‘Great Mountains Suspended from Every Single Letter’: Thomas Wakefield and his Hebrew Bibles

Benjamin Williams

The 1521 Hebrew Bible now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, has long attracted the attention of readers wishing to consult the annotations of Cambridge’s first Regius Professor of Hebrew, Thomas Wakefield (1500–1575).[1] Among them was the Revd John Johnson (1662–1725) who, in 1706, referred to this bible in his defence of the Coverdale Psalter of the Book of Common Prayer. Drawing attention to the rendering of Psalm 77: 6, ‘In the night I commune with mine own heart, and search out my spirits’, he noted that, while the Prayer Book uses the first person throughout, the Hebrew ends with a third-person verb (‘my spirit made diligent search’ in the King James Version). Johnson defended the Prayer Book by appealing to the Hebrew Bible of Thomas Wakefield, who had added the first person form in Hebrew as an interlinear annotation.[2] Johnson failed to note that Thomas’s gloss was drawn from a source more ancient still: Rabbi David Kimḥi’s commentary on the Psalter. Printed in the First Rabbinic Bible (1517), this commentary was omitted from later editions, likely due to Kimḥi’s outspoken opposition to the Christological interpretation of the Psalms.[3] It was thus through the mediation of Thomas Wakefield’s Bible, and due to the authority Johnson invested in the annotations of ‘one of the first Masters of Hebrew in England’, that the medieval rabbi of Provence became the unlikely guarantor of the reliability of the liturgical Psalter of the Church of England.

---

[1] On the establishment of this praelectorship, see F. D. Logan, ‘The origins of the so-called Regius Professorships: an aspect of the Renaissance in Oxford and Cambridge’, in *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford 1977), 271–8. Note that Thomas referred to himself on the flyleaves of his manuscript Book of Hours (on which see Carley, ‘Robert and Thomas Wakefield: a biographical sketch’ in this volume; also n. 8 below) as ‘publicus Lector Regiae Lectionis hebraicae apud cantabrigiam’ and also, before the names of his children, as ‘. . . Regii professoris hebraicae linguae in alma Achademia Cantabrigia’.

[2] ‘Here there is an Enallage of Person conceal’d; and so *Tho. Wakefield*, one of the first Masters of *Hebrew* in *England*, understood these words; for in a Bible, with his Marginal Notes, there is written, as it seems, with his own hand, ואחפש ב<מ>חשבתי: Over these words, in the *Hebrew* text: וְיַחְפֵּשׂ רוּחִי’; John Johnson, *Holy David and His Old English Translators Clear’d* (London: Knaplock, 1706), second pagination 60 (cf. 13, 35). The annotation is found at fol. 417r of the Trinity Bible.

[3] P. van Boxel, ‘Hebrew books and censorship in sixteenth-century Italy’, in *Jewish Books and their Readers: Aspects of the Intellectual Life of Christians and Jews in Early Modern Europe*, ed. S. Mandelbrote & J. Weinberg (Leiden 2016), 75–99, at 77–9. On Johnson, see S. Mandelbrote, ‘Writing the history of the English Bible in the eighteenth century’, in *The Church and the Book*, ed. R. N. Swanson, Studies in Church History 38 (Woodbridge 2004), 268–78, at 272–5.

Thomas's bible continues to intrigue readers for the light it sheds on sixteenth-century Hebrew scholarship in England. James Carley has examined it in the context of other books from Thomas's library, now scattered in several collections, thus revealing the wide reading that informed Thomas's annotations.[4] Among these volumes was the copy of Bomberg's 1525 Rabbinic Bible now at Chetham's Library, Manchester, which was annotated both by Thomas and a later reader. Maya Rosen has compared the marginalia in the Chetham's and Trinity bibles in the light of traditions of Hebrew scholarship in England that may be traced back to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[5] Philip Alexander, on the other hand, has looked beyond the sixteenth century by studying the approaches of Thomas and the later reader of the Chetham's Bible in order to examine Hebrew scholarship at the time of the production of the King James Bible.[6]

The purpose of this chapter is to consider how and why Thomas studied the Trinity Bible by identifying the questions he brought to the biblical text, the sources he read and cited, and the methods he used to sift and transform information in the process of annotating the Hebrew. The focus will be on Genesis, a heavily annotated text that illustrates many of the methods used to study the Bible as a whole. The first part of the chapter will introduce Thomas's approach to reading the Hebrew Bible, and the resources at his disposal by analysing selected annotations on the initial verses of the creation narrative. The second part will examine his treatment of two textual problems in Genesis 4, the narrative of Cain and Abel. The final section will present forays further afield in the Trinity Bible that illuminate Thomas's use of commentaries and vernacular translations and inform an assessment of his reasons for annotating his Hebrew bible.

Thomas Wakefield and his Quarto Hebrew Bible

[4] J. P. Carley, 'Lambeth Palace Library in 1611 and its contribution to Christian Hebraism', in *Labourers in the Vineyard of the Lord: Scholarship and the Making of the King James Version of the Bible*, ed. M. Feingold (Leiden 2018), 30–58; id. 'Religious controversy and marginalia: Pierfrancesco di Piero Bardi, Thomas Wakefield, and their books', in *TCBS* 12 (2002), 206–245; id. 'Thomas Wakefield, Robert Wakefield and the Cotton Genesis', in *TCBS* 12 (2002), 246–65. See also his 'Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield brothers' in this present volume.

[5] M. Rosen, 'The Bible unbound: the Wakefield brothers and Christian Hebraism', senior thesis (Princeton University 2017).

[6] P. Alexander, 'The early seventeenth century glosses in Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible (1525) in Chetham's Library, Manchester', conference paper, 'The King James Bible: The Scholarly Context', Exeter College, Oxford, 13 July 2011.

Though relatively little is known of Thomas Wakefield's life, some biographical details can be gleaned from the annotations in books he owned, and particularly from the entries in his manuscript Book of Hours.[7] Born on 7 September 1500 at Pontefract, he married twice and was the father of nine children.[8] He followed in the footsteps of his elder brother Robert in learning Hebrew and teaching at Cambridge.[9] While Robert incorporated at Oxford in 1532, where he served as a founding canon of King Henry VIII's College and styled himself 'sacrarum literarum professor', Thomas was appointed in 1540 as Praelector in Cambridge for life.[10] This entailed lecturing regularly,[11] though Paulus Fagius, Immanuel Tremellius, Antoine Chevallier, and Philip Bignon are known to have undertaken Hebrew tuition at Cambridge during the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth I. It has long been assumed that, as a committed Catholic, Thomas was relieved of his teaching duties during these Protestant regimes.[12] Unlike Robert, Thomas brought no works to press. His 1544 examination of Hebrew linguistic usage in the New Testament, dedicated to Henry VIII, remains in manuscript in the British Library.[13] Besides this, we must rely on Thomas's annotated books to assess his scholarly achievements. Unfortunately, his library

[7] For a detailed discussion of his life see Carley, 'Biographical sketch'.

[8] The Book of Hours, our primary source of information on his life, survives as Washington, DC, Folger Shakespeare Library, MS V.a.228. As noted by Powell, despite the 1538 royal proclamation ordering the excision of the liturgy and image of Thomas Becket, these remain intact in Thomas's book: see D. Powell, 'Book of Hours', in *'The Pen's Excellencie': Treasures from the Manuscript Collection of the Folger Shakespeare Library*, ed. H. Wolfe (Washington, DC, 2002), 27–9; A. Radford, 'Thomas Wakefield, Hebraist', in *Notes and Queries*, 12th ser. 5 (April 1919), 91; D. Roberts, 'The expurgation of traditional prayer books (*c*. 1535–1600)', in *Reformation* 15 (2010), 23–49; E. Duffy, *Marking the Hours: English People & Their Prayers 1240–1570* (New Haven, CT, 2006), 150–55, 158. The entry of his marriage in 1540 shows that Thomas was still using the Folger Hours after the proclamation.

[9] On the grounds of John Fisher's recommendation that Wakefield be granted leave in 1523 to perfect his knowledge of Hebrew abroad, Lloyd Jones suggested that, like his brother, Thomas studied Hebrew on the continent. It is unclear, though, which of the Wakefield brothers Fisher meant. See G. Lloyd Jones, 'Wakefield [Wakefeld], Thomas', in *ODNB*.

[10] Logan, 'Origins of the Regius professorships', 276.

[11] J. W. Clark (ed.), *Endowments of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge 1904), 156.

[12] J. B. Mullinger, *The University of Cambridge*, 2: *From the Royal Injunctions of 1535 to the Accession of Charles the First* (Cambridge 1884), 416–17. See further above, **??**.

[13] *Locutiones seu phrases quae reperiuntur in Nouo Testamento et primo apud Mattheum quae uidentur secundum proprietates (quae idiomata Graece uocantur) linguae Hebraeae siue sacrae*, MS Add. 5663. Gifted on Christmas Day, the book appropriately begins with an elucidation of 'Hebraisms' in the genealogy in Matthew 1, sung that day at Matins (A. Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to Their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto 1982), 62). Among the similarities noted are Matt. 1: 1 ('The book of the generation (*liber generationis*) of Jesus the Christ') and Gen. 5: 1 ('This is the book of the generations (*sefer toledot*) of Adam', fol. 13r–v); and the use of the verb 'to know' to refer to sexual intercourse in Matt. 1: 24–5, Gen. 4: 17, Gen. 4: 25, and 1 Sam. 1: 19 (fols. 14v–15r; on Thomas's comparison of the Hebrew *yada*ʿ and Greek γιγνώσκω, see below). The desire to identify and explain similar expressions in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament is also evident in the Trinity Bible where Thomas noted some of the parallels he also discussed in the *Locutiones* (e.g. at Gen. 5: 1, fol. 4v, and 1 Sam. 1: 19, fol. 194v). On the *Locutiones* see Carley, 'Biographical sketch'. Hebrew and Aramaic in the New Testament, it should be noted, was a key theme in Robert Wakefield's *Oratio*; see Robert Wakefield, *On the Three Languages*, ed. G. Lloyd Jones (Binghamton, NY, 1989), 134–51.

does not survive intact. On his death in 1575, the majority of his books were held in trust for his son, also named Thomas, by John Whitgift (*c.* 1530–1604), master of Trinity College, Cambridge, and later archbishop of Canterbury. They appear never to have reached their intended recipient, but passed from Whitgift to his successor Archbishop Richard Bancroft (1544–1610) and thereafter became part of the archiepiscopal library. A number of Thomas's books remain in Lambeth Palace Library, but others have been identified in further collections, including Chetham's Library, Manchester; Pembroke College, Cambridge; St Catharine's College, Cambridge; Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge; Canterbury Cathedral Library; the Harsnett Collection in the Albert Sloman Library at the University of Essex; and Christ Church, Oxford.[14]

Among the most heavily annotated of Thomas's books is his copy of the quarto edition of the Hebrew Bible published at the famous Venetian press of Daniel Bomberg in 1521, now at Trinity College, Cambridge (shelfmark: Adv.c.1.18).[15] The text of this edition is similar to that printed in Bomberg's First Rabbinic Bible of 1517 under the editorial supervision of the Jewish convert Felix Pratensis (Felice da Prato). Alongside that four-volume folio edition, which included selected targumim and medieval commentaries, Bomberg issued a quarto Hebrew Bible containing the biblical text alone. The close resemblance of the text in the folio and quarto editions led Ginsburg to conclude that they were printed concurrently, the quarto being set from the same blocks of type that had just been used to print the folio.[16] The smaller edition was evidently sufficiently popular to

[14] See Carley, 'Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield Brothers', and references cited therein.

[15] Thomas's ownership is indicated at the foot of the final page of biblical text (fol. 528r), where he signed his name twice in Hebrew. The first is a transliteration that employs biblical vocalization: "תוֹמַס בַּכְּפָלְךָ". In the second, Thomas translated his first name according to the etymological meaning 'twin' (cf. John 11: 16 and the entry תאם in Johannes Reuchlin, *De rudimentis Hebraicis* (Pforzheim: Anshelm, 1506), 536) and employed the post-biblical double vav to render the 'W' of 'Wakefield', thus creating a contemporary Hebrew name: ' תאם ווקבלד' (see Carley, 'Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield brothers', fig. 3. I am grateful to James Carley and Joanna Weinberg for drawing attention to these notes). Notes by Robert Wakefield are also found in the Trinity Bible, including a superscript Latin translation of Psalm 116 on fol. 427v (cf. Carley, 'Religious controversy', 241). Since being annotated by Thomas, the volume has been rebound, the edges cropped, and the flyleaves replaced. The *ex libris* of James Ibbetson D.D. (1717–1781) have been pasted onto the new boards, and the name of the later owner Granville Sharp (1735–1813) has been written beneath. A label records that the book was part of the bequest of William Aldis Wright (1831–1914), who served as librarian and vice-master at Trinity and also bequeathed his Hebrew manuscripts; see H. Loewe, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Hebrew Character Collected and Bequeathed to Trinity College Library by the late William Aldis Wright* (Cambridge 1926). In this chapter, the text of cropped annotations has been restored by comparison with Thomas's sources. Non-standard spelling, pointing, and accentuation have been retained. Editorial additions are enclosed within chevrons; Latin suspensions are expanded silently. Unless otherwise noted, translations are by the author.

[16] On this edition, see C. D. Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible* (London 1897), 948–52; J. Penkower, 'The first edition of the Hebrew Bible that Bomberg published and the beginning of his publishing house' (Heb.) in *Kiryat sefer* 58 (1983), 586–604, at 596–7; id. 'Jacob ben Ḥayyim

merit a reprint just four years later. The pagination of the 1521 text is similar to that of its predecessor, though folio numbers have been added, the Five Megillot have been placed after the Pentateuch rather than among the Hagiographa, and the textual variants glossed by Pratensis have generally been omitted. A new colophon names the Adelkind brothers as the printers and indicates that the book was produced at the same time as Bomberg's *editio princeps* of the complete Babylonian Talmud (1519/20–23) and the 1522 edition of the *Hilkhot Rav Alfas*.[17]

Among the notes that Thomas Wakefield added to the title-page of his copy are quotations from the commentaries of two Jewish exegetes that encapsulate his approach to interpreting the Hebrew Bible. On the verso is a statement from Menaḥem Recanati's commentary on the Pentateuch (Fig. 1): 'Great mountains are suspended from every single letter of the Torah'.[18] The source is a comment on Deuteronomy 10: 17: 'For the Lord your God is the God of gods and the Lord of lords'. In accordance with his conception that 'there is nothing outside [the Torah]',[19] Recanati exhorted the reader to fathom the meanings of Scripture and explained the divine names in the verse as references to the kabbalistic sefirot *ḥokhmah*, *binah*, and *malkhut*. Though Thomas might have read this statement directly in Recanati's commentary, he would certainly have encountered it in Sebastian Münster's *Hebraica Biblia* (1534) where it was accorded a very different meaning.[20] In his explanation of the exhortation in Deut. 10: 16 to 'circumcize the foreskin of your heart', Münster likened the uncircumcized heart to the 'blindness' (*caecitas*)

---

and the rise of the Biblia Rabbinica', PhD diss. (Heb.; Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1982), 305, 406–10; A. M. Haberman, *The Printer Daniel Bomberg and the List of Books Published by his Press* (Heb.; Zefat 1978), 30 (no. 9).

[17] Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 952–6; Haberman, *The Printer Daniel Bomberg*, 38 (no. 67).

[18] 'אין בתורה אפילו אות אחת. שאין הררין גדולים תלויים בה:', fol. 1v (cf. Venice: Giustiniani, 1545, fol. 201r). On Recanati and his commentary, see M. Idel, *Kabbalah in Italy 1280–1510: A Survey* (New Haven, CT, 2011), 117–38, esp. 136.

[19] 'שכל החכמות כלן רמוזין בתורה ואין דבר חוץ ממנה' Menaḥem Recanati, *Sefer taʿamei ha-mitsvot ha-shalem*, ed. S. Lieberman (London 1962), fol. 2r.

[20] Though Kabbalah is rarely mentioned in Thomas's annotations, at Num. 24: 17 (fol. 105r), 'a star (כּוֹכָב, *kokhav*) comes forth from Jacob', he wrote, 'כוכב significatur Cabalistice <no>men Tetragrammaton יהוה' and attributed the interpretation to Abraham Saba's *Tseror ha-Mor*. The likely source is Sebastian Münster, *Hebraica Biblia* (Basel: Bebel, Isingrin and Petri, 1534), vol. 1, fol. 151r, where Münster explained that the numerical value of the first two letters of כוכב (i.e. 26) is equal to that of the Tetragrammaton, and that of the last two (22) to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. The Torah, comprised entirely of these letters, will be fulfilled perfectly in the messianic age. In addition, a reference to Reuchlin's *De arte cabalistica* is found in an annotation on Jer. 25: 26 (fol. 322r) where Thomas summarized Jerome's explanation that Sheshach (שֵׁשַׁךְ) may be identified as Babylon (בבל) by substituting letters at opposite ends of the alphabet (*atbash*; cf. Robert Wakefield, *On the Three Languages*, 105, and J. Weinberg, 'The remarkable Hebraism of Robert Wakefield' in the present volume). Thomas referred to the third part of Reuchlin's treatise where this method of substitution is discussed in the context of the kabbalistic technique of *temurah*; see Johann Reuchlin, *De arte cabalistica* (Hagenau: Anshelm, 1517), fol. 72v. Thomas's copy is now LPL, **B525 (R3).

attributed to Israel in the Latin text of Rom. 11: 25. Citing Recanati as evidence of Jewish awareness that 'many great mysteries' lie hidden within Scripture, Münster claimed that 'they do not have the grace to understand it'.[21]

Extracted and pasted on to the title-page of Thomas's Hebrew Bible, Recanati's statement has been deprived of its original kabbalistic significance and of the anti-Jewish sentiment of Münster. It now reads as a general assertion of the multiplicity of meaning inherent in the Hebrew Bible. The dictum, which would have been visible to Thomas every time he opened his book to read and annotate, explains his endeavour to reveal the full meaning of every element of the biblical text by filling each page with expository annotations.[22] To this end he drew interpretations from the medieval commentaries of Rashi (Solomon ben Isaac), Abraham ibn Ezra, David Kimḥi (Radak), Moses Naḥmanides, Levi Gersonides, Menaḥem Recanati, and Abraham Saba;[23] from the grammatical and lexical work of Kimḥi (the *Mikhlol* with the *Sefer ha-Shorashim*); and from the concordance of Isaac Nathan (*Meʾir Nativ*).[24] These insights are joined by those of the Church Fathers, including Cyprian of Carthage, Eusebius of Caesarea, Jerome, and Augustine.[25] The contemporary voices of Johann Reuchlin, Elijah Levita, Sebastian Münster, Jacob Ziegler, Martin Luther, Wolfgang Weissenburger, and Guillaume Postel join the chorus.[26] In addition, annotations labelled 'T. Wakefield', 'Rob(ert)us

[21] Münster, *Hebraica Biblia*, vol. 1, fol. 175v. Cf. S. Burnett, 'A dialogue of the deaf: Hebrew pedagogy and anti-Jewish polemic in Sebastian Münster's *Messiahs of the Christians and the Jews* (1529/39)', in *Archive for Reformation History* 91 (2000), 168–90.

[22] The exception that proves the rule is fol. 92r, the text of Num. 7: 47b–71. The detailed list of offerings in Num 7: 12–83, which partially lacks masoretic pointing due to the twelve-fold repetition of the offerings in verses 12–17, is sparsely annotated as a whole.

[23] E.g. Rashi at Gen. 10: 14 (fol. 7r); Ibn Ezra at Gen. 16: 12 (fol. 10r); Kimḥi at Psalm 94: 4 (fol. 422r); Naḥmanides at Gen. 4: 19 (fol. 4r); Gersonides at 1 Kgs 8: 12 (fol. 241v). Thomas's citation of Recanati on Gen. 32: 25 (fol. 22r) and Saba's *Tseror ha-Mor* on Num. 23: 3 (fol. 104r) were perhaps taken from Münster, *Hebraica Biblia*, vol. 1, fols. 32v, 150r.

[24] E.g. the references to the *Mikhlol* at Gen. 22: 18 (fol. 14r) and *Sefer Shorashim* at Gen. 6: 14 (fol. 5r), and to the *Meʾir Nativ* at Lev. 3: 4 (fol. 65v). On this latter, see R. Shalom, 'Meʾir Nativ: the first Hebrew concordance of the Bible and Jewish Bible study in the fifteenth century, in the context of Jewish-Christian polemics', in *Aleph* 11 (2011), 289–364.

[25] E.g. the citations of Cyprian's *De lapsis* 11 at Gen. 3: 14 (fol. 3v), of Eusebius's *Praeparatio evangelica* XI 5 (in Latin, see n. 47) at Deut. 32: 1 (fol. 137v), of Jerome's commentary on Ezek. 28: 12 at Gen. 1: 26 (fol. 2v), and of Augustine's *The City of God* XVI 11 at Gen. 11: 1 (fol. 7v).

[26] For example, Reuchlin, *De rudimentis Hebraicis*, 72, at S. of S. 4: 9 (fol. 142r); Levita's *Tishbi* (Isny: Fagius, 1541, 185) and *Masoret ha-Masoret* (*ed. princ.* Venice: Bomberg, 1538) on Gen. 12: 1 (fol. 8r); Münster's *Hebraica Biblia* (vol. 1, fol. 13r) at Gen. 15: 16 (fol. 9v); Ziegler's *Terrae sanctae, quam Palaestinam nominant* (fols. 49r, 22r) and Weissenburger's *Terrae sanctae altera descriptio* (fol. 127r) at Gen. 32: 23 (fol. 22r); and Guillaume Postel's *De originibus seu de Hebraicae linguae et gentis antiquitate* (Paris: Lescuier, 1538), sig. B2^{v} at Gen. 10 (fol. 7r). Thomas's copy of Reuchlin's *De rudimentis* is now LPL, **B525. (R3) (Carley, 'Religious controversy', 236). His annotated *Tishbi*, later owned by Richard Allestree (1621–1681), is now Oxford, Christ Church, K.8.10 (see n. 99). On Thomas's copy of the 1536 edition of Ziegler and Weissenburger (Strassburg: Wendelin Rihel), now LPL, *KS 104 (Z5), see Carley, 'Lambeth', 51. The reference to Luther is at

Wakef(ield)', or simply 'Wakefield' reveal the insights of one or other of the brothers.[27] By drawing together Christian and Jewish interpretations old and new, Thomas created an annotated Hebrew Bible that discloses the multiplicity of meanings that the aphorism on the title-page declares to be inherent within the biblical text.

A second title-page annotation is attributed to David Kimḥi: 'The readings were confused during the exile'.[28] This is an extract from Kimḥi's comment on 1 Kgs 17: 14, Elijah's promise that the Widow of Zarephath's flour and oil would last 'until the day the Lord gives (תתן) rain upon the ground'. In the biblical text, a marginal Masoretic note indicates that the anomalous form of the verb נתן (*n-t-n*, 'to give') should be pronounced as the infinitive construct תת (*tet*). Kimḥi accounted for the distinction between the text as written and read (*ketiv-kere*) by developing the account presented in his introduction to the book of Joshua that attributed the alternative readings to the loss of books and learning during the Babylonian exile. Many of the resulting textual divergences were corrected in the time of Ezra on the basis of majority readings, but others were reconciled by placing one reading in the text and another in the margin.[29] By writing this snippet from Kimḥi's commentary on the title-page rather than at 1 Kgs 17: 14, Thomas has transformed an explanation of a facet of the Masorah into an expression of general confusion regarding the biblical text. It now serves as a heading to his own copious notes on the divergent renderings he encountered in the Septuagint, the Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus

---

Thomas's annotation of Gen. 19: 8, where Lot referred to his angelic visitors at Sodom as 'these men' (לָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵל, *la-anashim ha-el*, fol. 11v). Thomas noted: 'pro האלה, ut Infra xx<vi> vbi Lutherus male pro de<o> transtulit'. The text in question is Luther's 1529 revision of the Vulgate in which, at Gen. 19: 8, the word *ha-el* has been translated as 'God' ('dummodo viris istis Dei nihil mali faciatis') rather than as the demonstrative pronoun (more commonly spelt *ha-eleh*). Thomas's incorrect indication that the error occurs at Luther's translation of Gen. 26: 4 shows that he did not consult this work directly. He may have misunderstood the imprecise description of the mistake in Münster's *Hebraica Biblia* (vol. 1, fol. 17r). See *Pentateuchus; liber Josue; liber Judicum; libri Regum. Novum Testamentum*, ed. Martin Luther (Wittenberg: Schirleitz, 1529), fol. 7r.

[27] At Eccles. 5: 5 (fol. 150r), Thomas recorded insights from Jerome's commentary on the meaning of *shegagah* alongside a Latin translation attributed to his brother: '<neg>ligentia, Rob(ert)us Wakef(ield)'. (This differs from the translation *ignorantia* in Robert Wakefield, *Paraphrasis in librum Koheleth* (London: Gybson, 1536), sig. B2^{r}.) The same definition, also attributed to Robert, is at Lev. 5: 18 (fol. 67r); see n. 30.

[28] 'בגלות נשתבשו הנסחאות kimchi. 3. reg. 17', fol. 1r.

[29] On Kimḥi's accounts of the origins of *ketiv-kere* readings, see F. Talmage, *David Kimhi: The Man and the Commentaries* (Cambridge, MA, 1975), 92–4. On the use of Kimḥi's commentary in early modern debates concerning the origins of the *ketiv-kere*, see E. Lawee, *Isaac Abarbanel's Stance towards Tradition: Defense, Dissent, and Dialogue* (New York, NY, 2001), 175–7, 185; B. B. Levy, *Fixing God's Torah: The Accuracy of the Hebrew Bible Text in Jewish Law* (Oxford 2001), 80–81; G. E. Weil, *Élie Lévita: humaniste et massorète (1469–1549)* (Leiden 1963), 303–306; Azariah de' Rossi, *The Light of the Eyes*, trans. J. Weinberg (New Haven, CT, 2001), 397–8; Penkower, *Jacob ben Ḥayyim*, 16–18, 27–8 (English summary, IV, VI–IX); cf. A. Grafton & J. Weinberg, *'I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue': Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, MA, 2011), 307–328. On Robert Wakefield's study of the Masorah, see A. Grafton, 'Some early citizens of the *Respublica Litterarum Sacrarum*: Christian scholars and the Masorah before 1550', in *Reformation* 23 (2018), 17–28.

and Theodotion (as cited by Jerome), Targum Onkelos, the Fragment Targum, and Targum Jonathan.[30] By selecting and evaluating these readings and organizing them on the pages of his Hebrew Bible, Thomas brought order to the confusion of renderings that the title-page annotation attributed to the vicissitudes of exile.

Annotating the Creation — Thomas Wakefield on Genesis 1: 1–2

FIG. 1. Cambridge, Trinity College, Adv.c.1.18, fols. 1v–2r. Courtesy of the Master and Fellows of Trinity College Cambridge.

[30] For Aquila, see Lev. 5: 18 (fol. 67r), and for Symmachus and Theodotion, Isa. 5: 2 (fol. 279v). The readings are cited in Jerome's commentaries on Eccles. 5: 5 (*S. Hieronymi Presbyteri: Commentarius in Ecclesiasten,* ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 72 (Turnhout 1959), 293) and at Isa. 2: 37 (R. Gryson & P.-A. Deproost (eds.), *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe: livres I–IV*, AGLB 23 (Freiburg 1993), 268). For Targum Jonathan, see Josh. 22: 33 (fol. 175v).

A survey of selected comments on the first two verses of Genesis 1 (Fig. 1) show how Thomas used the commentaries and versions at his disposal, together with recent Latin translations of the Bible, to gain an understanding of the text. The verses read:

(א) בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ׃

(ב) וְהָאָרֶץ הָיְתָה תֹהוּ וָבֹהוּ וְחֹשֶׁךְ עַל־פְּנֵי תְהוֹם וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים מְרַחֶפֶת עַל־פְּנֵי הַמָּיִם׃

1. In the beginning God created (*bara elohim*) the heavens (*ha-shamayim*) and the earth.

2. The earth was formless and void (*tohu va-vohu*). Darkness was on the face of the deep, and the spirit of God was hovering over the face of the water.[31]

In the margin beside verse one, the annotation *syllepsis* draws attention to an apparent lack of agreement between subject and verb,[32] in this case the ostensibly plural word *elohim* ('God') and the singular verb *bara* ('created').[33] Syllepsis is one of a host of stylistic and rhetorical features which, in accordance with the fundamental principles of Renaissance textual study,[34] Thomas noted attentively as he read. Labels such as *proverbium*, *allegoria*, *metonymia*, and *metaphora* abound.[35] The confident identification of expressions as unusual (*phrasis rara*) or idiomatic (*hebraismus*; *phrasis frequentissima*; *Repetitio, hebraismi more*) demonstrates the familiarity that Thomas gained with the Hebrew language by reading the entire Bible.[36]

---

[31] fol. 2r.

[32] Syllepsis is also noted at Exod. 17: 1 (fol. 46v), Num. 20: 1 (fol. 101v), 2 Sam. 3: 1 (fol. 217v).

[33] As the first occurrence of *elohim* in the Hebrew Bible, its form was frequently noted here by commentators. For instance, Münster proposed the literal Latin translation, 'In principio creavit dii coelum et terram'. Then, calling attention to the alternation of singular and plural verbs referring to God in Gen. 1: 26–7, he claimed that the doctrine of a triune Deity was present in the Old Testament. *Hebraica Biblia*, vol. 1, fol. 2r.

[34] See, for instance, L. Jardine, 'Humanism and the sixteenth-century Cambridge arts course', *History of Education* 4 (1975), 16–31; W. S. Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500–1700* (Princeton, NJ, 1956), 116–37; A. Grafton & L. Jardine, *From Humanism to the Humanities. Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe* (London 1986), 5–14.

[35] E.g. Isa. 22: 13 (fol. 286v), 1 Kgs 2: 5 (fol. 236r), Lev. 13: 33 (fol. 72v), 2 Sam. 22: 5 (fol. 232r).

[36] E.g. 2 Sam. 17: 5 (fol. 227v); 2 Kgs 13: 14 (fol. 265v); Gen. 24: 38 (fol. 15v); Gen. 26: 13, (fol. 17r). Thomas also divided texts he read into their principal sections. For instance, each of the Ten Plagues is numbered ('PRIMA PLAGA.', '.2.ª plaga.' etc.) at Exodus 7: 19–11: 5 (fols. 39v–42r), and Exodus 12 is headed 'De pascha Celebra<ndo>' (fol. 42v). Thomas also read with attention to moral meanings that could be drawn from the text. For instance, he praised Ruth's faithfulness to Naomi by exclaiming, 'O fidelis uox mulieri<s>' (Ruth 1: 16–17, fol. 143v). Thomas often perceived and noted parallels between the Old Testament and the New. For instance, beside God's statement to Abraham that 'in you all the families of the earth will be blessed' (Gen. 12:

An annotation on verse one supplements the Hebrew with the Aramaic renderings of Targum Onkelos and the Fragment Targum (which Thomas called Targum Yerushalmi):

בְּחוּכמָה בָּרָא יְיָ׃

Haec Thargum ירושלמי.

Onkelos: בְּקַדְמִין בָּרָא יְיָ

Though several editions of Targum Onkelos were available to Thomas, the distinctive spelling and idiosyncratic accentuation of some quotations show that he referred to the text in the Complutensian Polyglot. His annotated copy is now at Pembroke College, Cambridge.[37] Thomas juxtaposed Onkelos's close translation of the Hebrew text ('In the beginning the Lord created . . .') with the rendering of the Fragment Targum. The *editio princeps* of this latter was the First Rabbinic Bible of 1517, and Thomas's transcription of the Tetragrammaton as three yods (יְיָ) matches the spelling of this edition (the Third Rabbinic Bible (1546–8) and the Fourth (1568) print יְיָ instead).[38] The Fragment Targum's rendering 'by means of Wisdom the Lord created . . .' reflects the rabbinic association of Wisdom, as personified in Proverbs 8, and the Torah, identified as the tool or blueprint with which God accomplished the creation.[39] As Philip Alexander has suggested, the New

---

3, fol. 8r), he noted 'Euangelium.' and 'Galat. 3.', a reference to Paul's explanation that the promise to Abraham anticipated the Gospel that the Gentiles would be justified by faith (Gal. 3: 8).

[37] Shelfmark: LC.I.152–6. These five volumes, stamped with Whitgift's arms, are recorded in his catalogue (Dublin, Trinity College, MS 3, p. 25: 'Biblia Haebr: Idiomate / fol. vol. 5 complu:). The spelling of Thomas's Aramaic rendering of *tohu va-vohu* as צַדְיָא וְרֵקַנְיָא (*tsadya ve-rekanya*) suggests that he used the Complutensian Polyglot to annotate this passage (the 1517 and 1525 Rabbinic Bibles give the plene spelling וְרֵיקַנְיָא). Citations that employ the single accent *atnaḥ* between words (e.g. at Gen. 48: 22 on fol. 33v and Lev. 13: 33 on fol. 72v), a distinctive feature of the Complutensian text of Targum Onkelos, confirm Thomas's use of this edition. Cf. L. D. Merino, 'El texto arameo en la Políglota Complutense', in *Estudios Bíblicos* 72 *V° centenario de la Biblia Políglota Complutense* (2014), 119–60, at 123–4; E. van Staalduine-Sulman, *Justifying Christian Aramaism* (Leiden 2017), 11–36.

[38] The Fragment Targum on the Pentateuch is bound into some copies of the 1525 Rabbinic Bible (including the source of M. Goshen-Gottstein (ed.), *Biblia Rabbinica: A Reprint of the 1525 Venice Edition* (Jerusalem 1972)), but it was not published as part of this edition and is not included in Thomas's copy at Chetham's Library (see Penkower, *Jacob ben Ḥayyim*, 427; Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 962–3). In this latter, Thomas underlined the text of Targum Onkelos to Gen. 1: 1 and added the quotation from the Fragment Targum ('in תרגום ירושלמי / בְּחוּכמָה בָּרָא יְיָ', 'in the Targum Yerushalmi: / By means of Wisdom God created') just as he also copied it into the Trinity Bible. A targumic text not included in the 1525 edition has thus been supplied by hand. On Christian scholars who used two Rabbinic Bibles, see S. Burnett, 'The strange career of the *Biblia Rabbinica* among Christian Hebraists, 1517–1620', in *Shaping the Bible in the Reformation: Books, Scholars and Their Readers in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. B. Gordon & M. McLean (Leiden 2012), 63–84, at 72, 78.

[39] P. Alexander, ''In the beginning': rabbinic and patristic exegesis of Gen. 1: 1', in *The Exegetical Encounter between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity*, ed. E. Grypeou & H. Spurling (Leiden 2009), 1–29, at 5–17; id. 'Pre-emptive exegesis: Genesis Rabba's reading of the story of creation', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 43 (1992),

Testament's identification of Christ as the agent of creation (cf. Col. 1: 16, Rev. 3: 14) may underlie Thomas's interest in this rendering, and he would have encountered it in Christian Kabbalistic interpretations that attributed the Christological interpretation to the Fragment Targum itself.[40]

These annotations reveal Thomas's use of the Trinity Bible to organize and compare parallel biblical texts. The Complutensian Polyglot provided the Hebrew of the Pentateuch alongside the Vulgate, Septuagint, and Targum Onkelos. In the Rabbinic Bibles, the Fragment Targum was issued as an independent fascicle rather than alongside the Hebrew or the other targumim. By selecting and copying excerpts from different sources into his quarto bible, Thomas created a ready point of reference to information that was previously only available in separate works. In enabling a direct comparison of the differing targumic renderings with the Hebrew text of Gen. 1: 1, the Trinity Bible fills the role of a custom-made Rabbinic Bible.

Studying the notoriously obscure phrase *tohu va-vohu* in Gen. 1: 2 sent Thomas in search of recent Latin translations, parallel biblical texts, and comparable imagery in classical Latin literature. He noted the translation 'desolata, et inanis' ('deserted and empty') from Sanctes Pagnini's *Veteris et Novi Testamenti nova translatio* (1527),[41] and 'informis' ('shapeless') from Sebastian Münster's *Hebraica Biblia*.[42] The rendering 'inculta et uacua' ('uncultivated and empty') from the 1543 Zurich Latin Bible of Leo Jud has been squeezed beneath in small script and a lighter shade of ink, perhaps as a later addition.[43] Conspicuous by its absence is the Vulgate's rendering 'inanis et vacua' ('empty and void').[44] The Vulgate is cited elsewhere in the Trinity Bible and the omission here may

---

230–45, at 234–9; P. Schäfer, 'Bereshit Bara Elohim: Bereshit Rabba, Parashah 1, Reconsidered', in *Empsychoi Logoi – Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst*, ed. A. Houtman & others (Leiden 2008), 267–89, at 268–9; id. *Mirror of His Beauty: Feminine Images of God from the Bible to the Early Kabbalah* (Princeton, NJ, 2002), 79–81.

[40] Alexander, 'Early seventeenth century'; M. Idel, *Ben: Sonship and Jewish Mysticism* (London 2007), 507–530; Reuchlin, *De arte cabalistica*, fol. 53v; Agostino Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti ad veritatem Hebraicam recognitio* (Lyon: Gryphius, 1531), 23 (Wakefield's copy is LPL, E18.(S8); Carley, 'Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield brothers', **??**).

[41] Lyon: Du Ry, fol. 1r.

[42] Vol. 1, fols. 1r, 2r.

[43] *Biblia sacrosancta Testamenti Veteris & Novi* (Zurich: C. Froschoverus), fol. 1r. On Thomas's annotated copy, now Canterbury Cathedral Library, W/0-5-10, see Carley, 'Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield brothers'. On this edition, see B. Gordon, 'Remembering Jerome and forgetting Zwingli: the Zurich Latin Bible of 1543 and the establishment of Heinrich Bullinger's Church', *Zwingliana* 41 (2014), 1–33.

[44] As printed in, for instance, *Biblia cum pleno apparatu* (Lyon: Sachon, 1511), fol. 4r, or the Complutensian Polyglot.

be due to overfamiliarity rather than neglect.[45] But, as will be discussed below, Thomas expressed his reservations regarding the accuracy and authenticity of the Latin translation in general circulation in several of his annotated books. In this instance, the comparison of new Latin renderings shows that the purpose of his research was not to rehearse the common translation of *tohu va-vohu*, but rather to get behind it at the full sense of the Hebrew.

References to Deut. 32: 10, Isa. 34: 11, Jer. 4: 23, and Job 12: 24 above the line and in the margin show that Thomas also sought to understand *tohu va-vohu* by examining other occurrences of the terms in the Biblical text. Thomas must have looked up these verses in the Trinity Bible as, in each case, the word *tohu* has been underlined and definitions have been supplied.[46] This shows that, by annotating his bible, Thomas made it into a network of cross-references to facilitate independent navigation of the Hebrew text without recourse to a concordance or dictionary. By following the trail from one verse to another, he could locate words of interest wherever they appear in the canon, consider their meanings in different contexts, and compare the interpretations and translations he had noted in each place.

Thomas often drew attention to parallels he perceived in classical literature.[47] In the space above Gen. 1: 2, the annotation *Rudis indigestaque moles. ouid. in metamor.* shows that, like Reuchlin, Luther, Calvin, and others, Thomas associated the primordial chaos of Genesis with the 'rough and confused mass' described at the outset of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1, 5).[48] A further quotation was perhaps prompted by the translation of *tohu* as *inanis* ('void'). Perceiving a verbal analogy with the primordial gathering of the elements 'through the great void' in the Song of Silenus in the sixth of Virgil's *Eclogues*,

[45] See, for instance, references to the 'comunis translatio' at Exod. 14: 25 and 15: 14 (fol. 45r).
[46] Fols. 137v, 292r, 309r, and 450v respectively.
[47] For instance, at Eccles. 10: 19 (fol. 152v) 'and money is the answer to everything', Thomas quoted Plato's *Phaedo* 66d: 'Omnia enim pecuniarum gr<ati>a fiunt', 'for everything comes about for the sake of wealth'. (As in the case Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica*, Thomas referred to a Latin translation even though Greek texts had been printed, including the 1513 Aldine edition of Plato's *Opera Omnia* and the 1544 Stephanus edition of Eusebius.) Similarly Gen. 19: 36 (fol. 12v), 'and Lot's two daughters became pregnant by their father', prompted a reference to Aeschinus's rape of Pamphila in Terence's *Adelphoe* 474–5, 'Virgo ex eo compressu gravida facta est' ('the girl became pregnant from that embrace').
[48] T. Fenton, 'Chaos in the Bible: Tohu vavohu', in *Jewish Education and Learning: Published in Honour of Dr David Patterson on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. G. Abramson & T. Parfitt (London 1994), 203–220; R. S. Watson, *Chaos Uncreated: A Reassessment of the Theme of 'Chaos' in the Hebrew Bible* (Berlin 2005), 13–14.

Thomas wrote *Magnum per inane, Vergil. Eglog. 6.* In these cases, well known Latin school texts serve to illuminate comparable imagery in the Hebrew Bible.[49]

A definition of *tohu va-vohu* has been drawn from Kimḥi's *Sefer ha-Shorashim*, an immensely popular lexicon among early modern Christian scholars of Hebrew.[50] Thomas's annotation on Genesis 1: 2 reads:

בֹּהוּ. הָיְתָה אֶרֶץ תהוּ ובהוּ ענ<ין> שממה ורקות. והוו תמורת ה"<א> למד הפעל. ואמרו חכמי המחקר כי תֹהוּ הוא הדבר שאין לו דמות וצורה והוא מזומן מעותר לקבל כל דמו<ת> וכל צורה. וקורין לו בלשון הִיוּלִי (פי׳.ηλυ).

ובֹהוּ הצורה והיא דבר שיש לו כ<ח> וגבורה להלביש את היולי דמות ותמונה. ובהתחברם היתה בריאת העולם. רד"ך.

Bohu. '[The earth] was formless and void.' [This means] desolation and emptiness. They [the words *tohu* and *bohu*] are in the form of *lamed-he* verbs. The philosophers have explained that *tohu* is matter without shape or form, though it has potential to receive them. It is designated by the term *hiuli* (which means υλη).

Bohu is form. It has the ability and power to clothe *hyle* with form and shape. The creation of the world was accomplished by bringing them together. Radak.

This annotation shows that Thomas sought Kimḥi's definition of *tohu va-vohu* by turning in the *Sefer ha-Shorashim* to the entry on *bohu* (root בהה). He appears to have used the late thirteenth-century Provençal manuscript formerly in the possession of Norwich cathedral priory, which, as Judith Olszowy-Schlanger has shown, was annotated by Robert Wakefield.[51] Notes in Thomas's hand show that he too read this manuscript.[52] At the

[49] A. Grafton, *Defenders of the Text: The Traditions of Scholarship in an Age of Science, 1450–1800* (Cambridge, MA, 1991), 31; A. Blair, '*Ovidius Methodizatus*: the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid in a Sixteenth-Century Paris College', *History of Universities* 9 (1990), 73–118; D. S. Wilson-Okamura, *Virgil in the Renaissance* (Cambridge 2010), 20–26, 47–76.

[50] P. van Boxel, *Jewish Books in Christian Hands: Theology, Exegesis and Conversion under Gregory XIII (1572–1585)* (Vatican City 2016), 64.

[51] Now Cambridge, St. John's College, MS I. 10; see J. Olszowy-Schlanger, '"My silent teachers": Hebrew manuscripts as the source of Robert Wakefield's Hebraism', in the present volume.

[52] Some of his annotations record comparisons with a printed copy. This is apparent at Kimḥi's definition of אזוב (*ezov*) by means of the Arabic *saʿtar* (سَعْتَر, also spelt صَعْتَر), 'oregano'. Though דַּעֲתָד is written in the manuscript, Thomas has annotated 'צעתר *in impresso codice*' (p. 11). This corresponds with the entry as printed in, for instance, the Venice: Bomberg, 1529 edition, col. 16, s.v. אזב; cf. E. W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (London 1863), vol. 1, 1300, s.v. سعتر.

definition of *bohu*, he underlined the word *hiuli* and wrote the Greek spelling υλη in the margin.[53] When he copied the text into the Trinity Bible, Thomas integrated this gloss into the definition itself, labelling it with the abbreviated form of the Hebrew word *perush* as if it were Kimḥi's own explanatory Greek transliteration. The comment as a whole, extracted from the alphabetic list in the *Sefer ha-Shorashim* and placed alongside the text of Genesis in the Trinity Bible, has now been transformed from a lexical entry into an exegetical gloss.

Thomas also used the medieval commentaries of Rashi and Abraham ibn Ezra to study Genesis 1. The two were printed together in the Pentateuch of the Second Rabbinic Bible of 1525. His annotations on the words *bara* and *tohu va-vohu* show that he read the copy at Chetham's Library alongside the Trinity Bible and transferred exegetical texts from the former into the latter.[54] For instance, at Gen. 1: 1, Ibn Ezra argued that the verb *bara* does not necessarily indicate *creatio ex nihilo* because it is used throughout the creation narrative, even after the initial creation of matter.[55] Thomas's study of this comment in the 1525 Rabbinic Bible is indicated by a marginal annotation in his hand ('ברא') and the text has been divided into semantic units to facilitate comprehension. When he copied the text into the Trinity Bible, Thomas included some of the divisions as a punctuation marks. The comment has been squeezed directly after the citation of Kimḥi's definition of *bara* in the *Sefer ha-Shorashim* and, like the translation from the Zurich Latin Bible noted above, is written in a lighter shade of ink.[56]

רובי המפרשים אמרו שהבריאה להוציא יש מאין. וכן אם בריאה יברא י״י. והנה שכחו ויברא אלהים את התנינים. ושלש בפסוק אחד. וגומר. אבן עזרא.

The majority of commentators say that creation (*ha-beriʾah*) means bringing matter into existence *ex nihilo*, as is the case in [the verse], 'If the Lord creates a [new] creation (*beriʾah yivra*)' (Num. 16: 30). But they have overlooked [the verse], 'And God created

[53] p. 38.
[54] The shelfmark of the Chetham's Bible is A.7.16–17. See Matthew Yeo, *The Acquisition of Books by Chetham's Library, 1655–1700* (Leiden 2011), 66, 146–7.
[55] See the discussion in C. Sirat, *A History of Jewish Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1985), 105–106.
[56] Col. 74 in the Venice: Bomberg, 1529 edition.

(*va-yivra*) the sea monsters' (Gen. 1: 21), and the three instances in the same verse [in Gen. 1: 27] . . . Ibn Ezra.[57]

Thomas also consulted Rashi's commentary on Genesis 1, marking the text in his 1525 Rabbinic Bible with the acronym 'רש"י' to facilitate navigation of the many components of the page. He copied the following extract into the Trinity Bible on the verso of the previous folio:

תֹהוּ. לשון תמה ושממון שאדם תוהה ומשתומם על בהו שבה. תֹהוּ אשטורדי"שון בלעז.

בֹּהוּ. לשון רקות וצדו. רש"י.

Tohu means 'astonishment' and 'desolation', since one would be astonished and desolated over the void (*bohu*) within it. *Tohu* means *astordisson*[58] in the vernacular.

Bohu means void and empty space. Rashi.[59]

These annotations demonstrate the different purposes served by Thomas's Hebrew bibles and allow us to trace the progress of his studies. In the Second Rabbinic Bible, the juxtaposition of Rashi and Ibn Ezra on the Pentateuch enabled a direct comparison of the rabbinic interpretations cited by the former and the grammatical explanations of the latter.[60] The passages that Thomas selected and copied thus testify to a process of adjudication between differing and sometimes opposing exegetical approaches.[61] This demanding endeavour requires the ability to navigate and read medieval Hebrew texts printed in unvocalized Rashi script, to understand the significance of the interpretations, and to tease out the differences between them. Having selected interpretations from the multifaceted pages of his Rabbinic Bible, copying them into the Trinity Bible allowed

[57] fol. 2r.
[58] A. Darmesteter, *Les gloses françaises de Raschi dans la Bible* (Paris 1909), 7.
[59] fol. 1v.
[60] On the addition of Ibn Ezra's commentary to that of Rashi in the Pentateuch of the 1525 Rabbinic Bible, see E. Reiner, '"No Jew should learn anything but the Talmud alone": a dispute over books and forbidden books in 16th century Ashkenaz' (Heb.), in *Ta Shma: Studies in Judaica in Memory of Israel M. Ta-Shma*, ed. A. Reiner & others, 2 vols (Alon Shevut 2011), 2. 705–746, at 733–4.
[61] For introductions and bibliography, see A. Grossman, 'The school of literal Jewish exegesis in northern France', in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation*, ed. M. Sæbø, 1/2: *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages: The Middle Ages* (Göttingen 2000), 321–77, at 321–2, 332–46; U. Simon, 'Abraham ibn Ezra', in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, 1/2: *From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages: The Middle Ages*, ed. M. Sæbø (Göttingen 2000), 377–87.

immediate access to those that Thomas deemed to be of greatest importance. Thus sifted and distilled, they may now be studied in conversation with a new range of exegetical information drawn from lexica, patristic commentaries, ancient versions, and recent translations.

The results of Thomas's study of Rashi and Ibn Ezra on Genesis 1: 1–2 appear to be additions to previous layers of annotations. The placement of Ibn Ezra's comment after the quotation from Kimḥi in a different ink suggests that it was added at a later stage. The quotation from Rashi, together with a further comment of Ibn Ezra,[62] were fitted on the previous page, suggesting that they were written when less space was available around the Hebrew text of Genesis 1. If so, then Thomas would already have been familiar with the text when he resorted to the Hebrew commentaries. His earlier study of Kimḥi's *Sefer ha-Shorashim* and the translations of Pagnini and Münster were supplemented by later advanced research into the Rabbinic Bible and the addition of translations from the more recent Zurich Latin Bible. This extended process of annotation can account for Thomas's use of both the Complutensian Polyglot and the Second Rabbinic Bible, which partially overlapped in content. While the former presented the Hebrew text and Targum Onkelos alongside Latin versions that could serve as a beginner's crib, the latter enabled a more advanced reader to compare the Hebrew and Aramaic texts with medieval commentaries unaided. The reasons for Thomas's citation of so many sources on Genesis cannot then be attributed merely to a desire to amass information for the sake of it, but must also be sought in his progress in Hebrew language, his developing scholarly interests, and the publication of new editions during his lifetime.[63]

Other Brothers – Thomas Wakefield on Cain and Abel

[62] The definition of *shamayim* from the Long Commentary on Exod. 12: 6.

[63] A further example is provided by the notes on Neh. 4: 9–5: 11 (fol. 480r) which appear to have been written in two stages. Annotations in a darker ink cite the Latin translations of Pagnini and Münster, and thus have a *terminus post quem* of 1534. Annotations in a lighter ink have been written immediately after, and sometimes over, the earlier notes. As these latter cite the Zurich Latin Bible, they have a *terminus post quem* of 1543. The later annotations include a reference to Kimḥi's *Sefer ha-Shorashim*, showing that Thomas sought new insights from Hebrew sources after an initial familiarity with the text. A Latin translation of Thomas's own was added during the second reading, a product of his more advanced knowledge. Carley's suggestion that Thomas inherited books annotated by Robert after the latter's death in 1537 (see 'Religious', 210, and n. 15 above), the reference to the ascendancy of Thomas Cromwell (d. 1540, see below), and the publication dates of the works cited together support a dating of Thomas's initial study of the Trinity Bible to the years immediately before his appointment as Regius Professor in 1540. Therefore the annotations I have examined might tentatively be dated *ca.* 1537–1547.

FIG. 2. Cambridge, Trinity College, Adv.c.1.18, fol. 4r. Courtesy of the Master and Fellows of Trinity College Cambridge.

Thomas's use of the resources at his disposal to address textual problems in the Hebrew Bible can be demonstrated by examining his annotations of Genesis 4 (Fig. 2).[64] As in the case of the Creation narrative, Thomas's abundant comments on this chapter are written in inks of different shades and were penned over an extended period of time. The placement of the annotations on the page follows a basic plan that is evident throughout the Trinity Bible: while the shortest glosses are squeezed between the lines, most comments are in the left and right margins. This leaves the wide upper and lower margins for extended

[64] fol. 4r.

citations. As a consequence, annotations are not necessarily placed next to the relevant verse, and some words have been underlined or marked by *signes de renvoi* that send the reader in search of a gloss.

Thomas encountered exegetical challenges from the very first verse:

וְהָאָדָם יָדַע אֶת־חַוָּה אִשְׁתּוֹ וַתַּהַר וַתֵּלֶד אֶת־קָיִן וַתֹּאמֶר קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה׃

And the man knew (*yadaʿ*) his wife Eve and she conceived and bore Cain. She said, 'I have acquired a man with (*et*) the Lord'.

Five notes in the Trinity Bible reveal Thomas's consideration of the sense in which Adam 'knew' Eve and the meaning of *et* at the end of the verse. He addressed the former by noting down two biblical passages: '.I. reg. i. ut matth. i. ἐγινωσκε'. The first reference is to the conception of the prophet Samuel. Thomas's interest lies in the statement that 'Elkanah knew (*va-yedaʿ*) his wife Hannah',[65] which illustrates the use of the Hebrew verb *y-d-ʿ* to refer to carnal knowledge. Here and at Gen. 4: 1, the Septuagint uses the verb γιγνώσκω with the same meaning. This word underlies the association Thomas made between these verses and the conclusion of Jesus's genealogy in Matt. 1: 25: 'And [Joseph] knew (ἐγίνωσκεν) her not until she gave birth to a son'.[66] By thus comparing Hebrew occurrences of the verb 'to know', and by establishing the semantic range of the equivalent term in the Septuagint, Thomas determined the meaning of the verse under discussion.

The significance of *et* was more difficult to resolve. This particle usually marks a definite direct object, though it may also serve as the preposition 'with'. Thomas added a circle in the Hebrew text as a tie mark, linking the term to four marginal annotations that cite parallel verses and Greek and Aramaic renderings. The note 'cum, ut gen. 6 bis, et isa. 28.' identifies instances in which the Hebrew means 'with',[67] though the sense in which Eve acquired her son 'with the Lord' remains unclear. Thomas referred to several translations to shed light on the issue:

[65] 1 Sam. 1: 19. Thomas's reference to this verse is recorded in the Trinity Bible (fol. 194v) where he wrote 'gen. 4' over the word *va-yedaʿ* ('and he knew').
[66] See n. 13 above.
[67] The references are to Gen. 6: 9, 18–19 and Isa. 28: 15, 18.

διὰ. 70.ta קְדָם chal. . . .

קְדָם יְיָ ch.

εν θεω. 70.ta

The notes marked 'chal.' and 'ch.' refer to the Aramaic ('Chaldean') rendering of Targum Onkelos. The abbreviation '70.ta' attributes citations to the Septuagint. While Thomas could have found the rendering διὰ ('through') in any printed edition of the latter then in circulation,[68] the reading εν θεω is from a different source.[69] Thomas encountered it in the *Veteris Testamenti ad veritatem Hebraicam recognitio* (Lyon: Gryphius, 1531) of the scholarly librarian Agostino Steuco, who recorded readings from manuscripts in his custody at the Grimani library.[70] Steuco addressed this verse by questioning the Vulgate's rendering *possedi hominem per deum*, 'I have gotten a man through God'.[71]

. . . Neque est per deum, sed à deo. Sic enim habent Hebraica, אֶת יְהוָה. Quoddam scholium apud Graecos hic extat, quod tradit Hebraice atque Syriace haberi ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον ἐν θεῶ, id est acquisiui hominem in deo. Quod tamen minime uerum est.

[68] The Septuagintal annotations in the Trinity Bible that I have compared with printed editions that circulated in Thomas's lifetime and collations of the Cotton Genesis show that Thomas cited the Complutensian Polyglot and Strassburg Greek Bible (*Divinae scripturae, ueteris noueque omnia* (Greek), ed. J. Lonicer, 4 vols in 5 (Strassburg: Cephalaeus, 1524–6)). I have not found any readings that can be attributed to the Cotton Genesis with certainty. For instance, at Gen. 11: 16 (fol. 7v), Thomas cited <κα>ι εζησεν <εβε>ρ ετη ε<κα>τον τρια<κο>ντα τεσ<σ>αρα ('Heber lived 134 years [and begat Phaleg]'). This agrees with the text in the Complutensian Polyglot (which served as the basis of the reading in the Antwerp Polyglot, *Biblia Sacra Hebraice, Chaldaice, Graece & Latine*, Plantin, 1568–73, vol. 1, 33). However the Aldine (*Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Novaeque Omnia* (Greek), Venice, 1518, fol. 4r), Strassburg (vol. 1, fol. 10r), and Basel (*Divinae Scripturae, Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, Omnia* (Greek), Hervagius, 1543, 8) editions place ἔτη after τέσσαρα while, according to the collation of Ernest Grabe (*Collatio codicis Cottoniani*, ed. H. Owen (London: Nichols, 1778), 9), the Cotton Genesis reading is τεσσερα. Consulting the Complutensian Polyglot rather than a Greek bible would have allowed Thomas to note differences between the Septuagint and the other versions. In this case, the Hebrew, Targum Onkelos, and the Vulgate claim that Heber was a mere 34 at the time of Phaleg's birth rather than a centenarian, a discrepancy that may explain Thomas's decision to cite the passage (cf. J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta, GA, 1993), 152–61). Thomas's annotations at Gen. 28: 19 (fol. 19r) and Deut. 32: 43 (fol. 138v), discussed in notes 118 and 119 below, cite the Strassburg text of the Septuagint. On his use of the Cotton Genesis, see Carley, 'Thomas Wakefield', and Herbert Kessler's chapter in the present volume.

[69] It is not in any printed edition of the Septuagint in circulation during Wakefield's lifetime nor, according to the collations of Junius-Ussher and Grabe, in the Cotton Genesis; Bryan Walton (ed.), *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta* (London: Roycroft, 1653–58), vol. 6, 109 (sixth pagination); Grabe, *Collatio*, 3.

[70] On Steuco, see R. K. Delph, 'Emending and defending the Vulgate Old Testament: Agostino Steuco's quarrel with Erasmus', in *A Companion to Biblical Humanism and Scholasticism in the Age of Erasmus*, ed. E. Rummel (Leiden 2008), 297–318; T. Dunkelgrün, 'The multiplicity of Scripture: the confluence of textual traditions in the making of the Antwerp Polyglot Bible (1568–1573)', PhD diss. (University of Chicago 2012), 43–5; Carley, 'Lambeth', 48–50; also his 'Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield brothers'; J. Weinberg, 'Azariah de' Rossi and Septuagint Traditions', *Italia* 5 (1985), 7–35, at 12–13, 19–22.

[71] As printed in, for instance, *Biblia cum pleno apparatu* (Lyon: Sachon, 1511), fol. 5r.

Hebraice enim quomodo se haberent uidimus. Per Syram aeditionem, quae saepissime à Graecis scriptoribus citatur, nescio an afferam, eos sentire de ea, quae nunc apud Hebraeos sub nomine Onchelos & Ionathae circunfertur, in qua non est in deo, sed מן קהם יהוה. Hoc est à deo.

. . . It does not mean 'through God', but 'from God', for in Hebrew they have אֶת יְהוָה. A certain comment is found here in the Greek, which relates that the Hebrew and Syriac have ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον ἐν θεῶ, which means, 'I have acquired a man in God (*in deo*)'. This is most certainly incorrect, for we have [already] seen how the Hebrew is expressed. Regarding the Syrian version (which is very often cited by the Greek writers), I do not know whether I should mention what is expressed by the Hebrews [and] now circulates under attribution to Onkelos and Jonathan. Therein is found not 'in God', but rather מן קהם יהוה [*sic*], which means 'from God'.[72]

Here Steuco cited a scholion on Gen. 4: 1 which attributes the reading *εν θεω* to Greek sources called the 'Hebrew' and the 'Syrian'. The identity of these sources has long been a source of confusion and here we see Steuco grappling with the problem.[73] Evidently conceiving of the 'Hebrew' as a translation of the Hebrew Bible as he knew it, Steuco rejected the scholion's rendering of the word *et* as inaccurate. The attribution of the reading to the 'Syrian' prompted confused references to the source first as Syriac ('Syriace') and then as Syrian ('Syram aeditionem'). Though Steuco even suggested that the text might be reflected in the Aramaic targumim, he admitted that Targum Onkelos reads 'from God' rather than 'in God'. Onkelos's rendering appears to agree with the meaning that Steuco initially designated as correct, but a misquotation of the Aramaic only adds to the confusion, as מן קהם יהוה has been printed instead of מן קדם יהוה.

[72] Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti*, 131.

[73] Ἑβραῖος καὶ Σύρος ἐκτησάμην ἄνθρωπον ἐν θεῷ, '[The] Hebrew and the Syrian: 'I obtained a man in God.'' See R. B. ter Haar Romeny, *A Syrian in Greek Dress: The Use of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis* (Louvain 1997), 47–86, 218–20; id. '"Quis sit ὁ Σύρος" revisited', in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, ed. A. Salvesen (Tübingen 1998), 360–98; J. Wevers (ed.), *Septuaginta: Genesis* (Göttingen 1974), 95; N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, trans. W. Watson (Leiden 2000), 161–7; M. W. Scarlata, *Outside of Eden: Cain in the Ancient Versions of Genesis 4.1–16* (New York, NY, 2010), 33–4.

The annotations in Thomas's personal copy of Steuco, now at Lambeth Palace Library,[74] show that he read this comment with a critical eye. Underlining the misprinted quotation from Targum Onkelos, he corrected it by adding a *dalet* above the line. In the margin, he added 'קדם יהוה ÷ coram deo. in codice meo'. This shorter Aramaic rendering reflects the reading of Targum Onkelos in the Complutensian Polyglot, where Eve's statement is expressed with the preposition קֳדָם (*kodam*, 'before') rather than מִן קֳדָם (*min kodam*, 'from'). Thomas then translated this into Latin as *coram deo*, 'in the presence of God'.[75]

Though Thomas noted inaccuracies in Steuco's comment, it nevertheless informed his understanding of the text of Gen. 4: 1. Thomas copied the scholion *εν θεω* into his Hebrew Bible, labelling it as a Septuagintal reading without going into details. There it supplements other Greek and targumic texts, the list of parallel biblical passages, and the explanation that *et* might be translated into Latin as *cum*, 'with'. Though Thomas did not indicate a preference for any one of these readings, the annotations are nevertheless selective as Steuco's preferred translation 'from God' has been overlooked.

The Hebrew of Gen. 4: 8 posed another textual difficulty because the expression *va-yomer kayin* ('and Cain said') leads the reader to expect direct speech, but none is given. The gap is marked in the 1521 Hebrew Bible with a line-break mid-verse:

וַיֹּאמֶר קַיִן אֶל־הֶבֶל אָחִיו

וַיְהִי֙ בִּהְיוֹתָ֣ם בַּשָּׂדֶ֔ה וַיָּ֥קָם קַ֖יִן אֶל־הֶ֣בֶל אָחִ֑יו וַיַּהַרְגֵֽהוּ׃

And Cain said (*va-yomer kayin*) to his brother [. . .]

and when they were in the field, Cain rose up against his brother and killed him.

[74] Shelfmark: E81.(S8).

[75] The Complutensian Polyglot gives 'קָנִיתִי גְּבֶר קֳדָם יְיָ' whereas the First Rabbinic Bible has 'קָנִיתִי גַּבְרָא מִן־קֳדָם יְיָ' and the Second has 'קָנִיתִי גַּבְרָא מִן־קֳדָם יְיָ'. If *in codice meo* indicates the Complutensian Polyglot, Thomas has followed the designation of the work simply as a *codex* in the famous passage of the introduction (cited below). An alternative is that *in codice meo* here refers to the Trinity Bible and that Thomas copied his own annotation of the Hebrew text of Gen. 4: 1 (itself excerpted from the Complutensian Polyglot) into his copy of Steuco. Thomas wrote the Tetragrammaton in full, a reading that differs from the three *yod*s in the Complutensian text of Targum Onkelos. Because of the extreme rarity of the unabbreviated spelling of the Tetragrammaton in targumic texts (see M. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections* (Cambridge 1992), xii), this is likely to be a change that Thomas made himself.

Noting that the text was divided over two lines, Thomas sought an explanation in Elijah Levita's *Masoret ha-Masoret*. The blank space created by the line-break provided a convenient place to note: 'Secundum Eliam Levitem est hic פִּיסְקָא seu <פַּרִיגְמָ>א' ('According to Elijah Levita, this is a pause or break').[76]

Different readings of this verse were known to Thomas. The Samaritan Pentateuch (as cited by Jerome), the Septuagint, and the Fragment Targum all attribute to Cain the statement, 'Let us go to the field', while the Vulgate gives, 'Let us go forth'.[77] But Rashi and Ibn Ezra addressed the apparent lacuna in the Masoretic Text by speculating on the topic of the brothers' conversation: according to the former it was an argument,[78] while the latter said that Cain reported God's admonition. Two annotations indicate Thomas's preference for the latter solution. Between the lines of the biblical text is written:

> scilicet ea quae locutus est dominus Hier.
>
> That is, what the Lord said. Jerome.

In a marginal note, Thomas also referred to the interpretation of Ibn Ezra:

> וַיֹּאמֶר קַיִן. הקר<וב> אלי שאמר לו כל התוכחות שאוכיח<ו>[79] השם. אבן עזר<א.>
>
> <Qu>em sentit et dedit <Hi>eron. in Annotationibus.
>
> 'And Cain said.' The best explanation, in my opinion, is that [Cain] told [Abel] of all the rebukes with which God had reprimanded him. Ibn Ezra.
>
> Jerome understood and explained this similarly in his annotations.

Here, Thomas noted that an unlikely pair of exegetes, Saint Jerome and Rabbi Abraham ibn Ezra, shared the view that Cain informed Abel of something that God had told him. Uncovering Thomas's sources takes us from his copy of Jerome's *Hebrew Questions on*

---

[76] Levita, *Masoret ha-Masoret* (Venice: Bomberg, 1538), 69, 79.

[77] The Fragment Targum, as printed in the First Rabbinic Bible, reads 'אִיתָא וְנִפּוֹק לְאַפֵּי בָרָא'. The Septuagint and Vulgate, as printed in the Complutensian Polyglot, read 'διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸν πεδίον' and 'Egrediamur foras'. On the Samaritan, see below.

[78] On this interpretation, see J. Byron, *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition: Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the First Sibling Rivalry* (Leiden 2011), 63–72.

[79] שאוכיחו should read שיוכיחו (see n. 82 below).

Genesis, now at Lambeth Palace Library,[80] to the text of Ibn Ezra in his 1525 Rabbinic Bible. Both books have been annotated and show that Thomas turned from the Church Father to the medieval rabbi, drawing a link between the patristic and medieval Jewish insights in the margins of his books.

Jerome's commentary on Gen. 4: 8 reads:

> Et dixit Cain ad Abel fratrem suum. Subauditur ea quae locutus est dominus. Superfluum ergo est quod in Samaritanorum & nostro uolumine reperitus: transeamus in campum.[81]
>
> 'And Cain said to his brother Abel.' 'What the Lord spoke' is understood. So [the statement] 'let us go out into the field', as is found in our scroll and in that of the Samaritans, is superfluous.

In his copy of Jerome's commentary, Thomas underlined the very words he copied between the lines of the Trinity Bible. Establishing the same link between Jerome and Ibn Ezra, he remarked *sic sentit Aben ezra*, 'Ibn Ezra understood [the verse] in the same way'. The web of cross-references between Thomas's texts and commentaries is completed by an annotation in his 1525 Rabbinic Bible. The words from Ibn Ezra's commentary that Thomas transferred into the Trinity Bible have been underlined and a marginal note reads *sic sentit diuus Hieronymus*.[82] This triangle of annotations shows Thomas studying the Hebrew Bible by establishing links between the text and its patristic and medieval Jewish commentators in the margins of his books. As a result of this process, Thomas would no longer need to consult multiple books or to wade through the dense contents of the Rabbinic Bible to consider the interpretation of this verse. He could now access the explanations of Jerome and Ibn Ezra simply by consulting the summaries he wrote in the Trinity Bible.

---

[80] Jerome, 'Divi Hieronymi Qvaestiones sive Traditiones Hebraicae in Genesim', in *Opus epistolarum*, ed. Erasmus, 3 vols in 1 (Basel: Johann Froben, 1524), 3. 204–234. Shelfmark: *D65. (J3) (Carley, 'Bardi', 237; also 'Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield brothers'). This comment had an eventful transmission history and was included in Rabanus Maurus's commentary on Genesis. Thomas's copy survives in Lambeth Palace Library and he underlined part of the interpretation in question (Hrabanus Maurus, *In Genesis et Exodum* (Cologne: Joannes Prael, 1533), 99; shelfmark: **E1235. H7) but also pursued Jerome's insight *ad fontes*.

[81] Jerome, *Opus epistolarum*, 3. 206.

[82] A typographical error in the 1525 Rabbinic Bible explains Thomas's misspelling in the quotation (see n. 79). A later reader has corrected the text in the Chetham's Bible.

Thomas also noted a problem in the margin of his copy of Jerome's *Hebrew Questions*:

> Egrediamur foras. Comunis translatio. Hic liquet comunem translationem latinam non esse Hieronymi.
>
> 'Let us go forth' is the common translation. Here it is apparent that the common Latin translation was not by Jerome.

The problem here is that Jerome's commentary upholds the lacuna in the Hebrew text of Gen. 4: 8 while the Vulgate places the words 'Let us go forth' (*egrediamur foras*) into Cain's mouth. So how could the translation and the commentary be by the same person, asked Thomas Wakefield. This discrepancy reveals an important reason for Thomas's reservations regarding the authenticity and reliability of the Latin rendering in general circulation and his preference for fresh translations made directly from the Hebrew Bible.

Concern regarding the textual corruption of the Vulgate had long prompted attempts to standardize its text in line with the Hebrew.[83] This was a theme of the inaugural *Oratio* of Robert Wakefield, who dismissed the corruptions of the Vulgate as scribal errors and defended Jerome's original authorship.[84] But in 1513, Paul of Middelburg, bishop of Fossombrone, called the attribution into question by noting discrepancies between the Vulgate and Jerome's commentaries.[85] Thomas advanced the very same argument in the margins of his copies of Jerome's *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* and the *Veteris Testamenti ad veritatem Hebraicam recognitio* where, like Erasmus before him,[86] he took issue with Steuco's defence of Jerome's authorship.[87] The wider implications of this argument for Thomas's treatment of the Vulgate are apparent in a severe assessment of its

---

[83] F. van Liere, *An Introduction to the Medieval Bible* (Cambridge 2014), 91–102. The discrepancy between the Vulgate and Jerome's comment on Gen. 4: 8 was apparent to medieval readers, including Andrew of Saint Victor, particularly because the two texts were juxtaposed on the page in the *Glossa Ordinaria.* See G. Dahan, 'L'exégèse de l'histoire de Caïn et Abel du XII^{e} au XIV^{e} siècle en Occident: textes', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 50 (1983), 5–68, at 20, 41, 48, 60–61.

[84] Robert Wakefield, *On the Three Languages*, 49.

[85] Paul of Middelburg, *Paulina, de recta Paschae celebratione* (Fossombrone: Petrucci, 1513), sig. B7^{r}. See E. Rice, *Saint Jerome in the Renaissance* (Baltimore, MA, 1985), 173–85; Weinberg, 'Azariah de' Rossi', 13.

[86] Erasmus's letter to Steuco (*ep*. 2465) and Steuco's reply (*ep*. 2513) are printed in *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen, 12 vols (Oxford 1938), 9. 204–224, 289–307.

[87] For instance, at Jerome's interpretation of Gen. 17: 17 (Jerome, *Opus epistolarum*, 3. 214) and Steucho's comment on Gen. 18: 10 (*Veteris Testamenti*, 255).

reliability in his annotation on the well known introductory explanation of the *mise en page* of the Complutensian Polyglot:

> Now we must briefly deal with the manner in which we have arranged the languages of the Pentateuch in the book itself. When the book has first been opened, two pages present themselves to you, one on each side, both of which have three principal columns. The one placed on the outer margin contains the Hebrew Truth. The one on the inner margin is the Greek edition of the seventy interpreters, above which is placed a word-for-word interlinear Latin translation. We have placed the Latin of St Jerome between them, as if between the Synagogue and the Eastern Church: placing [them] like the two robbers, one on each side, but Jesus—the Roman or Latin Church—in the middle. Whenever the others deviate from the correct understanding of Scripture, this one alone is built on solid rock [and] always remains steadfast in the truth.[88]

Evidently vexed by the association of the Catholic Church with a text he considered to be untrustworthy and by the opinion that the Vulgate was more reliable than the Hebrew, Thomas underlined the offending passage and wrote in the margin: *Non est hoc verum quod scribit de Romana ecclesia; erravit enim illa foede* ('What he writes regarding the Roman Church is not true, for it has erred dreadfully'). An explanatory reference has been added in a different ink: *Ex Ruffino de symbolo Apostolorum*. According to Rufinus's commentary on the Apostles' Creed, 'no heresy has its origin' in the Roman Church. But Rufinus pointed to examples where the wording of the creeds of the churches of Rome and Aquilea differed from one other and from that of the Eastern churches. Furthermore, as Erasmus noted in his 1533 treatise for Thomas Boleyn, the version of the Roman creed

[88] 'Nunc de modo quo linguas Pentateuchi in libro ipso disposuimus: breuibus agendum est. Primum itaque aperto codice duae se tibi chartarum facies hinc et inde offerent: quarum vnaquaeque tres praecipuas columnas habet. Ex quibus ea quae ad marginem exteriorm sita est: Hebraicam continet veritatem. Quae vero interiori margini adhaeret: Graeca est septuaginta interpretum editio: cui superponitur latina interlinearis traductio de verbo ad verbum. Mediam autem inter has latinam beati Hieronymi translationem velut inter Synagogam et Orientalem Ecclesiam posuimus: tanquam duos hinc et inde latrones medium autem Iesum hoc est Romanam siue latinam Ecclesiam collocantes. Haec enim sola supra firmam petram aedificata (reliquis a recta Scripturae intelligentia quandoque deuiantibus) immobilis semper in veritate permansit.' *Vetus Testamentum multiplici lingua nunc primo impressum* (Alcalá: Arnaldus Gulielmus de Brocario, 1514–17), vol. 1, sig. *3^{v}. Many readers picked out the bold comparison between the Catholic Church, Judaism, and Eastern Christianity, and it has been underlined in the copies in Lambeth Palace Library (**E1 1514), which belonged to the library of the Convent of the Franciscan Recollects in Antwerp in the sixteenth century, and Cambridge University Library (F151.a.8.2), once owned by Bishop John Moore (1646–1714) of Ely.

known to Rufinus differed from the Apostles' Creed used in his day. A comparison of the early witnesses thus revealed that Roman practice was not immutable and enabled the recovery of a text more ancient than was currently in use. Approaching the comparison of the biblical versions in a similar way, Thomas rejected the notion that discrepancies should necessarily be decided in favour of the Vulgate by virtue of its status and use as the Church's lectionary Bible. On the contrary, the Hebrew may be used to shed light on the errors in the Latin. A critical comparison of the versions that gave priority to the Hebrew text was thus essential to attain the 'correct understanding of Scripture'.[89]

Thomas's confidence in the integrity of the Hebrew text is confirmed by the annotations on Gen. 4: 8 in the Trinity Bible, his 1525 Rabbinic Bible, and his copy of Jerome's *Hebrew Questions*. Though the testimony of the versions could have led him to reconstruct a reading that had been lost in transmission, he seized instead upon the explanations of Jerome and Ibn Ezra because they made sense of the Hebrew text as it stands. Jerome also dismissed the significance of other readings, thus lending further support to Thomas's stance. By bringing the insights of Jerome and Ibn Ezra together with the reference to Levita's *Masoret ha-Masoret* in the Trinity Bible, he explained the apparent gap in Gen. 4: 8 as an authentic and integral feature of the Hebrew Bible and interpreted the text in its own right.

Commentaries, Versions, and Translations

While Thomas drew on numerous sources to study Genesis, some of the later books of the Hebrew Bible are less densely annotated. Extensive references to Kimḥi's *Sefer Shorashim*, the translation of Pagnini, and the 1543 Zurich Latin Bible and are found throughout, suggesting that these served as basic reference works. But no supplementary references to medieval Hebrew commentaries are found in many of the historical books and Hagiographa. By comparison with the text of Genesis, the annotation of these texts appears to be incomplete, as if a more detailed analysis was not sustained through the whole Bible. Chronicles is particularly sparsely annotated, and translations drawn from

[89] Erasmus, *Explanatio symboli apostolorum*, ed. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, in *Opera omnia Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami*, vol. 5/1 (Amsterdam 1977), 220–22; J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd edn (London 1972), 100–130; cf. Rex, *Theology of John Fisher*, 148–61.

Pagnini and the Zurich Latin Bible sit alongside occasional references to Ziegler and Weissenburger and notes labelled as Thomas's own insights.

Some of the resources Thomas consulted were relevant only to particular texts. His annotations on the Psalter cite the translation and commentary that Martin Bucer published under the pseudonym Aretius Felinus and the commentary of David Kimḥi. Thomas's copy of the former is now in Lambeth Palace Library.[90] Though a number of objections have been added in the margins, which occasionally reveal a preference for the interpretations of Rabbi David Kimḥi over those of the German reformer, the frequent citation of 'Felinus' in the Trinity Bible reveals Thomas's reliance on Bucer's comments.[91] Kimḥi's commentary on the Psalter would have been available to Thomas in several incunable and sixteenth-century editions. A clue regarding the one he used is provided by his apparent ignorance of Kimḥi's objections to Christological exegesis of the Psalter. For instance, at Psalm 45: 18, 'Therefore nations will praise you for ever and ever', Thomas cited the beginning of Kimḥi's interpretation: 'They will praise you forever: This is to say, they will acclaim you as king over them. Radak'.[92] He failed to note that Kimḥi continued this comment with a rebuttal of Christological interpretations of the Psalm. Then at Psalm 110, a text interpreted Christologically in New Testament texts including Eph. 1: 20 and Heb. 7: 11, Thomas cited the explanation in the body of Kimḥi's commentary that the 'priest' in verse 4 was a 'king and a ruler'. He did not note that this identification formed part of Kimḥi's later refutation of the association of the figure with Jesus. If Thomas did indeed read a text of this commentary without the anti-Christological comments, he may have consulted the Isny 1541–2 edition or had access to a copy of the First Rabbinic Bible that lacked the 'Responses that Radak made to the Christians regarding a few of the Psalms' that were bound into some copies.[93]

---

[90] Shelfmark: E1430. (B8).

[91] See the citation of Bucer's discussion of the location of Tarshish at Ps. 48: 8 (fol. 410v), drawn from *S. Psalmorum libri quinque ad Ebraicam veritatem versi* (Strassburg: Andlanus, 1529), fol. 220r (the beginning of the cited passage is underlined in Thomas's copy); cf. Carley, 'Religious', 208–209; C. Hopf, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation* (Oxford 1946), 205–217.

[92] 'יהודוך לעולם. כלומר י<ודו> אותך למלך עליהם. ר<ד״ק.>', fol. 410r.

[93] Though the Cremona 1561 and Venice 1566 editions of the Psalter with Kimḥi's commentary also lack the anti-Christological comments, Thomas's use of the Isny edition is suggested by his annotation at Ps. 86: 6, 'הַאֲזִינָה יְהוָה תְּפִלָּתִי' ('Give ear to my prayer, O Lord'): 'אֲדֹנָי in alio exemplari' (fol. 420r). As *adonai* was printed instead of the Tetragrammaton in the Isny edition (fol. 64r), this may be the one Thomas used. Could his copy be the '*Sephir Tahilim*' listed among the Hebrew commentaries in the 1612 Catalogue of Lambeth Palace Library? See Carley, 'Lambeth', 31. (A copy of the First Rabbinic Bible that contains the extra sheet, headed 'אלו הן התשובות שעשה רד״ק לנוצרים על קצת מזמורים.' is Bodl. Opp. Fol. 24. See n. 3 above.)

Thomas noted vernacular translations throughout the Trinity Bible. At Proverbs 1, for instance, he considered the unusual compound conjunction that begins verse 29, 'Because (*taḥat ki*) they hated knowledge and did not choose the fear of the Lord'. Suggesting that it could be translated as an interrogative, he gave French and English equivalents: 'Gallice, pur quoi. Anglice, For why'.[94] By selecting two-word expressions, he attempted to show how the Hebrew phrase could be represented as closely as possible in vernacular languages.

Often extended phrases are translated. An example is the obscure statement of Boaz's servant in the account of Ruth gleaning in the field (Ruth 2: 7). According to the Septuagint, the servant commended Ruth because she had not stopped working (οὐ κατέπαυσεν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μικρόν) while, according to the Vulgate, the point was that she had not returned home (*ne ad momentum quidem domum reversa est*). The confusion lies in the meaning of the word שבתה, which might be derived from the verb 'to stop', 'to return', or, as pointed in the Masoretic Text, 'to stay' (*shivtah*). Setting aside the versions, Thomas translated directly from the Hebrew text before him into English: 'Anglice. sche ta<r>yed lytle at home'.[95]

Some trial and error was involved in pinpointing the English terms that corresponded with the Hebrew. Evidently struggling to understand the architectural terminology in the Vision of the New Temple in Ezek. 40: 26, Thomas offered several tentative definitions of *elamav*, initially writing: 'angl. portalles, ni fallor'.[96] The concluding 'if I am not mistaken' shows Thomas anticipated this would not necessarily be his last word on the matter. Indeed, a second definition, 'vaults', was later scratched out when he finally settled on 'porch'. This equivocation shows that defining technical Hebrew terms in the vernacular was a matter of some experimentation and provisionality.[97]

Thomas sometimes remarked on similarities and differences between English, Latin, and Hebrew idioms. For instance, in the account of the scapegoat ritual on the Day of Atonement at Leviticus 16, verse 21 begins, 'Aaron will lay both of his hands (*shetei yadav*) on the head of the live goat'. Thomas noted, '<d>uae manus eius, sic et nos

[94] fol. 435r.
[95] The text is 'זֶה שִׁבְתָּה הַבַּיִת מְעָט:', fol. 144r.
[96] וְאֵלַמָּו, fol. 367v.
[97] This is explicit at Num. 14: 4 (fol. 96v), where the expression *nitena rosh* is glossed: 'Anglice. let us lay oure heades to gedre'. Evidently dissatisfied with the rendering, Thomas later returned to the passage and noted in a lighter ink: 'Vel melius, Lett us make an heade, or, captane'.

loqui<m>ur. Hys two handes. pro, <b>othe hys handes'.[98] Here we see Thomas manipulating the English language to explain the difference between the Hebrew and Latin constructions *shetei yadav* ('the two of his hands') and *duae manus eius* ('the two hands of his'). By translating them as 'both his hands' and 'his two hands' respectively, alternative English turns of phrase illustrate the difference between the construct state in Hebrew and the genitive in Latin.

Vernacular definitions of unfamiliar words are found in many of Thomas's books, including his Strassburg Greek Bible (1524–6), now at Lambeth Palace Library.[99] Recording definitions would have aided memorization and facilitated future reference to the texts. But some of the vernacular translations in the Trinity Bible reveal reading habits particular to this book. In her examination of Thomas's English glosses, Rosen noted similarities with Tyndale's translations.[100] That Thomas read the Hebrew Bible alongside English renderings is confirmed by comments that attribute English translations to Myles Coverdale.[101] For instance, in his comment on the dedication of the Temple at 2 Chr. 5: 11, Thomas glossed the terse statement *ein lishmor le-maḥlekot* as follows:

> nec erat ut seruarent ordines non erat obseruare distinctiones, pagn. Anglice. bycause the coureses were not kepte. Couerdale. And dyd not then wayt by course.[102]

This annotation shows that Thomas consulted several translations of the difficult Hebrew phrase. Though he did not indicate the source of the first, 'nec erat ut seruarent ordines' is the rendering of the 1543 Zurich Latin Bible.[103] As noted, the second ('non erat obseruare distinctiones') is Pagnini's translation.[104] The rendering designated 'Anglice' appears in

[98] fol. 76r.
[99] For instance, in Gen. 4: 11, the verb ἔχανε is glossed 'χαινω angl[.] to yaine, or[,] gape' (vol. 1, fol. 4v). The shelfmark of Thomas's copy is E41.L6: see Carley, 'Thomas Wakefield, Robert Wakefield, and the Cotton Genesis', 252–3. On a vernacular translation in the hand of Robert Wakefield in Longleat House, MS 21 that is similarly labelled *anglice*, see Olszowy-Schlanger, 'Hebrew manuscripts as the source for Robert Wakefield's Hebraism', **??**. Many English translations of lexical entries have been added to Thomas's annotated copy of Levita's *Tishbi* (see n. 26 above) which, as a result, partly functions as a Hebrew–English glossary.
[100] Rosen, 'The Bible unbound', 72, 127–30.
[101] On Coverdale's debt to Tyndale, see D. Norton, 'English bibles from *c*. 1520 to *c*. 1750', in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, 3: *From 1450 to 1750*, ed. E. Cameron (Cambridge 2016), 305–344, at 309–310.
[102] Fol. 507v.
[103] fol. 186r.
[104] fol. 153r.

the Coverdale Bible of 1535.[105] The final anonymous English translation is found in the Great Bible of 1539.[106] The presence of four renderings shows that Thomas undertook a comparative study of the translations of his contemporaries, bringing both Latin and English translations to bear. This shows that such works were not merely a crib to help understand the Hebrew, but enabled an examination of the text in the light of diverse possible renderings.

One reason for Thomas's vernacular annotations is explicit in a note on the consecration of Aaron and his sons at Lev. 8: 6, 'And [Moses] washed them with the water' (*va-yirḥats otam ba-mayim*). Thomas first wrote the translations, 'Anglice. with water; Latine. aquis'. Then noting that the meaning expressed in Latin by the ablative case of *aquis* is conveyed in English and Hebrew by means of a preposition (*ba-mayim,* 'with water') he wrote:

> Hic uidere est p<hr>asim hebraicae linguae p<ro>piorem esse nostrae uernaculae quam latinae.
>
> Here it can be seen that the phrasing of the Hebrew language is closer to our vernacular than to Latin.[107]

Though reminiscent of Tyndale's claim that 'the propirties of the hebrue tonge agreth a thousande tymes moare with the english then with the latyne',[108] Thomas's statement relates to a specific construction rather than to features of Hebrew and English more generally. It indicates that, where a Hebrew idiom cannot be rendered directly into Latin, a

---

[105] *Biblia the Bible* ([Antwerp: de Keyser,] 1535), fol. 93r. In the Trinity Bible, Coverdale translations are also marked at Job 7: 5 (fol. 449r), 11: 2 (fol. 450r), 13: 13 (fol. 451r), 35: 6 (fol. 457r); 2 Chr. 4: 16 (fol. 507v), 10: 15 (fol. 511v).

[106] 'and dyd not then wayte by course', in *The Byble in Englyshe* (London: Grafton and Whitchurch, 1539–41), fol. 75v; similarly, the Bishops' Bible reads 'and did not then wayte by course', in *The holie Bible* (London: Iugge, 1568), fol. 130v. See Norton, 'English bibles', 309–311, 313–15, 319–22; id. *The King James Bible: A Short History from Tyndale to Today* (Cambridge 2011), 7–32; G. Latré, 'The 1535 Coverdale Bible and its Antwerp origins', in *The Bible as Book: The Reformation,* ed. O. O'Sullivan (New Castle, DE, 2000), 89–102; M. D. Orth, 'The English Great Bible of 1539 and the French connection', in *Tributes to Jonathan J. G. Alexander*, ed. S. L'Engle & G. B. Guest (London 2006), 171–84. For further bibliography, see E. G. Bagley, 'Writing the history of the English Bible: a review of recent scholarship', *Religion Compass* 5 (2011), 300–313.

[107] Fol. 68v. Notes on similarities between English and Hebrew are also found at Gen. 42: 28 (fol. 29r), Lev. 15: 18 (fol. 75r), Lev. 16: 21 (fol. 76r, noted above), Num. 20: 19 (fol. 102r), Josh. 9: 2 (fol. 165v), Dan. 8: 15 (fol. 468r).

[108] William Tyndale, *The obedie(n)ce of a Christen man and how Christe(n) rulers ought to governe* (Antwerp, 1528), fol. 15v.

suitable English expression may sometimes provide a closer equivalent. Vernacular translations, whether his own or those from a published translation, may thus reflect and shed light on Hebrew in ways that Latin cannot. Underlying Thomas's comparisons of existing translations and new formulations is a desire to illustrate the syntax of the biblical text in a classical or vernacular language and thus to explain its meaning with the utmost clarity.

Thomas sometimes also used the ancient versions as translations that shed light on obscure Hebrew. Thus at Gen. 31: 49, the obscure account of the naming of the mound that served as a witness of Jacob and Laban's covenant, Thomas commented on the syntax of the phrase *ve-ha-mitspa asher amar*:

> phrasis mihi ignota, sed 70.[ta] habent, καὶ ἡ ὅρασις <ἣν> εἶπεν. Subest enim eclips<is> et mitspah (sit testis) qu<am> dixit.
>
> The phrase is unknown to me, but the Seventy have, ''and The Sight, which', said he' So there is an underlying omission: ''and (let) Mizpah (be a witness), which', said he'.[109]

Apparently unable to understand the Hebrew clause, Thomas checked to see how it was translated in the Septuagint. Though the Greek text of this narrative is arranged differently from the Hebrew, the use of the accusative relative pronoun to render *asher* provided the key to understand the syntax of the text.[110] By translating the Septuagint into Latin, Thomas construed the Hebrew phrase as the continuation of Laban's speech in the previous verse in which the mound was designated as a witness.

In cases when Thomas perceived a disagreement between the Greek and the Hebrew, he sometimes used the Septuagint to reconstruct the *Vorlage* that lay before the translators and thus to investigate the transmission of the biblical text. For instance, at Gen. 14: 7, among the list of tribes attacked by Chedorlaomer and his allies is 'the whole field (שדה, *sadeh*) of the Amalekites'. The Hebrew is supported by the reading of Targum Onkelos, which Thomas noted by writing the Aramaic חקל (*ḥakal*, 'field') above the line.

[109] Fol. 21v. Thomas evidently consulted the Strassburg Greek Bible as, in his copy, he underlined εἶπεν and noted in the margin 'ιδον in antiquo cod<ice>' (vol. 1, fol. 33r). As confirmed by Grabe's collation (p. 34), this is the reading of the Cotton Genesis (see below).
[110] See Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 524; S. Brayford, *Genesis* (Leiden 2007), 371.

But the Septuagint's reading, 'all the rulers of Amalek', suggests that the translators used a Hebrew text that read שרי (*sarei*, 'princes of') rather than שדה.[111] Thomas accordingly noted in the margin,

> pro שדה septuaginta legerunt שרי.
>
> Instead of שדה, the Seventy read שרי.[112]

Though Thomas evidently conceived of the Septuagint translators as working from a Hebrew text that differed from his own, he did not accept the reading as preferable or correct. In this regard, his assessment may be distinguished from that of Agostino Steuco. When commenting on this verse, Steuco reconstructed the Septuaginal *Vorlage*, urged his readers to consider 'the variety which is found even in the Hebrew codices', and suggested that many other changes had crept into the Hebrew text.[113] *Hebraica veritas* thus ceded to *Hebraica varietas*. Evidently vexed at such an affront to the integrity of the Hebrew, Thomas vented his anger in the margins of his copy: *Non est uerum. Consentiunt enim omnia exemplaria* ('This is not true, for all the exemplars are in agreement'); and *haec suspicio prorsus uana est* ('this suspicion is totally groundless').[114]

The agreement that Thomas perceived in exemplars of the Hebrew contrasts with his characterization of the Septuagint. As James Carley has shown, Thomas collated his Strassburg edition of the Greek Bible with the Cotton Genesis, a manuscript of the Septuagint dated to the fifth or sixth century, which he called *antiquissimus codex* and *antiquissimum exemplar*.[115] On occasion, Thomas also cited a third text called *alium exemplar*. The readings of this last agree with those of the Complutensian Polyglot.[116] Thomas's comparison of these three texts shows that he treated the Septuagint not as a

---

[111] The reading in the Strassburg Greek Bible (vol. 1, fol. 12v) is 'πάντας τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἀμαλὴκ'; see Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 190. On the confusion of *dalet* and *resh* in textual transmission, see below and n. 121.
[112] fol. 9r.
[113] See R. Hendel, 'The dream of a perfect text: textual criticism and biblical inerrancy in early modern Europe', in *Sibyls, Scripture, and Scrolls: John Collins at Seventy*, ed. J. Baden, H. Najman & E. Tigchelaar (Leiden 2017), 517–41, at 518–19.
[114] Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti*, 229.
[115] Now BL MS Cotton Otho B. VI. See Carley, 'Thomas Wakefield', 252–3; W. Horbury, 'The Septuagint in Cambridge', in *Jewish Reception of the Greek Bible Versions. Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. N. de Lange, J. G. Krivoruchko & C. Boyd-Taylor (Tubingen 2009), 9–38, at 12–13.
[116] E.g. at Gen. 9: 27 (fol. 9r) and Gen. 25: 25, 27 (fol. 24v).

standardized work whose accurate transmission could be assumed, but rather as one riddled with textual uncertainties and variants.[117] This judgement is reflected in an annotation in the Trinity Bible at Deut. 32: 43, 'Sing out, O nations, [with] his people for he will avenge the blood of his servants; he will render vengeance against his foes and atone his land [for] his people'. Thomas quoted the Septuagint's reading, considerably longer than the Hebrew, in the margin.[118] But rather than considering the implications of the Septuagint's *Vorlage* for the transmission of the Hebrew text, Thomas merely concluded 'sed variant<ur> codices graeci' ('but the Greek books vary'). The differences between the readings in his Strassburg Greek Bible and Complutensian Polyglot account for this statement and explain Thomas's reluctance to use texts that vary among themselves to emend the Hebrew Bible.[119]

Despite Thomas's general defence of the integrity of the *Hebraica veritas*, occasional corrections can be found in the Trinity Bible. At Gen. 3: 17, Thomas annotated the divine statement 'cursed be the ground because of you (*ba-ʿavurekha*)' by crossing out

[117] On Robert Wakefield's judgement that the Greek manuscripts were 'lacerata, inversa, mutilata, manca, varia, & corruptissima', see Grafton, 'Some early citizens', 24. See further S. Mandelbrote, 'The history of Septuagint studies: early modern western Europe', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*, ed. A. Salvesen & T. M. Law (Oxford 2021), 33–52.

[118] fol. 138v. According to the Complutensian text of the Septuagint: 'Rejoice, O heavens, with him, and let all God's angels bow down to him. Rejoice, O nations, with his people, and let all the sons of God take strength in him. For he will avenge the blood of his sons, take vengeance on [his] enemies and repay them with justice, and repay those that hate him. The Lord shall purge the land of his people.' (εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῶ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῶ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ. ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικεῖται, καὶ ἐκδικήσει καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἀνταποδώσει, καὶ ἐκκαθαριεῖ κ[ύριο]ς τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.') Thomas cited the Strassburg edition (vol. 1, fol. 214r–v) in the Trinity Bible, which omits the underlined text, reads αἷμα instead of ἅμα, and adds αὐτοῦ after ἐχθροῖς. Thomas added the omitted text into the margins of his own copy of the Strassburg Greek Bible and emended αἷμα by deleting the iota. A marginal note accuses the translators of departing both from the *hebraica veritas* and from the text cited at Rom. 15: 10, and condemns the inaccuracy of the edition: 'It is evident here that the Seventy differ very greatly ('to the extent of the fifteenth interval') from the Hebrew Truth and from Paul himself (Rom. 15), and this book is extremely corrupt' ('Hic manifesto et δι<σ>διαπασων dissentiunt .70.^{ta} ab hebraica ueritate et ab ipso paulo Roman. 15. et codex iste corruptissimus est'). Cf. J. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (Atlanta, GA, 1995), 533.

[119] Thomas's misgivings concerning the Septuagint extended to the translators' ability to render the Hebrew text accurately. This is evident at Gen. 28: 19, '[Jacob] called that place Bethel, but Luz (*ulam luz*) was its name formerly'. Taking *ulam* to be part of the place-name, the Septuagint calls the old city Oulammaous (Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, 454). Thomas recorded this in the Trinity Bible (fol. 19r) by noting in the margin: '<70.^{t}>$^{a.}$ καὶ οὐλᾱμμαοὺς ἦν <ὄν>ομα τῇ πόλει τὸ πρότερον'. A comparison with Thomas's Strassburg Bible (vol. 1, fol. 28v) shows that he considered this to be a mistranslation. There he underlined the offending word, copied the *Hebraica veritas* into the margin, and wrote *stulte* as if to scold the translators for a careless mistake (cf. Jerome's *Hebrew Questions on Genesis* on 28: 19 and 35: 6, 220, 224 in the 1524 edition). Thomas's concerns regarding the accuracy and stability of the Septuagint are also reflected in his annotated copy of *Veteris Testamenti ad veritatem Hebraicam recognitio* where he underlined Steuco's complaints and amplified them with marginal paraphrases: 'septuaginta artem gramaticam ad unguem non intellexerunt' ('the Seventy did not have a perfect knowledge of the art of grammar', 136), 'In Editione .70.^{ta} multi sunt errores' ('there are many errors in the Septuagint', 80), '.70.^{ta} hallucinantur' ('the Seventy are deluded', 271).

the *resh* of *ba-ʿavurekha* and inserting a *dalet* above the line (אֲרוּרָה הָאֲדָמָה בַּעֲבוּדֶּךָ).[120] Annotations in the Strassburg Greek Bible and of Steuco's discussion of the Vulgate's rendering show he was aware of the underlying textual problems. The Septuagint's ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου suggests that the Hebrew has been construed as ארורה האדמה בעבודיך ('cursed be the ground by your deeds').[121] The Vulgate reads *maledicta terra in opere tuo*, and Steuco speculated that Jerome read בעבודך.[122] The difference between these reconstructed readings and the Masoretic Text lies partly in the substitution of the graphically similar letters *resh* (ר) and *dalet* (ד) which, as Jerome had suggested in his Old Testament commentaries, could easily be confused in the course of transmission.[123] A strongly worded comment in the margins of Thomas's copy of Steuco calls into question the authenticity of the Vulgate's rendering, presumably as Jerome reported that the Hebrew text was *peccata* (עֲבֵרָה) in his *Hebrew Questions*.[124] But Thomas nevertheless entered the emendation into his Hebrew Bible, apparently bringing the text in line with the Vulgate and Septuagint. As no explanation has been added, it is unclear whether the correction served as an *aide memoire* of his research into the verse or whether this is an exception to his general reluctance to correct the Hebrew. The full significance of this unusual emendation was known to Thomas alone.[125]

This unexplained annotation is among a number of indications that the Trinity Bible was intended primarily for Thomas's personal use. Another has been spotted by James Carley at the beginning of Esther 3, the account of King Ahasuerus promoting the wicked Haman and ordering his servants to bow down to him. The passage has been

---

[120] fol. 3v.

[121] A marginal annotation in Thomas's copy of the Strassburg Greek Bible (vol. 1, fol. 3v) explains as follows: 'propter te בַּעֲבוּרֶךָ sed septuaginta legerunt בַּעֲבוֹדֶיךָ', 'on account of you, *ba-avurekha*, but the Seventy read *ba-avodeikha*'.

[122] Steuco, *Veteris Testamenti*, 126.

[123] M. Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on His Commentary on Jeremiah* (Leiden 2007), 53–61. This is acknowledged by Thomas in his citation of Jerome's comment at Isa. 44: 28 (fol. 297v).

[124] 'Hic manifeste liquet hanc latinam uulgarem et comunem aeditionem, cum ipsemet eam (ut nos legimus) citat, et hic et saepe aliâs corrigit et emendat iuxta hebraica, non fuisse Hieronymi, alioqui oportet aliam ostendere, quam ipse tam frequenter arguit.' Cf. Jerome, 'Divi Hieronymi Qvaestiones', 206.

[125] Another correction is found at S. of S. 1: 17 (fol. 141v) where the *ḥet* of רָחִיטֵנוּ has been crossed out and replaced with *he*. The two readings represent a *ketiv-kere* distinction that has not been indicated in this edition but could be found in the 1525 Rabbinic Bible. Thomas's emendation brings the text in line with the *kere*. For an acknowledgement of contemporary textual diversity, see n. 93 above. Robert Wakefield also defended the reliability of the *Hebraica veritas* which, he said, was accurately preserved and treated by Jews in the synagogue 'with as much reverence as we treat the Eucharist in our churches'. He nevertheless pointed to discrepancies between the traditions of Ben Asher and Ben Naphthali as signs of occasional error. Robert Wakefield, *Syntagma de hebræorum codicum incorruptione* ([London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1534]), sigs. F4^{r}, I2^{v}; cited in Grafton, 'Some early citizens', 20, 23–4. Thomas also corrected typographical errors in the paratext of the Trinity Bible, for instance inserting the missing chapter number at 2 Kgs 17: 1 (fol. 268v).

glossed, ‘Haman exaltatur noster Crumwellus’, ‘Haman is exalted [like] our [Thomas] Cromwell’. The identification of the Vice-Gerent of Spirituals with the archenemy of Israel was certainly a comment that Thomas ‘would not wish to circulate widely’ in his name.[126] Further political comment is found at 2 Sam. 4: 12 where David condemned his allies Rechab and Baanah to death for the killing of Saul’s son Ishbaal and they were dismembered and hanged. Thomas wrote: *<sicu>t nos angli facimus nostris <cons>piratoribus*, ‘Just as we English do to our conspirators’.[127] When Thomas explained Old Testament rituals, his personal familiarity with Catholic liturgy is evident in vernacular references to clerical garb and sacramentals. Thus the water of the Red Heifer ceremony in Num. 19: 9 is defined as ‘holye water’, the vestment worn by the High Priest at Exod. 39: 22 is a ‘tunycle’, and the linen ephod in which David danced at 2 Sam. 6: 14 is an ‘Albe; or, surpless’.[128] In addition, alongside translations of the curse that Canaan was to be the ‘slave of slaves’ (Gen. 9: 25, fol. 7r) is a note that this served as part of a papal title: ‘seruus seruorum .i<d est>. Infimus seruus. Qualem se papa uocat’. These notes show that, when explaining the meanings and usages of these expressions, the terms familiar to Thomas reflected Catholic belief and practice, and he recorded them in the privacy of his personal bible without any polemical edge.[129]

The presence of annotations for Thomas’s eyes only would not have precluded the dissemination of selected interpretations in adapted forms. The Trinity Bible would have served as an ideal book for lecturing on the Hebrew Bible, the marginalia providing interpretations for the teacher to explain to students as they annotated their own copies. Any ‘notes to self’ could be quietly omitted. However, as mentioned above, Thomas seems not to have lectured for much of his tenure and this is unlikely to have been the main purpose for which the book was used.[130] An alternative possibility is suggested by Grafton

---

[126] Carley, ‘Religious controversy’, 231. The passage is at fol. 154v. See also Carley, ‘Books owned or annotated by the Wakefield Brothers’.

[127] fol. 219r. Conspiratorial plots are a theme in Thomas’s annotations, and are noted also at Esther 2: 21 (fol. 154v), 2 Sam. 15: 12 (fol. 226r), and 2 Kgs 11: 14 (fol. 264v).

[128] Fols. 101r; 63r; 220r; see Rosen, ‘The Bible unbound’, 102. On the controversy surrounding the wearing of the surplice in Trinity College chapel during Thomas’s tenure, see A. F. S. Pearson, *Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism 1525–1603* (Cambridge 1925), 19.

[129] Note though that, while Henry VIII’s 1535 proclamation prompted some to deface the Pope’s title in copies of the Bible, Thomas has added it to his (cf. n. 8). D. MacCulloch & E. Solopova, ‘Before the King James Bible’, in *Manifold Greatness: The Making of the King James Bible,* ed. H. Moore & J. Reid (Oxford 2011), 26–7.

[130] See J. Leonhart, ‘Classics as textbooks: a study of the humanist lectures on Cicero at the university of Leipzig, *ca.* 1515’, in *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*, ed. E. Campi, S. De Angelis (Geneva 2008), 89–112; A. Blair, ‘*Ovidius Methodizatus*’; A. Grafton, ‘Teacher, text and pupil in the Renaissance class-room: a study from a Parisian collège’, *History of Universities* 1 (1981), 37–70.

and Weinberg's demonstration that annotation could serve as an intermediate step between reading and independent composition.[131] If Thomas's ultimate goal were to publish a book, his aim in studying the Bible would have been similar to that of Robert Wakefield and his pupil Richard Pace, whose reading of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiastes at Syon Abbey in the 1520s yielded Pace's *Praefatio in Ecclesiasten recognitum ad Hebraicam veritatem* and Wakefield's *Paraphrasis in librum Koheleth*.[132] Thomas never revealed the purpose of his annotations and the nature of any potential publication is conjectural. But as the notes would be incomprehensible without the Hebrew, such a volume would necessarily reproduce the biblical text. The crude printing of the very few words in Hebrew script in Robert's publications, for which the lack of moveable Hebrew type in England necessitated the *ad hoc* production of woodcuts, shows that an annotated edition of the Hebrew Bible would have been a most ambitious project.[133] This was accomplished in Münster's *Hebraica Biblia,* printed in Basel through the collaboration of the firms of Bebel, Isingrin, and Petri,[134] though here the inclusion of a complete Latin translation opened the publication to a wider audience, whereas Thomas's annotations would be useful only to those who wished to focus exclusively on the Hebrew. The potential market for an expensive publication enterprise would be diminished yet further if Thomas's translations into English and first person plural references to his vernacular and homeland ('nostrae uernaculae', 'nos angli') indicate that his annotations were primarily intended for an English-speaking readership. The practical difficulties inherent in printing a Hebrew Bible with annotations for an English audience in the sixteenth-century may partly explain why Thomas's notes remain in manuscript.

The foregoing examination permits an assessment of some of Thomas's scholarly achievements and limitations. By studying the complete Bible, he clearly gained an expert command of biblical Hebrew. The diverse sources cited show that Thomas was a well equipped scholar with access to an up-to-date library stocked with magnificent folio editions of the biblical text in multiple languages. No superficial reader, detailed investigations into obscure phrases and textual problems enabled the formulation of his

[131] Grafton & Weinberg, *I Have Always Loved*; T. Dunkelgrün, 'The Christian study of Judaism in early modern Europe', in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, 7: *The Early Modern World, 1500–1815* (Cambridge 2017), 316–48, at 340.
[132] With regard to the dates of composition and publication of the latter, see R. Rex, 'The earliest use of Hebrew in books printed in England: dating some works of Richard Pace and Robert Wakefield', in *TCBS* 9 (1990), 517–25, at 519–20, 523; also the contributions of Carley, Rex, and Weinberg to this volume.
[133] Rex, 'Earliest use'; C. Clair, *A History of Printing in Britain* (London 1965), 31. Robert lamented the printer's lack of Hebrew characters in his *Oratio*; Wakefield, *On the Three Languages*, 45.
[134] S. Burnett, *Christian Hebraism in the Reformation Era (1500–1660)* (Leiden 2012), 204–205.

own interpretive notes and English and Latin translations. In addition to the Hebrew text, Thomas often referred to the Aramaic targumim, sometimes using the Complutensian Polyglot with its Latin translation. He also gained the ability to navigate and compare the multiple texts in the Second Rabbinic Bible. But beyond the Hebrew commentaries printed there, Thomas's knowledge of Jewish exegesis was limited principally to citations in secondary sources; despite the publication of a host of midrashim and medieval commentaries during his lifetime,[135] there is little evidence that Thomas's interest extended far beyond the texts included in the Rabbinic Bible. Regular reliance on Hebrew and Aramaic resources can be seen in well annotated passages of the Trinity Bible, especially in parts of the Pentateuch, the Psalter, Isaiah, and the Minor Prophets. But Thomas did not study the whole Hebrew Bible in such detail, and some passages from the historical books and the Hagiographa have been read only with fundamental reference works.

A comparison of the different biblical texts that Thomas annotated shows that his study of the Trinity Bible was determined by the unique status he accorded to the Hebrew text. While perceived corruptions in the Vulgate and Septuagint and the errors of later interpreters elicited biting criticism, he treated the Hebrew text as printed in his copy of the Bomberg 1521 edition as an unassailable witness to biblical truth. The recording of inner-Septuagintal variations in the Strassburg Greek Bible is quite unlike Thomas's comparison of the integral Hebrew text to single representative readings of the versions. These often serve as interpretive translations that clarify obscurities and thereby enable the Hebrew to be understood without emendation. Selective citation and the orientation of different readings around the *Hebraica veritas* in the Trinity Bible thus bring order to the diversity Thomas encountered in his various editions and manuscripts. The Hebrew text is also the point of comparison of the contemporary renderings he found in the Latin and English editions of Catholic and Protestant translators. New and ancient sources have thus been brought together in an effort to identify the most apposite renderings of the Hebrew and thereby to shed light on the biblical text.

While the annotation of the Trinity Bible was in itself an act of study, it also served to create a book that would have been of the greatest use to its owner in the future. Reference to a given passage now opens up a wealth of insights that were formerly scattered throughout Thomas's library. Extracts from diverse texts with different aims and

[135] B. Williams, *Commentary on Midrash Rabba in the Sixteenth Century: The* Or ha-Sekhel *of Abraham ben Asher* (Oxford 2016), 4–7, 14–16, 24.

structures have been brought together to serve a single purpose and organized according to chapter and verse. Cross-references allow the rapid location of passages and annotations that should be considered in the light of one another. The Trinity Bible is thus a *vade mecum*, a convenient record of the selected insights that Thomas deemed to be of sufficient importance to merit future reference. As quotations are generally cited with attributions, it also serves as a map to the resources in Thomas's library that are relevant to particular biblical passages. The comments and translations cited in the Trinity Bible could thereby inform and shape his ongoing studies. Where different interpretations are cited without adjudication, they feed a continuing engagement with the text without committing the reader to a single viewpoint. The figure of mountainous explanations suspended from the letters of the Hebrew Bible was therefore a fitting maxim for a project that enabled a learned examination of the text in all its complexity without foreclosing the conclusion of the investigation.