Antonio Gerace*

Francis Lucas ‘of Bruges’ and Textual Criticism of the Vulgate Before and After the Sixto-Clementine (1592)

DOI 10.1515/jemc-2016-0008

Abstract: This article deals with to the little known but very influential Leuven biblical scholar Francis Lucas ‘of Bruges’ (1548/9–1619). In particular, it traces the change of methodology in Lucas’ textual critical activity, due to publishing of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate (1592), intended by the Vatican as the definitive text of the Vulgate. The author shows how Lucas was a realist and adapted his scholarly activities in the field of textual criticism to the contemporary ecclesiastical policies and sensitivities through the analysis of Lucas’ works.

Keywords: Francis Lucas ‘of Bruges’, John Henten, Nicholas Tacitus Zegers, textual criticism, Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, Council of Trent

1 Introduction

In its fourth session, the Council of Trent declared the Latin Vulgate ‘authentica.’ However, since the Council fathers were also aware of the many scribal mistakes in the text due to its thousand-year history, they asked for the publication of an emended version to be produced.¹ The Council called for an intense textual critical and philological study of the Bible in its Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Syriac and Latin versions, in order to reconstruct the ‘original’ text. Several Catholic scholars devoted themselves to this work, including the focus of this

¹ “Insuper eadem sacrosancta Synodus [...] statuit et declarat, ut haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot saeculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur, et quod [=ut] nemo illam reiicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat [...] decernit et statuit, ut posthac sacra scriptura, potissimum vero haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio quam emendatissime imprimatur” (“Sessio quarta: Decretum secundum; Recipitur vulgate editio Bibliae praescribiturque modus interpretandi sacram scripturam ...,” in *Concilium Tridentinum: Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatum nova collectio* [=CT; 13 vols.; Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1901–2001], 5.3:91–92).

*Corresponding author: Antonio Gerace, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; Fscire, Bologna, Italy, E-mail: antonio.gerace@kuleuven.be

contribution, the Leuven scholar Francis Lucas ‘of Bruges’ (1548/9–1619). Unfortunately, the secondary literature on this author is sparse. The most valuable among these is the study of Arthur De Schrevel, who wrote an article on Lucas in the *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*² and compiled a critical edition of of his 137 letters in 1889.³ In 1903, Alfred Poncelet published another ten letters from Lucas,⁴ and finally, there is another epistle in Hildebrand Höpfl’s 1913 work on the Vulgate.⁵ In addition, another important work is the monograph on the Diocese of St. Omer – a milieu in which Lucas spent the greater part of his life –, written by Oscar Bled at the end of the nineteenth century.⁶ Furthermore, information can be derived from the correspondence that Lucas had with his publisher, Christopher Plantin (1520–89), and which was been edited by Max Rooses and Jan Denucé.⁷ The most important study on Lucas’ text-critical activity is Henri Quentin’s *Mémoire sur l’établissement du Texte de la Vulgate* (1922)⁸ since it reveals the methodology Lucas used leading up to the publication of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate in 1592.

However, Quentin’s work does not study how Lucas changed his textual critical approach after the publication of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate. Thus, this essay will pick up where Quentin left off and show how Lucas changed his text-critical approach due to publication of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate. The contribution will be divided into three parts. The first part deals with the years 1574–92. The *terminus post quem*, 1574, is determined by the publishing of ‘his’ edition of the Vulgate,⁹ to which follows the *Notationes in sacra Biblia* in 1580¹⁰

² Arthur C. De Schrevel, “Lucas, François,” *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*, 12 (1893): 550–63.

³ Arthur C. De Schrevel, “Documents pour servir à la biographie de François Lucas,” *Annales de la Société d’Émulation pour l’étude de l’histoire et des antiquités de la Flandre* 39 (1891): 359–97.

⁴ Alfred Poncelet, “Dix lettres inédites relative a François Lucas de Bruges,” *Annales de la Société d’Émulation pour l’étude de l’histoire et des antiquités de la Flandre* 53 (1903): 226–59.

⁵ Hildebrand Höpfl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata*, *Biblische Studien* 18 (Freiburg i.B.: Herder, 1913), 317–22.

⁶ Oscar Bled, *Les évêques de Saint-Omer depuis la chute de Thérouanne 1553–1619* (Saint-Omer: H. D’homont, 1898).

⁷ *Correspondance de Christophe Plantin*, ed. Max Rooses and Jan Denucé, 9 vols. (Antwerp: Buschmann, 1883–1920).

⁸ Henri Quentin, *Mémoire sur l’établissement du texte de la Vulgate*, 1st part, *Octateuque*, *Collectanea Biblica Latina* 6 (Rome: Desclée et Cie/Paris: Gabalda, 1922), 128–46, concerning Lucas, see esp. 138–46.

⁹ *Biblia Sacra: Qui in hac editione, a Theologis Lovanienibus prestitum sit, paulo post indicator*, ed. Francis Lucas (Antwerp: Christopher Plantin, 1574; hereafter abbreviated as “*Biblia* 1574”).

¹⁰ Francis Lucas, *Notationes in Sacra Biblia: quibus, variantia discrepantibus exemplaribus loca summo studio discutiuntur*, ed. Francis Lucas (Antwerp: Plantin, 1580).

and another Vulgate edition in 1583,¹¹ which has the *Notationes* in appendix. Quentin has already dealt with this period, devoting a significant portion of his study to the realization of the 1574 Vulgate in particular. I will basically follow Quentin's analysis, while also discussing a few extracts from the ms. Vat. Lat. 6236 which contains a *specimen*, or a preparatory document of the *Notationes* submitted to Card. Sirleto.

The second part of my essay deals with the years 1592–1603 and will contribute new insights into Lucas' work. The *terminus post quem* is the publication of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate (1592), including the 10 year monopoly it enjoyed and also the Pope's ban on any possible change of 'his' emended Bible. On the one hand, the ban severely limited the text-critical work that could be done. On the other hand, it shows the growing power of papal authority.

Finally, the third part of the work focuses upon the years 1603–18, and the expiration of the ten years monopoly, during which Lucas used a new methodology, completely different from his previous approach. The *terminus post quem* of this third period is given by the publication of the *Romanae correctionis*, in 1603.¹² In this third period, Lucas also published other text-critical works such as the *Notarum ad varias lectiones in quatuor Evangeliiis* (1605),¹³ a critical apparatus attached to his Commentaries on the four Gospels (1606–16), and which will be an object of particular attention here. Eventually, at the end of his life, Lucas published a final booklet which gathered additional *lectiones* of the Vulgate, the *Libellus alter continens alias lectionum varietates* in 1618.¹⁴ Prior to the analysis of Lucas' textual criticism, I will introduce Johannes or 'John' Henten's 1547 Vulgate which was the basis of Lucas' 1574 edition, showing its importance in the international context by quoting a letter of Girolamo Seripando (1493–1563) the Superior General of the Augustinian Order. After this general introduction, I will furnish a brief biography of Lucas.

11 *Biblia Sacra: Qui in hac editione, a Theologis Lovanienibus prestitum sit, paulo post indicator*, ed. Francis Lucas (Antwerp: Christopher Plantin, 1583; hereafter abbreviated as "*Biblia* 1583").

12 Francis Lucas, *Romanae Correctionis: In Latinis Biblis editionis Vulgatae jussu Sixti V. Pont. Max. recognitis, loca insignora* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1603).

13 Francis Lucas, *Notarum ad varias lectiones in quatuor Evangeliiis occurrentes libellus duplex: Quorum uno graecae, altero latinae varietates explicantur* (1605; attached to the Commentaries on the four Gospels 1606–1616).

14 Francis Lucas, *Libellus alter continens alias lectionum varietates, in eisdem Biblis latinis, ex vetustis manuscriptis exemplaribus collectas: Quibus possit perfectior reddi, feliciter coepta collectio, si accedat Summi Pontifici auctoritas* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1618).

2 From 1546 to 1574: The Vulgate between authenticity and emendation in Leuven

In the context of the Golden Age of Biblical Scholarship,¹⁵ textual criticism of the Vulgate was one of the most important areas of research. Over the centuries, several *lectiones* of the Vulgate had been handed down frequently with stark variations between them due to the ignorance of the copyists. Differences ranged from simple scribal or typographical mistakes, to deliberate ‘corrections.’ At the fourth session of the Council of Trent (8 April 1546), the Vulgate was declared to be the ‘authentic’ version of the Bible for the Catholic Church.¹⁶ Notwithstanding this decision, the Tridentine fathers were aware of the necessity to restore the text to its ‘original’ version as conceived by Jerome. However, in 1561, Cardinal Girolamo Seripando, writing to Cardinal Marc’Antonio da Mula, called ‘Amulio’ (1506–1572) affirmed that

[...] this Council declared in other occasions that in reading, in preaching and in discussing, no other translation than the Vulgate is to be used. It remained the undecided doubt “which is this *Vulgate*,” since anyone would be taken, it would be found [in it] some reading that now is not as it was cited by some Father under the title of *Vulgate* that they had in that time.¹⁷

The Cardinal was of course referring to the decree *Insuper* of the fourth session of the Council of Trent, issued fifteen years earlier. In another letter to Amulio, Seripando proposed a ‘temporary solution,’ at least until the Vatican Printing Press could publish a new emended edition, as required by the Tridentine fathers.¹⁸ In particular, Seripando said: “I really appreciated that [edition] of

¹⁵ See Wim François, “Augustine and the Golden Age of Biblical Scholarship in Louvain (1550–1650),” in *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Matthew McLean and Bruce Gordon, Library of the Written Word 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 235–89.

¹⁶ Wim François and Antonio Gerace, “Trent and the Latin Vulgate, a Louvain Project?,” in *The Council of Trent: Reform and Controversy in Europe and Beyond (1545–1700)*, ed. Wim François and Violet Soen (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming [2017]).

¹⁷ “havendo questo Concilio altre volte decretato, che nel leggere, nel predicare et nel disputare non si usasse altra translatione che la Vulgata, resto’ dubbio indeciso, qual fosse questa Vulgata, perche’ qualunqua si pigliasse, si troverebbe qualche luogo non star cosi’ hora, come era citato da alcuni Padri sotto il Titolo della Vulgata che all’hora si teneva” (Seripando to ‘Amulio’, Trent, 23 October 1561, in Höpfl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata* [see n5], 305–6).

¹⁸ “[sacrosanta synodus] [...] statuit, ut posthac sacra scriptura, potissimum vero haec ipsa vetus, et vulgata editio, quam emendatissime imprimatur” (“Sessio quarta: Decretum secundum ...,” in *CT* [see n1], 5.3:91–92).

Leuven, which is what I was more familiar with.” The quality of this Leuven edition was due to its minimalism: “it simply contains the emended edition of the Vulgate, with about twenty ancient manuscripts, and it puts in the margin a variety of readings [along] with the number of the ancient books which agree with that reading.”¹⁹

Seripando was referring to the Vulgate produced by the Leuven theologian John Henten, in 1547. As Seripando maintains, Henten made use of about twenty Latin manuscripts, a figure also clearly cited in the dedicatory epistle of his Vulgate edition. However, the Leuven theologian did not focus upon the relationship between the Latin translations and their Hebrew and Greek ‘originals.’²⁰ This decision was due to the fate suffered by Robert Estienne (1503–59). Henten appreciated the Parisian exegete and based his edition on that of Estienne’s,²¹ but because the Parisian scholar was treated with severe suspicion when he left annotations in the margins showing various *lectiones*, Henten decided to leave them out of his edition. Indeed, Estienne had used both Hebrew and Greek texts, maintaining that the most faithful readings of the Bible had been handed down by Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament and by Greek copies of the New Testament. In effect, according to Estienne, the Latin translation should be emended on the basis of the ‘original’ texts.²² Given Estienne’s experience, Henten preferred to avoid any reference to the Hebrew and Greek texts.

The revision of the Vulgate in Leuven continued uninterrupted after Henten’s 1547 Vulgate. Apart from the work done by Henricus Gravius—unexplored by research until now—the most important author who worked on textual criticism of the Bible in Leuven was the Franciscan friar Nicholas Tacitus Zegers (1495–1559). In 1559, Zegers published his ‘New Testament,’ preceded by his *Castigationes* in 1555 which expressed the hope that the Pope would make it

19 “Non lasserò di dire, che tra l’altre Impressioni si potrebbe haver qualche aiuto: à me assai soddisfà la Lovaniense la quale è quella che io ho più familiarmente usata. Contiene semplicemente l’*Edittione vulgata corretta con circa XX Esemplari Antichi, et mette in margine qualche Varietà di lectioni col numero de libri antichi che convengono in quella lettione*” (Trent, 25 June 1562, in Höpfl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata* [see n5], 307–8).

20 “summo studio curavimus [...] non solum quae castigatius excusa erant exemplaribus, vero aliis quoque plus minus viginti [...] ex horum collatione restitueremus, quod fieri posset, veterem ac vulgatam editionem synceritati suae atque puritati: non miscentes nos interim quaestionis, num Graecis et Hebraeis ubique respondeat” (*Biblia ad vetustissima exemplaria nunc castigata*, ed. John Henten [Antwerp: Plantin, 1547], 2r^o; hereafter abbreviated as “*Biblia 1547*”). See also Quentin, *Mémoire* [see n8], 130–32. More precisely, Henten made use of 29 sources, cf. the lists of the codices, *Biblia 1547*, iii.

21 Quentin, *Mémoire*, 144.

22 Quentin, *Mémoire*, 104–12, esp. 108–10.

the reference edition for the entire Church. Zegers asked two Popes to take his works into consideration, but neither Julius III nor Paul IV paid any attention to his request.²³ The work of the Franciscan was a source of inspiration for Lucas, especially Zegers' *Castigationes*, and both found their way into Lucas' *Notationes*. In fact, the Franciscan was using of the original Greek and Hebrew texts to emend the Latin text and the knowledge of the ancient languages was a key principle in Zegers' textual critical approach. For instance, in the preface of his *Scholion* (1553), the Franciscan explains that whoever wants to correctly comprehend the Apostles' writings, viz. the New Testament, must know the language in which those texts were written, i. e. Greek, the *tropoi* or figures of speech of this tongue, as well as the cultural context of which it was a part. Moreover, Zegers held that one should know the external influences to which that language was subjected to, such as Syriac or Hebrew which influenced the Greek texts due to the Hellenistic context in which they were written.²⁴ Zegers may even have

23 "Si tamen digna et catholica uti speramus iudicabitur, adprobare, et apostolica autoritate roborare confijrmare, et pro germania atque authentica ubique terrarum legendam committere [hanc novi instrumenti editionem], posthabitis in editionibus, quae huic adversantur" (dedicatory epistle to Pope Julius III, in Nicholas Tacitus Zegers, *Epanorthotes: Castigationes in Novum Testamentum, in quibus depravata restituuntur, adiecta rescantur, & sublata adiunguntur* [Cologne: Arnold Birckmann, 1555], f. A3r-v). – "Amplitudini hanc editionem dicamus, ut quicquid hic castigatum, mutatum, additum, ademptum vel est adnotatum, ipsius subiaciat censurae atque iudicio [...]. Hic nihil opus esse putamus Tuam sublimitatem remorari prolixa praemonitione, de ijs omnibus quae hic ultra omnes totius orbis editiones praestita sunt quum: inspectum et subinde consultus hic codex facile commonstraturus quicquid studiosus quisque hic cupiet cognoscere: et idem fere Castigatoris nostri nuper evulgati <per>oratio legentibus demonstret" (dedicatory epistle to Pope Paul IV, in *Novum Jesu Christi Testamentum juxta veterem ecclesiae editionem*, ed. Nicholas Tacitus Zegers [Leuven: Stephanus Valerius, 1559], f. A2r-v).

24 Zegers provides an example to clarify his thought, although he refers to the Latin translation of the New Testament, since this was the version to which the reader was more accustomed: "Quisque recte intelligere et interpretari scripta apostolorum [...] cum necesse est, non ignorare peculiares quosdam arcanum literarum tropos ac loquendi consuetudines. Nam, ut exempli causa, primum de vulgata nostra et ecclesiae usitata novi instrumenti versione loquamur: quo pacto han intelligeret qui veterem illum loquendi modum, quo tum vulgus utebatur, et quo ispa versio pro omnium captu, proque faciliiori ipsius intellectu, ac publica totius vulgi utilitate conscri si quidem conscripta est? Siquidem nostra hac aetate diversus plane est, et dubio procul castigatior, delicatior, et latinior loquendi usus est, ut si hunc cum veteris illius populi loquendi conferas [...] hic ab illo discrepare videatur. Quo etiam sit, ut quo quisque latinior ac Tullianae eloquentiae instuctor est, hoc fere minus in arcanis literis vulgatam hanc legens editionem adsequatur atque intellegat [...] nam ut graecam linguam, qua omnes pene ab ipsis autoribus descripti sunt novi instrumenti libri, recte calleas, eiusque peculiares dicendi formae optime teneas, nisi etiam aliarum quorundam linguarum, veluti Hebraicae, Chaldaicae et Syriacae proprietates, imo barbarismo: denique, nisi et peculiares nonnullarum sive latinorum

criticized Trent's proclamation of the Vulgate as the authentic version for the Church when he declares his preference the Greek version, at least with regard to the New Testament, affirming that the reading of the original archetype is more comprehensible than the Latin *lectio*.²⁵ Lucas was influenced by the same biblical humanist perspective and he preferred to follow the methodology of both Estienne and Zegers rather than that of Henten, who relied only upon Latin manuscript sources. The Franciscan appears many times in Lucas' works, at least before 1592. Lucas also stressed the importance of the Hebrew and Greek 'originals' for emending the Latin text. In summary, Henten and Zegers were the basis of Lucas' textual criticism. In regard to Henten, as I will show with Quentin, Lucas actually was appreciating Estienne's work on the Vulgate since Henten based his work on that of Estienne's. And from Zegers, Lucas recovers a more philological approach by using the 'original' sources.

3 A scholar from Bruges in Leuven: A brief biography of Lucas

According to De Schrevel, Lucas was born in the final months of 1548 or at the beginning of 1549 in Bruges,²⁶ as deducible from his toponym, *Brugensis* where he also had his early education. After the town became troubled by the iconoclastic movement (1566–68) then raging in the Low Countries,²⁷ he

sive graecarum vocum apud emendate loquentes minime aut secus usitarum significantias non ignores, non erit sane unde synceram tibi possis divinatorum eloquiorum polliceri intelligentiam" (Nicholas Tacitus Zegers, "De phrasibus quibusdam paulino sermoni familiaribus," in *Scholion in omnes Novi Testamenti* [Cologne: Arnold I Birckmann, 1553], 2r–3r).

²⁵ For instance, in the *Epanorthotes*, after having spoken about the 'declaration of authenticity' that the Council fathers attributed to the Vulgate, Zegers says: "neque rursus dixerim, quod graecam editionem prorsus damnandam aut contemnenda censeam: sunt enim permulta in ipsa quae usque adeo depravatae non sunt, ut depravari haud facile potuerint, nisi forte sic, ut corruptela ipsa facile potuerit deprehendi ac tolli: et ipsa archetypi lectio non raro aliquid habet intellegibilis, et plus interdum lucis evidetiae, aut energiae adfert insinuatque lectori, quam lectio latina: sed qui illi non tantum fidendum iudicem, quantum huic nostri: et ne quis id omne esse veritatis et protinus credat habendum pro indubitatio, quicquid cernitur aut refertur esse in graecis" (Zegers, *Epanorthotes*, 7r).

²⁶ De Schrevel, "Lucas, François" [see n2], 550.

²⁷ Still important to the iconoclastic movement in Bruges specifically, is Arthur C. De Schrevel, *Troubles religieux du XVI^e siècle au quartier de Bruges, 1566–1568* (Bruges: De Plancke, 1894), 3. On the iconoclastic movement in the Low Countries, see Solange Deyon and Alain Lottin, *Les casseurs de l'été 1566: L'iconoclasme dans le Nord* (Villeneuve d'Ascq: Presses universitaires du Septentrion, 2013). See also Alastair C. Duke, *Dissident Identities in the Early Modern Low*

moved to Leuven where he studied arts in the Pedagogy of the Castle and on the 6 March 1568, graduated as *magister artium* in fifth place, out of a class of 55 students.²⁸ After two years, in 1570, he met with Iohannes Wilhelmus Harleminus (1538–78), a professor of Hebrew for a short time (1568–1569) at the *Collegium Trilingue*.²⁹ Thereafter, Harleminus became rector of the Jesuit College. Thanks to his teaching, Lucas learned Semitic languages such as ‘Chaldean’ (Aramaic), Hebrew, and Syriac (an Aramaic dialect). During this period, again thanks to Harleminus, he became acquainted with Wilhelmus Lindanus (1525–88), later the Bishop of Roermond and subsequently of Ghent,³⁰ as well as with the Jesuit theologian Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621),³¹ who came to Leuven in 1569 and alongside whom Lucas possibly studied in the very same classroom, resulting in a long friendship.³² Over the course of just a few years, Lucas obtained a thorough knowledge of ancient

Countries (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009), 178–98; Phyllis M. Crew, *Calvinist Preaching and Iconoclasm in the Netherlands, 1544–1569* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978).

28 De Schrevel, “Lucas, François,” 551.

29 For the history of the *Collegium Trilingue*, see Henry de Vocht, *History of the Foundation and the Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense 1517–1550*, 4 vols., *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 10–13 (Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil, 1955).

30 William Lindanus (Wilhelm van der Lindt) was firstly Bishop of Roermond and Ghent successively. See Petrus Th. van Beuningen, *Wilhelmus Lindanus als inquisiteur en Bisschop: Bijdrage tot zijn biografie (1525–1576)* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1966).

31 On Bellarmine’s stay in Leuven, see Lucien Ceysens, “Bellarmine et Louvain,” in *L’Augustinisme à l’ancienne Faculté de théologie de Louvain*, ed. Mathijs Lamberigts and Leo Kenis (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 1994), 179–205.

32 “Johann Willems, Guilielmius, of Haarlem, who, after his studies at the *Trilingue*, was appointed as professor of Hebrew in 1568; besides the ‘three’ languages [viz. Latin, Greek and Hebrew], he also knew Chaldaic, Syriac and Arab [...]. He entered the Jesuit Company in 1569” (de Vocht, *History*, 2:156–57). See also Félix Nève, *Mémoire historique et littéraire sur Le Collège [sic] des Trois-Langues à l’Université de Louvain* (Brussels: M. Hayez, 1856), 247–48. Additionally, Lucas “vers 1570, il avait eu la bonne fortune de se lier d’amitié avec le P. Jean Guilielmi (Willemsz.), connu aussi sous le nom de Harleminus, professeur d’Ecriture sainte et de langues bibliques au collège des Jésuites, à Louvain” (De Schrevel, “Lucas, François” [see n2], 551). Concerning the friendship between Lucas and Bellarmine, Bled writes: “Dans une de ses lettres le cardinal Bellarmine l’appelle: *amicum suavissimum et virum modestissimum*” (Bled, *Les évêques de Saint-Omer* [see n6], 423n3). Moreover, “Grâce à Guilielmi, Lucas fut admis dans l’intimité de Guillaume Lindanus, évêque de Ruremonde, puis de Gand, et entra en relations avec beaucoup d’autres savants, en particulier avec le P. Robert Bellarmine, qui professait la théologie aux scolastiques de la Compagnie de Jésus, sous le rectorat de Guilielmi” (De Schrevel, “Lucas, François,” 551). Bellarmine even cited Lucas in his works, in particular making reference to his *Notationes* [see n10], see Roberto Bellarmino, *Disputationum de Controversiis Christianae Fidei Tomus Primus* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1586), 92.

languages and, because of that, he received from the Leuven Faculty of Theology the difficult task of reviewing Henten's 1547 Vulgate, even though he was still a young man.³³

4 Lucas' first period: 1574–1592

4.1 The 1574 Vulgate

The starting point of Lucas' text-critical work is Trent's *Insuper* decree. As the Leuven scholar recalls, the Tridentine fathers declared the Vulgate to be the authentic version of the Bible given its antiquity and longstanding use in the Church. However, as Lucas noticed, it was precisely this antiquity that caused a variety of readings to come about in the manuscripts.³⁴ He spent all his efforts in revising – in the sense of emending – Henten's 1547 edition. In 1574, Lucas was able to publish it with Christopher Plantin in Antwerp (even before having achieved the degree of licentiate in Theology, in 1575 or 1576).³⁵ With the aim of producing the best text possible, Lucas decided to go further than Henten. In fact, Lucas did not accept all of Henten's textual choices. After analyzing the different *lectiones*, including those placed in the margin of Henten's text, Lucas put certain signs to indicate his opinion.³⁶ He compared the Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic 'originals' of the Old Testament and the Greek and Syriac texts of the New Testament, using Plantin's Polyglot Bible (1568–73), the so-called Antwerp

33 "Le principal auteur de la révision [scil. l'édition de la Vulgate de 1574] qu'elle représente, Luc de Bruges, n'avait encore que vingt-six ans" (Quentin, *Mémoire* [see n8], 138). All of Lucas' works were published by Plantin in Antwerp. On this printing house see, for instance, Leon Voet, *The Plantin Press (1555–1589): A Bibliography of the Works Printed and Published by Christopher Plantin at Antwerp and Leiden* (Amsterdam: Van Hoeve, 1980).

34 See for instance the dedicatory epistle in Lucas, *Notationes* [see n10], esp. 5 ff.

35 See De Schrevel, "Lucas, François," 551. It appears that he never obtained the doctorate in Theology.

36 "In primis minime ignorandum est, illum hac editione prodire Bibliorum Textum, qui a Domino Hentenio castigatus, et Lovanii anno 1547 est excusus [...]. Deinde observandum est, eas lectiones, paene omnes, quas in margine Hentenius collocaret, qualescumque essent, a nobis relictas et examinatas. Nam etsi earum multae tolli merebantur: tamen, ad aliorum codicum emendationem, eas relinqui, et rejectionis signo notari utile videbatur" (*Biblia* 1574 [see n9], 2).

Biblia Regia, to that end.³⁷ The reason for this choice was the difference (*diversitas*) between the various Greek and Latin editions of the Bible. Lucas wanted to read more texts in order to have the most complete overview of the Scriptures, at least in his assumption. In a certain sense, Lucas intended to restore Estienne's methodology, and it is even possible that Lucas initially had the intention of issuing an emended version of Henten's 1547 edition.

However, as Quentin suggests, after Lucas heard that Pope Pius V³⁸ organized the second Roman Committee (1566–72) to edit the Vulgate, Lucas may have decided not to alter the text of the Leuven Vulgate.³⁹ In his *Notationes*, Lucas even emphasizes that “Henten's text, as it was published, was not changed.”⁴⁰ Lucas clearly wanted to affirm that the text he was using had already been accepted by the censoring authorities. Therefore, Lucas limited himself to adding only marginal notes from his reading of the Bible in ‘original’ tongues. These marginal notes were considered useful in cases when the Latin codices seemed ambiguous, since the references to the original could make difficult Latin readings more intelligible. He was careful, moreover, to stress that his analysis would be focused solely upon philological (*vox*) and/or grammatical (*casus*, for nouns, and *tempus*, for verbs) difficulties⁴¹ in order to avoid

³⁷ “Praeterea expensae sunt eadem lectiones, veteris quidem instrumenti, ad Hebraicum, Graecum, et Chaldaicum: novi vero, ad Graecum et Syriacum editionis Regiae Textus” (*Biblia* 1574, 2). The reference is to *Biblia sacra hebraice, chaldaice, graece, & latine* (Antwerp: Arias Montanus and Christopher Plantin, 1568–73).

³⁸ Quentin, *Mémoire* [see n2], 161–68. There were five Roman Committees on the emendation of the Bible. The first under Pius IV (1561), the second under Pius V (1569), the third under Sixtus V (1586), and the fourth and the fifth under Gregory XIV, both issued on 1591. Lucas worked on both his Vulgate and the *Notationes* under the second Roman Committee, composed by four cardinals: Marco Antonio Colonna (1523–97), Guglielmo Sirleto (1514–85), Cristoforo Madruzzo (1512–78), Jérôme Souchier (1508–71), Antonio Carafa (1538–91). In the meantime, Gregory XIII issued also a Committee on the emendation of the LXX. On the five Roman Committees on the Latin Vulgate, see Quentin, *Mémoire*, 147–208. See also Francesco Andreu, “Il teatino Antonio Agellio e la Volgata Sistina,” in *La Bibbia ‘Vulgata’ dalle origini ai nostri giorni: Atti del simposio internazionale in onore di Sisto V. Grottamare, 29–31 agosto 1985*, ed. Tarcisio Stramare, Collectanea biblica latina 16 (Vatican City: Vatican Library, 1987), 68–97, esp. 78–90.

³⁹ “Luc de Bruges est un esprit tout différent. Il ne prend aucune décision. Si doué qu’il soit d’esprit critique, il ne fait pas besogne d’éditeur: le texte d’Hentenius sortira de ses mains sans le moindre changement. Sans doute, il n’avait pas toute la liberté nécessaire, car on était dans l’attente de l’édition officielle qui se préparait à Rome, et puis il était très jeune encore” (Quentin, *Mémoire*, 144).

⁴⁰ “quanquam a nobis, textus, ut ab Hentenio est editus, verbis neutiquam mutatus sit” (Lucas, *Notationes* [see n10], 8).

⁴¹ “Quia vero talis propemodum exemplarium Graecorum, qualis Latinorum, diversitas est. Etiam aliarum editionum exemplaria Graeca a nobis consulta sunt. Ad haec igitur universa jam

the impression that his desire was to interfere with the Vatican Committee's work on the Vulgate. In addition, Lucas went farther than Henten by using the works of Latin Christian exegetes from antiquity to the Middle Ages.⁴² In particular, he referred to Hilarius of Poitiers (c. 300–c. 368), Ambrose (c. 340–97), Jerome (c. 347–420), Augustine (354–430), Gregory the Great (c. 540–604), the Venerable Bede (ca. 673–735), Rabanus Maurus (c. 780–856), and Radulphus Flaviacensis (twelfth century).⁴³ Unfortunately, Lucas does not furnish a reason why he chose these authors over others, although the choice may have been due to what was available in Leuven.

4.2 1580: The *Notationes in sacra Biblia*

Following Quentin's suggestion, I maintain that Lucas wanted to publish a new edition of the Vulgate, but after hearing about the work of the Vatican Vulgate Committee, opted for a simple re-printing of Henten's 1547 Bible with the addition of more notes in the margin. However, De Schrevel proposes an additional reason for Lucas' choice. He states that because the great variety of *lectiones* could not be shown merely with marginal notes, Lucas he felt the need to provide further explanation of the readings. To that end, and with Harleмиus' approval and support,⁴⁴ the author began to compile his critical

recensita, variae lectiones collatae sunt [...]. Ad haec, cum deprehensum est, discrepare Latinam translationem a fonte ex quo fluxit, non raro annotato est, non quod Versio vulgata ad eum modum putetur corrigenda, sed, quandoque, quod talia sint, ut videri verisimiliter possit ea ab Interprete translata in aliis Latinis scriptis reperiri posse: quandoque, quod ejusmodi sint, ut eorum cognitio non parum conferat. Praeterea cum animadversum est Latinam vocem, casu, tempore, aut simili modo ambiguum esse, vox Hebraica aut Graeca ex qua illa olim translata fuit, si ad eum modum ambigua non erat, ad marginem est notata, ut illius ambiguitas tollatur" (*Biblia* 1574, 2).

⁴² See "Quid in hac Bibliorum editione sit prestitum," in *Biblia* 1574.

⁴³ Benedectin monk from the Convent of St. Germain de Flaix (= *Flaviacensis*) of the twelfth century. Lucas used the commentary on Leviticus, *In mysticum illum Moysi Leuiticum libri XX*, whose printed edition appeared in Cologne, in 1536 by the printer Eucharius Cervicornus (1516–1547).

⁴⁴ "Ille [scil. Harleмиus] mihi auctor fuit, ut anno aetatis XXIV, scriberem Notationes in varias lectiones Bibliorum" (Lucas 'of Bruges', *In sacrosanta quatuor Jesu Christi Evangelia ... continens completum Evangelii secundum Johannem* [Antwerp: Plantin, 1616], 3). Concerning Lucas' age, it is difficult to say when he was born exactly. He maintained that at 24 years of age he wrote *Notationes*, published in 1580, but it is more likely that he was 24 years old when he started to write his work, otherwise he must have been born in 1556. Using De Schrevel's dating, Lucas was born in 1548. About Harleмиus, Lucas mentions him also in the *Epistula Dedicatoria* to Cardinal Sirleto in *Notationes*, 11–14.

apparatus, the *Notationes in sacra Biblia*.⁴⁵ Quentin's and De Schrevel's arguments describe Lucas' intent in two successive stages. Originally, Lucas may have intended to emend Henten's text but feeling impeded by the work of the official Roman revision committees, opted instead for compiling an appendix to show the alternative readings he had found in various sources. Lucas hoped to finish his work within three months after he had finalized his revision and to publish the critical apparatus as an attachment to his 1574 Vulgate edition.⁴⁶ However, the work proved to be laborious and it took him five years to complete it. This delay was due not only to the intrinsic difficulty involved in the work, but also to the religious and political context. Indeed, during the Dutch revolt (1568–1648), the Scottish mercenary army under the command of William I (1533–84) entered the city on 2 February 1578, forcing the University to dismiss its professors and scholars. Moreover, a return to Bruges was impossible for Lucas due to the Calvinist Republic that had been recently founded (1578–84).⁴⁷

Lucas finished his revised Latin edition in 1579 and a year later, the *Notationes in sacra Biblia* were printed by Christopher Plantin. This work, which was dedicated to Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (1514–85), focused upon the Vulgate from a textual critical perspective. While he examined the various *lectiones* that had been handed down over the centuries, including those from the Hebrew and Greek texts, he also analyzed the numerous interpretations of the Church Fathers. However, Lucas avoided the controversial topics that were at the center of the debate between Catholic and Reformation-minded exegetes. In comparing original texts, he simply provides a philological analysis that was corroborated by the Greek and Latin Fathers' interpretations.⁴⁸

4.2.1 The preparation: *Specimen* and *Notationes in sacra Biblia*

The publication of the *Notationes* was a multiyear project for the reasons previously examined. Namely, Lucas offered the complementary textual material that he could not include in the 1574 Vulgate due to the work of the Roman Committee (as supported by Quentin), as well as the impossibility of explaining the great variety of *lectiones* in the margin of the Vulgate (as emphasized by De

⁴⁵ De Schrevel, "Lucas, François" [see n2], 553.

⁴⁶ De Schrevel, "Lucas, François," 553.

⁴⁷ Bled, *Les évêques de Saint-Omer* [see n6], 422. In the meantime, he had to leave Leuven for Bruges twice, to be ordained by Bishop Remi Drieux (1519–94) first as a deacon (June 1574) and thereafter as a priest (April 1577). See De Schrevel, "Lucas, François," 553.

⁴⁸ Lucas, *Notationes* [see n10], 2–10, 16–20.

Schrevel). It seems clear, however, that Lucas' first intention was to give an emended version of the Bible based on the methodology of Estienne and Zegers in order to provide a substitute for Henten's Vulgate.⁴⁹ Nonetheless, after hearing about the work of the Roman Committee, he carefully chose to simply add more *lectiones* to the margin of his Bible edition, a text that was identical to Henten's 1547 version. Furthermore, he also wanted to elaborate on the Vulgate philologically, and to do so he decided to publish a separate work, viz. the *Notationes*.

An attestation of this work occurs in a letter from Plantin to Benito Arias Montano (1527–98), dated 22 October 1575, in which the Antwerp publisher discusses a letter sent to him by Harleminus in which the Jesuit asked the publisher to gather information, from Card. Sirleto himself or from Arias Montano – editor of the *Biblia Regia* –, before the *Notationes* on the Old Testament were offered to print. The reason why Harleminus asked for Sirleto's judgment is clear: at that time, the Cardinal was the librarian of the Vatican library⁵⁰ and was working on the second Roman Committee for the emendation of the Vulgate. What Harleminus considered of importance was not only Sirleto's judgment on the first part of the *Notationes*, but also – and above all – the Cardinal's ideas about the Hebrew Bible and Pagnini's Latin translation,⁵¹ which had not been appreciated by Bishop Lindanus⁵² and the Spanish theologian León de Castro.⁵³ Harleminus' letter to Plantin comes as no surprise since the Jesuit was Lucas' patron and had invited him to publish his *Notationes*. Harleminus' demarche may also be considered as a precautionary measure, given the negative opinion that Lindanus and De Castro had voiced concerning

49 Later I will show, for instance, Lucas' appreciation for Hebrew *lectiones*, something Estienne also preferred.

50 Guglielmo Sirtleto was the fifth *bibliothecarius*, from 1572 to 1585. See the entire list on the website of Vatican Library, <https://www.vatlib.it/home.php?pag=storia>, accessed on 16.12.2014.

51 Sante Pagnini (1470–1541) was an Italian biblical philologist who published the first Latin translation of the Bible of the Modern Era directly from Hebrew: *Veteris et Novi Testamenti nova translation* (Lyon: Mareschal, 1527).

52 See Wilhelmus Lindanus, *Meditationes in Aureum illum Psalmum CXVIII* (Cologne: Cholinus, 1575), 69.

53 León de Castro ([16th c.]–1586[?]) was a Spanish Biblical scholar and professor of Rhetoric, Hebrew and Greek at the University of Salamanca. He was particularly opposed to Hebrew texts, as evidenced by the work to which Harleminus was referring: *Commentaria in Esaïam prophetam, ex sacris scriptoribus graecis, & Latinis confecta, aduersus aliquot commentaria, & interpretationes quasdam ex Rabinorum Scriniis compilatas* (Salamanca: M. Gastius, 1570). At present, the only biography on this scholar is V. de la Fuente, *Biografía de León de Castro* (Madrid, 1860).

Lucas' work. The Jesuit also begged Plantin for as much precision as possible (*perscribere*, 'to write in full') in his advice, reminding Plantin that he should always inform him concerning the latest published works, even those by Lindanus and De Castro. Lucas made use of Lindanus' and De Castro's texts even though he did not agree with their reticence in regard to the Hebrew Bible and Pagnini's translation.⁵⁴ Since Lucas used the Hebrew Bible and the translation of Pagnini, it may be taken for granted that Sirleto permitted their use.

Together with Harlemius and Plantin, Sirleto was a key figure in the realization of Lucas' work. Indeed, there was a frequent exchange of letters between the Cardinal and the young Leuven scholar. Moreover, another document provides proof of Sirleto's influence upon Lucas' text. Indeed, there are still a few pages of the *Notationes* in the Vatican Library, on both the Old and New Testament, which Lucas sent to the Cardinal in order that his work could be approved prior to its publication and not incur the accusation of spreading errors or heresy. Unfortunately, it is impossible to say exactly when this document was written and sent, but it must have been before 23 November 1576. Indeed, in a letter to Balthasar (Baldassarre) Ansidei (1555–1614), a scholar close to Sirleto⁵⁵ dated 23 November 1576 (IX Cal. X^{br} anni MDLXXVI), Lucas referred

54 "Existimarem [ego, scil. Harlemius] bonum esse, si vel ex ipso Sirleto vel ex D. Aria Montano posses primo quoque tempore intelligere antequam notationes in Vetus Testamentum de variis lectionibus in lucem prodeant, quid Sirletus sentiat de variis lectionibus Novi Testamenti, et de Bibliis Hebraeis ac Pagnini quae Léo Castri, et Lindanus in libello Cardinali dedicato, tantopere insectantur: quia Magister Franciscus Lucas faceret de his mentionem et forte refutaret argumenta Domini Lindani si putares tutum. Proinde rogo ut si commodè facere possis ejusdem Domini Cardinalis Sirleti iudicium de dictis notis Bibliis Hebraeis et Panigni per opportunitatem expiscari et ad nos quando commodum tibi erit perscribere digneris et quid faciendum sit admonere. *Nolim vero te posthac meliores horas in talibus indagandis et refellendis impendere ne dicam perdere*" (Plantin to Arias Montano, 22 October 1575, in *Correspondance de Christopher Plantin* [see n7], 5:34). I want to underline Harlemius' harsh tone, especially in the final sentence, as evidenced by my italic: "I would not want that you spend, not to say *to lose*, the best hours in both examining and refusing such things in future." About Lucas' quotations from Lindanus, see for instance *Notationes* [see n10], Ps 13:3, p. 104. Concerning Lucas' reference to De Castro, see *Notationes*, Is 40:2, p. 287.

55 Jeanne Bignami, "Baldassarre Ansidei," *Dizionario biografico degli Italiani*, 3 (1961): 419–20; see there for further references. The letter is still preserved in the Vatican Library (Cod. Reg. Lat. 2023, 80–82). Native of Perugia, learned Greek and Latin, Ansidei studied in Rome from 1571 to 1577 and he obviously knew Guglielmo Sirleto since Ansidei was, according to Charles Dejob, "bibliothécaire à la Vaticane sous les ordres de Sirleto, et plus tard garde des archives du Vatican" (Charles Dejob, *De l'influence du Concile de Trente sur la littérature et les beaux-arts chez les peuples catholiques* [Paris: E. Thorin, 1884], 378).

to the comments on the *Notationes* on the New Testament that he had received from Sirleto and to another document he had previously sent to the Cardinal.⁵⁶

The document (Vat. Lat. 6236 ff. 128r–129v) is entitled *Specimen 5 Locorum ex variis lectionibus francisci Lucae Brugensis* [Example of five passages from Various Readings of Francis Lucas of Bruges].⁵⁷ It contains the drafts of Lucas' analysis of five periscopes: Gen 3:15, Ps 5:9, Sir 10:27, Isa 6:1, Matt 3:16. The comparison between this *specimen* and the later *Notationes* shows a few differences between these two documents and even some interesting changes. The pericope that has the most important variations is that on the verse Gen. 3:15. The analysis of this biblical passage in the *Notationes* presents some changes and additions, in comparison to the *Specimen*, which have been put between brackets:

(nos certe post D. Hentenium, nullum vulgatae editionis codicem potuimus reperire qui diversim legeret: nam Parisiensium sunt quos pro *ipse* Hentenius adfert: neque constat de Sorbonico correctorio qui alter est Parisiensium, an ex Hebraeo, an ex Latinorum codicum auctoritatem, sic legendum doceat; ut neque de Aloysij exemplaribus an nostrae sunt aeditionis, cuius certe Clarij Biblia, quae *ipsum* habent, non sunt)

⁵⁶ The *specimen* was sent before the 1576 letter to Ansidei, precisely because of the reference to Estienne; indeed, Lucas asks to Ansidei if Sirleto disliked the name *Stephanus* (“Scire et velim an displiceat Robertum Stephanum nominatum fuisse”) and, in the *specimen*, the Cardinal in effect deleted this name, as shown later. The letter to Ansidei should be considered as a reaction to Sirleto's comments to the *Specimen*. In any event, from the letter it seems that this *specimen* was only one of the documents that Lucas sent to Sirleto regarding his *Notationes*. Indeed, Lucas already knew the feedback around the quotation from “heretical” scholars in the part of *Notationes* dedicated to the New Testament: “[...] ago [tibi, viz. Ansidei] gratias quod me certiore facere monereque dignatus fueris, displicere Romanis Patribus ac nominatim Illustrissimo Doctissimo Piissimoque Cardinali Sirleto, cui labor noster iamdiu desudavit, quod in notationibus, quas in varias lectiones novo testamento nuper a Plantino Nostro edito adieci, citentur Munsterus et Erasmus, homines haeretici, aut certe hareseos apud bonos omnes suspecti” and Lucas also explains the reason behind using their works in this letter (Lucas to Balthasar Ansidei, 23 November 1576, in Höpfl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata* [see n5], 317). Lucas also used Sirleto's works; indeed, both in *Notationes* and in *Specimen* references are made to Sirleto's *Annotationes variarum lectionum in psalmos* (1572) and to Sirleto's *Varias lectiones in ecclesiasticum* (not published).

⁵⁷ In Höpfl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata*, 112, the incorrectly reported title is *Specimen 5 locorum S. Scripturae*; besides Fayen correctly writes *Specimen 5 Locorum ex variis lectionibus francisci Lucae Brugensis*: this discrepancy is strange, since Höpfl had read Fayen, see Höpfl, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata*, 111n2 (even if the year of the *Revue des bibliothèques et archives de Belgique* is incorrectly reported as 1906 instead of 1905), and Arnold Fayen, “Lettres Plantiniennes (1574–1581),” *Revue des bibliothèques et archives de Belgique* 3 (1905): 437n3.

The topic developed in this passage, viz. the different reading of *ipsa/ipse/ipsum*, is not relevant at this point.⁵⁸ Instead, the important element that should be stressed here is the general expression *Parisienses*, underlined in the above quotation. It would be very difficult to say who these ‘Parisians’ are simply by reading the *Notationes*. However, in the *Specimen*, Lucas larifies who they are, or rather, who *he* is. Indeed, Lucas used this vague term to conceal a troublesome name, that of Robert Estienne.

As Quentin has already maintained,⁵⁹ the *Parisienses* present in the *Notationes* replaced the name of Estienne that appears in the *Specimen* as *Stephanus*. However, this name was deleted by a Vatican hand (obviously Sirleto) in the body of the text. The text of the *Specimen* therefore reads ‘~~Stephanus~~’, and in the margin ‘(Parisienses)’ written between brackets. Moreover, in the letter to Ansidei, Lucas asked whether Sirleto disliked the references to Estienn and if he should refer to him by the name *Stephanus*, leaving out *Robertus*, so that he could not be easily recognized.⁶⁰ Unfortunately, Ansidei’s answer regarding Sirleto’s position is missing, but from the change ‘~~Stephanus~~’ – ‘Parisienses’ it seems that Lucas was obliged by Sirleto to delete this name and replace it with a vague reference to ‘Parisians.’

58 I just want to emphasise that Sirleto had a copy of Henten’s Bible (1547), which the Italian cardinal annotated by hand, both in light and in dark ink. This printed edition is still preserved in the Vatican Library (Vat. Lat. 9517, see Quentin, *Mémoire* [see n8], 168) and concerning Gen 3:15, in the margin, there is a clear attestation that Sirleto read Lucas. Indeed, there is annotated in light ink ‘Luc. B. f./ P. Lau./ laboribus.’ The former is surely Lucas, whose work(s) are in the reader’s mind. About ‘P. Lau.’, I can just suppose that he was possibly the Benedictine monk Jerónimo Lloret (Hieronymus Lauretus), with the ‘P.’ as *pater*, who wrote, *Sylva allegoriarum sacrae scripturae mysticos eius sensus et magna etiam ex parte literales complectens* (Barcelona: Pablo Cortey et Pedro Malo, 1570). This book explains all possible Biblical allegories; in particular there are references to Gen 3:15 analyzing the words *Calcaneus*, *Conterere*, *Semen*. On Gen 3:15 and its interpretation during the Golden Age, see T. Gallus, *Interpretatio mariologica protoevangelii posttridentina usque ad definitionem dogmaticam immaculae conceptionis pars prior: Aetas aurea exegesis catholicae a concilio Tridentino (1545) usque ad annum 1660* (Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1953), 21–22.

59 Quentin, *Mémoire*, 145. See also P. Maertens, *Franciscus Lucas Brugensis et le texte de l’Ancien Testament (première partie)*, 6, online: http://www.academia.edu/2651905/Franciscus_Lucas_Brugensis_et_le_texte_de_lAncien_Testament_premi%C3%A8re_partie_, accessed on 16.12.2014.

60 “Scire et velim an displiceat Robertum Stephanum nominatum fuisse [...] nusquam enim Robertum Stephanum, sed Stephanum ubique nuncupavimus, ut non facile a quovis cognosci possit” (Höpfel, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata* [see n5], 319–20). On Robert Estienne, see for instance Elizabeth Armstrong, *Robert Estienne: Royal Printer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).

Although he does mention the manuscript Vat. Lat. 6236, Quentin does not put the passages of both the *Specimen* and the *Notationes* in which the change from ‘Stephanus’ to ‘Parisienses’ occurs in his *Mémoire*. I have decided, therefore, to present them by transcribing those passages present in the manuscript on the left and the corresponding passage of the *Notationes* on the right. Doing so better reveals Lucas’ text-critical preferences and the consequences of Sirleto’s intervention on the *Notationes*. In particular, I will focus upon Ps. 26:4 to provide an example of Lucas’ critical approach during his ‘first period.’

4.2.2 Three testimonies of Lucas’ appreciation of Estienne in the *Specimen*:
Ps 5:9, Matt 3:16 and Gen 3:15

Lucas agreed with most of Estienne’s text-critical methodology. He not only quotes the same manuscripts and medieval *correctoria* as Estienne, but he also prefers the Hebrew readings to those of Latin and Greek texts, like the Parisian. Indeed, in the *Specimen* there are two pericopes (Mt. 3:16 and Ps. 5:9) in which the name ‘Stephanus’ is present, showing, on the one hand, Lucas’ appreciation for Estienne’s readings and on the other, Sirleto’s remark not to mention him. In the annotation to Ps. 5:9, there is even a quotation from the Cardinal’s *Annotationes variarum lectionum in psalmos* (1571).⁶¹

<i>Specimen</i>	Margin	<i>Notationes</i>	Margin
Antiqui autem Latini codices Epanorthae, quatuor Stephani , unus Hentenij, duo nostri (Brug. Lob.), habent: <i>dirige in conspectu meo viam tuam</i> , quae et Graecorum quorundam codicum, Theodorito teste, lectio est, ac nominatim, Graeci exemplaris Vaticane Bibliothecae, id quod cum dignitate, tum eruditione et pietate clarissimus, S. R. E. Cardinalis, D. Guillelmus Sirletus, in suis variorum lectionum in Psalmos annotationibus refert, et nostra ad Vaticana collatio notat.	(Parisiensium)	Antiqui autem Latini codices Epanorthae, quatuor Parisiensium , unus Hentenij, tres nostri*, habent: <i>dirige in conspectu meo viam tuam</i> , quae et Graecorum quorundam codicum, Theodorito teste, lectio est, ac nominatim, Graeci exemplaris Vaticane Bibliothecae, id quod cum dignitate, tum eruditione et pietate clarissimus, S. R. E. Cardinalis, D. Guillelmus Sirletus, in suis variorum lectionum in Psalmos annotationibus refert, et nostra ad Vaticana collatio notat.	*Brug. Lob. Torn.

61 Guglielmo Sirleto, *Annotationes variarum lectionum in psalmos: Ad sacri Bibliorum apparatus instructionem* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1571).

Between the *Notationes* and the *Specimen* no relevant differences occur, with the only exception being the reference to a supplementary manuscript in *Notationes*,⁶² that of Tournai, something that may further confirm Estienne’s reading. It is interesting to note that the Cardinal sometimes agreed with Estienne. For example, in this case both of them would read, “in conspectu meo viam tuam.”⁶³

The second passage in which ‘~~Stephano~~’ appears is Matt 3:16:

<i>Specimen</i>	Margin	<i>Notationes</i>
Capitis tertij versu decimosexto: <i>et vidit spiritum Dei, descendentem sicut columbam, et ‘venientem’ super ipsum.</i>] haec unius manuscripti lectio, eius quod a Stephano notatum est, S. Germani lati, minime est contemnenda: sic enim recte, et Graece vertuntur, et Syra. Caeterum altera, <i>Et venientem super se</i> , quae vulgo recepta est [...].	‘(Parisiensibus)’	Capitis tertij versu decimosexto: <i>et vidit spiritum Dei, descendentem sicut columbam, et ‘venientem’ super ipsum.</i>] haec unius manuscripti lectio, eius quod a Parisiensibus notatum est, S. Germani lati, minime est contemnenda: sic enim recte, et Graece vertuntur, et Syra. Caeterum altera, <i>Et venientem super se</i> , quae vulgo recepta est [...].

‘~~Stephano~~’ is deleted and in the margin of the *Specimen* ‘(Parisiensibus)’ is annotated between brackets, as corrected by Sirleto. Once again, Lucas agreed with Estienne’s *lectio*, which he says should not be censured at all (*minime est contemnenda*), since it contained the correct translation both from Greek and Syriac ‘originals.’⁶⁴

The third annotation in which Lucas refers to Estienne is Gen 3:15, although it is hidden behind the expression *unus*:

62 A codex from Torn. = Tornacum = Tournai. See the “Catalogus eorum quibus usi sumus S. Scripturae Librorum,” in Lucas, *Notationes* [see n10], 23–24. The other two manuscripts are from Lobbes (Lob.), and Bruges (Brug.).

On Lobbes Bible, see for instance Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, “La Bible de Lobbes à Trente? Au sujet de quelques bibles apportées à des conciles (Constance, Bâle, Trente),” *Revue Bénédictine* 118 (2008): 135–47.

63 For Estienne’s reading, see *Biblia*, ed. Estienne (Paris: Estienne, 1546), 164v.

64 In this case, Estienne’s text also follows the tradition, viz. *super se*, simply including the alternative lectio ‘super ipsum’ in the margin, see *Biblia*, ed. Estienne, 292r.

Specimen	Margin	Notationes
Capitis tertij versu decimo quinto: <i>ipsa conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius.</i>] Latinorum exemplarium pleraque legunt <i>conteret caput tuum. Unus</i> S. Germani oblongum, cum Sorbonico correctorio, <i>ipse habet conteret caput tuum.</i> Harum lectionum posterior, Hebraeo conformior est.	(Parisiensibus)	Capitis tertij versu decimoquinto: <i>ipsa conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius.</i>] Latina exemplaria pleraque scribunt <i>conteret caput tuum.</i> S. Germani oblongum et Sorbonicum correctorium, a Parisiensibus notata, ipse legunt conteret caput tuum. Harum lectionum posterior, Hebraeo conformior est.

In the *Notationes*, Lucas also added a *Parisiensibus notata*, viz. noted by Estienne, although his name was hidden by a generic *unus* in the *Specimen* and their (or his) *lectio* ‘ipse’ was said to be closer to Hebrew originals.⁶⁵ This reading was handed down by two codices in particular: *S. Germani oblongum* or *sangermanense oblongum* (Paris, B.N. lat. 11504–11505 = Geo), one of Estienne’s main sources, and the *Correctorium Sorbonicum*.⁶⁶ In fact, Lucas’ purpose was to give all possible *lectiones* handed down over the centuries through a great array of manuscripts, trying to show which reading was closer to the original meaning, or at least to illustrate those *lectiones* that are more similar to the ‘original’ sources, such as the Hebrew text. In Lucas’ view, he had to mention that Estienne had correctly put in the margin the *lectio* ‘ipse.’

The letter to Ansidei, to which I have referred earlier, confirms the philological approach that Lucas takes in his text-critical works. Indeed, the Leuven scholar affirmed that Sirleto disliked his quotations from Erasmus (c. 1466–1536) and Sebastian Münster (1488–1552), whom good Catholics considered to be “heretics” or at least suspected of heresy. However, Lucas decided to quote them – although not *nominatim* – properly because both Erasmus and Münster sometimes proposed plausible readings.⁶⁷ Ansidei seemed to have allowed

65 As Quentin states, according to Robert Estienne “le texte hébreu est l’instrument de critique par excellence pour l’établissement du texte de la Vulgate” (Quentin, *Mémoire* [see n8], 108).

66 Unfinished, the *Correctorium Sorbonicum* was made by William the Breton (d. 1356), cf. Jacques M. Vosté, “Medieval Exegesis,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 10, no. 3 (1948): 229–46 (236).

67 “displicere Romanis Patribus ac nominatim Illustrissimo Doctissimo Piissimoque Cardinali Sirleto [...] citentur Munsterus et Erasmus, homines haeretici, aut certe haereseos apud bonos omnes suspecti [...]. Porro non sunt illi a me nominati [...] sed necessitatem quadam, quod ipsi vidisse se codices scribant, quibus, verisimilis lectio probari possit, quos qualesve nos videre invenire haud potuerimus” (Höpfel, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata* [see n5], 317–18).

Lucas to quote Erasmus⁶⁸ but not Munster, who is actually absent from the *Notationes*. Moreover, the Leuven scholar asked whether Ansidei disliked the references to François Vatable ([15th c.]–1547)⁶⁹ and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (1455–1536), while specifying that the Leuven theologian and censor, John Molanus, had allowed him to read the emended version of their works.⁷⁰ Ansidei must have prevented him from referring to both Vatable and Lefèvre d'Étaples. For instance, Lucas quoted the passage in his letter in which there is the reference to Lefèvre d'Étaples, but, in the *Notationes*, the author changed this name to *quidam*:⁷¹

Letter to	Ceterum testatur <i>Faber</i> , quod Iansenius refert antiquos quosdam codices
Ansidei	habere in Luca, ordinem eundem quem Matthaeus habet.
<i>Notationes</i>	Caeterum, testatur <i>quidam</i> ; quod Iansenius refert antiquos quosdam codices
	habere in Luca, ordinem eundem quem Matthaeus habet.

Another possible name that might have offended the Curia was that of the Italian humanist Lorenzo Valla (1405/7–57), although it seems that Cardinal Sirleto did not particularly dislike him.⁷² Thus, with respect to his Bible edition, Lucas wanted to collect those readings by both the early humanists and his contemporaries, always having in mind the goal of amassing all possible *lectiones*. Following this aim, he quoted both ‘heretical’ and Catholic scholars, among whom were Valla, Erasmus, Münster, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Vatable, Zegers,⁷³ Henten, Cornelius Jansenius of Ghent (1510–76), Lindanus, and others, although he had to disguise the names of some of them. At the same

⁶⁸ For instance: Lucas, *Notationes*, 350, commenting on Mt. 5:23.

⁶⁹ See, for instance, Dick Wursten, “François Vatable, so much more than a ‘name,’” *Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 73 (2011): 557–91.

⁷⁰ “Restat de Vatablo interrogem [...] et de Jacopo Fabro [...] interdictum enim est Vatabili bibliis et Fabri commentariis, donec fuerint expunctis licis suspectis emendata, sed Vatabili quidem Biblia habuius ab Academia nostra emendata atque approbata; Fabri vero in Psalmos commentaria ut et emendata Vatabli Biblia dedit nobis librorum inquisitor M. N. Molanus legendi licentiam” (Höpfel, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata*, 320).

⁷¹ *Quidam*, ‘someone’, was often used when catholic censorship was involved; for instance, Jansenius of Ghent had to remove the name ‘Erasmus’, replacing it exactly with *quidam*. See, for instance, Michael Andrew Screech, “Erasmus and the Concordia of Cornelius Jansenius, bishop of Ghent: Christian Folly and Catholic Orthodoxy,” in *Colloque Erasmi de Liege: Commémoration du 450e anniversaire de la mort d’Erasmus*, ed. Jean-Pierre Massaut (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1987), 303–4.

⁷² For instance: Lucas, *Notationes* [see n10], 350, commenting Matt 5:23.

⁷³ For instance, see the analysis of Matt 3:16, Lucas, *Notationes*, 349.

time, Lucas keeps a constant, watchful eye on the Latin and Greek fathers of the Early Church as well as upon medieval commentators.

4.2.3 The methodology in theory and practice: The *Notationes* on Ps 26:4

Although Lucas was young – he started to write when he was 24 years old – this work shows his deep knowledge of both the Scriptures and ancient languages. Furthermore, he used a particular methodology to analyze the Bible, something that is clearly visible in his analysis of Ps 26:4. After the explanation of the Fathers' readings of a particular passage, he declared that he would focus upon the different *lectiones* in each language, from Latin manuscripts to Hebrew texts, in addition to the Greek versions. Only by way of this thorough process could he propose his version to be the most genuine reading (which was not inspired, he claimed, by his own theological interpretation). Below, I have cited an extract of the *Notationes*, transcribing part of Lucas' analysis on Ps. 26:4.

Ut videam voluntatem Domini. Ad hunc modum legunt universa nostra Latina scripta, cum Latinis Tractatoribus, Arnobio, Hieronymo, Cassiodoro, Beda, Haymone, Remigio, Thoma Aq., Hugone de S. Victore, & alijs [...]. Sunt vero alij quidam Latini codices, qui una mutata littera scribant, *Ut videam voluptatem Domini*; Suessoniens exemplar (id quod est Parisiensium fide in Bibliorum margine notatum est) & Psalterium R.mi D. Lindani opera castigatum [...] ut videam voluptatem Domini [...] huic scripturae, inter Latinos Patres, S. Augustinus suffragatur [...]. In hac Latinorum varietate, si, ex Graecis et Hebraicis libris, ferenda sententia est, posterior scriptura probanda, prior erronea iudicanda est. Est enim Graece τοῦ θεωρεῖν με τὴν τερπνότητα Κυρίου. τερπνότης, voluptatem, delectationem, iudicunditatem, non voluntatem denotat [...] Hebraice est [...] Noam, decorem, pulchritudinem, iucunditatem, designat. Hinc vertit Hieronymus: ut videam pulchritudinem Domini [...] Chaldaeus est [...] dulcedinem. Quae omnia, aut cum voluptatem idem signat, aut voluptatem spectant. quinetiam, voluptatem transtulit quidam. Complures itaque aetatis nostrae scriptores, *voluptatem* non *voluntatem*, legendum censuerunt: Pagninus, Iansenius, Bredembachius, Folengius, Eugubinus, Varlenius. Neque enim ea est Graecis et Hebraeis, quae Latinis, vocum vicinitas, ea quae errori occasionem dedisse videtur, vel quod scribae, *voluntatem* pro *voluptatem* [...] legerint, (nam & alijs, quibusdam Scripturae locis voces istae varietate efficiunt) vel quod *voluntatem* emendandum iudicarint, quia id convenientius videtur. Minime vero, aut probandus est error, quia constans est; aut recipiendus, quia antiquus.⁷⁴

As Lucas explains, the major part of the Latin manuscripts reads *voluntatem* (will), together with many 'commentators': Arnobius of Sicca (d. ca. 327), Jerome (ca. 347 – 420), Cassiodorus (ca. 485 – c. 585), the Venerable Beda

⁷⁴ Lucas, *Notationes*, 114–15.

(ca. 673 – 735), Haimo of Auxerre (d. ca. 878), Thomas Aquinas (1225 – 1274), Hugo of St. Victor (ca. 1096 – 1141), etc. However, in some Latin codices *voluptatem* (enjoyment/delight) occurs, as handed down by the Illuminated Psalter–Hours of Yolande de Soissons (thirteenth century, now at New York, Morgan Lib., MS. M. 729), as noted by Estienne and Lindanus, and which was also reported by Augustine (354 – 430).⁷⁵ Augustine in particular reads *delectationem Domini*, and Lucas says that he ‘supports’ (*suffragat*) the reading *voluptatem*. It is possible that Lucas did not stress the different reading *delectationem/voluptatem* since these two nouns are synonyms. In addition, he may have wanted to focus on *voluptatem/voluntatem* to show how easily mistakes could occur in Latin and why it was necessary to appeal to the ‘originals’ in choosing the correct reading. Indeed, after having shown the discrepancy between the Latin sources, Lucas appeals to both Greek and Hebrew to argue that they use words closest to the Latin *voluptas*. Thus, he argues that Latin translators have made a scribal error by changing *voluptas* into *voluntas*. Finally, he demonstrates the reading *voluptas* by referring to early modern authors: Sante Pagnini, Cornelius Jansenius of Ghent, Matthias Bredenbach (ca. 1499–1559), Giovanni Battista Folengo (1490–1559), Agostino Steuco ‘Eugubinus,’ viz., from Gubbio (1497–1548) and Hieronymus Vairlenius (1511–1589).

Finally, Lucas summarized his methodology in the final short phrase, which I have underlined. The oldest manuscripts may not, necessarily, have handed down the genuine reading, and/or one cannot argue that a particular reading is correct only because of its consistency in the majority of codices. The only way to choose the correct tradition is by way of a thorough philological analysis and by using the original Greek and Hebrew Bible texts.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, Lucas did not want to suggest a correction of the Vulgate because he accepted that the “*vetus Editio Latina, a Tridentino Concilio probata, atque authentica pronunciata.*”⁷⁷ Lucas still wanted to fulfill the will of the Church, which in the fourth session of the Council had asked for an emendation of the biblical text, ‘cleaning’ it from scribal errors. Therefore, he wanted to answer this request by comparing the *Vulgata*

⁷⁵ See Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos I–L*, Ps 26:4, 6–7, in *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*, vol. 38, ed. Eligius Dekkers and Jean Fraipont (Turnhout: Brepols, 1956), 152.

⁷⁶ On this, see also Philip Maertens, *Franciscus Lucas Brugensis et le texte de l’Ancien Testament (première partie)*, online: https://www.academia.edu/Documents/in/Franciscus_Lucas_Brugensis, accessed on 16.12.2014.

⁷⁷ Lucas, *Notationes*, 6.

with the original texts and by showing all *germanae lectiones*.⁷⁸ To that end, he had to use many different editions, both printed and in manuscript form.⁷⁹

To conclude this section, Lucas' methodology can be summarized in three steps:

- a. To take all possible Latin readings, referring also to *Latini Tractatores*, viz. the Latin commentators, or the Latin Church fathers, analyzing different readings, with a constant view to contemporary scholars.
- b. If there are different readings, to also take the Greek and Hebrew original texts, comparing these to the Latin *lectiones*.
- c. To try to offer the most genuine reading, following two philological principles:
 - i. Just because an error is frequent does not mean that it should be received as a correct reading ("aut probandum est error, quia constans est").
 - ii. The oldest *lectio* is not necessarily the correct one ("aut recipiendus quia antiquus").

4.3 1583: The republication of the Leuven Vulgate

As already shown, Lucas limited himself in 1574 to a re-publication of the text of the Leuven Vulgate. For, after hearing about the Roman Committee, which was revising the Latin Bible, he opted not to interfere with its work and therefore, offered a text that had already been accepted and appreciated by Rome, viz. Henten's 1547 edition. However, in his version, Lucas included more *lectiones* from the Greek, Syriac, and Hebrew in the margins, after considering the interpretations of several exegetes.

After five years of work, in 1580, Lucas was able to publish a critical apparatus to the Vulgate, the *Notationes in sacra Biblia* and, although he had to correct his text following Cardinal Sirleto's advice, gave further annotations about the readings handed down in different manuscripts. This work brought him great renown, thanks to which he was invited by the Bishop of St. Omer,

⁷⁸ "[...] ut Synodi [scil. Tridentini] desiderio satisfaceret Theologica Facultas [scil. Lovaniensis] et D. Hentenio olim, et post nobis, hoc operis demandavit, quanquam a nobis, textus, ut ab Hentenio est editus, verbis neutiquam mutatus sit. Nam enim, ex Hebreo, Graeco, Chaldeo, aut Syro, vulgatam emendare studuimus Versionem Exemplaria: sed cum variare reperta essent vulgatae Versionis exemplaria, adhibita sunt Haebrae et Graeca, plerumque etiam Chaldea et Syra, ut dignosci posset qua Exemplaria lectionem servarent germanam" (Lucas, *Notationes* [see n10], 8).

⁷⁹ For all texts used by Lucas, see "Catalogus" [see n62], 21–24.

Jean Six, to come to his diocese in 1581, along with other Catholic scholars from Bruges. There, the bishop even offered him the office of private chaplain and secretary in the same year.⁸⁰ Finally, in St. Omer, Lucas achieved the goal that he had had in 1574 (according to De Schrevel), viz. to print ‘his’ Vulgate edition supplemented with a text-critical apparatus. In 1583⁸¹ the Plantin Press published a very beautiful edition of this 1574 Vulgate, supplemented with the 1580 *Notationes in sacra Biblia*, which had been approved by Rome, in order that the reader might know (and possibly even adapt the Bible text to) the variants most faithful to the Hebrew and Greek ‘originals.’

In conclusion, Lucas’ approach was completely philological and not theological. This is also evidenced by his quotation of ‘heretical’ authors when he mentioned their *lectiones*. Whereas this was the methodology Lucas’ adopted when working on the 1574 edition, he had to change his methodology again following the ‘petrification’⁸² of the Latin Vulgate in the Sixto-Clementine edition (1592), as I shall examine in the following section.

5 Lucas’ second period: 1592–1603

5.1 1592: The issue of the Vatican Vulgate and the Pope’s ban

After the publication of the 1583 edition, Lucas waited almost two decades for releasing a new text-critical work. Indeed, the third Roman Committee was able to emend the Vulgate and publish a new edition. The basis of the Committee’s edition was actually the 1583 Lucas edition. Carafa was able to offer an emended text that contained “ten-thousand interpolations.”⁸³ Pope Sixtus had, however,

⁸⁰ Bled, *Les évêques de Saint-Omer* [see n6], 422. “Jean Six à peine monté sur le siège épiscopal de Saint-Omer (juillet 1581), l’appela auprès de lui pour en faire son chapelain intime et son secrétaire” (De Schrevel, “Lucas, François,” [see n2], 555).

⁸¹ *Biblia* 1583 [see n11].

⁸² Jean-Pierre Delville also speaks about the ‘pétrification’ of the Vulgate with the arrival of the Sixto-Clementine edition. See Jean-Pierre Delville, “L’évolution des vulgates et la composition de nouvelles versions latines de la Bible au 16e siècle,” in *Biblia: Les Bibles en latin au temps des Réformes*, ed. Marie-Christine Gomez-Géraud (Paris: Presses de l’Université Paris-Sorbonne, 2008), 71–106 (80).

⁸³ “Come base fu scelto un esemplare della bibbia popolare di Lovanio-Anversa del 1583, stampata da Cristoforo Plantin. I risultati dell’accurato esame venivano trascritti e inseriti in due esemplari, oggi nella Vaticana: cod. Vat. lat. 12959–12960 [...]. Ma quali non furono la meraviglia e la costernazione del Carafa e dei suoi iomini, allorché pochi giorni dopo, si sparse la notizia che il papa non era più soddisfatto del lavoro, che aveva respinto in blocco le correzioni

disregarded the Committee's preparatory work and had, on his own initiative, promulgated an edition which was even closer to the Leuven Vulgate, the so-called *Vulgata Sixtina*, in 1590.⁸⁴ However, this work was not appreciated by the Congregation of the Cardinals and a week after the death of Pope Sixtus V (27 August 1590) they ordered, first, the suspension of the selling of this edition and the destruction of the printed copies shortly thereafter.⁸⁵ The need for an official text still remained and therefore, in 1591, Gregory XIV issued a fourth Committee, which reorganized into the fifth and final Committee. The basis of the Committee's work was the *Codex Carafianus*, viz. the Leuven Vulgate emended by Carafa's third Committee. Eventually, in 1592, the *Vulgata Sixtina* was replaced by the so-called Sixto-Clementine, issued by Clement VIII. This edition was actually very important, since it was the Vulgate requested by the Council of Trent almost 50 years earlier.⁸⁶ Indeed, the preface of St. Jerome is preceded by a short document, "Ad perpetuam rei memoriam," in which the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate is clearly established as being the only acceptable version for the Church. This text can be divided into three main sections: (1) the ban, (2) the possible condemnation, (3) the mandate.

e che si era deciso di fare da solo la revisione. Cos'era accaduto? Forse la vista di diecimila interpolazioni, anche se scelte con tanta diligenza ed erudizione?" (Andreu, "Antonio Agellio e la Volgata Sistina" [see n38], 85–86).

84 Andreu, "Antonio Agellio e la Volgata Sistina," 86–88. Specifically on the *Vulgata Sixtina*, see also Henri de Saint-Marie, "Sisto e la Volgata", in Stramare, *La Bibbia 'Vulgata'* [see n38], 61–67, and Dante Balboni, "L'edizione a stampa della 'Vulgata' di Sisto V," in Stramare, *La Bibbia 'Vulgata'*, 107–17.

85 *Biblia sacra vulgatae editionis tribus tomis distincta* (Rome: Vatican Typography, 1590). See Quentin, *Mémoire* [see n8], 190. Only few copies were saved from destruction and one of them is still preserved in the Maurits Sabbe Library of the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies in Leuven (Maurits Sabbe Library: P22.053.2/F°).

86 Wicks in his contribution maintained: "The prefaces prepared under Pope Clement VIII do not declare the 1592 edition to be the authentic Vulgate of the Tridentine Decree of 1546" (Jared Wicks, "Catholic Old Testament Interpretation in the Reformation and Early Confessional Eras," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation: From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, ed. Magne Sæbø, Michael Fishbane and Jean Luis Ska, 2 vols. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2008], 2:635–36). We do not agree with that interpretation, as has already been exposed in François and Gerace, *Trent and the Latin Vulgate?* [see n16], esp. n90–91. A clear proof of its presumed authenticity is given by Clement VIII's ban: this measure would be totally disproportionate and useless, if this Vulgate were not considered the only 'authentic' version. It is true that the word '*authentica*' does not appear in the document "Ad perpetuam rei memoria," but the Pope clearly writes, through Marcello Vestri Barbiani, his 'domestic secretary,' that the text of the Bible was *restitutus*: *restitutio* in Latin means *to restore*, *to return to the original state*; in this *restitutus* we should read the authenticity of this Vulgate. Moreover, this text, the only acceptable version for the liturgy, was not replaced until the *Nova Vulgata* in 1979.

In the first section,⁸⁷ three elements can be seen:

- (a) The text of the Vulgate was accurately purged (*accuratissime expurgatus*) and restored to the primitive condition (*restitutus*). Since the Vatican Press printed this text, it can no longer be changed. Furthermore, this Vulgate should be preserved in the future exactly as it was printed by the Vatican Press.
- (b) The Pope prohibits (*Nos ... inhibemus*) the publication of the Vulgate in both Italy and ‘*ultra montes*’ for ten years, giving the monopoly to the Vatican Press.
- (c) After ten years have elapsed, other publishers can print the Vulgate, but only by using a copy of Sixto-Clementine printed by the Vatican, without any changes, and by strictly following the text.

In the second section, Clement VIII addresses himself to printers and book sellers who would dare to transgress these stipulations, suggesting several punishments for them. He points to the situation in which a printer, against the Pope’s will, dares to print, to sell, to offer for sale, to diffuse or to divulge the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate at any moment during this decennial monopoly, or in which a bookseller presumes to sell, put up for sale or to divulge copies of the said Vulgate edition, – or even of future editions of it –, which may offer a different text or layout in respect to the official version. Transgressors of the papal stipulations may be punished by a genuine excommunication, in addition to the confiscation of all of their books, and other possible punishments issued by the Pontiff directly.⁸⁸ In the final section, the Pope orders Patriarchs,

⁸⁷ “Cum sacrorum Bibliorum Vulgatæ editionis textus summis laboribus ac vigiliis restitutus, et quam accuratissime mendis expurgatus, benedicente Domino, ex nostra typographia Vaticana in lucem prodeat; Nos, ut in posterum idem textus incorruptus, ut decet, conservetur, opportune providere volentes, auctoritate apostolica, tenore præsentium districtius inhibemus, ne intra decem annos a data præsentium numerandos, tam citra quam ultra montes, alibi quam in nostra Vaticana typographia, a quoquam imprimatur. Elapso autem præfato decennio, eam cautionem adhiberi præcipimus, ut nemo hanc sanctarum Scripturarum editionem typis mandare præsumat, nisi habito prius exemplari in typographia Vaticana excuso: cujus exemplaris forma, ne minima quidem particula de textu mutata, addita, vel ab eo detracta, nisi aliquid occurrat, quod typographicæ incuriæ manifeste ascribendum sit, inviolabiliter observetur” (Clemens papa VIII, “Ad perpetuam rei memoria,” in *Biblia Sacra: Vulgatæ Editionis Sixti Qvinti Pont. Max. ivssv recognita atque edita* [Rome: Vatican Press, 1592]).

⁸⁸ “Si quis vero typographus in quibuscumque regnis, civitatibus, provinciis, et locis tam nostræ et S. R. E. ditioni in temporalibus subjectis, quam non subjectis, hanc eamdem sacrarum Scripturarum editionem intra decennium præ dictum quoquo modo, elapso autem decennio, aliter quam juxta hujusmodi exemplar, ut præfertur, imprimere, vendere, venales habere, aut alias edere vel evulgare : aut si quis bibliopola a se vel ab aliis quibusvis, post datam

Cardinals, Bishops, Prelates, and the clergy to ensure that his decision is respected.⁸⁹

5.2 1599: The Pope's privilege to Plantin's Press. The Antwerp Vulgate

As we have seen, the Clement VIII was firmly convinced that he had restored the Vulgate and, because of that, established a Vatican monopoly on the printing of the Bible for ten years, even excommunicating those who did not respect the decision. Nevertheless, after a few years, Clement VIII understood the impossibility of printing his Vulgate only in the Vatican Press. The problem was that it was impossible to distribute enough copies to every Catholic dioceses, especially in Germany and other regions north of the Alps.⁹⁰ Therefore, on 11 March 1597, the Pope allowed the Antwerp printer Johannes Moretus, successor of Christopher Plantin, to print the Sixto-Clementine. Moretus was the only publisher north of the Alps (*trans Alpes*) to receive this privilege, even though the decennial monopoly on printing the restored Vulgate remained in vigor. Clement VIII sent a copy of the last available reprint of the official text of the Bible, the 1593 edition, to the Plantin Press, asking, or rather ordering, copies identical to the original to be produced.⁹¹

praesentium, hujus editionis impressos libros, seu imprimendos a praefato restituto et correcto textu in aliquo discrepantes, seu ab alio, quam a typographo Vaticano, intra decennium excusos, pariter vendere, venales proponere, vel evulgare praesumpserit, ultra amissionem omnium librorum, et alias arbitrio nostro infligendas poenas temporales, etiam majoris excommunicationis sententiam eo ipso incurrat : a qua nisi a Romano Pontifice, praeterquam in mortis articulo constitutus, absolvi non possit" (Clemens papa VIII, "Ad perpetuam rei memoria").

89 "Mandamus itaque universis et singulis, Patriarchis, Archiepiscopis, Episcopis, ceterisque Ecclesiarum et locorum, etiam regularium Praelatis, ut praesentes litteras in suis quisque Ecclesiis et jurisdictionibus ab omnibus inviolate perpetuo observari curent ac faciant" (Clemens papa VIII, "Ad perpetuam rei memoria").

90 "Cum [...] cautum fuerit, ne sacrorum Bibliorum vulgatae aeditionis iussu felicitis recordationis Sixti Papae Quinti praedecessoris nostri recognitorum textus, alibi, praeterquam in Typographia Vaticana, imprimi posset [...]. Cumque ob locorum distantiam, et portorii onera, et ob alias graves difficultates, et impensas, sacrorum Bibliorum in dicta Typographia impressorum volumina, ad Germania praesertim, et alias ultramontanas regiones deferri vix possint" ("Clemens Pp. VIII Dilecto Filio Ioanni Moreto Typographo Antverpiensi," in *Biblia Sacra: Vulgatae Editionis Sixti Qvinti Pont. Max. ivssv recognita atque edita* [Platin: Antwerp, 1599], A4).

91 "Tibi soli trans Alpes, ut durante decennio proximo, Biblia vulgatae aeditionis huiusmodi iuxta, quam emendatissime tamen, et summa cum fide, nullaue facta additione, aut immutatione imprimere valeas" (see "Clemens Pp. VIII Dilecto Filio Ioanni Moreto," A4).

Finally, after two years, in 1599, Moretus published the first *trans Alpes* edition of the Sixto-Clementine.⁹² In spite of the Vatican recommendation not to change anything, the work changed obvious typographical mistakes of the Roman Vulgate. With the aim to restore the 1599 Vulgate edition to the 1593 Roman copy sent earlier by the Pope to the Plantin Press, John Moretus received the assistance of scholars such as George Colvenerius (1564–1649)⁹³ and Lucas ‘of Bruges.’ This revision was made through a letter exchange, characterized by the inclusion of long appendices containing lists of the typographical errors.⁹⁴ Lucas highlighted the discrepancies between these two Vulgates with a well-defined methodology: he put all the differences into two columns, in order to clearly compare the 1599 Antwerp version to the 1593 Sixto-Clementine edition. As an example of the accuracy of this work, I have included an extract from a letter sent by Lucas to Moretus’ son Balthasar on 4 September 1601 (the underlinings are mine):⁹⁵

⁹² *Biblia Sacra: Vulgatæ Editionis Sixti Qvinti Pont. Max. ivssv recognita atque edita* (Antwerp: Platin, 1599).

⁹³ George Colvenerius was Royal professor of Theology in the University of Douai, see A. van der Meersch, “Colvener (Georges),” *Biographie Nationale de Belgique*, 4 (1873): 311–13.

⁹⁴ See the letters in De Schrevel, “Documents” [see n3], 210–12. For instance, Lucas writes: “Mitto, quos ex collectione Romani Bibliorum exemplaris [viz. 1593 edition], observavi errores exemplaris vestri [viz. 1599 edition]” (Lucas to Balthasar Moretus, 4 September 1601). Previously, John Moretus received a letter a few months previously, also furnished with an appendix, by George Colvenerius, who also remarked upon those typographical mistakes in the Antwerp edition or at least discrepancies with the Sixto-Clementine: “Mitto pauculas, quae tua laus est et correctoris tui, mendas in editione Bibliorum ad exemplar Romanum, in quibus tua [viz. 1599 edition] a Romana impressione dissident. Observavi et alia non pauca in quibus non dubito errorem esse vel typographicum vel alium, sed nihil omnino notavi in his nisi ubi dissentis a Romano exemplaris” (George Colvenerius to John Moretus, 26 April 1601, in De Schrevel, “Documents,” 210).

⁹⁵ Lucas to Balthasar Moretus, 4 September 1601, in De Schrevel, “Documents,” 214. Consultation of the copy of the 1599 Antwerp Vulgate preserved in Leuven at Maurits Sabbe Library shows that there is not always a correspondence between the typographical mistakes reported in the appendix and those ones actually present in this Vulgate. For instance, in Gen 10:14 there is correctly ‘Chasluim’ and not ‘Chassuim’ or, in Num 24:24 the appendix has ‘trienibus,’ but in the Vulgate we read ‘triemibus’ (instead of ‘trieribus’). I have autoptically seen the original letter, still preserved at the Archive of Plantin Museum, Reg. 87, f. 303 and I could verify that De Schrevel has correctly transcribed the text: in sum, the problem of the discrepancies still remains.

Biblia		Antv (viz. 1599).	Rom. (viz. 1593)
Gen.	2. v. 16.	praecipitq.	praecepitq.
	10. v. 14.	et Chassuim	et Chasluim
	11. v. 11.	Vixtiq. postq.	Vixtiq. <u>Sem</u> postq.
	13. v. 12.	in opidis	in oppidis
	30. v. 27.	Labam	Laban
	v. 31.	nihil volo	Nihil volo
	32. v. 4.	Praecipitq	Praecipitq

6 Lucas’ third period: 1603–1618

6.1 1603: The *Romanae correctionis ... loca insigniora* and the typographical mistakes occurring in the 1593 Roman Vulgate

It was not only the 1599 Antwerp edition that presented typographical mistakes. Pinpointing the discrepancies between 1599 Plantin printing and the 1593 Vatican Vulgate, Colvenerius and Lucas were even able to find typographical errors within the latter edition. Therefore, they promptly sent these mistakes to Cardinal Baronius, through the intermediary of Moretus.⁹⁶ It was the presence of these typographical errors⁹⁷ in the 1593 Vatican edition that gave Lucas the inspiration to write a booklet (*libellus*), to be published alongside the second Antwerp Vulgate (1603).⁹⁸ Lucas published it separately in order to respect the

96 “Quare summopere mihi gratulor ac gaudeo de censura quam Ill.ma R. T. mihi transmisit locorum quorundam in Romano Bibliorum exemplari quae errorem typographicum R.dis Dominis Francisco Lucae decano Audomarensi et Georgio Colvenerio” (John Moretus to Card. Baronius, 3 January 1603, in De Schrevel, “Documents,” 240). De Schrevel also adds *Passages de la Vulgate, éditée à Rome en 1593, que François Lucas et Georges Colvenerius supposent être entaches d’erreurs typographiques et que le cardinal Baronius renvoie a Jean Moretus I, munis de observations*, see De Schrevel, “Documents,” 234–38.

97 He always spoke about typographical errors. For instance, Lucas writes to John Moretus: “Porro inter colligendum illas Romanorum correctiones, observavi loca quaedam, quae, ut persuasus sum, in Romanis Bibliis erronea sunt excusa; illa in schedula descripta ad te mitto, ut eorum, si placet, Romanos reddas certiores, illuque tibi sententiam suam significant, qua intellecta, siquidem vitia typographica sint, vel emedes in iis quae imprimis Bibliis, vel, si loca praeterieris antequam illi scripserint, ad calcem annotes. Velim autem ego quoque certior fieri, si quid illi respondeant; jam enim ego in observationibus illis meis scripsi, videri mihi typographicos esse errores” (Lucas to John Moretus, 12 March 1602, in De Schrevel, “Documents,” 221–22).

98 *Biblia Sacra: Vulgatæ Editionis Sixti Qvinti Pont. Max. ivssv recognita atque edita* (Antwerp: Platin, 1603).

Pope's will not to have changes to the Vulgate text itself (*nullaque facta additione, aut immutatione imprimere valeas*⁹⁹). The booklet, dedicated to the Bishop of St. Omer, Jacobus Blasaesus, was entitled *Romanae correctionis*. The aim of this *libellus* is expressed in a letter of Lucas, addressed to John Moretus:

I send you the booklet (*libellus*) on the correction of the Roman Bible (*de Romana correctione*), which serves to ornate the Sistine Bible [scil. 1593 Sixto-Clementine] [...] attached at the end, in order that both those who do not yet have the Sistine Bible and also those who have it, but were habituated to other editions, could, thanks to this booklet, emend their own Bible copies and make it conform to the Sistine Bible; finally, the others could understand how the Sistine Bible is different from the other Bibles, facts that many people do not know, even though they have the Sistine Bible.¹⁰⁰

On the basis of this quotation, it is obvious that Francis Lucas intended his *libellus* to be an appendix to the Antwerp Sixto-Clementine edition of 1603 and to provide a list of the emendations present in the Sixto-Clementine text. The goal was to allow scholars to compare the Sixto-Clementine version to other versions and to correct the other, older versions. The second aim seems to have been the correction of the typographical errors that were present in the 1593 Roman Vulgate. The noun which he used to indicate these mistakes, *vitiola*, shows that he considered them to not be important in terms of faith,¹⁰¹ since they are simply due to *inscitia* and *incuria* of the printers, viz. their non-comprehension of the Bible and their negligence in their work. This is to say that the fault was not in the Bible, but rather in those who had printed it. In any case, Lucas left the decision whether or not to insert this booklet into his new edition of the Sixto-Clementine to Moretus.¹⁰² Below are a few examples of these

⁹⁹ *Biblia Sacra* (1599) [see n92], A4.

¹⁰⁰ “[...] mitto libellum de Romana correctione, qui serviet orandis Sixtinis Biblis [...] ad calcem additus [...] ut et ii qui nondum habent Sixtina Biblia et ii qui etiam habent, assueverunt aliis exemplaribus, sua Biblia ex hoc libello possint corrigere et Sixtinis accommodare; denique alii intelligere, quo differant Sixtina Biblia ab aliis Bibliis, id quod plerique nesciunt etiamsi Sixtina Biblia habeant” (Lucas to John Moretus, 1 May 1602, in De Schrevel, “Documents” [see n3], 224, italics in the original).

¹⁰¹ “Verum hanc rem permitto iudicio et arbitrio tuo, hoc tantum addo: quod si in huiusmodi separatam impressionem propenderes, non necesse esse expectare responsum Romanorum ad pauca poca illa quae videntur mihi in autographo Romano esse vitiata: nam quia jam edita sunt cum illis vitiosis Sixtina Biblia et Romae, et Antuerpiae, et alibi, omnino indicari oportet vitiosa illa: qua si in excusione angustiae quae a vobis paratur, corrigantur, facile erit ad calcem illius excusioni id significare” (Lucas to John Moretus, 1 May 1602, in De Schrevel, “Documents,” 224, italics in the original).

¹⁰² “ea tamen est, plerorumque qui Typographiis praesunt, vel inscitia, ut non agnoscant, vel incuria, ut negligant, quod verum est, et inolitis vitiis postponant [...]. Dum igitur dispicio, quondam efficaciam remedium huic malo queat adhiberi, ne amplius ea loca corrumpantur,

corrections. They are taken from the chapter on *Genesis* in order to illustrate the double purpose of the booklet:¹⁰³

CAPITIS *primi versu secundo*: Et spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas. *Non sine causa, Romani Correctores, Domini, id est, τοῦ κυρίου, quod est in multis libris, mutarunt cum Dei, i. τοῦ θεοῦ quod est in aliis.* (9)

Versu 26. Et bestiis. Recte hic omiserunt vocem terrae, quam quidam libri addunt in hunc modum: Et bestiis terrae. (9)

CAP. XX. v. 7 Nunc ergo redde viro suo uxorem, quia propheta est: et orabit pro te, et vives. *Hic est ordo, non tantum Sixtinorum, verum etiam nostrorum antiquorum codicum, Hebraicae veritati consonantium. In aliis multis libris, illud quia propheta est, postponitur huic et orabit pro te.* (13-4)

CAP XXXV v. 8 Ad radices Bethel, subter quercum. *Legendum est subter, quod locum inferiorem significant, non super contrarium, tametsi hoc sit in Romana anni 1593. editione: error est enim typographicus.* (17)

In the first example, Lucas refers to *Romani correctores*, the members of the third Roman Committee, agreeing with their decision to change *Domini* (the Lord), to *Dei* (God) in Gen 1:2. In the second quotation, Lucas again agrees with the *Romani correctores*. However, the third example is more interesting; the Leuven scholar seems to prefer the *lectio* (or rather the order of the words) handed down through 'our ancient codices,'¹⁰⁴ to which he had access and which offer a reading that is closer to the Hebrew version. Finally, the last quotation is a clear correction of a typographical mistake: the adverb '*super*' (on), which is present in the 1593 Vatican edition, should be read as *subter* (under).

It is clear that the *Romanae correctionis* does not offer the same type of text-critical analysis that characterized the *Notationes* with its comparison of multiple manuscripts, its inclusion of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, or Syriac texts, and with its quotation of ancient, medieval, and modern exegetes. The reason for this change of methodology is clear: the two works have different aims. If the

quae iam dexterrime correctae sunt [...] et indicata ea quae reiecta est lectione, ita clare intelligere posset, quae proba sit lectio, reprobata sit lectio, quae textu exclusa, quae in textum, summi Pontificis Ecclesiae totius capituli, auctoritate recepta" (Lucas, *Romanae correctionis* [see n12], 4).

103 Lucas, *Romanae correctionis*. At the end of each quotation, there is the number of the page between brackets.

104 In all probability, Lucas is making a reference to that of Tournai, Lobbes and Bruges, since in *Notationes*, the author considers them *nostri*, 'ours.' In addition to the manuscripts of Tournai, Lobbes and Bruges, Lucas calls 'nostri' that of Liege, see *Notationes* [see n10], Ecc. 5:9, p. 277. Possibly, with 'nostri' he refers to those manuscripts present in the Low Countries.

Notationes had the intention of collecting all possible *lectiones* handed down over the centuries, the *Romanae correctionis* took the Sixto-Clementine to be the authoritative point of departure and its purpose is simply to show its typographical mistakes. No substantial changes could be considered acceptable after the Sixto-Clementine. Lucas had to avoid any reference to a better reading, since no reading could be considered better than that of the Pope's Vulgate.

In summary, the printing of the Vatican edition (1592) led to the 'crystallization' of the Vulgate text. After this point in time, it was not possible to put other *lectiones* in the margin of the authentic version of the Church, let alone to attach a booklet in which other parallel readings might be included. This variation with respect to the methodology used in *Notationes* and *Romanae correctionis* becomes clear not only after the reading of Lucas' exchange of letters with John Moretus, but also after considering different verses found in both works. For example, in the *libellus* there is no mention of the problematic reading of Gen 3:15. Its examination would be useless not only because it was already fully developed in *Notationes*, but especially because the Roman Committee had defined the only correct and faithful reading: there was no longer a reason to show divergent *lectiones* in respect to the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate.¹⁰⁵

In any case, the *Romanae correctionis* was not exempt from criticism. For instance, Willem Hessels van Est (1542–1613), shortly Estius, the renowned biblical scholar of the University of Douai, wrote to Lucas: "I observe in those corrections many things to be extolled to you, but not all."¹⁰⁶ Estius' criticism especially focused upon the absence of several emendations given by the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate. In his reply, Lucas admitted that he had not included all of them because, in his opinion, not every correction that the Roman Committee had made was justified. In other words, the Sixto-Clementine did not always follow the right *lectio*. It is clear that Lucas, in this private communication, did not appreciate the Vulgate's official text in all its passages. Nonetheless, due to the publication of the Sixto-Clementine, Lucas had to change his methodology in the last textual critical works he produced, as I will show now on the basis of

105 In any case, the text-critical studies could continue, in order to help scholars, but their results could not be inserted in the Vulgate: "Ita quoque non prohibet, quin alio genere characteris in hac ipsa Vaticana editione ejusmodi adjumenta pro studiosorum commoditate, atque utilitate, atque utilitate in posterum adjiciantur; ita tamen, ut lectiones variae ad marginem ipsius textus minime annotentur" (Clemens papa VIII, "Ad perpetuam rei memoria" [see n87]).

106 "Observo multa in illis correctionibus a te laudari, sed non omnia" (William Estius to Lucas, 14 December 1603, in De Schrevel, "Documents," 254).

the *Notarum ad varias lectiones latinas in quatuor Evangeliiis occurrentes*, the publication of which was actually approved by Estius.¹⁰⁷

6.2 1606: *Notarum ad varias lectiones*

The *Notarum ad varias lectiones* was finished at the same time as the publication of *Romanae correctionis*, since the abovementioned letter to Estius dates from 1603, if not earlier.¹⁰⁸ Like his previous work, this *libellus*, dedicated to his friend Cardinal Robert Bellarmine, was intended to be an appendix to his commentaries on the Gospels that were published in three volumes between 1606 and 1616.¹⁰⁹ Again, the purpose of this book was to analyze the various *lectiones*

107 “Quod autem observavi eruditio tua non omnia quae in illis Bibliis sunt a me laudari, fateor: ut et sunt non pauca loca illorum Bibliorum, quae in illo Correctorio omisi, tametsi variantia. Ratio ea est, quam animadvertit, adhuc deesse illis Bibliis [viz. 1593 Sixto-Clementine] quae ad exactam castigationem faciant; nimirum non omnia loca correcta, quae a nostro iudicio correctionem merebantur; sive, plures adhuc superesse lectionum varietates, e quibus non videantur ea Biblia sequi optime: id quod in quatuor certe Evangeliiis facile observabit qui hunc libellum Romanarum correctionum, contulerit cum altero meo libello jam pridem a vobis approbato, titulo: *Notarum ad varias lectiones latinas in quatuor Evangeliiis occurrentes*” (Lucas to William Estius, 22 January 1604, in De Schrevel, “Documents” [see n3], 255). About this *libellus*, see below.

108 Between *Romanae correctionis* and *Notarum ad varias lectiones* there is *Concordantiae Bibliorum sacrorum vulgatae editionis ad recognitionem jussu Sixti V. Pont. Max. Bibliis adhibitam recensitae atque emendatae* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1617). The *Concordantiae* is not exactly a text-critical work, being the alphabetical repertoire of the words of the Sixto-Clementine, with the indication and even the quotation of all the places in which they appear. Anyway, Lucas affirmed in the prefatory epistle that he corrected a previous edition of the *concordantiae*, the most complete and recent he was able to find, and used the emendation he had made in his *Romanae correctionis* to that end. As Frans Neiryck explains, Lucas firstly used *Concordantiae Bibliorum utriusque Testamentis Veteris et Novi, novae et integrae, quas re vera maiores appellare possis* (Cologne: A. Birckmann, 1567), but following the suggestion of Balthasar Moretus, he later used *Concordantiae Bibliorum utriusque Testamentis Veteris et Novi, novae et integrae, quas re vera maiores appellare possis: opus post omnes quae praecesserunt editiones, multis depravatis locis commode restituitis et castigatis, summo studio ac labore illustratum* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1585). See Frans Neiryck, “La Concordance de Franciscus Lucas Brugensis (1617),” *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 55 (1979): 366–72 (370).

109 –Francis Lucas, *In sacrosanta quatuor Jesu Christi Evangelia* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1606). In this volume there are two *tomi*.

- Francis Lucas, *In sacrosanta quatuor Evangelia, commentatorium tomus tertius* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1612).
- Francis Lucas, *In sacrosanta quatuor Evangelia, commentatorium tomus quartus et ultimus, continens completum Evangelii secundum Johannem* (Antwerp: Plantin, 1616).

present in the Bible and to distinguish the genuine version(s) from the spurious ones.¹¹⁰ Lucas explicitly reveals his methodology in the dedicatory epistle to Bellarmine. Lucas explains to have divided this work into two different volumes, one for the Greek differences in comparison to the *Biblia Regia*, and the other for the Latin *varietates*, in comparison to the Sixto-Clementine. In this analysis, Lucas encountered three kinds of variations and he followed a different approach for each type of variation:

- 1) The *varietas* is not very relevant (*exigua*). In this case, Lucas explains this variation.
- 2) The *varietas* is relevant, but some analogy (*quid habeat*) to the *lectio* of the Sixto-Clementine remains. In this case, he briefly explains what this variation (and analogy?) consists of.¹¹¹
- 3) The *varietas* diverges profoundly (*nihil verisimilitudinis*) from the Sixto-Clementine. In this case, Lucas completely rejected the variant reading without further analysis since the only genuine *lectio* was proclaimed to be officially handed down in the Sixto-Clementine.

The approach to the *Notarum* is clearly very different from the 1580 *Notationes*. Instead of his earlier text-critical principles, as “minime vero, aut probandus est error, quia constans est; aut recipiendus, quia antiquus,” Lucas now has to accept on authority that the correct reading had been established in the Vatican’s 1592 Vulgate. Therefore, he could only show the different *varietates* without saying which *lectio* was correct according to a more critical method. He was simply forced to reject those *lectiones* which differed profoundly from the Sixto-Clementine. By way of example, a short extract of the *Notarum* on Matt 1:14 is shown below:

110 “putavi mearum partium esse, ut et varias lectiones, sive Graece sive Latine occurrentes, annotarem, discuterem, examinarem: denique eam quae genuina esset, sive fontis Graeci, sive versionis Latinae, quod ejus a me fieri posset, indicarem, et a spuriis distinguerem” (dedicatory letter to Card. Bellarmine, in Lucas, *Notarum ad varias lectiones* [see n13]).

111 “in his duobus libellis, uno Graecas, altero Latinas Evangelicorum librorum varietates explicante, haec mihi servatur methodus, ut primum proponam, in Graecis quidem, eam lectionem quae est Regiorum; in Latinis autem, eam quae est Sixtinorum Bibliorum: deinde adferam eam quae ab illa variat, nec adferam tantum, verumetiam quo distinguatur describam, quando differentia exigua est (ut saepe est) ne vel in hoc ipsum correctorium irreat error (quale exemplum in quibusdam manuscriptis correctoris vidimus): postremo si quidem nihil verisimilitudinis habeat, uno eam verbo reprobem; si quid vero habeat id paucis exponam” (dedicatory letter to Card. Bellarmine, in Lucas, *Notarum ad varias lectiones*).

Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχονίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ] Decimusquartus è sedecim vetustis codicibus, cum quibus Parisienses olim contulerunt Graecam Novi Testamenti Editionem, legit, Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰαχεῖμ. Ἰαχεῖμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰεχονίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ. Ubi generationem unam studiose ab aliquot adjectam non dubium est esse, ad evitandas difficultates illas, quas in Commentario tractavimus. Nam ut a caeteris Graecis libris non agnoscitur illa generatio, ita neque a Syricis aut Latini, neque ab ullis omnino Tractatoribus, nominatim, inter veteres, Hieronymo atque Ambrosio Latinis, et Auctore operis in Matthaeum imperfecti atque Euthymio Graecis: ut praeteream, Jechoniae filii Joakim, non plures, sed unicum fratrem reperiri in sacris Litteris, Sedechiam inquam, I. Paral. 3. v. 16. nec Ἰαχεῖμ dictum esse patrem sed Ἰωαχεῖμ. Quare temerarium est, ex unius, ejusque alieni, nec visi fortasse, codicis, auctoritate, veterem et quidem constantem mutare sacrae scripturae lectionem: quod fecit Theodor Beza, cujus translatio est: *Josias autem genuit Jakim: Jakim autem genuit Jechoniam et fratres ejus.*

In this passage, Lucas disagrees with Estienne (*Parisienses*) and Theodor Beza (1519–1609) on the possibility of inserting the expression ‘τὸν Ἰαχεῖμ. Ἰαχεῖμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν’ (Iacheim. Iacheim generated), between Ἰωσίας δὲ ἐγέννησε [...] τὸν Ἰεχονίαν (Josias generated [...] Iechonia). What is important to demonstrate in this pericope, the very first one to be included in the *Notarum*, is how the methodology used by Lucas had changed, as is clear from the last few sentences: “temerarium est, ex unius [...] codicis auctoritate veterem et quidem constantem mutare sacrae scripturae lectionem.” If in *Notationes in sacra Biblia* (1580), the constancy and the antiquity of a *lectio* cannot guarantee the correctness of that particular reading, in the *Notarum*, as emphasized, it is said to be temerarious to choose a different *lectio* in respect to the constant and ancient one,¹¹² which is now to be identified with the Vulgate in its Sixto-Clementine form.

6.3 1618: The last work

The *Libellus alter continens alias lectionum varietates*, again dedicated to the Bishop of St. Omer Jacobus Blasiaeus, was Lucas’ very last work. It was printed

¹¹² In this case, moreover, there is also the reference to the ‘Parisians’ viz. Estienne, who was wrong, according to Lucas. Indeed, Estienne showed this idiosyncratic *lectio* in the margin of his edition of the New Testament in Greek: “*τὸν Ἰαχεῖμ. Ἰαχεῖμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν.” See ΤΗΣ ΚΑΙΝΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ ἈΠΑΝΤΑ ἙΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ (Paris: Robert Estienne, 1550), 1. It is interesting to note that Robert Estienne suffered a kind of *damnatio memoriae*: in the copy still preserved in Leuven at Maurits Sabbe Library (P225.042/Fo BIJB), ‘Stephanus’ was deleted both in the frontispiece and in the Greek version of the dedicatory letter (but not in the Latin version, present in the *verso* of the same page), leaving only the name *Robertus* behind.

in 1618 and Lucas died a year later on 19 February 1619. This *libellus* was intended to add elements that were not present in the *Romanae correctionis*.¹¹³ Nonetheless, he had to defend himself against the accusation of correcting the Sixto-Clementine, which was said to contain Jerome's genuine translation. In a reply to this accusation, he explained that he did not prefer a particular reading, but merely wanted to show *variae lectiones* of Latin manuscript while following the judgment of papal authority regarding the right *lectio* as contained in the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate.¹¹⁴

7 Conclusion

Lucas dedicated a major part of his life to the study of Scripture. He began his text-critical work with the preparation of his 1574 Vulgate edition and ended his scholarly activity one year before his death, with the publication of his final booklet in 1618 on the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate. The work of the Roman Committess (the second and the third) as well as the Pope's authority strongly influenced his approach during his long career. The Council of Trent certainly demonstrated an initial 'openness' to the textual criticism of the Bible when it asked for an emended version of the Vulgate. A year later, in 1547, John Henten had published a new edition of the Vulgate. However, Lucas did not appreciate it since it was made from only a few Latin manuscripts. In preparing his new edition, Lucas' initial intention was to restore the Vulgate and present a text most conformed to (Jerome's?) 'original.' When he started his work on the Bible, he wanted to give an emended version as requested by the Council, through the reading of many manuscripts and by taking advantage of his profound knowledge of the

113 "Jam offero alterum libellum, in quem, doctorum Theologarum hortatu, congeSSI alia loca notatu digna, ex veteribus Editionis Vulgatae manuscriptis libris collecta, quae hactenus non correctae, merito fortassi pleraque corrigi possent" (De Schrevel, "Documents" [see n3], 395).

114 "Nam, ut idem alias me monuit, Hieronymus versabatur, in corrigendis erratis Interpretum, quorum versiones in usum pluribus Ecclesiarum receptae jam fuerant: hic laboratur, non in corrigendo Interprete, sed in versione Interpretis emendanda ex ejusdem versionis exemplaribus, hoc est, in Notatorum erratis auferendis, qua re minus facile potest offendi [...]. Sed accuset me forte multi temeritatis et arrogantiae, quod post praeclaros illos viros, a Sede Apostolica delegatos ausim mutare aliquid in Bibliis, et iudicium meum illorum iudicio praeferre. Respondeo, quod mea mens non sit mutare aliquid aut praeferre: sed quod eas varias Lectiones, quas in latinis Vulgatae editionis codicibus et tractatoribus inveniam et verisimilitudinem habere videntur, in medium proferam iudicio Suae Sanctitatis iisque quos illa iterum committere possit relicto, an sint praeferendae aliisque surrogandae" (De Schrevel, "Documents," 395–96).

ancient tongues, viz. Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, Greek and Latin. Moreover, he also consulted readings occurring in the works of Greek and Latin commentators, ancient, medieval, and early modern, with the aim of offering the best text possible.

However, after hearing about the work of the Roman Committees on the Vulgate, he prudently decided not to interfere with their work. He abandoned his original intention, opting instead to simply re-release Henten's Bible, a text already accepted in Rome, simply adding more readings in the margin and including references to Greek and Hebrew texts. In any case, Lucas wanted to show how the text of the Scriptures was susceptible to variations over the centuries. All the variations of the Scriptures that he found were included in a second book, the *Notationes in sacra Biblia* (1580). Here, he explained his 'comparative' methodology, and – what was important – he tried to find the most faithful reading among those that were handed down through the centuries. He also added a philological principle to this 'comparative' approach: the constancy and the antiquity of a *lectio* does not prove its correctness.

However, in 1592, the Vatican Typography printed the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, offering the definitive version of the Vulgate for the Church, as ordered by the Council about half a century previous. After its publication, the Pope prohibited any further textual critical work on the Vulgate. The censure reveals the Pope's growing authority, as he was able to ban the sale of the Vulgate outside Rome (for a time) as well as all future text-critical scholarship relating to the text. Thus, the text of the Vulgate had become crystallized and no annotations with other readings were included in the margins of the 1592 Vulgate. Since the 'authentic' *lectio* had been established, any discussion about the most faithful reading was rendered meaningless. Therefore, Lucas had to change his approach to the study of Scripture, even though this turn was inspired by considerations of prudence and strategy and not by conviction, let alone by scholarly principles, as his private letter to Estius reveals. In any case, Lucas *de facto* annulled his philological method in his works published after 1600, such as his *Notarum ad varias lectiones*. In these works, he only listed various *lectiones*, without expressing a preference for a definite reading, having accepted the established text of the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate.