The Tridentine Ruling on the Vulgate and Ecclesiastical Censorship in the 1580s¹

WILLIAM
McCUAIG

Summary: *Four works by the historian Carlo Sigonio (1523-1584) were made the target of censures by ecclesiastical authorities in the early 1580s. His works were never put on the index of prohibited books, but the censures reveal the mentality and concerns of the censors more clearly than any other surviving documentation from this period. This article examines the censures directed against Sigonio's historical investigation of Old Testament history. By using sources such as the Greek text of the Old Testament, Philo, and Josephus, Sigonio committed the error of Judaizing.*

My field of historical study is the sixteenth century, and the overriding problem that interests me is whether or not there was a fundamental conflict between the culture of the Italian Renaissance, which had vanished by the end of the century, and the culture of the Counter Reformation. It is my view that there was, but it is a view that is not universally shared. My paper explores a particular instance of that conflict: the case in point concerns one of the last great humanists of the Italian Renaissance, Carlo Sigonio.²

He was professor of humanity (classical civilization) at the University of Bologna from the 1560s to the 1580s, and a distinguished historian. In the latter part of his career he began to investigate the history of late antiquity, and even ventured into the field of ecclesiastical history with the support of his bishop. This provoked an attack on him from the officials in charge of ecclesiastical censorship in Rome in the early 1580s. They compiled massively detailed critiques of four of his works pointing out hundreds of places where he had deviated from what they took to be Catholic orthodoxy, and where he had

failed to take a zealously apologetic stance on behalf of Church traditions. Sigonio replied boldly to his anonymous critics, and since he himself had a great deal of support in high places, the case was dropped and he was never placed on the Index of Forbidden Books. However, after his death in 1584, his works were not reprinted in Italy, whereas they had a thriving fortuna north of the Alps. Thus the campaign against him did have its effect in Italy in the long term.³ A few years ago, I began a project to prepare a modern critical edition of all the censures and Sigonio's replies. The intent is to bring forward evidence concerning the historical question with which I began — the existence or not of a conflict between Renaissance and Reformation culture in sixteenth-century Italy.

One of Sigonio's last works was published in 1583 under the title *De republica Hebraeorum*.⁴ An accurate paraphrase of this title would be: *On the polity and institutions of the Hebrews in the Old Testament period*. What qualifications did Sigonio have to undertake such a work? He was learned in Greek and Latin, and was one of Europe's foremost scholars in the field of historical study, especially of the ancient world. But he was not a theologian.⁵ And indeed his training as a historian of Greek and Roman civilization had left him with a *déformation professionnelle* that was ill suited in some ways to the study of ecclesiastical history, for it was bound to bring him into conflict with the theologians. The fact is that in venturing to write a historical handbook to Hebrew antiquities, Sigonio was repeating in a minor key one of the most famous ventures from the humanist past. Despite all the differences in their character and situation, Sigonio was doing something similar to what Erasmus had done when he undertook the editing and interpretation of the New Testament — an incursion onto theological terrain that had earned Erasmus the undying hatred of the theologians.

There is another parallel. It is well known that Erasmus lacked the full panoply of learning that he needed in order to execute his project. But it is also well known that Erasmus went ahead and executed it anyway, and that what he succeeded in bringing to fruition was important and influential. Something of the sort could be said about Sigonio's *De republica Hebraeorum*. He wanted his book to be straightforward and accessible, as Erasmus had wanted his work to be, and like Erasmus he carried it off. *De republica Hebraeorum* was reprinted more often throughout Europe than any of his other works, and this *fortuna* lasted into the eighteenth century.

Since Sigonio knew no Hebrew, and since his work was short, it was to be eclipsed by the studies of the great biblicists and Hebraists of the seventeenth

century. Indeed, it appeared in the shadow of several major works dealing with aspects of biblical history that had already appeared in the sixteenth century from Melchor Cano, Sisto de Siena, and Alfonso Salmerón, all professional theologians.⁶ Compared to their tomes, Sigonio's *De republica Hebraeorum* was no more than a handbook, but that was principally because it had no theological content at all. It was an attempt to reconstruct the historical facts about the phases of Hebrew history and the evolution of their institutions. Sigonio employed his full professional competence to cover the available primary sources (in Greek and Latin) and the patristic literature. And he brought an attitude of critical historical investigation to his work, seeking to resolve problems in the sources in the same way that he had resolved so many problems of Roman history.

In line with this attitude, Sigonio made liberal use of the two most obvious sources for Hebrew history and institutions apart from the Old Testament itself. These were the works of Philo and Flavius Josephus, the Jewish interpreters of the Jewish heritage to the Hellenistic World. In addition to their works, the cultural interface between the Jews of the diaspora and the Hellenistic world had produced another, and even more important attempt at mediation, several centuries before Philo and Josephus. I refer, of course, to the Greek translation of the Old Testament known as the Septuagint (LXX). There is no space here to go into the whole complex of problems associated with biblical studies, but as most scholars know, the LXX is not just a translation, but an original source of texts and historical information not found in the original Hebrew or in the Latin Vulgate — for in making the translations in the fourth century that were eventually to evolve into the Vulgate, Jerome had gone back to the original Hebrew, bypassing the LXX and derivative Latin translations, and adding a further history of the collection (or collections) of literature known summarily as the Bible.

What did Sigonio's censors have to say about his sources and the use he made of them? For using Philo and Josephus and the LXX as historical sources, Sigonio was accused of the serious crime of judaizing, and of launching a direct attempt to undermine the Catholic Church and the Vulgate. It was for this that he was attacked by the censor. But the censor had his own particular way of laying this charge. What the censor repeatedly accused Sigonio of doing was contravening the decree of the Council of Trent concerning the Vulgate.

The relevant decree had received the affirmative vote at Trent on 8 April 1546. It was a decree that was meant to bring order and clarity to the citation and use of the Bible text in the Catholic World. But (a little like the American

constitution) it was to prove to be a source of endlessly conflicting interpretations. In the decree the Latin Vulgate was declared to be the uniquely privileged version of the text, and its canon, meaning the list of those books conveying the directly inspired word of God, was defined. This in itself is a source of difficulty, for the textual tradition of the Bible is not only extremely complicated overall because of the existence of parallel streams of tradition in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, it is also complicated and confused within each of those streams. The council was defining as sacred and canonical a collection of texts that had not assumed a definitive textual physiognomy, for no attempt had ever been made to correct and standardize the numerous manuscripts and printed texts in circulation. The task lay ahead for the Church, and when in due course it was attempted with the Sixtine and Clementine editions of the 1590's, the attempt, as we know, was less than a resounding success.

The decree of 1546 goes on to state that the Vulgate text is to be considered the authentic text (*pro authentica habeatur*), and that it is not to be rejected under any circumstances. It states further that no interpreter in matters of faith and morals is to deviate either from the teachings of the Church, or the unanimous consensus of the Church fathers. But this lapidary decree left much unsaid and much unspecified concerning the Bible text. The decree says nothing about the relation of the Vulgate to the Hebrew and Greek texts, indeed it says nothing about these other texts at all. On what American constitutionalists would call a "strict construction," any scholar could feel that the decree left him perfectly free to consult the Greek and Hebrew Bible texts in the interests of comparative research. Whether or not this strict construction of the Tridentine decree was the one that obtained on the ground, in practical application in Italy, is another matter.

Comparative historical research was the very essence of what Carlo Sigonio's whole life had been dedicated to. Certainly his book on the history and customs of the ancient Hebrews was anything but a contribution to theology. It was intended as a handbook of chronology and factual information concerning the Hebrew tribes whose civilization is recorded in the Old Testament, and the primary source used by Sigonio was therefore naturally the Old Testament itself. In general he *did* cite from the Vulgate. But often the answer to the historical question he was trying to elucidate, while obscure in the Latin, was clearly set forth in the LXX text — to which he therefore naturally turned as well, citing it in his own literal Latin translations. What was the censor's reaction to Sigonio's use of LXX in this manner?

To start with a concrete example, one of the censor's most frequently

repeated objections was that Sigonio had gone outside the canon defined at Trent by consulting a book found only in the Greek Bible, the work known (in the Vulgate) as the third book of Esdras.⁷ The censor repeatedly brands this work as “non approbatus” because it was not included in the canon of scripture defined at Trent. And to the censor it was so clearly evident that “non approbatus” was equivalent to “damnatus” that he had a hard time articulating his conviction. He sees Sigonio as deliberately defying the decree of the council by mining the third book of Esdras for nuggets of historical information not found in the canonical books.

Even when Sigonio stayed within the bounds of the books defined at Trent as canonical, he often compared the corresponding texts in the LXX in search of more extensive and precise information about the matter at hand. And often he found it, for the LXX had been composed in the first place partly in order to present Hebrew history and customs in a manner likely to make them acceptable, or at least understandable, to the rational culture of the Greeks.

Here is a typical example of the censor’s response to Sigonio’s use of the LXX:

Adducit Graeca verba et interpretatur, refugit vulgatam editionem, et non videt se facere contra Concilium Tridentinum et graviter errare, quod alium textum inferat. Non requiritur in tractatione divinarum rerum iactantia varii sermonis, sed res exponendae sunt eo modo quo exponit Ecclesia Catholica Romana.

(Sigonio adduces the Greek text and explains it, shunning the Vulgate edition. He fails to see that in doing so he is acting in defiance of the Council of Trent, and erring gravely by introducing another biblical text. In treating divine matters, it is unnecessary to show off linguistic skills. What matters is to expound the material in the manner the Catholic Church expounds it).⁸

At another place, the censor raises the stakes: the text of the LXX as we have it, he says, is not the text known to the fathers in the ancient world, but a hybrid deliberately corrupted by later Jewish scholars in order to disguise the clear anticipations of Jesus the Messiah that it should contain. It is for this reason, he says, that the Council of Trent gave us its ruling that we should stick to the Vulgate and not even look at any other biblical traditions.⁹

In a couple of instances, the censor gives vent to the whole complex of attitudes that underlie his objections to Sigonio’s method. By looking beyond the Vulgate for information, and by declaring that in some places the literal sense of the Vulgate is less clear than that of other versions, Sigonio is said to

have cast an aspersion on the Vulgate and condemned the Council of Trent. By going to the Greek text he has exposed himself to the danger of being contaminated by the cunning devices of the rabbis, who would obviously select the Greek text as the vehicle for their alterations of God's word. The sacred scriptures, according to the censor, are to be read with humility and devotion, and for the sole purpose of knowing and worshipping God. Only the clergy can interpret them. Sigonio is wrong in detail because wrong in principle, for he is a layman, not a member of the clergy, and does not have the right to say anything at all about the contents of scripture. Sigonio's exposition is described as ambitious, overly clever, and arrogant.

The source of his error, as far as the censor is concerned, is his failure to confine himself to works approved by the Council of Trent. And, as the censor says, there is certainly no mention in the Council's decree of Philo and Josephus. Therefore, according to the censor, that meant they had been condemned and rejected. The council, according to the censor, wished to protect Christians against interpretations that followed the letter, not the spirit, of the text — for the letter kills, but the spirit gives life. Sigonio has fallen into the Jewish trap of interpreting the text according to the letter. This too the Council of Trent had tried to guard against with its decree.

The bad effects of any departure from what he conceived to be the intent of the Tridentine decree were plain to the censor:

... ingens haeresum pestis pullularet, quae ex sacris et bonis scripturis non sane et bene perceptis exoritur. Quare, qui non attestatur sacram scripturam iuxta editionem vulgatam efficit ut haereticus et Hebraeus occasionem errandi et confirmandi suos errores arripiant. . .

(. . . a vast plague of heresies would pullulate, arising out of the failure to take the sane and sound view of the holy and good scriptures. Whoever therefore does not confine himself to citing the holy scriptures in the Vulgate edition lets the heretic and the Hebrew seize the chance to deviate, and to defend their deviations. . .)¹⁰

This was the sin of which Carlo Sigonio had been guilty.

I want now to examine Sigonio's replies to his censor, and if I seem to cast him in too favourable a light, it should be remembered that the positions he defended vis-a-vis the censor were those that had been defended in recent decades by Melchor Cano, Sisto da Siena and Alfonso Salmerón, all of whom had sought to give their theology a historical dimension. It is also the case that in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the hierarchy of the Catholic Church

has come to terms with historical culture and set Catholic scholars free to pursue historical studies in a way that belatedly justifies Sigonio's stance in the sixteenth century. But the point is that the late sixteenth century was a very particular and difficult moment in the life of the Church: it was a moment when, for those like the censor, historically minded research from any person of learning on the Catholic side looked like betrayal.

On the specific question of his use of 3 Esdras, Sigonio simply pointed out that he had used it as a historical source, with no reference to its canonicity — though, as he noted, it is canonical in the Eastern Church, and was cited more often than the first and second books of Esdras in the patristic age. Sigonio stated, what was patently true, that he had used it to confirm and amplify data available in the canonical books, not to oppose them. In another response to the censor, Sigonio takes a direct look at the Tridentine decree itself: the fathers at Trent proclaimed the Vulgate to be “authentic.” Sigonio did not try to explore the exact positive meaning of this expression, which was just as well, because it had no precise meaning. It was an expression that by its very nature required to be given a concrete instantiation in order to become meaningful, and the episode of Sigonio and the censors is a significant case study in how it was taken in the late sixteenth century.

Sigonio did try to delimit the extent of the Tridentine decree by approaching it negatively — in other words, by concentrating on what the fathers at Trent had not said when they declared the Vulgate to be authentic. For instance, their decree did not assert that the Vulgate had greater clarity in every respect than the Hebrew or Greek texts, or that it was historically more informative. To state that would have been counter-factual and counter-intuitive, but in their wisdom, they had not touched on these aspects. Sigonio's conclusion, quite correctly on a narrow construction, was that they had therefore left it free for learned and pious Catholics to investigate the historical circumstances in which the divine revelation had been manifested.

On the matter of his occasional preference for the Greek text over the Latin because of its greater clarity, Sigonio pointed out that this greater clarity was self-evident, and gave examples. Indeed, it was one of the proud boasts of Catholic theology that the Vulgate contained deliberate obscurities in order to protect the divine mysteries from profane scrutiny. For Sigonio, the paramount authority granted to the Vulgate in theological matters was an entirely separate question from its usefulness as a historical source. But perhaps he failed to see that in the eyes of the alert theologians, his wish to give a simple and straightforward account of Hebrew history *did* amount to profane scrutiny.

Sigonio was able to turn to the Church fathers for assistance. Augustine himself, in his commentaries on selected books of the Old Testament, adduces problems having to do with the literal, historical meaning of the text, and sometimes compares the Greek with the Latin. The case of Jerome is even more probative for Sigonio, for although this writer was revered as the author of the Vulgate text, he had accepted a canon very different to the one accepted at Trent. Jerome had in fact adopted a canon based on the content of the Hebrew scriptures, a fact which Sigonio did not allege. Sigonio did suggest the glaringly obvious fact that the greatest biblical scholar of all had had constant recourse to the Hebrew and Greek texts, and could hardly have done otherwise. Indeed, Jerome's new translation was introduced into the Latin-speaking world against the fierce and near-unanimous resistance of his contemporaries, and it required many centuries before it in turn became the *vulgata*, in place of the Latin texts that had previously held sway.

In another of his replies, Sigonio examines the Tridentine decree in greater depth, and calls upon the authority of the distinguished Jesuit scholar, Alfonso Salmerón, a participant at the council. According to Salmerón, the council's decree left Catholic scholars a wide area of liberty in which to conduct their work without violating any norms, and as Sigonio said, he had done no more than make use of this liberty. Salmerón had noted that the decree does not even mention the Greek and Hebrew traditions, and therefore it certainly does not condemn them. The main purpose of the fathers had been to impose order on the Latin tradition in the wake of the disorder brought on by the Protestant heresy in Europe, and that is why the Vulgate was made the norm for guidance in matters of faith.¹¹

What never emerges in Sigonio's replies to his censor, and what would have been interesting to read, is any recognition that the source of the conflict is the discrepancy between the attitudes of a professional lay historian toward information about the Hebrew world, and that of a clerical theologian. For the historian, the holy scriptures can be viewed as a historical source and subjected to comparison and criticism like any other source. But the clerical theologian is trained to view the holy scriptures not as historical documents but as divine mysteries, and it is the historical method itself that horrifies him, not any heretical views adopted by Sigonio. However, it was not in Sigonio's interest to acknowledge that a fundamental cultural conflict was taking place between himself and his censor.

A modern writer may, on the other hand, wish to draw historical conclusions from this episode. It offers us evidence that the Counter Reformation did

not adhere to the strict construction of the Tridentine decree. It was Sigonio who held to the strict construction, along with all the other scholars within the Catholic world who wished to apply correct historical method to those aspects of their religious tradition where the historical method was applicable. And it was they who were accused of treachery by the censors. Sigonio's censor widened the Tridentine decree to cover a vast swathe of intellectual territory. The principle that what is not explicitly prohibited is permitted did not apply; the censor read the decree as totally exclusionary. For him, the fathers at Trent had meant to exclude any approach to the Bible text other than the purely theological, and they had intended to exclude completely from consideration any text other than that of the Latin Vulgate.

I would like to emphasize how farfetched it was for the censor to be trying to use the Tridentine decree in this way. The text of the decree gave him no warrant to forbid Sigonio the use of the LXX. Even more extraordinary is his claim that Sigonio had violated the decree by using Philo and Josephus: the decree refers only to the canon of holy scripture, and has nothing to do with Philo and Josephus or any other individual writer.

But in the mind of the censor, the Tridentine decree on the Vulgate has taken on a global meaning very different to what it literally states. For him it means the total exclusion of any sources for Judeo-Christian tradition except the Vulgate itself. And he was giving voice to a powerful current of opinion within the Church in Italy. Indeed, his was the dominant opinion until well into the seventeenth century. The voice of the censor is the authentic voice of the Counter Reformation. The historical conclusion is that, whatever anodyne interpretations may now be put on the Tridentine decree, it was given a strong interpretation in the sixteenth century, and that strong interpretation was the historical reality of the Counter Reformation.

University of Toronto

Appendix

Readers are here offered a sample of work in progress, a new edition of the censures of Sigonio and his replies. There are four sets of censures (and Sigonio's replies), each aimed at one of his published works. The two censures with Sigonio's replies published here come from the set of censures directed at his *De republica Hebraeorum*. It was published in 1582, and the censures and replies date from the period 1582-1583.

My edition is intended to replace the very defective one of Filippo Argelati

in vol. 6 of Sigonio's *Opera Omnia* (Milan: 1737). I have been able to recover large portions of text that were simply omitted from Argelati's edition, and this has made it necessary to give a new numbering of the censures.

The textual situation is complicated; readers will find a summary account of it in *Carlo Sigonio*, ch. 4 (1989), and may expect a fuller one in the future. No manuscript of Sigonio's replies to the censor survives, to the best of knowledge, so the surviving textual witness is Argelati's edition itself. Fortunately, internal criteria indicate that Argelati's text of these replies is fairly sound. (Likewise in Umberto Eco's *Il nome della rosa* the surviving textual tradition of a medieval manuscript is founded on a single copy of a printed edition, which disappears. Luckily copies of Argelati's edition of Sigonio are not so rare.)

For the censures themselves the text given by Argelati is very depraved, but MSS survives. Since this is a provisional publication I will not give an apparatus of variants, but the manuscript sources of my text of these censures are the following:

Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 3455, cc. 16r-49r. Boncompagni F9, cc. 211r-291r.

Roma, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, Vallicellianus R 46, cc. 494r-522r.

Censura 10

Ex libro *Exodi* cap. 15 adducit quaedam contra vulgatam editionem, praeterquam quod neglexit quaedam mysteriis plena, quae sine scelere omitti non poterant, quibus ostendit se non esse versatum in divina scriptura, et est magna temeritas ea aggredi et interpretari, quae ignores (inde enim tot exortae sunt haereses) cum divinae scripturae tractatio et interpretatio ad sanctos patres magnosque theologos attineat, et non ad quoscumque. Tractent enim fabrilis fabri; quod medicorum est, promittant medici; et aliud est Homerum, Virgilium, Ciceronem, Platonem, Aristotilem, Galen interpretari; aliud divinam scripturam. Atque ideo hic, qui rempublicam Hebraeorum informat, ex sacra scriptura et sanctis doctoribus decreta et instituta petere debebat, non a Josepho, Philone, et libro *Seder Olam*, ut facit pag. 77, et huius farinae scriptoribus, sed potius ex sacra scriptura et a vulgata editione, et non aliunde deducenda, quod fuit in causa cur toties in verba et in sensus peccet, et praesertim hoc loco, ubi duo praecipua omisit, unum est "Domini," aliud "et quod rectum est coram eo feceris," quod non est ferendum cum in eis verbis magna mysteria lateant.

In censuram 10 responsio

Textus quos Sigonius huc loci congeffit non ea mente produxit, ut illos interpretaretur aut mysteria in eis latitantia referaret. Protulit enimvero ut voces illas “mandata, praecepta, etc.” saepius in lege repeti ostenderet, ut testatur pag. 18, cui rei perficiendae sola materiali textuum productione indigebat; quos si praeterea enucleari et explanare voluisset, a proposito argumento quam longe abiisset. Quid ergo clamat censor, Sigonium prave ea loca interpretatum esse, quae nullo modo interpretatus est, neque interpretari debebat, aut mysteria neglexisse, cum nunc non esset his locus? Quod vero conqueritur quaedam contra vulgatam adduci, loca notare debuisset censor, in quibus nullam deprehendisset oppositionem, nisi forte contraria putet, quae licet cum vulgata eundem prorsus sensum habeant, in una tamen aut altera vocula discrepant.

Censura 90

Pag. 305. Citat Isaiam 1, [23]. Nititur probare versionem Graecam esse clariorem. Errat quia contradicit decreto Ecclesiae, et Concilii Tridentini. Deinde editio vulgata magis proprie et congrue rem exprimit, et proxime ad Hebraicam accedit.

In aedem pagina citat verba Christi apud S. Lucam 12, [59], quae deflectunt a vulgata, et cum Christus illud documentum dedit, quasi ex decretis Caesaris, sancti doctores declarant illa verba Christi redemptoris nostri spiritualiter, et ideo non sunt adducenda verba redemptoris permixta verbis gubernatorum huius saeculis, quasi corporales res et non spirituales Christus spectaverit.

In censuram 90 responsio

Concilii Tridentini decretum de vulgatae editionis authenticitate alibi expensum est, et Sigonio nequaquam opponi demonstratum. Utrum autem apertius et aptius dicatur “causa viduae non ingreditur ad illos” [*Is. q, 23*], quod est in vulgata; an vero “et litem viduarum non accipiunt,” ut est in Graeco, commentario non indiget. Quod obiicitur de mutatis verbis, est nihili mutatio: pro “minuto” posuit “quadrantem,” qua voce de eadem re disserens usus est Matthaeus 5 v.26; et pro “novissimo,” “unum,” quae duo ibi eandem prorsus habent significationem. Quamvis vero Christus illis Lucae verbis sensum spirituales subintelligeret, negari tamen non potest quin iisdem ad iudicalem Iudaeorum morem alluserit, quod unum ibi Sigonius expendit.

Notes

1. What follows is the text of a conference paper delivered at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Renaissance Studies, Carleton University, Ottawa, June 1993. It has been only lightly revised for publication, with documentation restricted to the essential minimum. An appendix has however been added.
2. See William McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio. The Changing World of the Late Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989).
3. See McCuaig, *Carlo Sigonio*, ch. 4, "Sigonio versus the censors," for fuller information. The censures were edited by Filippo Argelati in Sigonio's *Opera Omnia*, vol. 6 (Milan: 1737). Argelati's text is badly flawed: research in progress aimed at producing a correct recension has led to a renumbering of the censures, and to many other changes in the text he presents.
4. Carol Sigonio (Latinè Carolus Sigonius). *De republica Hebraeorum libri VII* (Bologna: Ioannes Rossius, 1582). There are many later editions.
5. Since Sigonio knew no Hebrew and had little knowledge of rabbinical literature he cannot even, strictly speaking, be counted among the Christian Hebraists. A recent, and for me illuminating, survey of this historical territory is Frank E. Manuel. *The Broken Staff. Judaism through Christian Eyes* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992). Unfortunately it is skimpy on the period before the seventeenth century. For Professor Manuel, not even the most learned of the genuine Christian Hebraists ever managed fully to understand Hebrew and Jewish culture. (If Sigonio stood at three or four removes from adequate knowledge of the subject about which he was writing in *De republica Hebraeorum*, then the author of this paper stands at five or six removes from even that much.) It is possible that Sigonio may be a more significant figure in the history of European studies of the Hebrew world than one would gather from Professor Manuel's very interesting book. Manuel does not recognize Sigonio as the founder of one particular genre that proliferated in the seventeenth century, that of political descriptions of the Hebrew commonwealth.
6. I have used the following editions: Melchor Cano (Latinè Melchior Canus). *De locis theologicis libri duodecim* (Salamanca: Mathias Gastius, 1563; ed. pr.); Sista da Siena (Latinè Sixtus Senensis). *Bibliotheca Sancta secunda editio* (Frankfurt: Nicolaus Bassaeus, 1575). The first edition of *Commentarii in evangelicam historiam* by Alfonso Salmerón (Latinè Alfonsus Salmero) appeared in Madrid in 1598; volume one contains prolegomena. Edition seen: *Alfonsi Salmeronis Commentarii in Evangelicam Historiam et in Acta Apostolorum. Vol. 1: Prolegomena* (Köln: Antonium Hierat and Ioannes Gymnicus, 1602). Three of Salmerón's prolegomena are cited by Sigonio in his replies to his censor. Since these replies date from c. 1582, it results that Sigonio must have been able to consult Salmerón's work in manuscript. I would be glad to hear from any scholar with knowledge of the manuscript circulation of Salmerón's work in Italy in the decades prior to publication.
7. I will call this work 3 Esdras because I keep to the usage of the scholars whose work I study, and for all of them the Vulgate was naturally the norm. Modern biblical scholars, even Catholics (who are no longer tied to the Vulgate) designate it "1 Esdras," whereas they call the Vulgate's 1 Esdras "Ezra", and the Vulgate's 2 Esdras "Nehemiah". Readers will find all these arcana explained in any good Bible commentary; the one I use is *The New Jerome*

Biblical Commentary, ed. Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1990); on 3 Esdras, see 67:38-39.

8. Censure 86 (McCuaig); = censure 82 (Argelati).
9. Censure 80 (McCuaig); = censure 76 (Argelati).
10. Censure 4 (McCuaig); = censure 76 (Argelati).
11. Salmerón, *Prologomenon* 3, "In quo explicatur, quae nam canonica scriptura, et quae Bibliorum editio pro germana et authentica habenda est" (pp. pp. 24-25 in the edition seen); cited by Sigonio in the response to censure 3.