.* ii, 2, no. 6080. The edition in two volumes has no title page.

⁴⁹² See above note 92.

⁴⁹³ *GKWD* iv, no. 4275.

⁴⁹⁴ Excerpt of his letter ed. Höpfl, *Beiträge* 307-308.

⁴⁹⁵ The copy of the Bible with his glosses is now *codex Vaticanus latinus 9517*, see Höpfl, *Kardinal* 50, n. 3; on his annotations see *ibid.* 17-56, 100-123. On his revision of the New Testament see Denzler, *Kardinal* 117-141.

⁴⁹⁶ For excerpts see Amann, *Vulgata* 19, n. 3, and Höpfl, *Beiträge* 94-95.

⁴⁹⁷ He was the nephew of Christoforo Madruzzo, on whom see above nn. 87, 128-129, 138 etc.

⁴⁹⁸ For an example of the way in which the commission worked, which reveals that Sirleto played the leading role, see Höpfl, *Beiträge* 97-100.

commission.⁴⁹⁹ The commission continued its work under Pope Gregory XIII but was interrupted by work on the publication of the LXX which began in 1578 and ended in 1588 with the publication of the Septuagint in the pontificate of Sixtus V (1585-1590).⁵⁰⁰

Once the LXX had been completed the Vulgate commission again commenced its work with all due speed, urged on by the new and energetic Pope. The commission, headed since November 1586 by Cardinal Antonio Carafa, used as their basis a copy of the third edition of Henten's Bible published at Antwerp in 1583 by Christophe Plantin (1520-1589),⁵⁰¹ into which they copied their amendments of the text. They also had at their disposal the manuscripts with Sirleto's annotations on the New Testament⁵⁰² and in view of the work which had already been carried out the commission completed its task in 1588.⁵⁰³ In a stormy interview with Carafa on 16 November 1588 the Pope expressed his view in no uncertain terms that the result was not to his liking and on the following day ordered the result to be handed over to him.⁵⁰⁴ From then on until June 1589 the Pope himself spent several hours a day on revising the text and correcting the proofs so that by the end of November 1589 the text was ready and on 25 November 1589 it was submitted to the Congregation of Prohibited Books.⁵⁰⁵ An examination of the revision clearly reveals that for the Pope it was not so much textology as the practical aim of strengthening the faithful that was of the utmost importance. The need for the revised text was to oppose heresy, not to arouse suspicions that the hitherto generally accepted text was corrupt and so in many cases he had merely restored the reading of the 1583 Antwerp Bible.⁵⁰⁶ It is hardly surprising that the text was delayed for five months at the Congregation of Prohibited Books since at least three of its five cardinals were

⁴⁹⁹ On the commission's work see Amann, *Vulgata* 21-25; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 77-101; Stummer, *Einführung* 178-180.

⁵⁰⁰ *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. Editum*. Rome 1589. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 4647. On this edition see Höpfl, *Beiträge* 119-125.

⁵⁰¹ *Biblia Sacra*. Antwerp 1583. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6170. It is in fact a reprint of the second edition of Henten's Bible, which had been revised by Frans Lucas of Bruges (1548/9-1619) and published by Plantin at Antwerp in 1574: *Biblia Sacra. Quid, in hac editione, a Theologis Lovaniensibus, praestitum sit, paulo post indicatur*. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6161. On their use of this Bible see Denzler, *Kardinal* 137, and Höpfl, *Beiträge* 106.

⁵⁰² For a list of the thirteen Vatican codices with Sirleto's annotations on the New Testament see Denzler, *Kardinal* 126, n. 47. The commission also had the annotations which he had made on some of the Old Testament books at their disposal, see *ibid.* 134-135. His annotations on the Psalms had been published in the Polyglot published at Antwerp by Christopher Plantin (1520-1598): *Biblia Sacra Hebraice, Chaldaice, Graece, & Latine Philippi II Reg. Cathol. pietate et studio ad Sacrosanctae Ecclesiae usum Christoph. Platinus excud.*, 8 vols. Antwerp 1569-1572, see vol. viii, 15th pagination, 1-11. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 1422. For an example of the readings at their disposal for Proverbs in four columns: 1. the 1583 Plantin edition; 2. Sirleto's annotations; 3. the commission's amendments to the 1583 edition and 4. Pope Sixtus V's final readings see Höpfl, *Beiträge* 239-277.

⁵⁰³ On their work see Amann, *Vulgata* 28-44; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 128-142; Stummer, *Einführung* 182-184.

⁵⁰⁴ See the autobiography of Cardinal Giulio Antonio Santoro (1532-1602), ed. Cugnoni, *Autobiografia* (xii) 3-372; (xiii) 15-205, see (xiii) 183.

⁵⁰⁵ On the establishment of this congregation in 1571 see above note 273.

⁵⁰⁶ See his readings in Proverbs as given in Höpfl, *Beiträge* 239-277; see above note 502.

opposed to it, viz. Cardinals Ascanio Colonna (1560-1608), William Allen (1532-1594) and Girolamo Della Rovere († 1592), as were, of course, the members of the commission which had prepared the text.

The printing of the Bible was completed at Rome on 10 April 1590 and the bull *Eternus ille celestium* accompanying the publication is dated 1 March 1590.⁵⁰⁷ In it the Pope explained that there were so many errors and variants in current editions that they had led to misinterpretations and the aim of the present edition was to establish a normative text and thus put an end to controversy.⁵⁰⁸ When after having eliminated errors and incorrect variants the Latin had nevertheless remained obscure it had been altered on the basis of the Greek and Hebrew texts.⁵⁰⁹ In order to do this a commission of learned theologians had been formed to advise him but the final task of choosing the correct variant had been exclusively his as the true and legitimate successor of the prince of the Apostles, Peter.⁵¹⁰ He therefore declared the present text to be the authentic one called for by the Council of Trent.⁵¹¹ Future breviaries and missals had to be revised in accordance with its text⁵¹² and the edition had to have replaced all others within four months in Italy and within eight months elsewhere.⁵¹³ It ends by stating that

⁵⁰⁷ *Biblia Sacra Vulgata Editionis ad Concilij Tridentini praescriptum emendata et a Sixto V. P.M. recognita et approbata*. Rome 1590. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6181. The original of the bull *Eternus ille celestium* has been edited by Baumgarten, *Vulgata* 40-63.

⁵⁰⁸ See ed. Baumgarten, *Vulgata* 43:

hec probatissima scripturarum editio, quam vinculum pacis, fidei unitatem, charitatis nexum, dissentientium consensionem, certissimam in rebus dubijs normam esse oportebat

⁵⁰⁹ Ed. *ibid.* 44.

⁵¹⁰ Ed. *ibid.* 44-46:

Itaque viros complures doctos, qui sanctarum scripturarum, sacre Theologie, multarumque linguarum scientia, ac diuturno variarum rerum usu, acrique, cum aliquid discernendum est, iudicio, ac solertia praestarent, deligimus ac simul congregavimus, ut in germana sinceraque sacri textus editione perquirenda, strenue laborarent, nobisque adiumento forent. Nos enim rei magnitudinem perpendentes, ac provide considerantes ex precipuo, ac singulari Dei privilegio, et ex vera et legitima successione Apostolorum Principis beati Petri, pro quo dominus ac redemptor noster, ab eterno Patre pro sua reverentia proculdubio exauditus, non semel tantum sed Ter rogavit, ut eius fides non humana carne et sanguine, sed eodem Patre inspirante ei revelata, numquam deficeret: cui etiam Dominis iniunxit ut ceteros Apostolos in eadem fide confirmaret, [...] adeo, ut in hoc laboriosissimae emendationis curriculo, in quo operam quotidianam, eamque pluribus horis collocandum duximus, aliorum quidem labor fuit in consulendo, noster autem in eo, quod ex pluribus esset optimum deligendo. Ita tamen ut veterem multis in Ecclesia ab hinc seculis receptam lectionem omnino retinuerimus.

⁵¹¹ Ed. *ibid.* 55-56:

declaramus, eam Vulgatam, sacre, tam veteris, quam novi testamenti pagine Latinam editionem, que pro authentica a Concilio Tridentino recepta est, sine ulla dubitatione, aut controversia censendam esse hanc ipsam, quam nunc, prout optime fieri potuit, emendatam, et in Vaticana Typographia impressam, in universa Christiana Republica, atque in omnibus Christiani Orbis ecclesijs legendam evulgamus decernentes, eam prius quidem universali sancte ecclesie ac sanctorum Patrum consensione, deinde vero Generalis Concilij Tridentini decreto, nunc demum etiam apostolica nobis a Domino tradita auctoritate comprobata, pro vera, legitima, authentica et indubitata in omnibus publicis, privatisque disputationibus, lectionibus, predicationibus et explanationibus recipiendam, et tenendam esse.

⁵¹² Ed. *ibid.* 57.

⁵¹³ Ed. *ibid.* 63. Distribution of the Bible began in May 1590 with copies being sent to leading Catholic rulers, see Baumgarten, *Vulgata* 110-111.

anyone who in any way infringed the provisions of the bull would incur the wrath of God.⁵¹⁴

The resultant text left much to be desired⁵¹⁵ and on 5 September 1590, nine days after the death of Sixtus V on 27 August, the College of Cardinals forbade all further sales and as many copies as possible were withdrawn.⁵¹⁶ On 5 December 1590 Niccolò Sfondrati (1539-1591) was elected pope taking the name of Gregory XIV.⁵¹⁷ The question at once arose about what to do about the disastrous edition. From Bellarmino's autobiography it is known that some were urging the Pope to ban the Bible publicly but Bellarmino, who had been a *consultor*, censor, of the Congregation for the Index since 1587, argued that this would harm papal authority and suggested that it should be corrected as quickly as possible and republished under Sixtus' name with a preface stating that because of the haste with which it had been printed some mistakes, typographical and others, had crept in.⁵¹⁸ The Pope agreed and the task of revision was entrusted to the Congregation for the Index under Cardinal Marcantonio Colonna, whose members included Cardinals Girolamo Della Rovere, Ascanio Colonna, William Allen, Frederigo Borromeo (1564-1631) as well as Bellarmino (cardinal in 1599) and the Spanish Jesuit Francisco de Toledo (1534-1596, cardinal in 1593). Working as rapidly as possible they replaced the earlier readings excised by Sixtus and it has been estimated that they made some 4900 alterations.⁵¹⁹

⁵¹⁴ Ed. *ibid.* 63:

Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostrorum statuti, declarationis, decretorum, voluntatum, prohibitionis et derogationis infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc attentare presumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius se noverit incursurum.

On the bull see Amann, *Vulgata* 66-81; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 145-146. On the arguments about whether the bull was ever legally promulgated see Amann, *Vulgata* 114-121; Baumgarten, *Vulgata* 112-121; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 187-204. The question cannot be addressed here.

⁵¹⁵ The omission of Numbers 30:11-13 may have been deliberate as the passage was cited by moral theologians to substantiate the view that husbands may annul vows of chastity taken by their wives without their consent.

⁵¹⁶ On the suppression of the edition see Amann, *Vulgata* 94-107; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 174-178. There was also political opposition to the bull as it reserved the right to print the revised Bible to the *Typographia Vaticana* for a period of ten years, ed. Baumgarten, *Vulgata* 56, to the detriment of other printers, especially at Venice, in France, Spain and Flanders; on this opposition see Amann, *Vulgata* 82-94; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 151-158; Stummer, *Einführung* 191-192.

⁵¹⁷ Giambattista Castagna (1521-1590) had been elected pope on 15 September taking the name of Urban VII but he died of malaria on 27 September before he could tackle the problem.

⁵¹⁸ His autobiography ed. Le Bachelet, *Cardinalat*, 442-466, see 457-458:

Anno 1591, cum Gregorius XIV cogitaret, quid agendum esset de Bibliis a Sixto V. editis, in quibus erant permulta perperam mutata, non deerant viri graves, qui censerent, ea Biblia esse publice prohibenda. Sed N. coram Pontifice demonstravit, non esse Biblia illa prohibenda, sed esse ita corrigenda, ut salvo honore Sixti Pontificis, Biblia illa emendata prodirent. Quod fieret, si quam celerrime tollerentur quae male mutata erant et Biblia recuderentur sub nomine eiusdem Sixti, et addita praefatione, qua irrepsisse aliqua errata vel typographorum vel aliorum. Et sic reddidit Sixto Pontifice bona pro malis.

On Bellarmino's brief autobiography, which goes from his birth in 1542 to 1613 see *ibid.* 438-442.

⁵¹⁹ See Baumgarten, *Vulgata* VI-VII; on their work see Höpfl, *Beiträge* 158-174; Stummer, *Einführung* 193-198. For a table of the alterations made in Proverbs with the comments of the members of the Commission see Höpfl, *Beiträge* 278-290. The old idea that a special commission was entrusted with the work of revision is incorrect, see Denzler, *Kardinal* 140, and Godman, *Saint* 141.

The work was finished in less than two years and the bull accompanying the revised edition, *Cum Sacrorum Bibliorum*, of Pope Clement VIII, who had been elected on 30 January 1592 after Gregory XIV's death on 16 October 1591, is dated 9 November 1592 and the edition was published in December 1592.⁵²⁰ In the preface to the edition, which was undoubtedly written by Bellarmino, it is claimed that Pope Sixtus V had himself seen that the first edition contained misprints and had ordered it to be revised.⁵²¹ It is true that Sixtus had noticed some misprints in the 1590 edition and had had them corrected either by having the correct reading pasted over the incorrect one, or by having a missing word added by a hand stamp or by pen,⁵²² but Bellarmino was being economical with the truth not merely because there is no evidence that Sixtus ever called for a revised edition but above all because the revision consisted primarily not in the correction of misprints but in the insertion of earlier readings and this glossing over the truth cost him his beatification when it was first considered in 1627 and again in 1753.⁵²³ The 1592 edition had been produced with such speed that it contained many misprints, many of which were eliminated in the 1593 edition and most but not all in the 1598 edition,⁵²⁴ which was, however, marred by misprints not found in the 1592 or 1593 editions. Once these misprints had been removed the Sixto-Clementine text remained the same until it was replaced by the *Nova Vulgata* in 1979.

The Council of Trent had refused to condemn the use of the vernacular for Biblical translations and the fourth of the ten rules for ecclesiastical censorship permitted persons to read them provided that they had obtained episcopal permission.⁵²⁵ It is, however, a striking fact that Catholic translations continued to be

⁵²⁰ *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti Quinti. Pont. Max. iussu recognita atque edita*. Rome 1592, Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6184. It must be stressed that Clement VIII's name does not appear in the title. The bull, which wisely omits the statement that this edition is to replace all previous editions, is also ed. *BDP* ix, 636-637, and is in most editions of the Sixto-Clementine Bible. It did reserve the right of printing the Bible to the Typographia Vaticana for 10 years but this once more created hostility and on 11 March 1597 Jan Moretus (1543-1610) obtained a licence to print it at Antwerp.

⁵²¹ The *Praefatio ad lectorem* is found in most editions of the Sixto-Clementine Bible, e.g. that published at Tournai in 1881, VI-VII, see VII:

Quod [viz. Sixtus' work] cum jam esset excusum, et ut in lucem emitteretur, idem Pontifex operam daret, animadvertens non pauca in sacra Biblia preli vitio irrepsisse, totum opus sub incudem revocandum censuit atque decrevit.

⁵²² See Baumgarten, *Vulgata* 26-27; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 150-151.

⁵²³ On this see Amann, *Vulgata* 126-132; Höpfl, *Beiträge* 186-221; Stummer, *Einführung* 201-202, and Godman, *Saint* 139-148, who concludes that, *ibid.* 147-148, in this affair Bellarmino was not a liar but a casuist: the retention of a secret is justifiable if its revelation could be put to evil use, *in casu* to harm the authority of the Church, while an incorrect statement is permissible if made with a mental reservation based upon the harm which a completely accurate statement would cause. This discrepancy did not go unnoticed in Protestant circles but their reactions – some fairly violent – cannot be described here. Bellarmino was finally beatified in 1923 and canonized in 1930.

⁵²⁴ Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 2, no. 6184*. In actual fact it only appeared in early 1599. For some of the corrections to the 1593 and 1598 editions by Francisco de Toledo see Höpfl, *Beiträge* 292-296.

⁵²⁵ See above notes 271 and 274.

made principally in countries where Protestant translations were available.⁵²⁶ Cardinal William Allen, a member of the commission to revise the Sixtine Vulgate,⁵²⁷ was one of those who collaborated on the translation of the revised Vulgate into English, the New Testament appearing at Rheims in 1592⁵²⁸ and the Old Testament at Douai in two volumes in 1609-1610.⁵²⁹ In the 16th century not only Protestantism but also anti-Trinitarianism was rife in Poland and the first Catholic translation of the Vulgate into Polish by Jan Niesz (c. 1523-1572) was published at Cracow already in 1561⁵³⁰ and went through three editions before being replaced by the translation of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate by Jacob Wujek (1541-1597), which was published posthumously at Cracow in 1599 after having been revised by a Jesuit commission headed by Stanislas Grodziecki (1541-1613).⁵³¹

In Croatia Protestant Biblical translations had been circulating since the mid sixteenth century: the first Croat (čakavian) translation of the New Testament by Anton Dalmatin and Stjepan Konzul was published at Tübingen by Ungnad in two volumes in Glagolitic in 1562-1563 and in Cyrillic in 1563.⁵³² In 1583 the Slovene translation of the New Testament by Primus Truber (c. 1508-1586) was published at Tübingen in Latin script⁵³³ and the Slovene translation of the complete Bible by Jurij Dalmatin appeared in Latin script at Wittenberg in 1584.⁵³⁴

⁵²⁶ See above notes 275-276.

⁵²⁷ See above note 519.

⁵²⁸ *The New Testament of Isus Christ, translated faithfully into English, out of the authentical Latin, according to the best corrected copies of the same, diligently conferred with the Greeke and other editions in divers languages [...]*. Rheims 1582. Darlow, *Catalogue* i, no. 134; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 61, no. 34. Reprint London 1975 (*English Recusant Literature*, 267). The Biblical text is accompanied by annotations and various other material.

⁵²⁹ *The Holie Bible faithfully translated into English, out of the authentical Latin. Diligently conferred with the Hebrew, Greeke and other editions in divers languages [...]*, 2 vols. Douai 1609-1610. Darlow, *Catalogue* i, no. 231; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 61, no. 35. It too is accompanied by annotations and other material. On this first English Catholic Bible see above note 276.

⁵³⁰ *Biblia. To iest Kxięgi Stharego y Nowego Zakona na Polski ięzyk z pilnoęęia wedęug Laęięskiey Biblięy od Koęęioęa Krzeęęięskiego powszechnego przyiethęy nowo wyęęona*. Cracow 1561. Darlow, *Catalogue*, ii, 3, no. 7383; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 104, no. 9. It contains no commentary. Facsimile reprint of the *editio princeps* by Olesch, *Leopolita* [i], 1^r-614^r.

⁵³¹ *Biblia to iest Księgi Starego y Nowego Testamentu wedęug ęacięskiego przekęędu stęrego w koęęiele powszechnym przyięęego nę Polski ięzyk znowu z pilnoęęię przeęęone [...]*. Cracow 1599. Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 3, no. 7389; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 105, no. 11. It has a commentary which was influenced by that in the 1582 Rheims edition of the English translation, see above note 529. For the many reprints of Wujek's Bible down to the 20th century see *BPL* iii, 420-422.

⁵³² Glagolitic: *Prvi del novoga testamenta [...]*. Tübingen 1562; *Drugi del novoga testamenta [...]*. Tübingen 1563. Badalię, *Jugoslavica* no. 94; Kruming, *Katalog* no. 24; Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 3, no. 8083; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 112, no. 1. Cyrillic: *Prvi del novoga teętamenta [...]*; *Drugi del novoga teętamenta [...]*. Tübingen 1563. Badalię, *Jugoslavica* no. 103; Kukuljevię, *Bibliografija* i, nos. 68-69; Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 3, no. 8084; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 112, no. 2. The Glagolitic edition has more Italicisms than the Cyrillic as it was intended for Dalmatia, the latter for Serbia.

⁵³³ *Ta Celi Novi Testament Nashiga Gospudi inu Isvelizharie Iesusa Christusa [...]*. Tübingen 1582. Badalię, *Jugoslavica* no. 176; Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 3, no. 8427; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 112, no. 5.

⁵³⁴ *Biblia, tu ie, vse svetu pismu, Stariga inu Noviga Testamenta, Slovenski, tolmazhena, skusi Iuria Dalmatina*. Wittenburg 1584. Badalię, *Jugoslavica* no. 180; Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 3, no. 8428; Vogel, *Bibeldrucke* p. 113,

The two New Testaments were translated from the Vulgate, the Bible from the original languages, but all three were influenced by Luther's German translation.

There can be little doubt but that the person best qualified to translate the Bible into a standardized Croatian vernacular was Bartol Kašić. After his studies at Rome he was appointed confessor (*poenitentarius*) at St. Peter's for Croat pilgrims to Rome and then spent the period 1609 to 1612 at Ragusa,⁵³⁵ after which, disguised as merchants, he and a companion were sent on a missionary journey into the Ottoman Balkans from November 1612 until June 1613.⁵³⁶ After having reported back to Rome, he was appointed confessor to the Croat pilgrims to Loreto from 1614 to 1618, when the newly elected Jesuit General Muzio Vitelleschi (1615-1645) ordered him to return to Ragusa to undertake a second missionary journey in the Balkans. Once again disguised as merchants, he and two companions left Ragusa on 20 August 1618 and only arrived back in the city on 25 February 1620,⁵³⁷ where he remained for the next thirteen years.⁵³⁸ In 1633 he returned to Loreto as the Croat confessor but in late 1634 or early 1635 he was transferred to Rome to replace Antonio (Antun) Ranzi, who had been Croat confessor at St. Peter's and censor of books published at Rome in Croatian from 1628 to 1634.⁵³⁹ He remained at Rome for most of the rest of his life and died there in 1650.

Kašić gave varying accounts of his work on the translation of the Bible, the sole definite date being 12 November 1631, when his translation of the New Testament was sent from Ragusa to Rome.⁵⁴⁰ His first account is in his memorandum

no. 10. There are two facsimile reprints; Berčić, *Biblia* (various paginations) and Glavan, *Biblia* (various paginations).

⁵³⁵ In the year of his death (1650) at the age of seventy-six while already in declining health Kašić began to write his autobiography but unfortunately he only managed to reach the year 1625, ed. Vanino, *Autobiografija* 12-140; on the period spent in Ragusa see *ibid.* 29-34. The circumstances in which he wrote his autobiography are known from a note by the Ragusan Jesuit Raffaello (Rafo) Prodanelli (1613-1693), who was personally acquainted with Kašić and appended his note to the autobiography, ed. *ibid.* 140. On Kašić see *idem*, *Barthélemy* 216-218; *idem*, *Bartol* 157-171; *idem*, *Données* 83-97, and the note (with bibliography) in Frangeš, *Geschichte* 739-740. He was only the second Croat confessor at Rome, the first being Marino Camillo (1551-1635), who heard Croat confessions at least from 1596 until 1606, on whom see Wicki, *Penitencijari* 29.

⁵³⁶ For his account of this journey see Vanino, *Autobiografija* 34-56; also ed. Fermeš, *Acta* 342-356. The picture which he paints of the plight of Christians in the Ottoman Balkans is fairly bleak. On this journey see Radonić, *Kurija* 15-18.

⁵³⁷ For his account of this journey see Vanino, *Autobiografija* 69-110; abridged in Fermeš, *Acta* 358-366. Radonić, *Kurija* 90, only mentions it in passing.

⁵³⁸ See Vanino, *Autobiografija* 113.

⁵³⁹ On Ranzi see Wicki, *Penitencijari* 30-32. It is often claimed that Kašić was Croat confessor at Loreto from 1633 to 1634 but his name appears in no list of confessors there or in any other Loreto source at this time see Wicki, *Penitencijari* 33, who considers that he probably remained in Rome, where the second edition of his translation of Roberto Bellarmino's *Dottrina cristiana breve: Nauk Karstyanski kratak Sloxen po naredbi S. Oca Papae Klementa Osmoga. Po Po. Ocu Robertu Bellarminu od Reda Druxbae Yessussovae, koyi pak bij Kardeno Sfetae Rimskae carkvae. A upisan Slovinski po Ocu Bartolomeu Kassichiu Paxaninu Bogoslovcu od istoga Reda*, Rome 1633, was being printed. No copy of the first edition of 1617 has been traced. For a reprint of the second edition see Stjepanić, *Nauk* 45-68. Kašić is the only Croat Jesuit ever to have been appointed confessor at St. Peter's twice, see Wicki, *Penitencijari* 28; on his two periods see *ibid.* 29 and 32-34.

⁵⁴⁰ On this date see below note 561.

of early 1633 sent to Cardinal Desiderio Scaglia, from 1632 until his death in 1639 the commissary of the Holy Office in Rome, in which Kašić stated that he had been requested twenty-three years previously, viz. in 1610, by Archbishop Fabio Tempestivo of Ragusa (1602-1616) and then again ten years previously, viz. 1623, by Tempestivo's successor, Archbishop Vincenzo Lantero (1616-1628, ⊥ 1649), to revise the Old and New Testament liturgical readings but since the earlier translations, both in manuscripts and printed editions, had been found defective and erroneous, it had been decided to make a fresh translation of the New Testament on the basis of the revised Vulgate. This decision had been ratified by the Propaganda, viz. in 1625,⁵⁴¹ which had promised to publish the translation if it received official approval. He had made the translation and then for six years, viz. 1625-1631, it had been revised by a commission of theologians who had compared it word by word with the Latin text⁵⁴² and the result had then been approved by Lantero's successor, Archbishop Tommaso Cellesi (Celesius, 1628-1633), viz. on 26 July 1631.⁵⁴³ He pointed out to the cardinal that whereas earlier versions had not been in a common language understood by all, his translation was⁵⁴⁴ and he asked the cardinal to grant permission for it to be published as the Propaganda wished.

In his petition to Pope Urban VIII in early 1634 Kašić stated that the *Natio Slavonica seu Illyrica* had long had the missal and breviary in the vernacular but they had no faithful Biblical text and all the versions in circulation varied considerably from the revised Vulgate and also contained errors, besides which heretical Protestant versions were also in circulation. When the Propaganda had been informed of this, it had instructed the archbishops of Ragusa to have the Old and New Testaments revised and corrected on the basis of the Vulgate. This had been entrusted to Kašić, who had taken twelve years to do so. For six years a commission of theologians appointed by the archbishops had revised the

⁵⁴¹ On this date see below note 551.

⁵⁴² The memorandum ed. Golub, *Quellen* 179, and Horvat, *Obranu* 187-188, see 187:

e stata rivista per sei anni continui con molta diligenza da Sacerdoti teologi deputati, et intendenti dell' una et l'altra lingua insieme con l'Autore, confrontando le parole illiriche parola per parola col testo latino.

Horvat, *ibidem*, considered that the memorandum had been sent to the prefect of the Holy Office, Cardinal Francesco Barberini (1597-1679), but the addressee is specified in the copy found in the archives of the Holy Office edited by Golub. The memorandum is undated but it must be of the first half of 1633, and not of 1634 as Horvat, *ibidem*, thought, since it makes no reference to the Holy Office's decision of 23 June 1633, on which see below note 573. That 1634 is excluded is also shown by the fact that Cellesi is referred to as alive, *il presente Monsignore Arcivescovo Tomaso Celesio*, *ibidem*, and he died in November 1633. In theory the memorandum could date from 1632 but it is inherently more likely that Kašić wrote it after his return to Italy in 1633, as Golub, *Quellen* 161, points out.

⁵⁴³ For Cellesi's approbation see below note 559.

⁵⁴⁴ Ed. Golub, *Quellen* 179; Horvat, *Obranu* 188:

anzi si stima, che sarà ben' inteso questo modo di parlare della presente translatione da Sacerdoti di tutte queste Provincie: e dell'Istria, della Crovatia, della Dalmatia, della Bosna, del Stato di Ragusa, della Hercegovina, della Servia, della Slavonia Sirmiense, et delli Slavi habitanti per tutta l'Ungheria, et Valachia, della Bulgaria, della Moldavia, della Rutenia, della Tracia Constantinopolitana in Corte del Gran Turco, della Circassia, et in molte parti dell'Asia.

translation and two years previously Archbishop Cellesi had approved it and sent it to Rome, where Archbishop Pietro Massarechi of Antibari (1624-1634) had also approved it in 1633.⁵⁴⁵ Kašić therefore begged the Pope to permit his translation of the New Testament *in a common and more cultivated language* to be published for the Illyrian clergy who did not know Latin.⁵⁴⁶ This again dates the revision to the period from 1625 to 1631 but it is not entirely clear whether the twelve years preceded the commission's work, in which case Kašić is referring to Archbishop Tempestivo's request, or included the commission's work, in which case he is referring to Archbishop Lantero's request.⁵⁴⁷ In fact it is Kašić's autobiography which makes it clear that he is referring to Archbishop Lantero's request since in it he quotes *in extenso* two letters from the Jesuit General Muzio Vitelleschi dated 24 December 1622 and 8 July 1623 respectively and between them Kašić states that it was then that he began work on his translation of the New Testament,⁵⁴⁸ which agrees with his statement in his memorandum of 1633 addressed to Cardinal Scaglia that ten years previously, viz. in 1623, Archbishop Lantero had requested him to revise the liturgical Biblical readings but that since they had been found to be defective it had been decided to make a fresh translation of the New Testament.⁵⁴⁹ That the Propaganda knew that in 1623 Kašić had begun work on this project is clear from the fact that when on 24 December 1623 the Bosnian Franciscan Paolo (Pavao) Papić (1593-after 1643) offered his services for the translation of the Bible he was informed on 10 January 1624 that they were not required as someone else was already engaged upon the task.⁵⁵⁰ Although the Propaganda knew that Kašić had begun his

⁵⁴⁵ On his approbation see below note 572.

⁵⁴⁶ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandić, *Bibelübersetzung* 195-196, see 196; *eadem*, *Drucklegungsversuch* 116; Vanino, *Données* 69; Horvat, *Obranu* 180, 182, see 182:

Ita etiam Novo Testamento typis edito sacerdotes illyrici ignari latini sermonis idiomate patrio, et non uni aut alteri civitati propria, sed toti nationi (quod p. Cassius spectavit curavitque) communi ac politiori lingua perfruantur.

The statement that the New Testament had been sent to Rome two years previously would date this petition to late 1633 or early 1634, a dating proposed by Horvat, *Obranu* 180, and Vanino, *Données* 96, n. 33. However, it refers to 1633 as passed, *ibidem*:

Romae pariter 1633 anno idem opus ut valde necessarium et perutile ab archiepiscopo Antibarensi [...] comprobatum fuit.

Moreover, a note on the reverse in Ingoli's hand states that the petition had been received from the Holy Office and that the translation had been sent to the cardinal of Cremona, viz. Scaglia, in June or July 1634, which also indicates early 1634 rather than late 1633, as von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 116, rightly considers; see the note ed. *ibidem*, and Horvat, *Obranu* 182.

⁵⁴⁷ Ed. *ibidem*:

qui [viz. Kašić] utilem omnino navavit operam per duodennium in opere seligendo, concinnando et perficiendo. Adhibiti sunt etiam eorundem archiepiscoporum autoritate per sexennium alii viri utriusque linguae et sacrae theologiae periti, qui codicem Novi Testamenti selecti praecipue et diligenter recognoscerent collato studio.

⁵⁴⁸ See his autobiography ed. Vanino, *Autobiografija* 122:

Hoc tempore coepit scribere universam sacri Novi Testamenti Scripturam Dalmatico eloquio [...] quam P. Cassius Dalmaticam fecit bis.

⁵⁴⁹ See above note 542.

⁵⁵⁰ See von Erdmann-Pandić, *Bibelübersetzung* 192, n. 6; Papić and another Franciscan had gone to Rome in 1623 to report on the Franciscan mission in Bosnia, see Pandić *Relatio* 211-234; on Papić and his translation of Bartolomeo da Saluto's *Le sette trombe per risvegliare il peccatore a penitenza* see Gavran, *Fra* 309-321; for

work on the New Testament in 1623 it was only in 1625 that it sent instructions to him via Archbishop Lantero to extend the project to the entire Bible by selecting the texts in early Illyrian codices and revising them on the basis of the Vulgate. This is known from Kačić's petition to Pope Urban VIII in 1644 in which he states that the instructions had been sent nineteen years previously, viz. in 1625, and that the task had taken him eight years to complete, viz. 1633. Since both Archbishops Cellesi and Massarechi had approved the result, he begged the Pope to allow its publication.⁵⁵¹ When precisely Kačić finished his translation of the Old Testament is uncertain but it was prior to 15 August 1636 since in his preface to his translation of the *Rituale* with that date he stated that it had been completed⁵⁵² and it is possible that it was already finished by 1632.⁵⁵³

a brief note see Vodnik, *Povijest* 222. It is often claimed that Kačić began his translation in 1622, e.g. Derossi, *Pjesma* 293; von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 99, n. 3; Katičić, *Sprache* 60; Stojković, *Bartuo* 198, n. 2; *idem*, *Karakteristika* 2; Čvelec, *Pitanja* 56. However, this is either based upon the statement in the 1634 petition that he had worked on it for twelve years, but that means twelve years prior to 1625 or 1631, not 1634, see above, or upon a conjecture by the Jesuit Giovanni Maria Mattei (Ivan Maria Matijačević, 1714-1791) in his unpublished *Annotazioni al precedente Memoriale*, see the excerpt ed. Stojković, *Bartuo* 206, and von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 105, n. 35:

Dicendo poi il Cassio nei suoi commentarii d'aver tradotto due volte il N. Testamento: "quam P. Cassius Dalmaticam fecit bis", congetturo, che dal 1622 fino al 1625 facesse una traduzione da se stesso nella lingua allora usuale e più comune nella Dalmazia, dalla quale siano poi stati estratti li vangeli e l'epistole del Messale stampate in Roma del 1641 per B. Tani in folio, accomodate prima al dialetto Ragusino da Luca Natali Raguseo [...]. Che indi ricevuto la commissione della Congregazione di Propaganda circa il 1625 in un col Testamento vecchio traducesse per la seconda volta il nuovo, o per meglio dire, scegliesse dalle antiche traduzioni quel tanto che meglio li sembrava et alla volgare l'accomodasse.

It has not, however, been noted that Mattei clearly based his conjecture upon his acquaintance with Kačić's unpublished autobiography since his quotation "*quam P. Cassius Dalmaticam fecit bis*" is taken from there, see above note 548.

⁵⁵¹ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandić, *Bibelübersetzung* 201, n. 35; *eadem*, *Druckverlegungsversuch* 118-119; Horvat, *Obranu* 207; Stojković, *Bartuo* 205-206:

B. Cassius Dalmata Soc. J. Professus ante annos novemdecim de Mandato sac. Congregationis de Propaganda fide sibi facto per Archiepiscopum Ragusinum coepit seligere ex antiquis codicibus linguae Illyricae Biblia sacra universa, atque illa concordare cum textu Latino vulgatae editionis authentico ac tandem annos octo Versione(m) selecta(m) communiori dialecto Illyrica confecit, ac conscripsit.

That the instructions were issued by the Propaganda in 1625 is also known from the title of the sole manuscript with part of Kačić's translation in his own hand, viz. the first of the three volumes of *codex R3613* in the Croatian National and University Library at Agram with the Pentateuch:

Ordo librorum Veteris Testamenti. Genesis. Exodus. Leviticus. Numeri. Deuteronomium. Versio Illyrica Selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag. Fide. Anno 1625.

See Bačić, *Handschriften* 7; Črepol, *Prijevodu* 43. Although the title from *seu Declaratio* was added later as the ink is less faded there is no reason to doubt the date as it agrees with that in Kačić's petition to the Pope in 1644, see above note 548. On the other two volumes also of the 17th century but by different hands, see Bačić, *Handschriften* 7-9. The second contains in the correct Vulgate order the books Ezra to Ecclesiasticus; the third has the New Testament. The same books as in vol. ii are in *codex 10/5* of the 17th century in Odessa Central Library, on which see *ibid.* 10. The only other MS known is *codex 58* in the Chapter Library of St. Anastasia's Cathedral at Zara, which has Joshua, Judges, Ruth, parts of 1 and 2 Samuel and 1(3) Kings, Job, part of the Psalms, and the Song of Songs, on it see *ibid.* 9. It was copied by five hands, most of it in 1788.

⁵⁵² See below note 605.

⁵⁵³ All three MSS with parts of the translation have dates recording when a particular section was finished and in some cases when the text was revised, see Bačić, *Handschriften* 8-10. The former are of 1631 on Kačić's autograph, viz. vol. I of the Agram codex, and of 1632 in vol. ii of that codex, the Zara and Odessa codices. The claim that these indicate the time of translation, thus Bačić, *ibid.* 13, is unacceptable as the codices are of fair

In early 1629 Kašić informed the Propaganda that the translation of the New Testament was ready and on 11 April the Propaganda requested Archbishop Cellesi to have it revised and when that had been accomplished to have it sent to Rome for checking and publication if it was found suitable.⁵⁵⁴ In reply to a letter from the archbishop of 30 October 1630 with an accompanying memorandum by Kašić the Propaganda informed the archbishop that they would ask the Jesuit General to allow Kašić to come to Rome now that his translation was ready so that it could be published under his supervision.⁵⁵⁵ This request was denied and on 30 March 1631 Archbishop Cellesi wrote to the Propaganda that Kašić was reluctant to send the translation to Rome as the Jesuit General had instructed since a fair copy had to be made and there were many things which would not be understood without Kašić's presence.⁵⁵⁶ In their next letter of 17 May 1631 to the archbishop the Propaganda instructed him to have the translation sent when the fair copy had been made and promised to approach the Jesuit General once again if publication required Kašić's supervision.⁵⁵⁷ Archbishop Cellesi replied on 21 June that if the reason for Vitelleschi's refusal was financial he would himself meet the costs of Kašić's stay in Rome⁵⁵⁸ and on 26 July 1631 he formally approved the revised translation, stressing that its publication would be of great benefit to the Church.⁵⁵⁹ On 8 August the Propaganda informed the archbishop

copies, not of the original translation that had been revised over a period of six years by the theological commission. They would thus indicate, but not prove since the entire translation has not been traced, that it was ready by 1632. Claims that he began in 1622 and finished in 1631, thus Derossi, *Pjesma* 293, or that he began in 1622 and finished in 1633, thus Katičić, *Sprache* 60, do not take all of the above data into account. Why Hannick, *Textgestalt* 71, claims that he began in 1620 and completed the translation in 1625 is unclear as it contradicts all the above data.

⁵⁵⁴ See their letter ed. Rothe, *Biblia* i, 459; von Erdmann-Pandčić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 105; Golub, *Quellen* 176; Horvat, *Obranu* 196. The decision had been taken at a congregation held on 7 April, see the excerpt of the minutes ed. von Erdmann-Pandčić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 105.

⁵⁵⁵ Ed. Rothe, *Biblia* i, 459; von Erdmann-Pandčić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 105; Golub, *Quellen* 176; Horvat, *Obranu* 196. The archbishop's letter and the memorandum have not been traced. In a letter to the Propaganda of 4 November 1631 Archbishop Cellesi wrote that Kašić would like the memorandum to be included in the edition, ed. von Erdmann-Pandčić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 106-107, see 107.

⁵⁵⁶ See the excerpt ed. *ibid.* 106.

⁵⁵⁷ Ed. *ibidem*, and *eadem*, *Bibelübersetzung* 193.

⁵⁵⁸ See the excerpt ed. *eadem*, *Drucklegungsversuch* 106.

⁵⁵⁹ This edition of his approval is based upon the copy in the Propaganda archives, *SOCCG*, vol. 394, f. 211^r, ed. von Erdmann-Pandčić, *ibid.* 107, and *eadem*, *Bibelübersetzung* 195, n. 21 [=P]; the copy in Kašić's *De variis versionibus* (on which see below note 577) in *codex Vaticanus latinus 6811*, ff. 24^r-31^v, see f. 28^{r-v}, ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 195 [=V]; the copy in the Agram MS of Kašić's Bible, *codex 3613*, f. 2^v, ed. Rothe, *Biblia* i, 460, and Repel, *Prijevodu* 44 [=B], and the copy in the Holy Office archives, *Censurae Librorum Ab Anno 1626 ad Annum 1640*, L. 1098, fasc. 12, f. 348^r, ed. Golub, *Quellen* 176 [=O]. Orthographic variants are not noted.

Thomas Ceesius Dei et Apostolicae Sedis gratia Archiepiscopus Ragusinus

Cum ex praescripto¹ Sacrae Congregationis² de Propaganda fide aliquot sacerdotibus theologiae latinae et illyricae linguae³ peritis praecepissemus, ut laboriosam accuratamque Novi Testamenti Vulgatae editionis ex textu latino in illyricum seu slavonicum idioma translationem selectam⁴ diligentissime⁵ cum ipsomet auctore perlegerent atque perficerent, fecerunt illi quidem maxima cum diligentia tum studio quod precepimus, atque nobis⁶ hoc biennio urgentibus perfecerunt. ⁷Omnia bene ac fideliter translata⁸ atque verba fere verbis reddita se perlegisse⁹ ac perpendisse¹⁰ nobis¹¹ testati sunt. Immo vero hanc unam translationem (sublatis quibuscumque¹² aliis deficientibus in multis et a vero sensu¹³ aberrantibus) ad divinam gloriam fidemque catholicam propagandam, conservandam et defendendam

that they had been unable to obtain Vitelleschi's approval for Kašić to come to Rome and asked him to urge Kašić to send the translation since once it was known that it could not be read without his assistance it would be easier to obtain the General's permission.⁵⁶⁰ An opportunity to have it sent safely to Rome arose when Archbishop Benedetto Bragadin of Corfu (1618-1658) passed through Ragusa on his way to make a *visitatio ad limina Apostolorum* and took it with him when he left on 12 November 1631.⁵⁶¹

The translation was first discussed at a meeting of the Propaganda on 23 December 1631, at which a memorandum from the theologians who had revised the translation was read out: they had revised the translation several times over five years.⁵⁶² They expressed the hope that the archbishop's approval would be sufficient for the Propaganda but if further checking at Rome was deemed necessary, then Archpresbyter Antonio Deodati (Antun Bogdanović, c. 1599-1656) of St. Jerome's Church of the Illyrians could undertake the task. They further advocated the publication of the translation in parallel Latin-Croatian columns so that the accuracy of the translation could be seen and they considered that the assistance of Kašić in supervising the printing would be required.⁵⁶³ On 2 January 1632 the Propaganda thanked both Archbishop Cellesi, Kašić and the commission for their efforts but added that since the translation of Scripture was a most important matter, it had been decided to have it examined by experts in both Scripture and the Illyrian language.⁵⁶⁴ On the

contra haereticos, schismaticos et¹⁴ infideles illyricis sacerdotibus catholicis ceterisque fidelibus peropportunitatem ac¹⁵ pernecessariam¹⁶ comprobarunt et dignam clarissima luce iudicarunt.¹⁷ Nos itaque eorum iudicium et¹⁸ approbationem merito laudamus,¹⁹ approbamus, atque hisce nostris litteris libentissime confirmamus, salva tamen omni reverentia meliorique iudicio Sacrae Congregationis. Datum Ragusii die 20 Iulii 1631. Thomas²⁰ archiepiscopus Ragusinus.

1.-2. *transponit B* 3. *satis, add. OV* 4. *om. P; (ex antiquis versionibus illyricis), add. OV* 5. *om. OV* 6. *om. V; Rothe perperam: vobis* 7.-8. *om. OV* 9.-10 *om. B* 11. *om. V* 12. *□repel perperam: quibusdam* 13. *saepe, add. P* 14. *atque P* 15. *et V* 16. *penè necessariam O* 17. *indicarunt BP* 18. *ac P* 19. *et, add. O* 20 *Celesius, add. P.*

The distribution of the variants clearly reveals that the text in Kašić's *De variis versionibus* corresponds to the copy in the Holy Office archives, whereas that in Kašić's Bible corresponds to that in the Propaganda archives, for which there is no obvious explanation. The variant *penè* (16) for *per* is surely a scribal error as is *indicarunt* (17) for *iudicarunt* (as the chiasmus in the following clause indicates).

⁵⁶⁰ The Propaganda's copy, ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Bibelübersetzung* 193-194; *eadem, Drucklegungsversuch* 106, is dated 9 August but those in the Agram and Zara copies of Kašić's Bible, ed. Rothe, *Biblia* i, 459, in Kašić's *Apologia* of 1639 (on this *Apologia* see below note 576), ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 197, and in the copy in the archives of the Holy Office, ed. Golub, *Quellen* 176, are dated 8 August, to which date preference must thus be given.

⁵⁶¹ See Archbishop Cellesi's letter to the Propaganda on that day, ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Bibelübersetzung* 194; *eadem, Drucklegungsversuch* 107. The Propaganda acknowledged receipt on 2 January 1632, ed. *ibid.* 108, and Golub, *Quellen* 177 (wrongly dated 8 August 1631).

⁵⁶² Again a discrepancy in the dates: in both his memorandum to Cardinal Scaglia of early 1633 and his petition to the Pope of early 1634 Kašić specified six years, see above notes 542 and 546.

⁵⁶³ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 107; the Croatian translation by Vanino, *Stjepan* 134-135, is not entirely accurate. On Deodati, who was archpresbyter and censor of Croatian books at Rome from 1626 until his death, see Burić, *Kanonici* 111.

⁵⁶⁴ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Bibelübersetzung* 194; *eadem, Drucklegungsversuch* 108; Horvat, *Obranu* 197-198; Rothe, *Biblia* i, 459-460.

same day the Propaganda decided that the linguistic commission would consist of Mrnavić, Levaković, Ranzi and Deodati and that when they had completed their examination they would confer with the theologians of the commission for the Arabic translation of the Bible.⁵⁶⁵

The result of the commission's deliberations became known when Archbishop Cellesi arrived in Rome on a visit *ad limina* in November 1632 and learned that the commission had rejected the translation as it was in neither Glagolitic nor Cyrillic and was also not in the archaic language used in the liturgy. He wrote two memoranda to the Propaganda, which were discussed at its meeting on 22 November. In one he stated that the translation, which he had heard had been rejected, had been made in a language understood in all the provinces of the region, whereas the old language in which it was intended to revise the translation would only be understood in a few villages in Dalmatia and Croatia. He therefore requested the Propaganda to examine the matter once more, adding that if Father Kašić's presence were needed he would have him brought to Rome at no cost to the Propaganda.⁵⁶⁶ In the other he stated that by ancient custom the Gospel and Epistle had been read in Illyrian but that since in the passage of time the translations had become corrupt priests had begun to make extempore translations, which in view of their lack of education had led to ridiculous and heretical interpretations. This practice he had banned and he had informed the Propaganda, which had instructed him to appoint experts in theology and the language to prepare a revised version. He had appointed six persons who had worked for three years⁵⁶⁷ and then it had been sent to the Propaganda, whose commission had rejected it as it was in neither Glagolitic nor Cyrillic. He pointed out that the language of the translation was understood throughout the region and urged the Congregation to have it printed since otherwise Christians, especially those in the Ottoman Empire, would listen to the translations by schismatics which contained heretical errors. It had been necessary for him to permit certain priests to make a temporary translation in order to quieten public feeling in the matter.⁵⁶⁸ It is clear that what had happened was that Kašić'

⁵⁶⁵ The decision ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 108. Work on the Arabic translation of the Bible had begun in 1624 but it was only in 1671 that the complete Bible with the revised Vulgate text and the Arabic translation published in parallel columns appeared at the Propaganda's press: Darlow, *Catalogue* ii, 1, no. 1652.

⁵⁶⁶ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 109; Horvat, *Obranu* 179:

La traslatione della scrittura del testamento nuovo in lingua schiavona che hoggi, per relatione d'alcuni, si dice esser spesa e fatica buttata, è stata fatta da persone che possiedono le lingue di quelle provincie e da alcuni naturali de luoghi et è vera lingua slava, che non solo da Ragusei e Dalmatia marittima, ma in tutte le provincie di Levante è intesa e parlata, e ne contorni di Servia, Bosna, Sirmio, Bulgaria et universalmente. L'altra vecchia, che intendono di correggere, non s'intenderà senon in alcuni villaggi della Dalmatia e Croatia e provincie di là. Per si prega la Sacra Congregazione d'abbraccia questa opera; e bisognando la presenza del padre Cassio, si farà venire senza che la S. Congregazione senta la spesa del suo viatico.

⁵⁶⁷ Yet another discrepancy in the dates, see above notes 560 and 562.

⁵⁶⁸ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 109; Fermentin, *Listovi* 25-26, see 25; Horvat, *Obranu* 177-178; see 178; Golub, *Quellen* 180:

translation had not been viewed as being for all Croatian Catholics, be they of the Latin or the Slavo-Latin rite, but exclusively for those of the latter rite and hence should be published in accordance with the Propaganda's decision of 18 December 1626 in the archaic form of Croat Slavonic and in either Glagolitic or Cyrillic.⁵⁶⁹ Although Ingoli was in favour of publishing the translation⁵⁷⁰ it was decided at the meeting on 22 November 1632 to leave the decision whether it was expedient to publish the translation to the Holy Office.⁵⁷¹

On 17 March 1633 while Archbishop Pietro Massarechi was on a visit *ad limina* Ingoli showed him Kašić' translation of the New Testament and he too gave his approval for its publication.⁵⁷² At this juncture, however, opposition to the publication appeared. The bishop of Agram, Francesco Erghely (Franjo Ergelski Hasanović, 1629—1637) in about May 1633 wrote to the Holy Office that he had heard that the archbishop of Ragusa intended to have a translation of the New Testament published in Ragusan dialect and pointed out that that dialect varied from others and therefore requested that publication be postponed until the other bishops and the monastic orders in Dalmatia, Bosnia and Croatia had been consulted since it was a matter which concerned all and not merely Ragusa. He ended by expressing the conviction that the Holy Office would not consider it necessary to print the translation as it would do more harm than good, just as similar translations had for other nations.⁵⁷³ The letter was read out at a meeting of the Holy Office in the presence of Urban VIII on 23 June 1633 and the Pope ordered that the translation should not be published until it had received the authorization of the Holy Office.⁵⁷⁴ At about the same time while on a visit to Our Lady's House at Loreto Bishop Giovanni Battista Agatić of Segna wrote to

Ma perchè alcuni, a quali fù commessa la revisione di detta opera, per vedere se ci era cosa contra fidem □ bonos mores, dissero, che era opera buttata, perchè non era caratteri di S. Girolamo □ di San Cirillo, fù messa da parte.

The memorandum is anonymous but a note appended to it in Ingoli's hand in the copy in the archives of the Holy Office states that it is by the archbishop of Ragusa, ed. Golub, *Quellen* 180.

⁵⁶⁹ See above note 393.

⁵⁷⁰ See his memorandum ed. von Erdmann-Pandōić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 110-111; Golub, *Quellen* 178-179; excerpt ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 178. It is undated but must postdate 23 June 1633 since it refers to the Pope's decision taken at the meeting at the Holy Office on 23 June 1633:

è paruto bene a Nostro Signore, che di nuovo si discuta quest'articolo nel Santo Officio se si deva stampare il detto testo.

On this decision see below. von Erdmann-Pandōić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 111, takes *testo* to be an abbreviation of *testamento*.

⁵⁷¹ The decision ed. von Erdmann-Pandōić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 109, and Horvat, *Obranu* 179:

Sacra Congregatio censuit remittendum esse huiusmodi negotium ad Sanctum Officium ut in eo discutiatur an expediat et conveniat Testamentum praefatum in ea lingua imprimere.

⁵⁷² Ed. Rothe, *Biblia* i, 460; von Erdmann-Pandōić, *Bibelübersetzung* 196, n. 23; *eadem*, *Drucklegungsversuch* 109; Horvat *Obranu* 196; □repeľ, *Prijevodu* 44. As in the case of Cellesi's approbation, see above note 559, the copy in the archives of the Holy Office, ed. Golub, *Quellen* 176, has been altered. The date of 1631 for Massarechi's approval in Radonić, □*tamparije* 43, is probably a misprint.

⁵⁷³ Ed. Golub, *Quellen* 177:

L'Eminenze Vostre troveranno chiaramente non esser necessario di stampar detta traduttione, anzi che appporterà più danno, che utile, come hanno fatto simili versioni per altri Nationi.

⁵⁷⁴ The decision ed. *ibid.* 170. On this meeting see *ibid.* 133-135.

the Propaganda urging it not to publish the translation made for the archbishop of Ragusa until the advice of the other bishops, the religious orders, the Holy Office and the inquisitor of all Dalmatia, viz. Cornelio Nassi (1601-1641), had been obtained. Instead of publishing at great expense something of so little benefit to the Illyrian nation, the Propaganda should have the translation examined by several people who knew Illyrian, Greek and Hebrew and if it was considered necessary it could be published for the benefit of all the Illyrian provinces and not only of Ragusa.⁵⁷⁵ This letter was read out at the meeting of the Propaganda on 4 July and it was decided that the archbishop of Zara, viz. Ottaviano Garzadoro, should be consulted.⁵⁷⁶

In his *Apologia*, a brief treatise written in 1639 to show that the invention of Glagolitic script was falsely ascribed to St. Jerome, Kašić claimed that this letter allegedly from the bishop of Segna had in fact been written by his *fellow-countrymen*, who had misused the bishop's name and had thus prevented the publication of his Biblical translation.⁵⁷⁷ In another short treatise on the various Slav versions of Scripture written at about the same time Kašić specified two reasons why his translation had not been published: this letter by *some malicious fellow-countrymen* and the death of Archbishop Cellesi.⁵⁷⁸ Kašić nowhere

⁵⁷⁵ Ed. von Erdmann-Pančić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 110; Golub, *Quellen* 178; Horvat, *Obranu* 183-184, see 184:

accipit letta e considerata bene la traduzione fatta non da un solo, ma da più huomini intelligenti della lingua materna illirica, dell'ebrea, e greca, nella qual' è stato scritto la maggior parte del testamento nuovo, sia poi stampata (se sarà giudicata necessaria) à beneficio commune di tutte le provincie della nazione illirica, non d'una sola di Ragusa, come di presente si pretende.

⁵⁷⁶ The decision ed. von Erdmann-Pančić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 110; Horvat, *Obranu* 184. Ingoli sent a copy of this letter to Cardinal Scaglia, see his note ed. Golub, *Quellen* 178, but precisely when is uncertain.

⁵⁷⁷ *Apologia adversus eos qui asseruerunt a S. Hieronymo Dalmata Doctore Maximo Slavonicos seu Glagoliticos caracteres repertos esse, et ab eodem universum corpus Sacrae Scripturae Dalmatis Slavonica lingua traditum esse*, ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 169-175, see 175:

Atque ita S. Hieronymus Dalmata Doctor Maximus ab impostura vindicatus est, falsitatisque arguuntur illi nostrates, qui apposito nomine Episcopi Segnensis in supplici Libello oblato S. Sedi Apostolicae ante sexennium versionem qua utuntur Dalmatae et Crovatae in Missali et Breviario esse S. Hieronymi Dalmatae asseruerunt, selectamque ex Veteribus versionem nuperam ne typis in lucem prodiret, magno cum damno Illyricorum Sacerdotum impediverunt.

It is doubtful whether Kašić himself had seen the letter since it does not contain an ascription of Glagolitic script to St. Jerome as Kašić claimed. Horvat, *ibid.* 175, n. 13, dated the *Apologia* to 1638 but it was written six years after the letter, which was discussed by the Propaganda on 4 July 1633. Kašić was clearly ignorant of the bishop of Agram's letter to the Holy Office as he nowhere mentioned it.

⁵⁷⁸ *De variis versionibus Slavonicis, Dalmaticis seu Illyricis, et Serblianis seu Ruthenicis*, ed. *ibid.* 191-206, see 198:

et sane iam editum fuisset, nisi, et obitus Domini Celesii accidisset, et Memoriale oblatum Sanctissimo Domino Nostro a quibusdam malignantibus Nationalibus intercessisset et opus pernecessarium perutileque huc usque impedivisset.

In later Latin *malignare* can mean *to scheme* and Kašić perhaps meant *scheming fellow-countrymen*. Since in this treatise he stated that the lectionary in Ragusan dialect had as yet not been published, *ibidem*, and it appeared in 1641, see below note 624, the treatise must have been written prior to then. It is immediately followed by another short treatise in the form of corollaries, objections and responses, *Corollaria, Obiectiones et Responsa*, ed. *ibid.* 200-206, in which Kašić expressed the hope that his translation of the *Rituale Romanum* would soon appear, ed. *ibid.* 206, and that was published in 1640, see above note 471. It is thus probable, but not proven, that all three treatises were compiled in 1639.

named the schemers but it is difficult to see how he could have meant anybody other than the four members of the commission which rejected his translation, Mrnavić, Levaković, Ranzi and Deodati. The letters of the bishops of Agram and Segna reveal remarkable similarities, not merely of content but also of text.⁵⁷⁹ Kašić clearly suspected that Agatić' letter was a forgery but that is unlikely since the Propaganda's decision to consult the archbishop of Zara about Agatić' letter would surely have brought that to light.⁵⁸⁰ Moreover, Agatić only died in 1649 and Kašić would have had ample opportunity to have informed him how his name had been misused. It is thus inherently more likely that the schemers at Rome had influenced the two bishops to undertake concerted action to prevent the publication of the translation, in which they were successful.

The decision of the Propaganda on 22 November 1632 to leave the question of permitting the translation to be printed to the Holy office led Kašić to send a memorandum to Cardinal Scaglia in early 1633 in which he listed five reasons why the translation should be published: 1. many Illyrian clergy were ill-educated and misinterpreted the extant translations which were defective and not in agreement with the Vulgate text: 2. some clergy made extempore translations at mass, which was an abuse: 3. an accurate translation was required to counter the influence of translations made by heretics and schismatics; 4. bad translations could be removed once his accurate one had been published; 5. earlier translations had not been in a common idiom, whereas his translation was comprehensible to all.⁵⁸¹ He left Ragusa after Easter in 1633 to become Croat *poenitentiarius* at Loreto and since he went via Rome it is quite possible that he delivered the memorandum in person.⁵⁸² Since he received no reply he sent his

⁵⁷⁹ For example, that of Bishop Erghely begins:

Il Vescovo di Zagabria in Croatia havendo inteso

ed. Golub, *Quellen* 177, while Bishop Agatić' letter begins, *ibid.* 178:

Il Vescovo di Segna havendo inteso

Both call for the suspension of publication in virtually the same words, Erghely, ed. *ibid.* 177:

Supplica riverentemente l'Eminenze loro si compiaccino di far soprasedere in questo negotio di tanta importanza, et ordinare, che se piglino prima la dovute e necesssarie informationi dalli Vescovi Nationali.

Agatić, ed. von Erdmann-Pančić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 110:

supplica riverentemente l'Eminenze loro si compiaccino à soprasedere in un negotio di tanta importance per pigliarne le dovute e necessarie informationi dalli vescovi nazionali

This was pointed out by Golub, *Quellen* 158.

⁵⁸⁰ As von Erdmann-Pančić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 110, n. 47, pointed out. Various reasons why Agatić might have written the letter have been suggested by Radonić, *tamparije* 46-47, but they are all hypotheses.

⁵⁸¹ Ed. Golub, *Quellen* 179, and Horvat, *Obranu* 187-188. For quotations see above notes 542 and 544.

⁵⁸² That he went via Rome is known from a note in the archives of the Holy Office to the effect that if Kašić' MS could not be deciphered the author would be in Rome after Easter when he could transcribe it, ed. Golub, *Quellen* 180. On the miraculous moves of Our Lady's House from Nazareth to Fiume in 1291, then on to Recanati in 1294 and finally to nearby Loreto by the Adriatic opposite Spalato in 1295 see above note 352. Already by 1337 some Slavs had founded the Confraternity of St Peter at Recanati and in 1429 Giorgio di Nicola of Capodistria had established an oratory dedicated to St John there, which was served by Slav clergy. By the mid-fifteenth century Illyrian pilgrims were arriving at Loreto in large numbers and a Slav confraternity had been established there. By the time Kašić was appointed *poenitentiarius* at Loreto there were mass Slav pilgrimages. On the Slav presence at Loreto and Slav pilgrimages from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries see

first petition to the Pope from Loreto in early 1634.⁵⁸³ In a letter to the Propaganda of May or early June 1634 Archbishop Ponzoni of Spalato warmly recommended that the translation be published to counter the influence of a translation of the New Testament which had been made by heretics and was full of errors. This letter was discussed at the meeting of the Propaganda on 19 June 1634⁵⁸⁴ but it was already too late.

The Pope had forwarded Kašić' petition to the Holy Office, which made its attitude very clear in its decision taken on 13 June 1634: 1. all copies of the translation were to be surrendered to the Holy Office; 2. a circular was to be sent to all the bishops of the region and the inquisitor at Zara instructing them to collect and burn all heretical versions, be they in Illyrian or any other language, and to enforce the rules of the Index; 3. the bishops were to show all diligence in ensuring that students devoted themselves to the study of Latin so that the need to use Illyrian in the liturgy would gradually disappear; 4. those who studied at Loreto or elsewhere at Rome's expense should be rewarded by their bishops upon their return with posts as befitted their knowledge of Latin so as to encourage others to undertake similar studies; 5. the clergy were to teach the catechism and preach at mass so that the faithful would learn all that was necessary for salvation.⁵⁸⁵ The decision ends with the blunt remark that there was no need for the new translation.⁵⁸⁶ Later in June or in July Ingoli surrendered the Propaganda's copy of the translation to the Holy office.⁵⁸⁷ The circular to the archbishops of Zara and Ragusa, the bishops of Segna, Lesina, Nona, Scardona, Agram and the inquisitor at Zara was sent on 11 November 1634 and, after outlining Cellesi's reasons for wishing to have the translation of the New Testament published and what the Holy Office had done at the request of the Pope, it lists the five decisions of 13 June and ends by instructing the bishops to

Grimaldi, *Pellegrini* 258-277; for pilgrimages from the sixteenth to twentieth centuries see Santarella, *Casa* 59-63, 88-90. The choice of Loreto as the place for the establishment of a *Collegium Illyricum Lauretanum* to train clergy for missionary work in the Balkans is thus scarcely surprising. On the *Collegium* see above note 412.

⁵⁸³ On its contents see above at notes 545-547.

⁵⁸⁴ His letter ed. von Erdmann-Pančić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 119-120, see 119:

L'arcivescovo di Spalato, venuto alla visita de sacri limini, reverentemente significa all'Eminenze loro, essergli venuto à notitia, che nelle parti superiori della Bosna siasi da eretici translato et divulgato il testamento nuovo in lingua illirica, ripieno, come si può tenere per certo, d'errori et falsità con pericolo d'evidente infettione di quelli poveri populi semplici et avidi de libri nuovi nell'loro idioma; et ricorda (se parerà alla prudenza loro esser bene), oppor alla malignità di quelli una vera et catholica translatione, già, com'intende, presentata à questa Sacra Congregatione opera di persona molto pia et versata in simili translationi.

That the letter was discussed on 19 June is known from a note on the reverse, see *ibidem*. Precisely which heretical New Testament the archbishop had in mind is unclear.

⁵⁸⁵ The original in the archives of the Holy Office ed. Golub, *Quellen* 171 and 175:

3. Moneri Episcopos, ut adhibeant maximum Studium in instruendis Alumnis, qui incumbant diligentissimè Latinis litteris ut paulatim evanescat praetenta necessitas linguae illyricae in sacris.

The abridged version ed. *ibid.* 174; von Erdmann-Pančić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 115, n. 62; Horvat, *Obranu* 185.

⁵⁸⁶ *Ibidem*: *De reliquo nihil opus hac nova versione.*

⁵⁸⁷ See above note 546.

acknowledge receipt of the circular and to report what had been done to execute its instructions.⁵⁸⁸

The Holy Office had to reply to the Propaganda's enquiry of 22 November 1632 as to whether it was expedient to publish Kašić' translation of the New Testament⁵⁸⁹ and it is scarcely surprising that the report drawn up for it was extremely negative. It adduces four reasons for not printing the Bible in the Illyrian vernacular in Latin script: 1. since the time of St. Cyril the Apostolic See had approved Scripture in Cyrillic script for the Slavo-Greek rite; 2. on 18 December 1626 the Propaganda had decided that the missal and the breviary for the Slavo-Latin rite were not to be revised in the vernacular but in the ancient Illyrian language;⁵⁹⁰ 3. learned experts may explain Scripture in the vernacular but to print vernacular translations for those ignorant of Latin would produce poison from honey and give rise to errors since a mere text is of no avail if its true sense is ignored. The ill-educated usurp the name of Scripture but scarcely grasp its true meaning; 4. all languages except Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek and Latin are constantly changing and for that reason the Council of Trent, session 22, chapter 8, had stated: "Although the mass contains great instruction for the faithful people, it nevertheless does not seem expedient to the Fathers that it should be celebrated in the vernacular language."⁵⁹¹ Since vernaculars are constantly changing, vernacular translations would also have to be constantly revised with the attendant danger that suitable translators could not always be found and in view of the variety and nature of languages the Popes would not find it easy to correct errors.⁵⁹² The report then deals with a specific point made by Kašić in his memorandum to Cardinal Scaglia, viz. that by printing a Catholic translation erroneous translations could be more easily withdrawn from circulation.⁵⁹³ heretics are not to be imitated even if they use Glagolitic or Cyrillic and not Latin script. To provide Illyrians who had never learned Latin script with books printed in it would be like telling a tale to a deaf man. Moreover, heretical versions had been destroyed and if some had survived they should be sought out and burned. Since there had been a version of Scripture in

⁵⁸⁸ Ed. Golub, *Quellen* 180-181. Kašić must have seen a copy of this circular since in his *Obiectiones et Responsa* he deals with them in the order 2-5 and 1, ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 203-206, as Golub, *Quellen* 168, points out; see below note 603.

⁵⁸⁹ See above note 571.

⁵⁹⁰ The report entitled *Non est expediens ut imprimatur versio Sacrae Scripturae facta lingua illyrica vernacula, seu nova, characteribus latinis*, ed. von Erdmann-Pančić, *Bibelübersetzung* 197-200; *eadem, Drucklegungsversuch* 111-115; Horvat, *Obranu* 209-214. It quotes the decision, e.g. ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 210; for the text of the decision see above note 393. The report is undated but there is no reason to assume that it postdates 1634.

⁵⁹¹ By quoting only the beginning of chapter viii the report misrepresents the Council's decision; for the full text see above note 238, cf. note 240.

⁵⁹² It then quotes the refusal of Pope Gregory VII to allow Duke Vratislav II of Bohemia to celebrate in Slavonic, ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 211-212. On this incident in 1080 see above notes 216, 218-219.

⁵⁹³ Cf. the memorandum, ed. *ibid.* 188:

4°. motivo sia per toglier via tutte le translationi non ben fatte, et piene d'errori, o per defetto di stampatori, o vero de scrittori.

use in the Church since the time of St. Cyril, a new vernacular version would represent danger, confusion and perniciion for ill-educated Illyrian priests.⁵⁹⁴ If the early translation, either in print or in manuscript, had been corrupted by the ignorance of scribes or the malice of heretics, it should be corrected by experts in Greek, Illyrian, Czech and Polish.

The author of the report writing in the first person singular then addresses the question of the use of the Latin script:

*Of Latin characters used for the Illyrian language I shall say only this: it is ridiculous to write in Illyrian or Slavonic with Latin characters. For all the writers of the Dalmatian littoral of our times who have printed something in their maternal Illyrian language in Latin characters have written (as far as orthography is concerned) arbitrarily and according to the fancy of their own minds so that the one opposes the other in orthography and the one cannot understand the other well. Until now Illyrians (I am speaking of the Illyrians in general) have never agreed amongst themselves about orthography when writing and printing with Latin characters, nor will they ever agree.*⁵⁹⁵

The reason for this is simple: Germans, Italians, Frenchmen and Spaniards learn one orthography through Latin, but the Illyrians are divided, those in Carniola, Carinthia and Styria learn Latin at school through the medium of German, those in Croatia through the medium of Hungarian, those in Dalmatia and the Illyrian littoral though the medium of Italian and all think that their method is best and disdain the suitable characters invented by SS. Jerome and Cyril for Illyrian. The reports ends:

*For not only the Hebrews, Chaldees, Arabs, Greeks and Latins but also the Illyrians have their own characters which the holy Fathers instructed by God bequeathed to their compatriots for the speech and pronunciation of the Illyrian language and the difficulty of pronouncing it so that it could be well and properly written.*⁵⁹⁶

⁵⁹⁴ The report ed. *ibid.* 212:

ad quid esset indoctis Sacerdotibus Illyricis Versio Sacrae Scripturae vernacula nova, nisi ad periculum, confusionem et perniciem.

⁵⁹⁵ Ed. *ibid.* 213:

De characteribus vero latinis in linguae illyricae usu, hoc tantum dicam: illyrice seu slavonice characteribus latinis scribere ridiculum est. Omnes enim nostrorum temporum scriptores Dalmatiae littoralis, qui materna illyrica lingua aliquid latinis characteribus typis mandarunt, suo arbitratu et iuxta proprii capitis cerebrum (quoad orthographia) scripserunt, ita ut alter alteri in orthographia adversetur et alter alterum bene intelligere non possit. Nunquam hucusque Illyrici (de Illyricis in communi loquor) de orthographia in scribendo et imprimendo characteribus latinis inter se convenerunt, nec convenient unquam.

⁵⁹⁶ Ed. *ibid.* 214:

Non enim solummodo Hebraei, Chaldaei, Arabes, Graeci et Latini, verum etiam Illyrici proprios habent characteres, quos Sancti Patres a Deo edocti propter illyricae linguae sermonem ac pronuntiationem, pronuntiandique difficultatem gentilibus suis ad bene apteque scribendum reliquerunt.

It has been suggested that the author of the report was one of the Ruthenian Basilian monks at Rome who wished to bring Croat Slavonic closer to the Church Slavonic of the Slavo-Greek rite,⁵⁹⁷ but in view of Kašić' complaints about his scheming fellow-countrymen suspicion must fall elsewhere, although the question of the authorship of the report must remain an open one for lack of further evidence.

Kašić' never abandoned his hopes of having his translation published. In his treatise on the various Slav versions of Scripture of c. 1639 he argued that of all Slav versions his was the easiest of all to understand as it had made use of most of the others,⁵⁹⁸ while in his corollaries, objections and responses written at about the same time he argued that since the Council of Trent had called for one authentic version of the Latin text as there had been many in circulation, it followed that a corrected Illyrian version based upon the revised Vulgate was required as there were many Illyrian versions.⁵⁹⁹ He supported the call of the Ragusan commission of 1631 that his translation should be published in a bilingual Latin-Croat edition as that would enable the Illyrian clergy to learn Latin more easily and the non-Illyrian clergy Slavonic.⁶⁰⁰ Kašić then went on to answer five possible objections. O(bjection): Pope Pius IV's index prohibited vernacular translations. R(esponse): Untrue, it had only condemned translations made by heretics and there were Catholic vernacular translations in German, French, Hungarian, Polish, Flemish and many other languages.⁶⁰¹ O: There were dangers in reading the Song of Songs and many other passages in the Bible. R: That equally applied to the Vulgate and other vernacular translations. O: An Illyrian translation was unnecessary since there were other remedies: 1. burn heretical and bad translations; 2. teach youth Latin; 3. the return of well-educated students of Loreto to the region; 4. preaching at mass as the Council of Trent had recommended;⁶⁰² 5. send manuscript translations to the inquisitor at Zara or the Holy Office at Rome. R: 1. without the existence of an authorized translation it would be difficult, especially in the Ottoman Empire, to establish which translations were heretical; 2. only in the towns of the Dalmatian littoral were there schools where the rudiments of Latin were taught, while in the Otto-

⁵⁹⁷ Thus Horvat, *ibidem*. von Erdmann-Pančić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 115, rightly calls this *gänzlich unwahrscheinlich*.

⁵⁹⁸ Ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 195:

Versio selecta ex omnibus fere praedictis de mandato Sacrae Congregationis descripta est meliori communiorique modo loquendi inque provinciis illyricis ad intelligendum faciliore quam sit ulla ex superius assertis

⁵⁹⁹ Ed. *ibid.* 200:

Necesse est igitur versionem selectam unam certam ac bene translata, interpretatamque Illyricis tradere, ut tollatur multarum confusio.

The idea that *translatam* refers to the previous translations and *interpretatamque* to Kašić', thus Golub, *Kašić's* 91, n. 3, is not entirely convincing. On the dating of these two treatises see above note 578.

⁶⁰⁰ On the call for a bilingual edition see above note 563.

⁶⁰¹ For the rule allowing approved vernacular translations to be read see above note 271.

⁶⁰² For the relevant Council text see above note 238.

man Empire there were neither schools nor teachers; 3. the students returning from Loreto looked for sees, archdeaconries and canonries, not poor parishes in the interior, and in any case their number was far too small for such a large region; 4. to preach at mass would be an excellent thing but there were insufficient bishops in the Ottoman Empire to ensure that this would be done, besides which it would not satisfy those who were asking for copies of Scripture; 5. there were vernacular Bibles in German, French, Flemish, Polish and Hungarian, all countries where the liturgy was not celebrated in the vernacular, whereas the Illyrians had had a vernacular liturgy for almost eight hundred years but had no vernacular Bible.⁶⁰³

In 1640 Kašić' translation of the *Rituale Romanum* was published at Rome and he ended his dedication of it to the Pope with an appeal for the publication of his translation of the New Testament.⁶⁰⁴ In his preface to the reader he stated that he had translated not only the *Rituale* but also all of the Bible, both Old New Testaments, as well as a lectionary of gospels and epistles and called upon the clergy, including the bishops and archbishops, to petition the Pope and the cardinals of the Propaganda to allow the translation to be printed so that they could truly understand and interpret Holy Scripture and preach on its basis.⁶⁰⁵ This call did not fall upon deaf ears and in 1642 the Illyrian clergy petitioned the Pope to allow the translation to be printed in Latin script, which was known to almost all the Illyrian clergy and easier to learn for priests of the Latin, viz. Glagolitic, rite and also for those of the Greek rite, Serbs, Moldavians and Ruthenians, who would thus be attracted to the Apostolic See of Rome.⁶⁰⁶ That Kašić' himself had

⁶⁰³ Ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 202-206. These five objections are, of course, the five points made in the decision of the Holy Office of 13 June 1634 not to publish his translation, see above note 585, which means that Kašić must have seen a copy of its circular of 11 November 1634 in which they are listed, see above note 588.

⁶⁰⁴ Ed. Horvat, *Ritual* + 2^v:

Utinam aliquando etiam lucem aspiciat Selecta à me ex antiquis Illyricis codicibus Versio Illyria Novi Testamenti, Tuo imperio, tuisq; perurbanis auspicijs (sic), ut ea tota Natio luce nova Evangelicae praedicationis, veritatis illustrata contra haereses, et schismata, Tu Sanctitatis aeterna recordatione glorietur, et oblectetur.

Since the Jesuit General, Muzio Vitelleschi, signed a faculty for it to be printed, ed. *ibid.* ++2^r, and it was published at the Propaganda's press, it is clear that both he and Francesco Ingoli supported this appeal.

⁶⁰⁵ Ed. *ibid.* ++ 4^{r-v}:

*Hochiu yosc, datti nà znanye Poctovanim Popovom, i Pastirom od duscà, dàsam ne sàmo prineslào ù nasc yezik ovim govorum opchënyim Ritual ovij Rimski, neggo takyer i sfà Sfeta Pijasma, Stàroga, i Novoga Zakonna: sfe, sctëye ù Biblij upijsano, i potvardyeno od Sfetoga Oça Pape.**

Takyer i Vangelistar, toyest, sfae Pistulae, i sfà sfeta Vangelya priko sfega godiscta tekùchia: i Kalendar, i Red od Missae: nekàbi sfak mogào razumitti onë, sctosctij Latinsko. [...].

Molitte dakle sarcanno, i prositte Poctovani Misniëi vassce Arhibiskupe, i Biskupe; dà upijssu S.O. Papi, i Kardenalom sfetoga skuppa od Razplodyenya Virre Isukarstovae, dà vam cinè, datti nà sfitlost Sfeta Pijasma, nekaih uzmëxete istino razumitti, i puku tomacciti, i pripovidati.

*He is, of course, referring to the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, not to his translation.

⁶⁰⁶ Ed. Golub, *Quellen* 175:

che si dia alle stampe (conforme alli decreti della Sacra Congregazione de Propaganda fide) con caratteri Latini communi a tutte le Nationi dell'Europa, è noti quasi à tutti li Sacerdoti Illirici, piu facili ad impararsi dalli Sacerdoti del Rito Latino et anco del Rito Greco dalli Serviani, Moldavi, è Rutheni, quali tutti s'affezionaranno alla Sede Apostolica Romana.

been involved in drawing up the petition is clear from the fact that it refers to *some malicious persons* whose memorandum had prevented the publication of his translation in 1633.⁶⁰⁷ Unfortunately the names of those who signed it have not been traced but since it was drawn up only in the name of the Illyrian clergy⁶⁰⁸ it is clear that none of the bishops had participated. The Pope forwarded the petition to the Holy Office, which on 1 July 1642 instructed that the clergy should be informed of the reasons why publication had not been permitted.⁶⁰⁹

Kašić' last attempt to obtain permission for publication was his petition to Pope Urban VIII in 1644 in which he pointed out that few Illyrian clergy knew Latin well enough to be able to interpret the Bible correctly and thus it was necessary to have an official translation, something which the Propaganda had appreciated, and they had thus commissioned it. He therefore begged the Pope, who had erected the Illyrian College at Loreto⁶¹⁰ and who had permitted the publication of the Illyrian edition of the *Rituale*, to allow publication of the translation of the Bible, which would drive out heretical, schismatic and anonymous Illyrian versions.⁶¹¹ Since the Pope did not forward this petition to the Holy Office it probably arrived shortly before or perhaps even after the Pope's death on 29 July 1644 and there is no evidence that Kašić made any subsequent approach to his successor, Innocent X, prior to his own death on 28 December 1650. He bequeathed his translation to his nephew Ermolao Cassio (Hermolaj Kašić', † 1686), the son of his brother Ivan (1577-1627) and a canon of Arbe, with a request to attempt to have it published.⁶¹² As it was, the first complete Croatian

The petition is undated but since it states that nine years have elapsed since 1633 when Kašić learned that his translation had been rejected it must be of 1642.

⁶⁰⁷ Ed. *ibidem*:

la Sacra Congregazione doppo matura consideratione decretò, che si stampasse, è si chiamasse à Roma il sodetto P. Cassio per assister' alla stampa. Venuto egli del 1633, trovò intorbidato il negotio da alcuni maligni con un Memoriale.

Cf. his then unpublished treatise on the various Slav versions of Scripture, ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 198:

Memoriale oblatum Sanctissimo Domino Nostro a quibusdam malignantibus Nationalibus.

⁶⁰⁸ Ed. Golub, *Quellen* 175:

Supplicano dunque humilmente li Sacerdoti Illirici.

⁶⁰⁹ The decision ed. *ibid.* 171.

⁶¹⁰ Kašić is referring to its reestablishment at Loreto by Urban VIII's bull *Zelo Domus Dei* of 1 June 1627; on this see above note 412.

⁶¹¹ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 118-119; Horvat, *Obranu* 207.

⁶¹² See von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 119. The three volumes of the Agram codex, which include Kašić' autograph, were purchased from a certain Ivan-Toma Gozini on Arbe and most of the Zara codex was copied in 1788 by a certain Petar Gozini, see Bašić, *Handschriften* 8-9. The Gozini (Galzigna) and Kašić' families were later related by marriage see Granić, *Ime*, genealogical table VIII; on Ermolao Cassio see *ibid.* 38.

It has been suggested that the reason why permission for publication was not granted was that the translation was not accompanied by a Catholic commentary, thus Murko, *Bedeutung* (v) 83, and Stojković, *Bartuo* 257, and it is true that some Catholic vernacular translations were accompanied by commentaries e.g. the English New Testament of 1582, see above notes 276 and 528, whose annotations influenced the Polish Bible of 1599, see above note 531. However, not all Catholic vernacular translations had a commentary, e.g. the Polish Bible of 1561, see above note 530, and the suggestion was rightly rejected by Vanino, *Ritual* 109.

Catholic translation of the Bible by the Franciscan Matija Petar Katančić (1750-1825) only appeared in 1831,⁶¹³ while Kašić' wish was only at last fulfilled in 1999, 349 years after his death.⁶¹⁴

Kašić' reaction to the decision of the Holy Office of 13 June 1634 not to permit the publication of his translation of the New Testament was to attempt to obtain at least the publication of the lectionary with the Gospel and Epistle readings in his translation. He submitted a request to Ingoli to be permitted to publish some of his original works as well as a translation of the lectionary corrected on the basis of the revised missal⁶¹⁵ and claimed that the lectionary printed at Venice contained grave errors.⁶¹⁶ In response to a request to indicate what these were he sent a list of the errors on the first few pages of the lectionary to Ingoli, which he prefaced by pointing out that Bandulavić had not obtained permission for the publication of his version and that he had dedicated it to Archbishop Marc'Antonio De Dominis of Spalato (1602-1616, ⊥ 1624).⁶¹⁷ On 31 July 1634 he was given permission to print the original works but not the lectionary⁶¹⁸ and here the matter might have rested had not Tommaso Cellesi's successor as archbishop of Ragusa, Antonio Severoli (1634-1639, ⊥ 1668), complained to the Propaganda on 1 January 1635 that in accordance with the Holy Office's circular he had banned extempore translation of the Gospels and Epistles at mass but that this had led to discontent and it had been heard that the Propaganda had the intention of publishing a lectionary.⁶¹⁹ On 17 March 1635 the archbishop wrote to the Propaganda that on their instructions the nuncio at Venice, Francesco

⁶¹³ *Sveto Pismo Starog' (Novog') Zakona, Sixta V. P. Naredbom prividjeno, i Klimenta VIII. Pape Vlastjom izdano; Sada u Jezik Slavno*-Illyricki Izgovora Bosanskog' prinesheno; Tad SS. Otacah i Nauciteljah Tomacenjem nakitjeno*, 4 vols. in 6. Budim 1831. *Sic; read *Slaveno-*. Djurić, *Katalog* no. 2425; Kukuljević, *Bibliografija* i, nos. 759-760. On Katančić, (with bibliography) see Frangeš, *Geschichte* 741-743.

⁶¹⁴ Rothe, *Biblia* i, 5-681. The edition is based upon the Agram codex. The translation is literal, even at the expense of good style, but accurate, see the remarks of Golub, *Kašić's* 93-96, and Katić, *Sprache* 66. The language is Štokavian of the Ijekavian variety with only a few lexical ikavisms as opposed to his later *Rituale* which is ikavian, see *ibid.* 68-69. In 1898 Repel, *Prijevodu* 45-57, edited his translation of Bellarmino's preface, Psalms 50 [51] and 136 [137], Proverbs cc. 3 and 9, Matthew c. 27, Acts c. 3, the Second Epistle of John and Revelation c. 21.

⁶¹⁵ Ed. von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 121, and Vanino, *Ritual* 101:

l'epistole et evangeli di tutto l'anno scelti, corretti et concordati col Messale Romano.

The request is undated but the decision of the Propaganda that he might print his original works is dated 31 July 1634, ed. *ibid.* 121-122.

⁶¹⁶ Ed. *ibid.* 122:

L'epistole e vangeli stampati a Venetia sono scorrettissimi, con errori gravi, per□ si potrebbe far riveder questi.

He has in mind the lectionary revised by Ivan Bandulavić and first published at Venice in 1613, see above note 232.

⁶¹⁷ Ed. *ibid.* 122-124, see 122. De Dominis had, of course, been posthumously tried and found guilty of heresy on 21 December 1624. Kašić in his attempt at least to obtain permission to publish the lectionary exaggerated these errors and von Erdmann-Pandić is right to consider that some of his examples are cavilling or even wrong, *beckmesserisch oder sogar falsch, ibidem*. On this list of errors see also Horvat, *Ispravak* 217-230, with an edition, *ibid.* 220-229.

⁶¹⁸ See above note 615.

⁶¹⁹ His letter ed. von Erdmann-Pandić, *Drucklegungsversuch* 120. That he was referring to the Holy Office's circular of 11 November 1634 is clear from his letter of the previous day, also to the Propaganda, ed. *ibid.* 115.

Vitelli (1582-1646), had informed him that missals in Illyrian, viz. the edition of 1631, with the Gospels and Epistles could be purchased at Venice but that his clergy had requested him to establish whether they had been printed in Glagolitic since the clergy in Ragusa could not read that script,⁶²⁰ despite which the Propaganda on 28 May 1635 decided to advise him to obtain copies of the missal,⁶²¹ to which the archbishop replied on 11 July 1635 that since he could not induce the clergy to learn Glagolitic he intended to have Kašić' translation of the lectionary revised and then apply for permission to have it printed.⁶²²

Precisely when the Propaganda agreed to the publication is unclear but a copy of Kašić' version of the lectionary was dispatched to Ragusa where its štokavian Croat clearly was not to the liking of the local clergy and so a revision was entrusted to the vicar general of the city, Luca Natali († 1642). In his *imprimatur* dated 1 June 1639 Antonio Deodati stated that the Gospels and Epistles could now be read in the Ragusan dialect, which he somewhat grandiloquently proclaimed to be the *lingua franca* of the entire region,⁶²³ although he hastily added that this in no way derogated from the dignity of the sacred Latin language.⁶²⁴ The lectionary was published at Rome in 1641⁶²⁵ and on 14 February 1642 Severoli's successor as archbishop of Ragusa, Bernadino Lavizzi (1639-1647), wrote to the Propaganda to ask for permission to use it. At the request of Ingoli⁶²⁶ the Holy Office on 10 September licensed its use in the

⁶²⁰ Ed. *ibid.* 121. Vitelli was nuncio at Venice from 1632 to 1643.

⁶²¹ Ed. *ibid.* 120.

⁶²² Ed. *ibid.* 121:

sono intorno a fare rivedere l'evangelistario del Padre Cassio et a suo luoco e tempo, per sodisfazione della diocese, dimaner□ licenza di farlo stampare.

von Erdmann-Pand□i□, *ibidem*, considers that this refers to his translation of the New Testament but *evangelistario* obviously means a lectionary, e.g. in his treatise on the various Slav versions of the Scriptures Ka□i□ reported that Archbishop Tempestivo of Ragusa had forbidden his clergy to make extempore translations and had instructed them to use the extant lectionary of Bandulavi□ (in □tokavian Croatian) until a new one in Ragusan dialect had been published:

praecepit ut uterentur interim Dalmatio Evangelistario donec novum Ragusina dialecto in lucem prodeat.

Ed. Horvat, *Obranu* 198. Ka□i□ himself in his preface to his translation of the *Rituale* makes a very clear difference between his *Vangelistar* and his translation of the Old and New Testaments, see above note 604.

⁶²³ See the excerpt ed. Stojkovi□, *Bartuo* 252:

nempe ut Solis lucem omnibus terris, ita Dei verbum omnibus gentibus Orientalibus evulgari par est: exeat itaque in fines orbis terrae sonus evangelicae tubae Ragusinis vocibus editus, ut divisio quodammodo Imperio, Occidentem Romana lingua, Orientem Ragusina percurrat.

Need it be said that Deodati was from Ragusa?

⁶²⁴ *Ibidem*:

neque illud officiet dignitati regnatrici dictae linguae; nam latinam obscuram sibi remotissimae nationes venerabuntur ut Sacram, Ragusinam quam intelligent, amplectentur atque amabunt.

On this *imprimatur* see Bogi□i□, *Posvete* 220, 223, and Stojkovi□, *Protivureformacija* 194-195.

⁶²⁵ *Vanghelia i pistule istomaccene is missala novoga rimskoga v iesik dubravacki sa grada, i darxava dubrovacke. P□ Bartolomeu Kassichiu Popu Bogoslov□u od Druxbe Yesussove.* Rome 1641. Kukuljevi□, *Bibliografija* i, no. 751. On it see Fu□ak, *Stolje□a* 226-232. Significantly, it was not printed at the Propaganda's press but at that of Bernardino Tani (c. 1605-1649). The extent to which Natali had revised Ka□i□' translation remains to be studied in detail.

⁶²⁶ See his note on the reverse of Lavizzi's letter ed. von Erdmann-Pand□i□, *Drucklegungsversuch* 125.

archdiocese of Ragusa⁶²⁷ and in a letter of 30 September Archbishop Lavizzi informed Ingoli that he had received permission for its use.⁶²⁸ Elsewhere Bandulavić' version of the lectionary continued to be used until the nineteenth century.⁶²⁹

Although the existence of the Slavo-Latin rite had had a significant and beneficial influence upon the decisions of the Council of Trent, subsequent events reveal that theory and practice do not always go hand in hand. Whereas the early editions of the Glagolitic missal and breviary reveal a gradual process of the elimination of archaisms in favour of more comprehensible language, this process was halted when, after the reluctance of Emperor Ferdinand II to finance the printing of liturgical books for the Slavo-Latin rite at Fiume, responsibility for this passed in October or November 1625 to the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* established less than three years previously. Just over a year later on 18 December 1626 it took the decision, which remained in force until the late nineteenth century, to return to a more archaic form of Slavonic and less than six months after that as from 5 June 1627 Ruthenian Uniats, who mistakenly believed that the Slavo-Greek rite had preserved the original form of Slavonic, were involved in the process of the revision of liturgical books for the Slavo-Latin rite, which led to a progressive Russification, or rather East-Slavonicization, of Glagolitic books in the mistaken belief that the use of the same language in the two rites would advance the cause of union,⁶³⁰ whereas in actual fact it led to a decline in the use of the Slavo-Latin rite. The exception to the rule was the publication of the *Rituale Romanum* in a vernacular Croat translation in 1640. It was not, however, in Glagolitic but in Latin script as it was also intended for the clergy of the Latin rite whose knowledge of Latin was often rudimentary because of a lack of adequate schools.

The Council of Trent had refused to ban vernacular translations of the Bible, although in practice these were subsequently mainly published in those languages in which Protestant translations were widely available. The Croat vernacular translation in Latin script made by Kašić for all Croats of both the Latin and the Slavo-Latin rite was never published because of the opposition of those who considered that only a Bible in archaic Croat Slavonic in Glagolitic script was in accordance with the decision of 18 December 1626. The ban on the publication of the translation imposed by the Holy Office on 13 June 1634 included a re-

⁶²⁷ See the decision ed. Golub, *Quellen* 172.

⁶²⁸ Excerpt of his letter ed. von Erdmann-Pandolfi, *Drucklegungsversuch* 125.

⁶²⁹ See above note 232. In the early 1750s the Ragusan Dominican Stefano Roza (Stjepan Rozić, † 1770) stated that there were no more than four or five complete copies of Kašić' and Natali's lectionary left in Ragusa, see Vanino, *Stjepan* 139, and it was reprinted in a slightly revised form in 1784 and 1841.

⁶³⁰ As Bratulić, *Bartol* 236, somewhat picturesquely put it:

In the plans of the Roman Propaganda the Croats were to be the bait by which a large fish was to be caught, the Christian fish of Orthodoxy.

commendation that the study of Latin by the clergy should be encouraged so that in the longer term the very use of Slavonic in the liturgy would become superfluous. The success of the Counter-Reformation was thus ultimately unpropitious to the maintenance of the Cyrillomethodian legacy in Croatia.

