

Remembering Jerome and Forgetting Zwingli

The Zurich Latin Bible of 1543 and the Establishment of Heinrich Bullinger's Church¹

Bruce Gordon

In early 1543, as relations between Swiss and German Protestants reached their nadir, the Zurich printer and publisher Christoph Froschauer produced a folio Latin Old Testament, Apocrypha, and New Testament.² This handsome volume was not an edition of the Vulgate, which was by no means despised by Reformed Protestants

¹ The following is a reworked and extended version of a lecture delivered in the theological faculty of Zurich University on the occasion of my receiving an honorary doctorate in April 2012. I wish to express my most heartfelt gratitude to the members of the faculty for this honour. In particular I wish to thank Peter Opitz, Christian Moser, and Christoph Uehlinger, the Dean. I am also grateful to the members of the audience, whose questions and observations I have tried to accommodate in the revisions. Research for this paper was carried out with the support of the Arts and Humanities Research Council of the United Kingdom and by research grants from Yale University. I am grateful to the Council and the University for their generosity. I wish also to thank Matthew McLean, Jamie Dunn, and Brad Holden for their assistance.

² *Biblia sacrosancta testamenti veteris et novi e sacra Hebraeorum lingua Graecorumque fontibus, consultis simul orthodoxis interpretibus religiosissime translata in sermonem Latinum [...]*, Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1543 (Christian Moser, Theodor Bibliander [1505–1564]: *Annotierte Bibliographie der gedruckten Werke*, Zurich 2009 [Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationgeschichte 27], no. B–8.1a/b). On Froschauer the standard work remains Paul *Leemann van Elck*, *Die Offizin Froschauer: Zürichs berühmte Druckerei im 16. Jahrhundert*, Zurich 1940.

and was frequently printed in Basel and Zurich.³ The *Biblia sacrosanta*, rather, was a new translation of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha together with a revision of Erasmus' 1535 *Novum Testamentum*.⁴ Although the print life of the Zurich Bible was relatively brief, the translation was widely admired and occupied an important place in the continuing efforts of Protestants to render scripture into Latin for the use of scholars, clergy, and educated laity.⁵

Yet, as the greatest intellectual achievement of the Zurich church by the early 1540s, there was something curious about the Latin Bible with its extensive prefaces and apparati. Searching through the prefatorial material yields no mention of the most prominent figure of the Zurich reformation, Huldrych Zwingli. The cause of this omission lies with the project of Heinrich Bullinger to rebuild the Zurich church after the disastrous defeat at Kappel in 1531.⁶ The new Bible was to be the supreme expression of a Reformed order defined by piety, learning, moderation, and institutional integrity. To make this change be possible, a subtle break with the

³ See Urs B. *Leu*, *The Book- and Reading-Culture in Basle and Zurich During the Sixteenth Century*, in: Malcolm Walsby and Graeme Kemp (eds.), *The Book Triumphant: Print in Transition in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Leiden 2011 (*Library of the Written Word* 15), 295–319.

⁴ The literature on the Zurich Latin Bible is limited. See Claire *Gantet*, *La Religion et ses mots: La Bible latine de Zurich (1543) entre la tradition et l'innovation*, in: *Zwingliana* 23 (1996), 143–167.

⁵ Josef *Eskhult*, *Latin Bible Translations in the Protestant Reformation: Historical Contexts, Philological Justification, and the Impact of Classical Rhetoric on the Conception of Translation Methods*, in: Bruce Gordon and Matthew McLean (eds.), *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, Leiden 2012 (*Library of the Written Word* 20), 167–185; Bruce *Gordon*, *The Authority of Antiquity: England and the Protestant Latin Bible*, in: *The Reception of Continental Reformation in Britain*, ed. Polly Ha and Patrick Collinson, Oxford 2010 (*Proceedings of the British Academy* 164), 1–22.

⁶ Heinrich Bullinger's building of the church in Zurich is examined in Hans Ulrich *Bächtold*, *Heinrich Bullinger vor dem Rat: Zur Gestaltung und Verwaltung des Zürcher Staatswesens in den Jahren 1531 bis 1575*, Bern 1982 (*Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte* 12); Bruce *Gordon*, *Clerical Discipline and the Rural Reformation: The Synod in Zurich 1532–1574*, Bern 1992 (*Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte* 16); Pamela *Biel*, *Doorkeepers at the House of Righteousness: Heinrich Bullinger and the Zurich Clergy 1535–1575*, Bern 1991 (*Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte* 15). For the »crisis« of the 1530s, see J. Wayne *Baker*, *Church, State, and Dissent: The Crisis of the Swiss Reformation, 1531–1536*, in: *Church History* 57 (1988), 107–120.

past was essential. The intentional eclipsing of Zwingli was not a crude denunciation of a fallen leader. In the polemical wars with Lutherans the Zurichers would continue to defend robustly their first reformer. In 1536 the letters of Zwingli and Oecolampadius were printed by Thomas Platter in Basel, and the text was prepared by the Zurich scholar Theodor Bibliander.⁷ Likewise, translations of Zwingli's last works by Leo Jud appeared in Zurich during the 1530s.

On the whole, however, Zwingli was not mourned in public.⁸ Unlike accounts of the peaceful end of Martin Luther, represented by his death mask, or John Calvin, surrounded by his friends, Zwingli had not died well. He had fallen in a nighttime raid, sword in hand, leading a military campaign many in his city had not wanted. His sudden death and the humiliation of Zurich had nearly led to the reversal of the reformation in the city. Zwingli would have to be grieved for by his friends in private. In public the young Heinrich Bullinger was charged with rescuing the Reformed church and restoring the tarnished reputation of the reformation. He understood that the name Huldrych Zwingli was simply too controversial to be mentioned. The Lutherans, with whom Bullinger still harboured hopes of agreement, reviled Zwingli, while the young John Calvin in Geneva would later make it clear that Zwingli's memory was too divisive, imperiling any possibility for Protestant unity.⁹

Huldrych Zwingli could not be the face of the church Bullinger struggled to erect during the 1530s. Restoration was creation and formation, requiring a changed narrative that emphasized theological continuity with the early church, Christian appropriation of classical learning, piety, and transformation through education. There was no place for the belligerence of the Zwingli years during which the Gospel was deployed to justify coercion and war. With ink and paper, the Zurich Latin Bible embodied the essential prin-

⁷ Ioannis Oecolampadii et Huldrici Zuingli epistolarum libri quatuor, Basel: Thomas Platter and Balthasar Lasius, 1536 (*Moser*, Theodor Bibliander, no. B-5.1).

⁸ Bruce Gordon, *Holy and Problematic Deaths: Heinrich Bullinger on Zwingli and Luther*, in: *Tod und Jenseitsvorstellungen in der Schriftkultur der Frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Marion Kobelt-Groch and Cornelia Niekus Moore, Wolfenbüttel 2008, 47-62.

⁹ Bruce Gordon, *Calvin*, London/New Haven 2009, 207.

ciples of Bullinger's theology and ecclesiology: a church grounded on the Word of God and a deeply Christocentric reading of the Old Testament. The church in Zurich is presented as standing in God's covenantal relationship with humanity, a firm and faithful body of the chosen people united with the past. Bullinger revered history, tradition, and institutions, and the 1543 Bible was very much a book of the church. Its prefatory material and glosses speak to Bullinger's attempt to balance the principle of *sola scriptura* with the interpretive authority of the church. The *Biblia sacrosancta* was at once doctrinal, catechetical, devotional, and pedagogical in character.

Why, one might well ask, did Protestants invest significant intellectual and financial resources in the production of Latin Bibles? The short answer requires us to understand the enduring importance of Latin for the Reformation churches.¹⁰ It was not only regarded as a sacred language, but it was the means by which the fruits of Hebrew and Greek scholarship could be conveyed to a broader audience, such as the clergy. Theodor Bibliander was to write in 1548 that Latin was the closest humanity came to a common language. It unites all the others.¹¹

The creation of Protestant Latin Bibles, however, was fraught with complications. What, if any, authority could these new translations possess? And, crucially, what constituted a proper translation? The scholars in Zurich, like Protestant translators in other places, found themselves facing the vexing question of how to balance humanist learning with doctrinal and ecclesiastical precision. This essay examines the formation of the 1543 Bible with particular attention to the way in which the Zurich scholars constructed a narrative of authority based on their translation, use of patristic sources, and the design of the text. The Bible that appeared in 1543 was only partially a new translation: the Zurichers had prepared the Old Testament from the Hebrew and the books of the

¹⁰ On Latin in the sixteenth century see Ann Moss, *Renaissance Truth and the Latin Language Turn*, Oxford 2003. On the place of Latin in the Reformed churches, see Peter Stotz, Heinrich Bullinger (1504–1575) and the Ancient Languages, in: Emidio Campi et al. (eds.), *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*, Geneva 2008 (*Travaux d'humanisme et renaissance* 447), 113–138.

¹¹ *De ratione communi omnium linguarum et literarum commentarius*, Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1548 (*Moser*, Theodor Bibliander, no. B–12), 30f.

Apocrypha from the Greek whilst making use of a emended version of Erasmus' 1535 New Testament. Accompanying the translation was an extensive set of prefatorial and paratextual material, some of which had already appeared in 1539.

The 1543 Latin Bible had a considerable history. During the 1520s under Huldrych Zwingli a group of scholars had begun work in Zurich on the interpretation of scripture, forming a body known as the »Lectorium« or »Prophezei«.¹² What distinguished the city on the Limmat in these early years of the Reformation was a group of men skilled in the ancient languages who were dedicated, following the principles of Erasmus, to the dissemination of the Word of God according to the ideal of *ad fontes*.¹³ Indeed, many of them had emerged from Erasmus' circle in Basel. Among the figures involved were Zwingli himself, Konrad Pellikan, who had been recruited from Basel, Jakob Ceporin, and Leo Jud. In brief, this learned fraternity met mornings at 8 am in the Grossmünster to read the Bible, beginning in 1525 with Genesis. Those gathered included the members of the chapter, the clergy of the city, the more advanced students, and some ministers from the rural areas. The sessions would open with a reading of the Vulgate by a student, signifying the high authority of the Latin Bible, which was respectfully attributed to Jerome. Initially Ceporin, succeeded by Pellikan after his early death in 1526, was responsible for the Hebrew, translating the text into Latin and noting the differences with the Vulgate. Zwingli read and translated the Septuagint into Latin and provided commentary. Leo Jud's role was to craft a vernacular translation that served as the basis for a sermon to the people.¹⁴

The work of the Prophezei was not only for the education of the clergy and laity. It was directed towards the publication of biblical commentaries and the translation of the Bible. In March 1529 the

¹² On the work of the Prophezei, see Traudel *Himmighöfer*, *Die Zürcher Bibel bis zum Tode Zwinglis (1531): Darstellung und Bibliographie*, Mainz 1995 (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz 154), 213–235.

¹³ On the emergence of a the south Rhineland biblical school, see Bernard *Roussel*, *De Strasbourg à Bâle et Zurich: une «école rhénane» d'exégèse (ca 1525-ca 1540)*, in: *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 68 (1988), 19–39.

¹⁴ Christoph *Zürcher*, *Konrad Pellikans Wirken in Zürich 1526–1556*, Zurich 1975 (*Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte* 4), 34–36.

Prophetenbibel was printed with an unattributed preface by Zwingli; the prophetic books had been studied in the Prophezei between 1527 and 1529.¹⁵ The emergence of a vernacular bible in Zurich involved the gradual shift away from Luther's translation on which the Swiss scholars had initially depended. In 1531 Froschauer produced a complete Bible that was an astonishing achievement, being the first complete vernacular Bible of the Reformation.¹⁶ The text, however, was not entirely native to Zurich, as the historical books, although revised, were drawn from Luther's translation. To the Pentateuch and prophetic books, however, the Zurichers added the poetic books and the Apocrypha, freshly translated from the Hebrew and Greek respectively.

This visually stunning Bible of 1531 was highly theological in nature, containing a preface by Zwingli and a phalanx of parallel texts and annotations (over 14,000). Most remarkable were the 190 woodcuts by Hans Holbein. Beautiful and theologically attentive this Bible may have been, but the Zurich translation project was by no means exhausted. During the 1530s the vernacular Bible continued to be revised with new translations from Hebrew and Greek appearing as the Zurich scholars progressed through the books of the Bible.¹⁷ By the middle years of the 1530s the Zurich scholars had produced their own translations of all the biblical books, an endeavour overseen by Leo Jud and Konrad Pellikan.

Contemporaneous with the work on the vernacular Bibles was a concentration on Latin biblical commentaries.¹⁸ Zwingli had trans-

¹⁵ Edwin Künzli, Vorwort zur Vorrede zur Prophetenbibel, in: Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke, vol. VI/2, Zurich 1968, 283–288.

¹⁶ The standard work is *Himmighöfer*, Die Zürcher Bibel, esp. 368–421.

¹⁷ Although Froschauer continued to print Bibles during the 1530s, a full revision of the 1531 Bible came in 1539/40 after the arrival in Zurich of the Jewish convert Michael Adam, who worked with Jud and Pellikan. In the 1540 Bible the concordance prepared for 1536 and 1538 printings was included. Johann Jakob Mezger, *Geschichte der deutschen Bibelübersetzungen in der schweizerisch-reformierten Kirche von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, Basel 1876, 119–121.

¹⁸ On Zwingli's exegesis, see Fritz Büsser, Zwingli, the Exegete: A Contribution to the 450th Anniversary of the Death of Erasmus, in: *Probing the Reformed Tradition: Historical Studies in Honor of Edward A. Dowey*, ed. Elsie McKee, Louisville 1989, 175–196; R. Gerald Hobbs, Zwingli and the Study of the Old Testament, in: *Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531): Legacy of a Radical Reform*, ed. Edward J. Furcha, Montreal 1985, 144–178; Gerhard Krause, Zwinglis Auslegung der Propheten, in: *Zwingliana* 11/4 (1960), 257–265; Edwin Künzli, Zwingli als Ausleger von Genesis und Exodus,

lated into Latin with commentary the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations, while his exegesis of Genesis and Exodus appeared after his death. As Peter Opitz has explained, »Zwingli's ›exegetical‹ Old Testament writings can only be characterized as genuine commentaries in a limited sense, however, since the explanations take various forms. Often they consist merely of explanations of words that draw on comparisons of usage in other passages, as well as on the Septuagint and the Vulgate. Zwingli's goal is evidently to avoid standing between the text and its audience with his exegetical comments, but rather to let the text speak.«¹⁹ This approach would be radically altered by Zwingli's successors. Although he was a competent Hebraist, Zwingli had a high view of both the Vulgate and the Septuagint and was deeply attached to them.²⁰ This accompanied a suspicion of the Masoretic text grounded in a worry that the use of rabbinic sources would corrupt the Christian message. He had Konrad Pellikan write to Kaspar Hedio following the appearance of his Hosea commentary to express concern about the effects of Judaizing.²¹

The tension over the use of rabbinic sources troubled the Zurich church.²² Although Pellikan was one of the leading Hebraists of his day, he remained wedded to the use of the Vulgate, as was evident in his major work, a commentary on the whole of the Bible (*Commentaria bibliorum*), printed between 1532 and 1535.²³ He used as

Zurich 1950; Max Lienhard, Aus der Arbeit an Zwinglis Exegetica zum Neuen Testament: Zu den Quellen der Schriftauslegung, in: Zwingliana 18/4-5 (1990/1991), 310-328; George R. Potter, Zwingli and the Book of Psalms, in: Sixteenth Century Journal 10/2 (1979), 43-50.

¹⁹ Peter Opitz, Zwingli's Exegesis of the Old Testament, in: Magne Saebo (ed.), Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation, vol. 2, Göttingen 2008, 422f.

²⁰ On the complicated relationship of the Septuagint and the Vulgate, see Paul B. Decock, Jerome's Turn to the Hebraica Veritas and his Rejection of the Traditional View of the Septuagint, in: Neotestamentica 42/2 (2008), 205-222.

²¹ Opitz, Zwingli's Exegesis of the Old Testament, 476.

²² Essential reading is Stephen G. Burnett, Christian Hebraism in the Reformation Era (1500-1660): Authors, Books, and the Transmission of Jewish Learning, Leiden 2012 (Library of the Written Word 19), esp. 11-47: »Birth of a Christian Hebrew Reading Public«.

²³ On Pellikan's *Commentaria*, see Zürcher, Konrad Pellikans Wirken, esp. 85-152; R. Gerald Hobbs, Conrad Pellican and the Psalms: The Ambivalent Legacy of a Pioneer Hebraist, in: Reformation and Renaissance Review 1 (1999), 72-99. See also R. Gerald

his text the Vulgate, which he attributed to Jerome, claiming that he would depart from the church father only when required by the Hebrew.²⁴ In his preface he stated that he would have been content with the Vulgate as it was but the printer Froschauer and his colleagues pressed him to revise the text.²⁵ His commentary also reflected the change in direction in Zurich biblical scholarship after Zwingli's death in 1531. In his preface Pellikan expressed concern that the work of the Prophezei had been overly concerned with grammatical questions. In contrast, his commentary was directed at educating the clergy and would be, therefore, written in simple Latin and focus on theological and pastoral issues. His rule for correcting the Latin proved highly conservative as he made relatively few alterations, and when he did emend the text the changes were strikingly in line with the Latin Bible of Sanctes Pagninus, the Dominican scholar of Lyon who produced a Latin translation in 1528.²⁶

Pellikan offered an extensive treatment of how Christians should read Jewish authors.²⁷ The providential role of the printing press, a theme stressed in the preface, had, in his view, made the Jewish texts available in order that one might learn more clearly the diction and grammar of the language.²⁸ The Jewish authors, however,

Hobbs, Pluriformity of Early Reformation Scriptural Interpretation, in: Saebø, Hebrew Bible, 482–484.

²⁴ Pellikan, like Zwingli, was deeply attached to the Vulgate because of its familiarity. In the preface to his *Commentaria* he wrote, »please God the popular translation continue in venerable authority amongst the Christian people, and that this one we have done be compared with it«. Cited from *Hobbs*, Pluriformity, 485.

²⁵ *Hobbs*, Pluriformity, 485.

²⁶ *Biblia: habes in hoc libro prudens lector utriusque instrumenti novam translationem aeditum a reverendo sacrae theologiae doctore Sancte Pagnino Lucensi [...]*, [Lyon: Antoine du Ry], 1528.

²⁷ See the review article by Jonathan *Karp*, Jews, Hebraism, and the Reformation World, in: *Reformation* 12 (2007), 177–190; Heiko A. *Oberman*, Discovery of Hebrew and Discrimination Against the Jews: The Veritas Hebraica as Double-Edged Sword in Renaissance and Reformation, in: *Germania Illustrata: Essays on Early Modern Germany Presented to Gerald Strauss*, ed. Andrew C. Fix and Susan C. Karant-Nunn, Kirksville, MO 1992, 19–34. See also the essays in: *Hebraica Veritas? Christian Hebraists and the Study of Judaism in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Allison P. Coudert and Jeffrey S. Shoulson, Philadelphia 2004, esp. Stephen G. *Burnett*, Reassessing the »Basel-Wittenberg Conflict«: Dimension of the Reformation-Era Discussion of Hebrew Scholarship, 181–201.

²⁸ *Commentaria Bibliorum et illa brevia quidem ac catholica, eruditissimi simul et*

provided nothing that pertains to the truth of dogma as they were ignorant of Christ, and even cursed him. As they were blinded by God, so their eyes were closed to the truth of scripture. Their teachings had many shortcomings, and their Chaldean translations and paraphrases contained the errors found in their commentaries. The Talmudic fables should be banished from the Christian republic.²⁹

Pellikan's contribution to Zurich biblical culture was enormous. The *Commentaria* went through three printings. Most significantly, it provided the theological basis for the Zurich church in the period after the Kappel War of 1531 and Zwingli's sudden death. As the teacher of Hebrew in the Lectorium, Pellikan set his mark on the way in which the Bible was to be read, and the extensive notes that accompanied his Latin text formed a foundation for the theological shape of the 1543 Bible. But he did not work alone. In 1531 his erstwhile student Theodor Bibliander arrived in the city from Basel.³⁰ A native Swiss, Bibliander had also studied with Oecolampadius, who was to prove an influential master. Oecolampadius was bold and polemical and insisted on translating from the Hebrew, creating fresh Latin versions. Pellikan, as we have seen, shared with Zwingli a reverence for the Vulgate.

Bibliander took up the position of professor of Old Testament, though he seems to have shared the task with Pellikan; it would be misleading to assume that one was a theologian and the other a grammarian. In 1535 Bibliander produced a Hebrew grammar,³¹ while Pellikan was writing his very theological commentary. Bib-

piissimi viri Chuonradi Pellicani Rubeaquensis, qui et Vulgatam commentariis inseruit aeditionem, sed ad Hebraicam lectionem accurate emendatam, [Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1532–1535], A4v.

²⁹ *Commentaria Bibliorum*, A4v. On Pellikan's anti-Jewish sentiments, see *Zürcher*, Konrad Pellikans Wirken, 209–215.

³⁰ On Bibliander, see Christine *Christ-v. Wedel*, Theodor Bibliander in seiner Zeit, in: Christine Christ-v. Wedel (ed.), *Theodor Bibliander 1505–1564: Ein Thurgauer im Gelehrten Zürich der Reformationszeit*, Zurich 2005, 19–60. On Bibliander's teaching Anja-Silvia *Goeing*, Vernünftig unterrichten: Bibliander als Lehrer, in *Christ-v. Wedel*, Theodor Bibliander, 61–82.

³¹ *Institutionem grammaticarum de lingua Hebraea liber unus*, Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1535 (*Moser*, Theodor Bibliander, no. B–4). On Bibliander's Hebrew grammar, see Anja Silvia *Goeing*, *Establishing Modes of Learning: Old and New Hebrew Grammars in the 16th Century*, in: Campi et al., *Scholarly Knowledge*, 157–182.

liander delivered his lectures on the Old Testament, which were attended by the leading churchmen in Zurich.³² To give a sense of the cross-pollination taking place within the city – it is likely that much of the material in Pellikan's notes for his commentary came from the lectures held by Bibliander. We know that when he arrived at a particularly troublesome passage in Ezekiel concerning the temple vision (ch. 40–48) Pellikan turned to Bibliander for assistance.³³

Bibliander's distinctive voice was also heard in 1534 when he produced a translation with commentary of the Old Testament prophet Nahum, very much in the style of Oecolampadius.³⁴ Quite arresting was Bibliander's attitude towards the Vulgate. Whereas Pellikan had made use of the Vulgate in his commentary, Bibliander set his own translation alongside Jerome's, as his teacher Oecolampadius had done, not with the intention of revision, but to present an entirely different rendering of the prophet. In his prefatory letter, Bibliander argued that Nahum had not been translated by learned men of his age.³⁵ In other words, it had not been treated by the humanists. This prophetic book, which speaks of God's judgement upon the nations, Bibliander added, was most appropriate for his own turbulent times, and should, therefore, be published in the interest of the church. As for his own role as translator, he adopted a guarded position:

»But I am not unaware that I am unequal with other divine translators, inasmuch as having been more fluent they are suited to the ears of our age, and that the majority also recommend shorter annotations, and indicate their opinions through pin pricks (as I might say). Indeed since our labour already seems to carry moderate influence in sacred letters or among those who have made a little progress, I have preferred to consult the work of those rather than my private opinion and to withdraw my own boldness in letters rather than to thrust it forth into the most sacred laws of charity.«³⁶

³² Ernst *Staehlin*, Die biblischen Vorlesungen Theodor Biblianders in einer Abschrift seines Bruders Heinrich Bibliander, in: *Zwingliana* 7/8 (1942), 522–526.

³³ *Moser*, Theodor Bibliander, nos. B–2.1–3.

³⁴ On the text and Bibliander's translation method, see Bruce *Gordon*, *Christo testimonium reddunt omnes scripturae: Theodor Bibliander's Oration on Isaiah (1532) and Commentary on Nahum (1534)*, in: *Gordon/ McLean, Shaping the Bible*, 107–142.

³⁵ *Propheta Nahum iuxta veritatem Hebraicam redditur*, Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1534 (*Moser*, Theodor Bibliander, no. B–3), 2r.

³⁶ *Propheta Nahum*, 2r–v.

Bibliander's tone anticipated the Zurich Latin Bible of a decade later in the manner that deference to other translators and sense of humility were tempered by the assurance that other scholars had been consulted in the preparation of the text. Further, the defensive stance belied a confidence in the linguistic achievements of the commentary. Concerning the nature of his translation, Bibliander provided a sense of purpose.

»I have at the same time raised my spirit to the divine explication of this writer Nahum, and also I have translated him anew into the Latin tongue, not only having imitated the special quality of the Hebrew and Roman words, but also having attempted to imitate the strength of their eloquence.«³⁷

For Bibliander, the translator possessed a prophetic spirit, for he »raised his spirit to the divine explication of this writer [Nahum]«. The translator acquires a distinctive voice, obliged both to achieve a fair rendering of the original Hebrew but also to provide the reader with good Latin. This claim distinguished his work, Bibliander argued, from the Vulgate occupying the other half of the page, which was neither entirely accurate nor appealing Latin. However, the relationship to Jerome's work was more complicated. A new translation, according to Bibliander, did not amount to a rejection of the Vulgate, which he freely declared to be the Bible of the Church. No one should think that he was attempting to replace the church father, though in a somewhat veiled critique he commented that Jerome was wont to remain a little too close to the Jewish sources. He concluded the letter to the reader with an appeal to Augustine found in the Zurich vernacular Bibles and later referenced by Bullinger in the 1543 Latin Bible. The divine Augustine held, Bibliander wrote, that it was useful to compare various translations, as well as to preserve what is familiar to the people, so that out of the collision of many versions the light of truth might spring forth more productively.³⁸

Bibliander's remarks reflect the multiple purposes of biblical translation in Zurich in which the ideals of both Jerome and Au-

³⁷ *Propheta Nahum*, 2v.

³⁸ *Propheta Nahum*, 2v.

gustine were appropriated. The inclusion of the Vulgate text was drawn from Augustine's argument that what was familiar to the church and people should be retained, whatever its shortcomings. Bibliander's translation of Nahum, however, was in the spirit of Jerome's principle of *Hebraica veritas*, the best possible interpretation of the original based on sound philology and use of rabbinic sources. Zurich sought to balance the two needs: humanist scholarship and pastoral care.

In Zurich the distinctive views of text and translation arose from a highly theological approach in which doctrinal instruction was embedded in the choice of vocabulary. Both Pellikan's *Commentaria* and Bibliander's Nahum, alongside works by Bullinger and Leo Jud, emphasized translation in the service of theological clarity. Alongside the use of words that carried specific theological meaning, the vernacular Bibles were heavily glossed and introduced with chapter summaries and extensive prefaces. In the Latin works the style of translation followed the principle of »complatio«, a smoothing of the text in pursuit of elegance and lucidity whilst retaining fidelity to the original.³⁹ At all cost an overly literal rendering of the original was to be avoided.

The result was a complex set of demands. What developed in Zurich stood in uneasy relationship to the first major Protestant translation of the Bible into Latin, which had appeared in 1534/35 in the nearby Swiss city of Basel, and was by Sebastian Münster, a former student of Konrad Pellikan.⁴⁰ This Bible offered a fairly literal rendering of the Hebrew together with extensive use of rabbinic material – large extracts of Jewish writings were inserted into the notes, something that appalled Luther. Münster's Bible was a major achievement in Hebrew scholarship. It first appeared in 1534 and 1535 in two folio volumes; this diglot text placed the Hebrew of Bomberg's first Rabbinic Bible alongside Münster's entirely new Latin translation in parallel columns. Each book of the

³⁹ Hobbs, *Pluriformity*, 485.

⁴⁰ *Hebraica Biblia Latina planeque nova Sebastiani Munsteri tralatione*, Basel: Johann Bebel for Michael Isengrin and Heinrich Petri, 1534/1535. On Münster, see the old, but useful biography Karl Heinz *Burmeister*, *Sebastian Münster: Versuch eines biographischen Gesamtbildes*, Basel 1963; Sophie *Kessler Mesguich*, *Early Christian Hebraists*, in: Saebø, *Hebrew Bible*, 268–272; *Burnett*, *Reassessing*, 181–201.

Bible was prefaced by a Latin introduction, and each chapter followed by Münster's Latin commentary. The translation was a colossal task, undertaken by a scholar working alone, and was, and remained, an immense service to scholars in an age when the community of Christian scholars with a genuine mastery of Hebrew was miniscule, a bare handful.

First of all, Münster translated literally, substituting word for word as best he was able; where was meaning if not in individual words? The result was »harsh«, »barbarous«, language which lacked the sonorous cadences and grammatical precision which a generation of Latinate humanists had been trained to practise and to esteem. Münster was unrepentant. This translation was by design »religious« not »Ciceronian«, and he expressed impatience with »delicate Latin ears«; such niceties were appropriate to profane literature, and not to Scripture, wherein even the Hebrew word order contained mysteries. He utterly rejected the concept of eloquence. The language must conform to the mind and spirit of the Hebrew peoples, even at the cost of retaining awkward-sounding Hebrew idioms. To change unnecessarily was to bleed meaning. Furthermore his annotations glossed every chapter with the interpretations of the Jewish mediaeval exegetes: Münster's approach to teaching was to hold nothing back, to trust the discrimination of the reader. The »obscure and tangled places« in scripture could not be fully understood without knowledge of the Hebrew tradition, and, although he anticipated attacks – Johannes Eck called him »rabbi Münster« – he intended to mediate this learning in service of a Christian readership. Indeed, it was as a combatant that he sought through his Bible to assert the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament, that it prefigured and prophesied the messiahship of Christ to any who read it aright.

How, then, did Münster regard Jerome's Vulgate? Münster, as had many before him, pointed to the »innumerable« and »intolerable errors« in the Vulgate translation as the motive for undertaking a new version. Yet Jerome for Münster, as for Pellikan and Bibliander, remained a model, and a forerunner, and a shield against criticism and smears.⁴¹ Jerome translated from the Hebrew,

⁴¹ On the crucial role of Jerome in early modern biblical discourse, see Scott

sought out Jewish teachers, toiled alone.⁴² Jerome also cautioned that Scripture was too important for indulging in stylistic elegancies. Münster resolved the tension by revering Jerome but denying that that he was the author of the Vulgate: one need only look at Jerome's commentaries, in which the mistranslations did not appear, to see this. The Vulgate was a patchwork of lesser minds; Jerome remained a model and a guide for the translator of Sacred Literature.

Münster's Bible was to appear in an expanded form in 1546, but at the end of the 1530s a curious episode took place that demonstrated both the strength of the communal approach to biblical scholarship that marked the South Rhineland school and the latent tensions.⁴³ The Zurich Church, in need of a Latin Bible, sought to put together Münster's text with the New Testament of Erasmus.⁴⁴ The Apocryphal books came from the Complutensian Polyglot. The Bible appeared in 1539 with an extensive preface by Bullinger in which he attacked pagan learning and wrote of »our wisdom«. For his part, Münster wrote to Bullinger, thanking him for the theological preface he had written in which Münster's translation was praised as »fide optima, dilegentia summa et sudoribus inestimabilis«. ⁴⁵

Mandelbrote, Origen against Jerome in Early Modern Europe, in: *Patristic Tradition and Intellectual Paradigms in the 17th Century*, ed. Silke-Petra Bergjan and Karla Pollmann, Tübingen 2010 (Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation 52), 105–135.

⁴² On Jerome and translation, see Jerome *Rebenich*, Jerome: The »Vir trilinguis« and the »Hebraica veritas«, in: *Vigiliae christianae* 47 (1993), 50–77; Vincent T. M. *Skemp*, Learning by Example: Exempla in Jerome's Translations and Revisions of Biblical Books, in: *Vigiliae christianae* 65 (2011), 257–284; Andrew *Cain*, The Letters of Jerome: Asceticism, Biblical Exegesis, and the Construction of Christian Authority in Late Antiquity, Oxford/New York 2009; Michael *Graves*, Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on His Commentary on Jeremiah, Leiden 2007; Megan Hale *Williams*, The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship, Chicago 2006.

⁴³ See Matthew *McLean*, Between Basel and Zürich: Humanist Rivalries and the Works of Sebastian Münster, in: *Walsby/Kemp*, The Book Triumphant, 270–294.

⁴⁴ *Biblia sacra utriusque testamenti et vetus quidem post omnes omnium hactenus aeditiones opera d. Sebastiani Munsteri evulgatum et ad Hebraicam veritatem quoad fieri potuit redditum [...]* Novum vero non solum ad Graecam veritatem, verum etiam ad multorum utriusque linguae et interpretum et codicum fidem opera d. Erasmi Rotterodami ultimo recognitum et aeditum. Additi sunt e LXX versione et Apocryphi libri sive Ecclesiastici, qui habentur extra canonem, Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1539.

⁴⁵ In Bullinger's preface to the 1539 Bible, *De Versione Bibliorum*. On Bullinger's reliance on other scholars for Hebrew, *Stotz*, Heinrich Bullinger, 126f. Münster's letter

Yet, despite Münster's pleasure in the adoption of his translation, the 1539 Bible presented it in a fashion at odds with his intended design. Offered as an octavo, this edition saw Münster's text shorn of the Hebrew-language column which the Latin column translated, shorn of the notes which explained words and the interpretations of the rabbis, shorn of its prefatory material, save that passage on the ordering of the canonical books. In this form it was not fit to serve its intended scholarly purpose. Without the annotations, the style of Münster's translation, so deliberately adopted to remove »obscuritas«, served no purpose and could only seem awkward alongside the New Testament of Erasmus.⁴⁶ That the edition went ahead in such a form appears to have been the will not of the Zürich scholars, and certainly not of Münster, but of the Basel printers who had underwritten the first edition of the *Hebraica Biblia*.

Münster's literal translation was not in line with the thinking of Bibliander, and without any annotations the Bible lacked theological shape. It was only printed once, but it bore testimony to the desire in Zurich church for a Latin translation of both testaments. Work on the vernacular Bible had continued apace and by 1540 a completely revised translation was printed by Froschauer.⁴⁷ It was at this point that Leo Jud was commissioned to begin work on a new Latin edition.

Why, one might ask, was Leo Jud charged with such an important task when such leading Hebraists as Pellikan and Bibliander were in the city? The answer is more complex than one might imagine. Certainly, Pellikan and Bibliander were committed to their teaching duties. Jud, for his part, was no novice, having been an assiduous translator of biblical, theological, and devotional texts for almost twenty years. During the 1530s a stream of vernacular editions of Erasmus, Thomas à Kempis, and the medieval

to Bullinger is dated 6 April 1539. A brief note recording this appears in Bullinger's *Diarium: Heinrich Bullingers Diarium (Annales vitae) der Jahre 1504–1574*, ed. Emil Egli, Basel 1904 (Quellen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte 2), 27.

⁴⁶ *Hebraica Biblia*, β5r: the annotations repair any obscurity caused by the use of Hebraisms in the translation.

⁴⁷ Die gantze Bibel, das ist, alle Bücher allts unnd neuws Testaments den ursprünglichen Spraachen nach auff's aller treüwlichst verteütschet, Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1540.

writer Ratramnus appeared.⁴⁸ Jud had been involved with the Prothezei from the start and was above all responsible for the evolving translations of the Zurich Bible.⁴⁹

However, there is more to the story, including an element central to the character of the 1543 Bible. The Latin translation was to be closely associated with Leo Jud not only because it was largely his work, but because he personally symbolized the Bible itself. As we shall see, in his preface to the edition, Heinrich Bullinger provides a vita of the dead Jud, attributing to him all the ideals of the Zurich church. The Jud of the 1543 Bible emerged as the model of Zurich scholarship, piety, and moderation. He had been in Zurich for the beginning of the reform movement in the early 1520s, survived the vicissitudes, and his spirit of learning, pastoral care, and humility was an exemplum for Bullinger's post-Kappel reconstructed church. By turning to Jud Bullinger was able to return to the origins of the Zurich reformation while embracing the changes essential for a new order. Jud was a founding father of the Zurich church, but the model he provided was of the scholar pastor, a man commemorated for his love of his parishioners, his excellent preaching, and careful scholarship. Jud was all the things Bullinger wanted to valorize, and, helpfully, he was not Zwingli.

The 1543 Zurich Latin Bible

The Zurich Latin Bible has a fascinating print history. In early 1543 it appeared in folio from the press of Christoph Froschauer,⁵⁰

⁴⁸ On Leo Jud's translation work see Christian Moser, Ratramnus von Corbie als »testis veritatis« in der Zürcher Reformation: Zu Heinrich Bullinger und Leo Juds Ausgabe des »Liber de corpore et sanguine Domini« (1532), in: Strenarum lanx: Beiträge zur Philologie und Geschichte des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit. Festgabe für Peter Stotz zum 40-jährigen Jubiläum des Mittellateinischen Seminars der Universität Zürich, ed. Martin H. Graf and Christian Moser, Zug 2003, 235–309.

⁴⁹ Backus has shown how this was reflected in his interpretation of the book of Revelation: Irena Backus, *Reformation Readings of the Apocalypse*: Geneva, Zurich, and Wittenberg, Oxford 2000 (Oxford Studies in Historical Theology), 93 f.

⁵⁰ *Biblia sacrosancta testamenti veteris et novi, e sacra Hebraeorum lingua Graecorumque fontibus, consultis simul orthodoxis interpretibus religiosissime translata in sermonem Latinum [...]*, Zurich: Christoph Froschauer, 1543 (Moser, Theodor Bibliander, no. B–8.1a/b).

followed the next year by quarto and octavo editions with much of the critical apparatus removed.⁵¹ The octavo *Biblia* has none of the prefatory material. The whole text was produced again in Zurich in 1550.⁵² In 1545 the Zurich translation mysteriously appeared in Paris from the press of the royal Robert Estienne.⁵³ The edition, designated a »nova translatio« without attribution to Protestant Zurich, was alongside the text of the Vulgate. The only portions of the prefatory material retained were the Compendium and list of books. The work became known as the »Vatable Bible« on account of the extensive notes included from François Vatable's lectures by his students and was reprinted in Paris by Estienne in 1565.⁵⁴ In 1546 Estienne produced an edition of the Psalms with the Vulgate and Zurich Latin translations, once more with the notes from Vatable's lectures.⁵⁵ Perhaps most astonishing was the printing of the Vatable Bible in 1584/5 in Salamanca. The parallel Vulgate and Zurich Latin translations appeared with the Vatable notes, which had been somewhat revised by Francesco Sancho and the theologians of Salamanca university. Whether the provenance of the Zurich translation was known to the Spanish scholars is not known.⁵⁶

The *Biblia sacrosancta* is structured in three parts. The first section contains the prefatory material and the Old Testament, opening with an *Encomium Scripturae sanctae* followed by an unsigned letter to the reader most likely written by Bullinger on behalf of the scholars involved in the translation (Bibliander, Pellikan and Gwalther). This letter precedes a modified version of the preface Bullinger had written for the 1539 Bible.⁵⁷ The two prefaces are followed by a *Compendium et scopus totius sacrae Scripturae utriusque Testamenti*. The books of the Old Testament were ordered according to a pattern that the Zurich scholars believed to come

⁵¹ Moser, Theodor Bibliander, no. B-8.2 (quarto) and B-8.3 (octavo).

⁵² Moser, Theodor Bibliander, no. B-8.6.

⁵³ Moser, Theodor Bibliander, no. B-8.4.

⁵⁴ Moser, Theodor Bibliander, no. B-8.7.

⁵⁵ Moser, Theodor Bibliander, no. B-8.5.

⁵⁶ Moser, Theodor Bibliander, no. B-8.8.

⁵⁷ The letter to the reader is entitled, »De operis huius instituto et ratione ad Christianum lectorem praefatio«. The preface from the 1539 Bible is »De omnibus sanctae scripturae libris eorumque praestantia et dignitate Heinrychi Bullingeri expositio, ad lectorem Christianum.«

from Cyprian.⁵⁸ As the preface states, the principal translator was Leo Jud, but following Jud's death in 1542 Theodor Bibliander took over the task and was responsible for Ezekiel 40–48, Daniel, Job, Psalms 102–150, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Solomon.⁵⁹ As noted above, Bibliander's translation of Nahum was reprinted in the 1543 Bible.

The second part of the Bible was the work of one man, Petrus Cholinus, who taught Greek in Zurich. He took responsibility for the Apocryphal books, or the »ecclesiastici libri« as they were named, for which he wrote an extensive preface dated 30 October 1542. The third part of the Bible is the New Testament, which is a slightly revised version of the 1535 Erasmus New Testament and annotations. The work on the New Testament was largely undertaken by Rudolph Gwalther, though Cholinus collaborated on the task until his death from the plague. A remarkable feature of the New Testament was Rudolf Gwalther's *Argumenta*, a verse summary of the whole Bible, designed to be learned by heart. Our discussion of the Bible will focus on its prefatory material with particular attention to the new preface prepared in 1543.

The Zurich Latin Bible was printed with two different title pages. One bore the coat-of-arms of the city of Zurich and the other Froschauer's printer's mark. The printing house was closely connected to the ruling magistrates and the presence of the city's arms on the title page only reinforced the official nature of the Bible. Also on the title page is a quotation from Romans 15:4: »For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.«

The prefatory material opens with the *Encomium Scripturae sanctae*, which is a series of quotations from scripture emphasizing the continuity between the two Testaments. The choice of term »encomium« is most intriguing, for the words of the Bible are used

⁵⁸ Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings, 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs.

⁵⁹ See Moser, Theodor Bibliander, 65.

to pour praise on scripture. The authors are clear that the beginning point of their Bible is God's Word. The biblical passages speak to God's intervention in the world through his communication. God has spoken, issued his commands and it is the duty of the people to obey. »From heaven he made you hear his voice to discipline you. On earth he showed you his great fire, and you heard his words from out of the fire« (Deut 4:36), and »Keep his commands and obey him; serve him and hold fast to him« (Deut. 13:4). There are also quotations from psalm 22 and 2 Timothy. Likewise, the *Encomium* quotes from Luke 16:29: »Abraham replied, ›they have Moses and the prophets; let them listen to them‹«. The passages chosen for the *Encomium* reflect profound themes in Zurich theology and ecclesiology: the one covenant uniting the two Testaments; the Christological reading of the Old Testament; and the emphasis on prophetic authority.

Following the *Encomium* is an anonymous and lengthy apology for the Zurich Bible (running to nine folio sides) likely written by Heinrich Bullinger and entitled *De operis huius institutio et ratione*. This preface will form the focus of the remaining part of the paper. The theological character of the Bible is revealed in the order of the prefatory material. First, in the *Encomium* scripture authenticates itself. *De operis* provides the historical and scholarly justification of the Zurich Bible. The second preface treats the nature of scripture and provides an account of the books of the Bible. Finally, in the *Compendium* the Zurich scholars present a statement of faith that forms the foundation of their theological reading of the Bible.

Let us turn to the first preface. *De operis huius institutio et ratione* details the methods employed in the preparation of the Bible and addresses the crucial objections which the Zurichers anticipated to a new Latin translation. A key rhetorical strategy in *De operis* was for the Zurichers to allow certain church fathers, notably Jerome and Augustine, to speak on behalf of their church. The tone is set as the preface opens with a quotation from Jerome's letter to Pope Damasus:

»Pious work, yet perilous presumption, to change the old and aging language of the world, to carry it back to infancy, for to judge others is to invite judging by all of them. Is there indeed any learned or unlearned man,

who when he picks up the volume in his hand, and takes a single taste of it, and sees what he will have read to differ, might not instantly raise his voice, calling me a forger, proclaiming me now to be a sacrilegious man, that I might dare to add, to change, or to correct anything in the old books?»⁶⁰

The translators of the Zurich Bible fully expected to be attacked for their efforts, but this response only justified their enterprise because it associated them with Jerome, who was fiercely criticized. The appeal to Jerome was subtle and multifaceted. Principally, Jerome was a model of scholarship and piety, and the Zurichers sought to cast their biblical work in his image. This action, however, was not without a degree of tension as the status of the Vulgate was somewhat ambiguous. On the one hand, the Zurich scholars, like Münster, were wary of suggesting that the Vulgate as received was Jerome's work. Yet, on the other, they spoke of the common version of the Latin Bible that was to be honoured. Further, although Bullinger sought protection behind the words of Jerome and Augustine, there was a clear sense that the translation produced in Zurich was superior in terms of scholarship. This posturing was precisely what Bibliander had done in his Nahum commentary. The Zurich Bible was rooted in antiquity but its quality was owing to the humanist scholarship of the sixteenth century.

Nevertheless, Jerome was the model to be emulated and the Zurich scholars identified key principles they had appropriated from the father: that he had not undertaken the translation for any personal gain, but rather because the pope had commissioned him; that he had done it in great love; that he had not added or subtracted anything to sacred scripture; and that he had worked from the original Hebrew and Greek.⁶¹ The Zurichers aligned themselves with these ideals, arguing that they did not have a private desire for a translation but had the task urged on them by »pious brothers«. Many leaders of the churches requested a new translation, and at first they had demurred, not because they thought themselves unequipped, but on account of their belief that others were better positioned to complete the task. Bullinger came

⁶⁰ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α 2r. Translation at http://www.ccel.org/ccel/pearse/more-fathers/files/jerome_preface_gospels.htm.

⁶¹ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α 2r.

to his central argument in justifying a new translation. There was not merely one translation from the Hebrew and Greek into Latin in existence.⁶² No form of writing, the preface continued, is more open to calumnies than translation, for even the learned disagree and are in love with their own versions. No one can know everything, Bullinger wrote, and 1 Corinthians 13:9 (»we know in part [...]«) was quoted to support the Zurich contention that it was not sufficient to have one Bible, because no one individual or group of scholars possess the ability to produce a definitive version.

The preface extends the argument. Not only should there be more than one translation, but there was something deficient in the existing Latin editions. Those who had undertaken translations from the Hebrew scriptures should be praised for their efforts, yet there were difficulties. Some had remained too close to the Septuagint, a sensitive point given Zwingli's veneration of the inspired ancient Greek translation. Others had followed too zealously the old Latin translations, while others had been too literal in their rendering of the Hebrew.⁶³ The reference to the Latin translations meant the Vulgate.

The translation of Sebastian Münster fell in the final category, and although it is clear from the annotations of the Zurich Bible that his work was heavily consulted and referenced, Jud, Bibliander, and Pellikan rejected his rendering of Hebrew as suitable for reading. The consequence of these shortcomings, according to the preface, was the failure to produce a coherent Latin translation. These remarks from the preface are all the more striking if we consider their implication for Zurich biblical culture. Bullinger was arguing that there was a place for a new Latin translation because no satisfactory one existed. Quite consciously he was distinguishing the 1543 Bible from what had come before: the reliance on the Septuagint (Zwingli), the Vulgate (Pellikan), and literal translation (Münster).

The Zurichers uncoupled Jerome from the Vulgate in order to associate him with their translation project. The connection between Jerome and the Zurich Bible was made explicit in the por-

⁶² »Praterea extare hodie non unam Bibliorum ex hebraeorum et Graecorum fontibus depromptam translationem Latinam.« *Biblia sacrosancta*, α2r.

⁶³ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α2v.

trayal of Leo Jud in the preface. To put it briefly, the vita of Jud was crafted to cast him in the likeness of the great translator of the Bible. Like Jerome, Jud was undaunted by detractors and followed the saying of the church father that »in the temple of God each one offers what he is able, some gold, some silver, some precious stones, others linen and purple and scarlet cloth; for us, it is fine if we offer the skin and hair of goats.«⁶⁴ Jud also made reference to another passage of Jerome, which he adopted as his own. »There are different gifts and talents of God, and cursed be the one who does not diligently busy himself with his entrusted talent; and so, in my poverty, I will attempt to be of some profit, if I am able.«⁶⁵ Bullinger put the words of Jerome into Jud's mouth; he not only translated according to the manner of the church father, but he spoke with the same voice. Jerome emerged as the patron of the Zurich Bible, turning the argument of the reformers' opponents on its head. Rather than causing offence by offering a rival Latin translation, they had followed the legacy of Jerome, who, as they interpreted him, advocated a plurality of editions.

The Leo Jud presented in the preface possessed many of the qualities of Jerome. Jud studied the Latin and Greek editions, as well as orthodox commentators of the Church, and after more than eighteen years of labour began to produce a new translation of the Old Testament from the *Hebraica veritas*. In his translation project he read the rabbinic interpretations, old and recent Christian writers, and did philological work. The preface described him as having a stack of books »like a forest«. All of this, and this point is crucial, was for the use of the Church (»ecclesia utilitatem«). Jud consulted with his colleagues, and when they corrected him he took it with good grace. He was aided by the work and diligence of the most renowned men, meaning Bibliander and Pellikan, who were experts in the Hebrew language and knew the commentaries. Like Jerome, according to the preface, he did not omit, distort, corrupt, or shorten the text.

The portrait of Leo Jud (or imitatio) presented the Zurich principles of biblical translation.⁶⁶ Jud's primary goal in translation

⁶⁴ Biblia sacrosancta, α2v.

⁶⁵ Biblia sacrosancta, α2v.

⁶⁶ On imitation and exemplarity, see Ann Moss, *Literary Imitation in the Sixteenth*

was the promotion of virtue and true piety in the service of what was useful to the many. According to the preface, he sought above all to be faithful to the Hebrew, but was not »superstitious« in his translation. This claim meant that he would translate the sense as faithfully as possible without excessive attachment to the literal meaning of words. For the most part he made use of plain language, but there were other considerations. Well-known words of Apostolic usage (such as *Benedictus*, *gratia*, etc), familiar to the church and the people, were retained, reflecting a pastoral quality to the translation.

This position, of course, had also been Erasmus's. The preface stressed the importance of plainness in translation, for 'God hates proud eloquence', preferring holy moderation joined with religion in speech.⁶⁷ Such claims convey the ambivalent attitude towards eloquence, which had to be used appropriately. Such an acknowledgement of the difficulties in rendering of the original into Latin led Bullinger to account for the annotations accompanying the translation. As no one human translation could be flawless the notes were presented to aid the reader to access the simplicity of the biblical word. As a translator, Jud smoothed (»complanatio«) out the bumps, filled in the holes. The Zurich Bible sought a balance between Latin that was easily accessible to its intended audience, the clergy, and fidelity to the original language. As one would expect of humanist scholars the language of classical rhetoric is evident. There is a particular emphasis on *perspecuitas*, the comprehensibility of individual words and of words joined together in a sentence. The result was to be a text that was at once readable and captured the literary forms of the Hebrew. The crucial word was moderation (»mediocritas«).

Century: Writers and Readers, Latin and French, in: *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, 1st ed., vol. 3, Cambridge 1999, 107–118; Timothy Hampton, *Writing from History: The Rhetoric of Exemplarity in Renaissance Literature*, Ithaca, NY 1990, particularly chapters 1 and 2; Izora Scott, *Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero in the Renaissance: With Translations of Letters between Pietro Bembo and Gianfrancesco Pico »On Imitation« and a Translation of Desiderius Erasmus, »The Ciceronian (Ciceronianus)«*, New York, NY 1910.

⁶⁷ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α3r.

Central to the preface was an account of Leo Jud's death, which involved a confession of faith and a commission to his fellow ministers. The Christological character of the confession is unmistakable:

»That Jesus Christ (he who is of one essence with the Father and the Holy Spirit) is essentially God, but also true man, from God the father, following his many promises, sent into the world, from the Holy Spirit in the body and in the womb of the pure Virgin Mary received and born. He is the true and expected Messiah, the one king, the great high priest, and redeemer of the world, who though guiltless and without sin suffered for our sins, with his precious blood washed us from our sins, and reconciled us with his father, with his living, powerful resurrection brought us damned men to life again in our nature and through our service.«⁶⁸

This confession is an image of Zurich polity. The heart of the translation work is Christ, who is to be found throughout the Old Testament. The scene of Jud's death represents the communal nature of biblical scholarship. Gathered around the bed and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the brethren are admonished by a dying colleague to continue the work. But something else highly significant was taking place. The Zurichers were appropriating Jerome. Whereas the church father had been the model of the single scholar laboring aware in solitude, Jud was presented in the context of communal biblical scholarship of the Swiss model. Jerome, therefore, was sanctioning their work and their means of working. Jud passed the baton to Theodor Bibliander to finish the Bible project. Bibliander was charged with completing the last chapters of Ezekiel, Daniel, Job, psalms 102–150, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs. Jud also requested that Konrad Pellikan review the work he had done and supervise the publishing of the Bible.⁶⁹

We have seen how Jerome was brought into the Zurich church, but what of the Vulgate? It could not be ignored as it had played a crucial part of the Prophezei from its inception. Bullinger responded to those who accused the Zurich church of undermining Jerome's version.⁷⁰ The preface assented to the idea that the authority of the scriptures was inviolable in the Church but argued that the

⁶⁸ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α3v.

⁶⁹ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α4r.

⁷⁰ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α4r.

version of the Bible chosen to be used should be free. For authority, it cited from the Decretal canon, as adapted from Augustine's letter to Jerome. »The loyalty of the old books to the Hebrew volumes must be examined: so the truth of the Greek words decides the norm of the new ones.«⁷¹ The governing principle was fidelity to the original languages. On these grounds there was room for another translation, for, according to the preface, the Latin Vulgate version did not correspond to the Hebrew and Greek in everything.

The Zurich scholars hammered home their central contention that the early church possessed many translations of the Old and New Testaments. Their appropriation of Jerome had multiple purposes. As a translator of the Bible from Hebrew and Greek he was not only a scholarly and devotional model, but the very historical justification for their labours. Even though, according to Bullinger, such fathers as Augustine, Cyprian, and Jerome knew Greek well (although Augustine did not), there were, the preface maintained, numerous editions of the New Testament. This claim was confirmed by Erasmus in his annotations.⁷² In Jerome's time there was no one Latin Bible in the Western Church that carried such authority that he did not dare to attempt a new translation.

The matter was not so easily resolved. The relationship between the Zurich Latin Bible and the Vulgate was complex. On the one hand, the historical justification for a new Latin translation rested on their argument that Jerome had not intended his Bible to be authoritative in the Church. There was little doubt, on the other, that the Vulgate was held in high esteem as the familiar Bible. The Vulgate embodied tradition, and the Zurich churchmen were struggling to position their humanist scholarship in relationship to history. This ambivalence is evident when the preface addressed the ticklish question of whether the Vulgate could still be regarded as the work of Jerome. *The Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers* is cited where Jerome wrote that he translated »the New Testament with fidelity to the Greek and the Old Testament close to [iuxta] the Hebrew«. ⁷³ Nevertheless, the preface continues, there remained

⁷¹ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α4v.

⁷² *Biblia sacrosancta*, α4v.

⁷³ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α4v. The *Catalogue* was written by Epiphanius (310–403).

some skepticism: »whether that version which is today received as the Vulgate, and is called Jeromian [Hieronymiana], is the very version that he mentioned, is not for us to say. Indeed his books cry out against it not a little, especially his *Questions* (On Genesis) or the *Hebraic Traditions*.«⁷⁴ The Zurich scholars adopted the familiar line that Jerome's own commentaries bear witness against the veracity of the Vulgate, yet unlike Münster and others they were not prepared to take a firm stance. This reflected the enduring reverence for the Bible in Zurich, where great stock was placed in historical continuity.

The preface returns to the question of multiple translations of scripture and draws once more on Jerome's words. The church exercises its »liberty« in accepting and rejecting translations and this privilege, according to the Zurich writers, is supported by Jerome's own remarks from the prefaces to his biblical commentaries. From the preface to the Pentateuch – »What, therefore [...] do we condemn the ancients? By no means! But after the studies of the pious in the House of God we do what we are able, and we offer in the tabernacle of God what we are able according to our portion of strength, knowing that the riches of one does not sully the poverty of others.«⁷⁵ And from his preface to Job – »Let those who will keep the old books with their gold and silver letters on purple skins, or, to follow the ordinary phrase, in »uncial characters«, loads of writing rather than manuscripts, if only they will leave for me and mine, our poor pages and copies which are less remarkable for beauty than for accuracy«.

Following these slightly oblique references to Jerome, the preface turned to Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana* (2 ch. 11), »most certain is that the ancient churches of east and west used very many and diverse copies and translations, which holily they did not believe and assert to be of any harm to the churches, but of great use.«⁷⁶ No other book in the history of the world has drawn as many outstanding scholars, who have translated, edited, and

⁷⁴ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α4v. See Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis, translated with Introduction and Commentary by C.T. Robert Hayward, Oxford 1995 (Oxford Early Christian Studies).

⁷⁵ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α5r.

⁷⁶ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α5r.

commented on it. This was true of eastern witnesses such as Origen and his *Hexapla* (six translations side by side), the *Septuagint*, and the *Editio communis*. Those who complain about contemporary translations do not know their church history. The church should not demand that these translations agree word for word, for that was not the case in the early church. It should suffice that they are translated faithfully and do not differ in doctrine and religion («*nostra religio*»). This appeal for unity contained a troubling note. The highly theological structure of the Zurich Bible, produced at a moment of great conflict within the Protestant churches, made all too likely that other Bibles would not agree »in doctrine and religion«.

Clearly the matter of the Vulgate was not resolved and the preface returned to the question and Jerome, »to follow his example«. The Zurich scholars did not, they claimed, wish to quarrel with others on account of their edition and version, nor had they sought to slight Jerome in any way. Further they had not sought to decree imperiously that their version should be received and others »spat out«. Those who do not like the Zurich Bible still have the Vulgate, which »we do not condemn by our version at all, although nevertheless we openly admit that it does not always and everywhere agree with the truth of the Hebrew and Greek.«⁷⁷ This is very much the spirit of Bibliander; respect for the Vulgate was coupled with a pervasive sense of superiority.

The remarks concerning the Vulgate anticipated a hostile reaction to the translation, and the preface contained a plea for a gentle reception, acknowledging that not everything was achieved in this Bible. If it had fallen short in anyway, »it was in error, and not a crime and they [the translators] should be corrected, not damned.«⁷⁸ They were always prepared to learn better, »for that reason if anyone more felicitously, more learnedly, and more tersely translates from the Hebrew into Latin the sacred books after those translations of ours, we will not be envious, we will not reprove, but we will approve rather of their faith and diligence, giving thanks the Lord, who gives faithful and felicitous talents to

⁷⁷ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α5r.

⁷⁸ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α5v.

his church.⁷⁹ The apology was common enough and such sentiments could be found in the biblical works of Erasmus and Sebastian Münster. The words acquire a greater resonance when we consider how isolated the Zurich church was in the early 1540s. Repudiated by Luther and most of German Protestantism, Bullinger and his colleagues had few allies.

The preface turned to the contents of the Bible and cited the *Expositio symboli* of Cyprian as the authority for the order of the books.⁸⁰ The *Expositio* was actually by Rufinus Aquileia, whom Erasmus identified as the author. In his 1521 edition of Cyprian (d. 258), Erasmus included an exposition of the Creed that he seems to have attributed to the father.⁸¹ This attribution was erroneous as the *Expositio* was, in fact, the work of Rufinus (340–410), who in a passage where he treated the topic of inspiration listed the books of the Bible.⁸² Both the Zurichers and Philipp Melancthon continued to attribute the work to Cyprian, perhaps as a subtle criticism of Erasmus.⁸³ Whatever the case, the order of books found in the *Expositio* was employed by the Zurich scholars. In the *Biblia sacrosancta* the Pentateuch is followed by the history books, the major and minor prophets, Job, Psalms and the three books of Solomon (Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, Song of Songs).

As for the annotations, the preface provides a detailed account of how they had been prepared. Leo Jud wrote the marginal summaries for the books he translated, a task completed by Theodor Bibliander following Jud's death. Compared to the Old Testament of Sebastian Münster, the marginal annotations for the 1543 Bible are much lighter, but by no means insignificant. According to the Zurich translators their purpose was twofold: to provide variant readings and to elucidate the meaning of the authors. They offered

⁷⁹ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α5v.

⁸⁰ *Biblia sacrosancta*, α5v.

⁸¹ *Opera divi Caecilii Cypriani episcopi Carthaginensis, ab innumeris mendis repurgata, adiectis nonnullis libellis ex vetustissimis exemplaribus, quae hactenus non habebantur, ac semotis iis, quae falso videbantur inscripta, una cum annotatiunculis*, Basel: Johann Froben, 1520.

⁸² *Opera divi Caecilii Cypriani*, 382.

⁸³ Timothy J. *Wengert*, Philip Melancthon's Last Word to Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, Papal Legate at the 1530 Diet of Augsburg, in: Irene Dingel et al., *Philip Melancthon: Theologian in Classroom, Confession, and Controversy*, Göttingen 2012 (*Refo500 Academic Studies* 7), 222.

occasion for a fuller consideration of the text and even a justification (»ratio«) of the translation,⁸⁴ though, the preface continues, »we dare to promise that only a few annotations will be after the manner of a very lengthy commentary.«

Of particular interest is the system behind the annotations and the way in which it informs us as to how the Bible was to be read. The description of the annotations above applies to the material in the outer margin, which was provided by Jud and Bibliander. On the inside margin we find the work of Konrad Pellikan, who had been charged with editing the whole Bible. Pellikan sought to draw attention to themes that were particularly memorable and notable (»memorabilia« and »observanda«). A series of »loci communes« formed a »concordantia« by which obscure passages might be compared with clearer ones. According to the preface Pellikan's approach was also based on Augustine's teaching in *De doctrina Christiana* in which he treated scripture interpreting scripture.⁸⁵ Pellikan's annotations consisted of brief thematic phrases and parallel biblical references that formed a theological reading of the Bible. The reader is directed to other passages in scripture that treat the same theme.

The two sets of marginal notes guide the reader in different ways. On the outer margin are the chapter summaries and notes that refer to (»alii legunt«) the Vulgate, the Septuagint, and Sebastian Münster's translation, demonstrating that the Zurich Bible was in conversation with these editions. These annotations also contain references to Hebrew words and offer more literal rendering of the original. It is here also that one finds historical information that illuminates the context of the passage. Only rarely does one encounter theological comment. The book of Isaiah is one place where theology makes its way into the outer margin annotations as there are numerous references to Christ and the Church. In addition to grammatical and historical information the Zurich scholars had great interest in the rhetorical nature of the Bible and a particular delight in demonstrating where classical rhetorical forms were to be found in scripture. This focus corre-

⁸⁴ Biblia sacrosancta, α6r.

⁸⁵ Biblia sacrosancta, α6r.

sponded to Bullinger's second preface, which defended the Bible as a sophisticated piece of writing that surpasses all the works of antiquity in its articulation of wisdom.

The inner margin annotations, the work of Pellikan, were entirely theological in nature. As noted, they provided a system for reading the text through the use of »loci communes« and parallel passages. Further, pithy theological and pastoral statements are offered, intended to aid the clergy in study and the preparation of sermons. The Bible became a theological textbook whose foundation was expressed in the *Compendium*. The two sets of marginal notes tell us a great deal about the character of the Zurich Bible. In the two margins we find the attempt to balance humanist learning with doctrine; the former in the service of the latter. Unlike Münster's Bible, the first major work of Protestant translation of scripture into Latin, which invited multiple readings, the Zurich Bible was shaped by the material on the inside margin, which was referenced to the prefatory writings. Both in the way in which the Bible was set out for the reader and in the language chosen by the translators, clear theological decisions had been made.

The preface has remarkably little to say about the New Testament other than to inform the reader that the text was based on Erasmus' (»beatissimae memoriae magnus«) last edition of 1535. The Dutch humanist's annotations had been slightly emended as a result of consultation with other editions, work done by Peter Cholinus and Rudolph Gwalther.⁸⁶ Gwalther was solely responsible for all the chapter summaries (»argumenta«) as well as the annotations from Acts 14 to the end of the work. The rest he did with others. What was said earlier about the Old Testament was repeated for the New: that there was no wish to impugn the Vulgate with this edition. »Should the Vulgate still be read in schools of theology, and the churches, and alone cited in sacred assemblies, there is no objection here.«⁸⁷ In common with other translators of the Bible in the sixteenth century the Zurichers had no doubt that their work would be criticized by others, but in this respect they would suffer as Jerome did.

⁸⁶ Biblia sacrosancta, α6v.

⁸⁷ Biblia sacrosancta, α6v.

De operis huius institutio et ratione provided the historical and linguistic justification for the Zurich Latin Bible. Through its appropriation of Jerome and Augustine it located itself in the biblical world of the early church, shaped by the influence of Erasmus. We find the Zurich church attempting to address several issues concurrently. How was Hebrew to be translated into Latin? What was the place of rabbinic sources? And how was humanist learning to be balanced by doctrinal fidelity? To understand the character of the Zurich response to these pressing questions of the early reformation *De operis* has to be read together with the other prefatory material with which it was placed in the Bible, and we shall briefly turn to these texts.

De omnibus scripturae sanctae, referred to in the first preface as the »Expositio«, was written by Bullinger for the 1539 Zurich Latin Bible and revised and somewhat expanded for the 1543 translation. Having established the historical authority of biblical translations in the first preface, Bullinger turned to the nature of scripture itself. His arguments echo those found in his *De scripturae sanctae autoritate* (1538), which he dedicated to Henry VIII. The tone of the preface is aggressive and almost polemical as Bullinger attacked those (unnamed) persons who regard scripture as inferior to the great works of classical literature. The quarrel is difficult to place, but it may well have concerned a disagreement among printers in Basel, who were publishing classical texts. Bullinger followed Juan de Vives (whom he cites) in his assault on Aristotle. Cicero appears as a witness for the prosecution and defence as Bullinger invoked the great Roman's authority both as an example of vain knowledge and as a guide to true rhetoric. The position that emerged reflected the educational system developed in Zurich; the liberal arts were not to be understood as an end in and of themselves, but as preparation for the study of scripture.⁸⁸

The prefatory material concludes with a *Compendium et scopus totius sacrae scripturae*. This work is a twelve article confession of faith that forms the theological heart of the Zurich Bible. The

⁸⁸ Anja-Silvia Göing, Die Ausbildung reformierter Prediger in Zürich 1531–1575: Vorstellung eines pädagogischen Projekts, in: *Bildung und Konfession: Theologenausbildung im Zeitalter der Konfessionalisierung*, ed. Herman J. Selderhuis and Markus Wriedt, Tübingen 2006 (Spätmittelalter und Reformation NS 27), 293–310.

articles were a summary of what the Old Testament and New Testament teach (»docent«) laid out in a theological order that mirrored Bullinger's other works. In the outer margin are the theological topoi, such as »Deus trinus et unus«, »homo«, »peccatum«, »ira, mors et damnatio«, etc. On the inside margin the reader finds the relevant scriptural references from the Old and New Testaments. The articles are extensive and take the reader through the whole of salvation history. For example, the Christological reading of the Old Testament is clearly evident in the fifth paragraph:

»But we learn by the books of the New Testament that the promised Christ (who is above all things God forever blessed and adumbrated and figured by sacrifices in the books of Old Testament) was at last sent by the Father, at that time, which he had established by his own council and had foretold in the prophets, at that time in which every evil was abounding. But he was sent, and made incarnate, and died and was raised from the dead, so that not on account of good works (for we were all sinners), but truly so that he might exhibit the abundant riches of his grace which he had promised and so that he might save us according to his mercy.«⁸⁹

The *Compendium* was crucial to the reading of the Bible. It was intended as proof that the teaching of the Zurich church was grounded in scripture alone, and as such it determined the essential pedagogical nature of the Bible. The reader was to be instructed in true doctrine through the reading of scripture and the marginal notes provided by the apparatus. The parallel biblical references led to the *Compendium*, where the reader received instruction. Further, there is a strong correlation between the theological topoi provided alongside the articles and those used by Pellikan in the text. This system of referencing brought the reader to the theological teaching of the Zurich churchmen.

The Zurich Latin Bible of 1543 had multiple purposes. As a book for the wider church, it declared the historical lineage, biblical scholarship, and doctrinal soundness of the Zurich Reformation. At home, it served as an essential tool for the training of clergy. Above all, however, it was intended to demonstrate the unitive nature of the Zurich church under Heinrich Bullinger. It was a book that embodied the institutional vision of the man who

⁸⁹ Biblia sacrosancta, 75r.

succeeded Huldrych Zwingli. He prosecuted reform with a firm hand. Scholarship was to be united with piety, the intellectual rigour of Jerome the translator was united with the pastoral concerns of Augustine the bishop. The *Biblia sacrosancta*, through its methods of translation, moved between the extremes of the literal and overly Ciceronian. In all things moderation, reflecting Bullinger's desire to stabilize and define the Zurich. Most importantly, text and paratext demonstrated the scriptural foundation of Zurich's theology.

In its material form the *Biblia sacrosancta* embodied the restored church in Zurich. The pages themselves reflected Bullinger's ideal of the right worship of God. With their clean Roman type and sparse annotations, the pages of the *Biblia* revealed Zurich's liturgical aesthetic of drawing the undistracted eye to the physical appearance of the Word, just as with presence of the table and pulpit at the front of whitewashed churches. The *Biblia* was the ecclesia. Scholarship and doctrine came together in a book shaped by memory and forgetting. The *Biblia sacrosancta* of 1543 gave the Zurich church a past and a patron, Jerome. It provided a model of doctrine and piety for home and across the Reformation world. There was, however, a price. Zurich could only have its Bible and church by remaining silent about the man who had begun its reformation.

Bruce Gordon, Ph.D, Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale Divinity School, Yale University, USA

Abstract: In 1543 the Zurich reformers produced Latin translations of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha together with a revised edition of Erasmus' New Testament. The *Biblia sacrosancta* was a beautiful volume, Froschauer's finest work. The work on the Old Testament was primarily done by Leo Jud, though it was completed by Theodor Bibliander and Konrad Pellikan after his death in 1542. The translation, together with the textual apparati, and the extensive prefaces form the most complete expression of the theological and ecclesiastical vision of the Zurich church under Heinrich Bullinger. Printed twelve years after the death of Huldrych Zwingli, the Bible embodied the ideals of a restored church that had to turn its back on its fallen founder. Zwingli was never mentioned and the model for a new, proud, and confident church was St Jerome, represented in the figure of the translator Leo Jud. This essay explores the relationship between biblical interpretation, identity, and church building for the second generation of the Reformation.

Keywords: Heinrich Bullinger, Leo Jud, Konrad Pellikan, Theodor Bibliander, *Biblia Sacrosancta*, Latin Bible, Translation, Hebrew, Zurich