

**The Anabaptists and the Jews:
The Example of Hätzer, Denck and the “Worms Prophets”**

by

James Samuel Beck

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Wycliffe College
and the Historical Department of the Toronto School of Theology
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
awarded by the University of St. Michael's College

Toronto 2000

© James S. Beck



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-57445-8

Canadæ

The Anabaptists and the Jews: The Example of Hätzer, Denck and the “Worms Prophets”

James Samuel Beck
Master of Arts
2000

Faculty of Wycliffe College, Historical Department of the Toronto School of Theology,
University of St. Michael's College

Abstract:

In 1527 in the city of Worms, Ludwig Hätzer, with the sterling assistance of Hans Denck, published the first German translation of the Prophets from the Hebrew text, popularly titled the “Worms Prophets.” Martin Luther’s criticism of the translation was that it was influenced too much by the Jews. Until now no effort has been made to ascertain whether there was a Jewish influence on the “Worms Prophets.” The purpose of this investigation is to discern the nature and degree of Jewish influence on the translation. Such an investigation provides an opportunity to begin to fill the gap in the larger question of the Anabaptists’ contacts with and attitudes toward the Jews, a study which has been long overdue. My study of external and internal evidence shows that Hätzer and Denck were in contact with certain Jews of the city of Worms and that they made use of Jewish expertise and the long tradition of Rabbinic biblical scholarship to aid them in their translation. Based on the nature of the translation it is safe to say that this contact reinforced the incipient inclinations of Hätzer and Denck away from Christian orthodoxy and toward anti-Trinitarianism.

The heart of the thesis is a detailed investigation of the annotations to the “Worms Prophets” with the purpose of identifying the dominant interpretive tradition which informed the efforts of the translators. The evidence reveals that Hätzer and Denck depended primarily on the Jewish interpretive tradition and that the source of that tradition was one or more of the Rabbis of Worms.

Contents

Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	Page 1
I. The Jews in Christian Europe	Page 7
A. Medieval Europe and the Jews	Page 8
B. The Renaissance and the Jews	Page 14
C. The Reformation and the Jews	Page 21
Summary	Page 30
II. Anabaptists and the Jews: Encounters and Attitudes	Page 33
A. Limitations of opportunity for encounters	Page 33
B. Anti-Judaism	Page 35
C. Sabbatarianism and other Judaizing Reforms	Page 39
D. Unitarianism, Anti-Trinitarianism and beyond	Page 45
Summary	Page 46
III. Denck, Hätzer, Hebraica and the Jews	Page 49
A. Hans Denck and the Jews	Page 49
1. Hebrew Language	Page 49
2. Encounters with Jews	Page 50
3. Internal Evidence	Page 54
B. Ludwig Hätzer and the Jews	Page 59
1. Hebrew Language	Page 59
2. Encounters with Jews	Page 62
3. Internal Evidence	Page 63
Summary	Page 67
IV. External Evidence: Jews and Anabaptists in Worms	Page 70
A. History of the Jewish Community	Page 70
B. Prominent Jews in Worms and their encounters with Christians	Page 71
C. The Anabaptist Community in Worms	Page 78
Summary	Page 80
V. Internal Evidence: The “Worms Prophets” and <i>Baruch der Prophet</i>	Page 81
A. The Hebrew Bible and the Early Reformation:	
The Development of the Tools of Hebraica	Page 81
1. The Hebrew Text of the Bible	Page 82
2. Grammars, Lexicons, and Concordances	Page 83
B. Printing history of the “Worms Prophets”	Page 86

Acknowledgements

The number of people to whom I must express my gratitude is surprisingly long. Were it not as long as it is, this project would be less than it is. I wish to say thank you to Dr. Edith Schipper of the *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, Munich, Nora Hoelzinger of the Munich *Stadtbibliothek*, Doris Lampert at the *Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek* in Darmstadt, and Dr. Helmar Härtel at the *Herzog August Bibliothek*, Wolfenbüttel who all generously assisted me in a circuitous but ultimately rewarding internet search for a very rare document. I am also grateful to Lois Bowman and her staff at the Menno Simons Historical Library, Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, Virginia who made available their two editions of the *Worms Prophets* and provided space for three days of research on those volumes. My gratitude also extends to the staffs of the various libraries of the University of Toronto system, particularly the friendly staff at the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies.

Individuals to whom I am indebted include Drs. Werner Packull, Victor Thiessen, and Bradley Walton for their valuable assistance with recalcitrant passages in Latin and German, and Dr. Richard Ascough for his stylistic suggestions on the introduction. Three people without whose assistance I simply could not have managed deserve special mention. Dr. Michael Milway, former curator of The Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, encouraged me throughout the project and proofread an at times very shaky first draft – including most of the languages in Appendix A! My advisor, Dr. A. J. Reimer, agreed to take me as his student and encouraged and supported me through some seemingly fallow periods. He read through two drafts of the thesis and his capacity for encouragement and constructive

criticism helped to mould the project. Finally, my wife Alicia, while working on her own doctoral program, took time out to assist me in my research on the *Worms Prophets* at Eastern Mennonite University, gave up her own study space for an extended period of time to facilitate my needs, supported me heroically through difficult times, and continues to love me far beyond my worth. To these three people this thesis is dedicated.

While all of the above-mentioned people contributed generously to the quality of this project, any and all errors that remain are my own. By the way, if you can hear me, Uncle Bob Sloane, I'm **finally** finished that thesis!

Introduction

With the rise of the Radical Reformation,¹ the Jews were no longer the only discernible religious minority in Western Europe, and the Radicals were persecuted with a similar kind of zeal that had been accorded to the Jews in the past, in a last doomed effort to preserve the unity of what had been European Christendom.² This persecution brought the sects of the Radical Reformation to a comparable existential level of exile and persecution that had been the lot of Jews for centuries. Finding themselves in similar social circumstances, the logic of the Anabaptist social views and their emphasis on the importance of the law brought them closer to the thinking of the Jews. In a similar state of powerlessness in the midst of crisis, the Anabaptists developed a strong sense of Messianic expectation that very possibly was influenced by a similar Messianic fervour among the Jews at the time.³

¹ The terms “Radical Reformation” and “Anabaptism” will not be used interchangeably. Radical Reformation was a term coined by G.H. Williams in an effort to provide a more accurate name for what Roland Bainton had called the Left Wing of the Reformation. While both terms are not without difficulty and considerable debate, here the Radical Reformation will be understood in terms similar to those expressed by Williams in his remarkable monograph of the same name and includes all the radicalizing impulses in the Reformation movement, of which Anabaptism is understood to be a founding group, and out of which a number of the other radical sects developed.

² P. Sigal, *The Emergence of Contemporary Judaism*, vol. 3 (Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1986) suggests that “it is likely that Jewish medieval martyrdom served as an example for the non-violent response of beleaguered Anabaptists” (p. 56).

³ Salo Wittmayer Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, second ed., 18 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1958-1983), vol. 13, pp. 185, 195, 243-244; H.H. Ben-Sasson, “Jews and Christian Sectarians: Existential Similarity and Dialectical Tensions in Sixteenth-Century Moravia and Poland-Lithuania,” *Viator* 4 (1973): 369-85; Sigal, *Emergence of Contemporary Judaism*, pp. 57-58. It should be mentioned that these Jewish scholars appear to have little awareness of the debate regarding Anabaptist historiography and tend to express an understanding of the nature and identity of Anabaptism more akin to something from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century confessional historians of mainline Protestantism than anything from the latter half of the twentieth century. See Jerome Friedman, *The Most Ancient Testimony: Sixteenth-Century Christian-Hebraica in the Age of Renaissance Nostalgia* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1983), p. 3 where he points out that

Many have considered the Anabaptists to be, on the whole, more sympathetic to Jews and Hebraica⁴ than the general populace, and a surprising number of their early scholars, Hans Denck (c. 1500 - 1527) and Ludwig Hätzer (c. 1500 - 1528) included, were Hebraists of varying degrees of competence.⁵ However, “the intellectual and sociopolitical contacts of these men [the Radicals] with, and their attitudes to, Jews and Judaism still await the necessary detailed exploration.”⁶ Little work has been done on this particular topic and this thesis attempts to fill part of that lacuna.

The affinity in thought and practice between the Jews and the Anabaptists was such that the Anabaptists were often accused of Judaizing, and there was enough evidence of individuals

Jewish scholars, when studying Christian Hebraists, show little comprehension of, or concern for, confessional distinctions between the various Christian groups of the Reformation period.

⁴ Hebraica is a term used by Jerome Friedman and others to identify the related disciplines of Hebrew language, Rabbinic biblical interpretation and Cabalistic mysticism. See for example Jerome Friedman, “Sixteenth-Century Christian-Hebraica: Scripture and the Renaissance Myth of the Past,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 11 (1980): 67-85.

⁵ L. I. Newman, *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1925), pp. 470-71, mentions, in addition to Denck and Hätzer, the Zurich Anabaptist and martyr Felix Manz (d. 1527), the Wittenberg colleague of Luther, Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt (c. 1480 - 1541), and the Lutheran preacher of Worms turned Anabaptist Jacob Kautz (1500 - 1532?). Carlstadt was never formally an Anabaptist but, as Calvin Pater argued in his doctoral dissertation, “Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt as the Intellectual Founder of Anabaptism” (Ph.D., Harvard University, 1977), he was one of the most significant, if not the most significant, contemporary theological influence on the development of Anabaptism. Hätzer’s inclusion among the Anabaptists is also problematic and his biographer designated him a “marginal figure” (*Randfigur*) of the Anabaptist movement (See J. F. Gerhard Goeters, “Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529: Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier: Eine Randfigur der frühen Tuferbewegung,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 70, no. 3-4 (1955): 344-45). Nevertheless, at the stage of his career during which he was translating the “Worms Prophets” with Denck it is not unreasonable to identify him as an Anabaptist, however briefly that designation may be legitimate.

⁶ Baron, *Social and Religious History*, vol. 13, p. 439 n. 45. Baron observed that while this state of affairs was not surprising it was regrettable.

and groups among the Anabaptists with anti-Trinitarian and Sabbatarian tendencies⁷ to lend some credence to the charges.⁸ For example, on April 13, 1527 in the city of Worms, Ludwig Hätzer, with the sterling assistance of Hans Denck, published the first German translation of the Prophets from the Hebrew text, popularly titled the “Worms Prophets.” Martin Luther’s criticism of the translation was that it was influenced too much by the Jews. In a letter to his

⁷ Note the work by Daniel Liechty on Sabbatarianism: “The Origins of Sabbatarianism Amongst East Central European Anabaptists in the Sixteenth Century,” in *Anabaptistes et Dissidents au XVIe Siecle*, ed. Jean Georges Rott and Simon L. Verheus (Baden-Baden: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 1987), pp. 325-36; *Andreas Fischer and the Sabbatarian Anabaptists: An Early Reformation Episode in East Central Europe*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History; 29 (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1988); *Sabbatarianism in the Sixteenth Century: A Page in the History of the Radical Reformation* (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1993).

⁸ A note of caution is necessary regarding accusations of Judaizing in the period of the Reformation. All forms of restitutionist reform in Christianity, i.e., reform efforts that seek to return to the early “pure” roots of the Church, are in fact Judaizing reforms to one degree or another and of one type or another. Since early Christianity was a branch of Judaism, the more thoroughly a group eschews the accretions of tradition and the more diligently it seeks to return to “apostolic” Christianity, the more readily should its efforts at reform reflect some type of Jewish influence. Róbert Dán, in his perspicacious article entitled “Judaizare – The Career of a Term,” provides an interesting catalogue of the stunning breadth of the number of accusations of Judaizing that occurred during the time of the Reformation. The German Catholic humanist Johannes Reuchlin (1454/5 - 1522) was called a “Judaizer” by conservative Catholics, the fierce Catholic opponent of reformers Johann Maier of Eck (1486 - 1543) and Martin Luther (1483 - 1546) – his dread opponent – both labelled the great German Protestant Hebraist Sebastian Münster (1480/8 - 1553) a Rabbi, indeed Luther designated all Hebraists of his time as Judaizers, and that despite his own facility in Hebrew. The Catholics held that Luther, the Zurich reformer Ulrich Zwingli (1484 - 1531) and the Genevan reformer John Calvin (1509 - 1564) were all Judaizers, Carlstadt charged the Lutheran nephew of Reuchlin Philip Melancthon (1497 - 1560) with Judaizing, and Calvin considered the Lutheran liturgy to be a Judaizing reform. The Spanish radical Michael Servetus (c. 1511 - 1553) accused the entire Roman Catholic Church of Judaizing, Protestant Churches with Jewish interpretation of the New Testament, and Calvin as “*verus judaeus*.” Calvin, in turn, titled Servetus “*bonus rabbinus*.” In purely temporal terms Calvin won the argument when Servetus suffered martyrdom in Calvin’s Geneva in 1553. The term Judaizer was used with equal abandon in the theological debates in the eastern parts of Europe. See Róbert Dán, “Judaizare - The Career of a Term,” in *Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century*, ed. Róbert Dán and Antal Pernát (Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982), pp. 28-30. See also G.H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Kirksville, Mo.: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992), p. 1264, where he identifies both Classical Protestantism and the Radical Reformation as Judaizing reforms of different types. On the restitutionist theme in sixteenth century reform, see Liechty, *Sabbatarianism*, pp. 3-7.

friend and colleague at Wittenberg Wenceslas Link (1482 - 1547), dated early May 1527, and just prior to his own efforts at translating the Prophets, Luther made no mention of the Jews in his assessment of the new translation: "I do not condemn the German translation of the prophets published in Worms, except that the German is quite confusing, perhaps due to the local dialect. The translators were diligent, but who can manage to do everything?"⁹ Later, in an open letter on translating, dated 1530, Luther said of the Worms translation: "It has been carefully done and approaches my German very closely. But Jews had a hand in it, and they do not show much reverence for Christ. Apart from that there is plenty of skill and craftsmanship there."¹⁰ Evidently as Luther worked on the Prophets with the Worms translation in hand he became more impressed with the Hebrew translation skills of Hätzer and Denck, but at the same time less enamoured of the translation itself because of the perceived Jewish influence.¹¹

⁹ Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, ed. Gottfried G. Krodel and Helmut T. Lehmann, trans. Gottfried G. Krodel, American ed., 55 vols., vol. 49 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p. 165. This means that Luther had acquired, and perused, the translation in Wittenberg in less than a month from the time it came off the press in Worms.

¹⁰ Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, ed. E. Theodore Bachmann and Helmut T. Lehmann, trans. Charles M. Jacobs E. Theodore Backmann, Jeremiah J. Schindel, William A. Lambert, American ed., 55 vols., vol. 35 (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960), pp. 194-95. For those familiar with the later writings of Luther on the Jews, this comment is surprisingly mild.

¹¹ This reservation did not prevent him from making use of the earlier translation for particularly difficult words and phrases, and at one point in his translation of Hosea, the manuscript contains a marginal note 'vide Hetzer.' See Hans Volz, "Continental Versions to c. 1600: German," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S.L. Greenslade, vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 105. Another intriguing example of the way in which Luther made use of the earlier translation can be found in his appropriation of an annotation at the end of the eighth chapter of Isaiah. The Hebrew phrase in question reads: גָּלִיל הַגּוֹיִם – over ha'yardan g'lil ha'goyim, which the "Worms Prophets" reasonably translates: "jensid dem Jordan jnn Galilea^a der heyden". The note reads: "Das ist Grentz," probably based on a Rabbinic interpretation (see Appendix A, n. 7). Luther's translation reads: "disseit des Jordans an der Heiden grantze," Martin Luther, *Biblia, das ist, die gantze Heilige Schriftt Deudsche* (Wittenberg: Hans Lufft, 1534; reprint ed., Frankfurt am Main: Röderberg-Verlag, 1983), p. v r. It seems clear that in this case Luther incorporated the gloss from the "Worms Prophets" right into the text of his own translation. Although some work has been done on the inter-relation of Luther's translation and the

The purpose of this investigation is to discern the nature and degree of Jewish influence on the translation. Such an investigation would provide an opportunity to begin to fill the gap in the larger question of the Anabaptists' contacts with and attitudes toward the Jews. My study of external and internal evidence shows that Hätzer and Denck were in contact with certain Jews of the city of Worms and that they made use of Jewish expertise and the long tradition of Rabbinic biblical scholarship to aid them in their translation. Based on the nature of the translation it is safe to say that this contact reinforced the incipient inclinations of Hätzer and Denck away from Christian orthodoxy and toward anti-Trinitarianism.

Because this is an area of study with little precedent, considerable effort will be required to establish background and context. To that end the first chapter comments on the history of Jewish-Christian relations and the state of Christian Hebraica – and the relationship between the two – in the medieval, Renaissance and Reformation periods respectively. The second chapter examines more closely the Radical Reformation and its encounters with, and attitudes toward, the Jews. A history of the demography of Jews in Europe – with the purpose of identifying the limits of the Jewish community in Europe in the sixteenth century – is followed by a survey of attitudes toward the Jews among the Radicals, from anti-Judaism to various types of Judaizing reforms all the way to Anti-Trinitarianism and conversion to Judaism. The first two chapters identify the dominant patterns of Christian attitudes to Jews and Hebraica in the medieval period, among the Humanists of the northern Renaissance, the Magisterial and Radical Reformers; the third chapter studies the lives of Denck and Hätzer in order to identify

"Worms Prophets" (the most thorough of which is Gerhard Krause, *Studien zu Luthers Auslegung der Kleinen Propheten*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie; 33 [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962], pp. 19-60), this promises to be a fruitful field for further enquiry.

their opportunities for learning Hebrew, the infrequency with which they had occasion to encounter Jews, and the internal evidence, based on their writings, which sheds some light on their attitudes toward the Jews. To this writer's knowledge, such an analysis of the writings of Hätzer and Denck has not been previously done.¹² The fourth chapter researches the history of the Jewish and Anabaptist communities in Worms, as well as the extant record of Christian encounters with Jewish scholars in Worms. The fifth chapter will contain a detailed investigation of the annotations to the "Worms Prophets" with the primary purpose of identifying the dominant interpretive tradition which informed the efforts of the translators. These particular questions have not been previously asked of this text.¹³ The chapter will conclude with a study of Hätzer's Foreword to his translation of three of the Apocryphal books, which he completed the following year, in which he makes an unambiguous statement regarding encounters with the Jews. This will be sufficient to identify the external and internal evidence for Jewish assistance on the translation. The external and internal evidence together shows that Hätzer and Denck depended primarily on the Jewish interpretive tradition and that the probable source of that tradition was one or more of the Rabbis of Worms.

¹² The study is much more thorough in the case of Denck's corpus due to the relative availability of their respective writings. While Denck's writings have been collected in the *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte* and there have been two recent English translations, there are no modern editions or translations of Hätzer's writings.

¹³ Indeed, it seems that the "Worms Prophets" and its annotations have not often been the subject of study. While working on two editions of the translation at the Menno Simons Historical Library at Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, Virginia, I had the opportunity to converse with Irvin Horst, the man who purchased the two volumes in Europe for the library at least thirty years previously. In the course of the conversation he said something to the effect that "at least someone is finally making use of them," implying that I was the first person in all that time to make a close study of these particular volumes of this valuable work.

I. The Jews in Christian Europe

In the late fourth and early fifth centuries, St. Augustine (354 - 430), bishop of Hippo, articulated what became the standard medieval Christian theological position on the presence of Jews in a Christian society. He believed the Jewish faith to be an atrophied and static representation of the old covenant which, having been superseded by the new covenant under Christ, unconsciously bore witness to the validity of the new covenant. Therefore he taught that Jews should be permitted to survive among the Christians to continue to be a mute witness to the validity of Christianity. He also believed that the Jews had an intrinsic value in a Christian society because they maintained the Old Testament biblical tradition, the prophecies of which proved the truth of Christianity. Because the Jews had a value to Christian society as Jews, they were to be neither expelled, killed nor converted. According to Augustine's understanding of the writings of Paul on the subject, the Jews had been blinded to the truth (as opposed to a conscious and deliberate rejection of Christ) and God would bring about their conversion before the final coming of Christ, but only after they had fulfilled their role of mute witnesses and keepers of the Book.¹⁴ These perspectives came to dominate the theological position on the Jews through much of the medieval period. Theological positions and the position of the Church, however, did not always carry the authority with those who wield the sword and exercise political power that the Church often wished they did. The official Church position on the matter did not prevent the local persecution of many Jewish communities throughout the Middle Ages, particularly in Northern Europe where the Papacy had less direct

¹⁴ Augustine, *Concering the City of God Against the Pagans*, trans. Henry Bettenson (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972), 18. 46, pp. 827-28; 20. 29, pp. 957-58. Jeremy Cohen, "Scholarship and Intolerance in the Medieval Academy: The Study and Evaluation of Judaism in European Christendom," *American Historical Review* 81 (1986): 594.

authority than it had in Italy and the Iberian Peninsula.

A. Medieval Europe and the Jews

Saul of Tarsus and his zealous defence of the purity of the Jewish faith was only the beginning of the history of hostility between Jews and Christians. In Christian Europe periods of peaceful coexistence between the two groups were all too infrequent. As the only identifiable religious *and* cultural minority in a remarkably homogeneous Christian Europe, the Jewish position was often tenuous.¹⁵ However, the advent of the Crusades in 1096 marked the beginning of a significant devolution in the quality of Jewish-Christian relations. The greatest persecution of Jews by the Crusaders occurred in the Rhine River region of Germany.¹⁶ The unrestrained violence and bloodshed of the first Crusade (over 100,000 Jews were killed in Alsace and the Rhineland), never quite matched in later campaigns, left a “permanent imprint upon the Jewish, as well as the Christian, evaluation of Judeo-Christian relations.”¹⁷ Relations in subsequent years were characterized by mutual hostility, distrust and frequent vituperation,

¹⁵ For the vicissitudes of Jewish life in medieval Europe, see the fine collection of official Church and State documents and contemporary historical accounts in R. Chazan, ed. *Church, State, and Jew in the Middle Ages* (New York: Behrman House, 1980). Chazan, in his introduction, pointed out the homogeneity of medieval European Christendom (p. 3). For a much more thorough treatment of the relationship between the papacy and the Jews see the monumental multi-volume work by Shlomo Simonsohn: *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, 8 vols., Studies and texts (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988), the first six volumes of which contain papal bulls and briefs regarding the Jews.

¹⁶ The area around Speyer, Worms and Mainz – known as Ashkenaz to the Jews – represented, after Sephardic Jewry in the Iberian Peninsula, the most significant flowering of Jewish culture in Europe.

¹⁷ Baron, *Social and Religious History*, vol. 4, p. 89. For Jewish accounts of the persecution see “Mainz Anonymous” and the other chronicles in Shlomo Eidelberg, ed. *The Jews and the Crusades* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977). The Latin account of Albert of Aix is recorded in August C. Krey, *The First Crusade* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921), pp. 54–55.

as well as significant acts of oppression, persecution and expulsion of the Jews by the Christians. Not surprisingly, by the year 1500 the Jewish population in Europe was the lowest it had been in the previous 1000 years.¹⁸

Interest in Hebrew by Christian scholars increased significantly throughout the high and late medieval periods. In the twelfth century, Hugh of St. Victor (d. 1142), in pursuit of the literal-historical sense of Scripture, believing (in error) that all Jewish interpretation was literal, turned to the Jews. He consulted with the Jews and learned some Hebrew himself. Through oral transmission he quoted material from *Rashi*, Joseph Kara, and Samuel ben Meir (*Rashbam*).¹⁹ Hugh's disciple Andrew (d. 1175) also depended on oral communication of the Rabbinic interpretive tradition, but Andrew's disciple, Herbert of Bosham learned Hebrew and even acquired a facility in Aramaic. He consulted with local rabbis, read medieval Hebrew grammars and commentaries and appears to have read at least some of the Talmud and classical rabbinic midrash.²⁰

However, attitudes that went beyond an interest in Hebrew and hostility to Jews in

¹⁸ Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 18. Certainly these were not ideal conditions for spiritual and intellectual cross-fertilization, yet apparently such did occur at least occasionally. An interesting example is the apparent dependence of the German Dominican mystic Meister Eckhart (c. 1260 - 1327) on the thought of the Spanish rabbi and philosopher Maimonides (1135 - 1204), Gershon G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (Jerusalem: Schocken Publishing House, 1941), p. 124. Scholem says that, for Eckhart, Maimonides was "a literary authority to whom Augustine at best is superior."

¹⁹ *Rashi* is Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac (1040-1105), born and lived in France, studied in Mainz and Worms, and established a dominant school of interpretation in France. Rabbi Joseph Kara, (b. c. 1060), exegete from Northern France, student and colleague of *Rashi*, also lived in Worms. *Rashbam* (c. 1085 - c. 1174), grandson of *Rashi*, born and lived in Troyes, France. Following his grandfather's example, his exegesis focussed on the plain sense of Scripture, being particularly alert to grammatical, literary and rhetorical qualities of the Hebrew text.

²⁰ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Hebraists, Christian (1100-1890)," by R. Loewe; Cohen, "Scholarship," p. 601.

medieval Europe were rare. Marc Saperstein published an article in 1986 in which he sought some positive images in the history of Jewish-Christian relations in an effort to balance the tendency toward unremitting negativity by contemporary scholars. However his efforts tend to emphasize rather than moderate the severity of the situation. He quoted a sermon by Berthold of Regensburg from the thirteenth century: "Now you see very well that a stinking Jew, whose odor is offensive to all, honors his holy days better than you. Bah! As a Christian you should be ashamed of yourself that you do not trust in God as much as the stinking Jew. . ." For Saperstein this represented an example of an occasion where Jews are compared favourably to Christians and is therefore considered a positive image!²¹

Despite increased interaction with Jews and a new awareness of the existence of a living and evolving Rabbinic Judaism, a reality quite contrary to the Augustinian perception of a moribund Old Testament Judaism, twelfth-century Christians, including the Hebraists, showed no inclination to undermine the status of the Jews within Christian society. The Church continued to oppose the murder of the Jews (though at times with little force or effect as in the case of the First Crusade) and it initiated no substantive mission to the Jews. European Christians still believed that the Jews among them played a valuable role in the divine economy of salvation.²²

The thirteenth century witnessed a maturation in the scientific disciplines of theology and biblical studies. The number of Christian Hebraists increased significantly and the recognition of the value of the *Hebraica veritas* (Hebrew truth) became increasingly widespread.

²¹ Marc Saperstein, "Christians and Jews - Some Positive Images," *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 236-46. "Stinking" was a literal epithet. See below p. 38 n. 75.

²² Cohen, "Scholarship," pp. 597-98.

Consequently there was a new awareness of the theological implications of the encounter with rabbinic Judaism. Increased familiarity with the post-biblical rabbinic tradition allowed churchmen a clearer perception of the gap between Old Testament Judaism and the religious faith of their Jewish contemporaries – a faith they deemed heretical. Aware now that Augustine's justification of the continued existence of the Jews as a stagnant and mute witness to the Old Testament faith could no longer be sustained, some Christians began to reject the value of the contemporary Jew in the divine economy. Some began to doubt the legitimacy of the ongoing existence of the Jewish community among the Christians and their polemic aimed to undermine that presence – a significant departure from earlier generations comfortable with the Augustinian position. The clearest evidence of these developments is the attack on the Talmud by the Church. The concern for the Church was that the Talmud contained heretical material – material that contradicted both Christianity and the Christian understanding of the Old Testament. It was denounced in a series of papal bulls in 1239 and 1244, burned by papal direction in Paris in 1242, and condemned by a commission of ecclesiastics and academics in 1248. These types of attacks on the Talmud continued throughout the century.²³

Thirteenth-century scholars such as William of Auvergne (c. 1180 - 1249), Albert the Great (c. 1200 - 1280), and Hugh of St. Cher made use of their knowledge of rabbinic sources without reservation, yet they participated actively in the condemnation of the Talmud in Paris. Raymond de Peñaforte (1185 - 1275), head of the Dominicans, was a leader in the attack on the Talmud, yet he strongly encouraged the clerics to study Hebrew and use rabbinic sources. He opened schools to train his mendicants in Hebrew. His purpose in this, however, was to

²³ Ibid., pp. 604-06.

enable them to be more effective in preaching to the Jews. A mission to the Jews had begun. Now that Augustine's justification for the presence of the Jews was lost, death, expulsion and conversion all became possible ways to rid Europe of this people who, at least for some, could no longer be tolerated in a Christian society.²⁴

Nicholas of Lyra (c. 1270 - 1340), a fourteenth-century Franciscan, depending on the work of Andrew of St. Victor and his own reading of *Rashi* and other rabbinic works, created a commentary of the whole Bible. However, Nicholas avoided any explicit or implicit legitimization of the perceived errors of rabbinic Judaism by making sure that his Hebraica did not depend on the Jews – he received no instruction from contemporary rabbis. He maintained that Talmudic Judaism and his Jewish contemporaries had deliberately deviated from Old Testament faith. While he acknowledged the necessity of the Hebrew text and Jewish scholarship in order to understand the biblical text, he believed that the Jews had corrupted the biblical text to conceal the Christological reading of messianic passages.²⁵

The rise of Christian Hebrew studies in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries corresponded with an increase in attacks on the very existence of the Jews among the Christians in Europe. Once Christians felt that they were able to deal with the Hebrew text of the Bible themselves, the Jews were no longer necessary as keepers of the Book. And as Christian scholars became familiar with the evolving nature of post-biblical Judaism they began to realize that the Jews were not the moribund and mute witnesses Augustine had believed them to be. Once Augustine's theological justifications for the toleration of the Jews in Christian society were

²⁴ Ibid., p. 608.

²⁵ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Hebraists, Christian," by Loewe; Cohen, "Scholarship," pp. 610-11.

lost, many Christians concluded that the Jews as Jews could no longer be tolerated. Not surprisingly, the thirteenth century saw the rise of a mission to the Jews and the end of the century saw the beginning of expulsions of the Jews from major nations and territories in Europe (see below p. 32). Clearly there were other, and perhaps even more pressing motives for Christian persecution of Jews. For example the economic motives for expulsions are readily identifiable.²⁶ Nevertheless, the erosion of a clear theological defence for the continued existence of Jews in a Christian society meant that there was much less authoritative opposition to these other motives for persecution.

Despite the above survey of medieval Christians with an interest in Hebraica, it has been estimated that between the years 500 and 1500 probably no more than a few dozen European Christians could read any Hebrew at all and far fewer could use the language in any constructive manner.²⁷ These Christian students of Hebrew in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries created no Christian Hebraica: there were no grammars, lexicons or readily available Hebrew texts that would allow Christians to study and learn Hebrew independently of the Jews. Consequently, the explosion of interest in Hebraica, generated by the Renaissance and Reformation movements, found Christian scholars ill equipped to develop the discipline without Jewish assistance.

²⁶ Medieval Jews were forbidden land ownership and entrance to most professions. They were forced into peripheral areas of the agrarian economy such as money lending and goods wholesaling. This niche made Jews important in the initial stages of change away from a strictly agrarian economy. As the economy changed, Christians began to take over these areas of the economy as well, making the Jews redundant. Economically it became both feasible and, depending on the size of the loans held by Jews on Christian heads of state, expedient to expel the Jews from various nations and territories. See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 17.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

B. The Renaissance and the Jews

In many ways the Renaissance represented an age of transition in which social, religious and intellectual norms began to be questioned and even discarded. The world view was often characterized by a perception that the present represented a decline from previous “golden” ages of cultural, intellectual and religious achievement. Within the framework of this perspective, the renewed emphasis on the study of ancient culture and language can be understood as a nostalgic effort to retrieve the good which had been lost. The Hebrew culture and language were believed to be among the most ancient and, despite the continued presence of virulent anti-Judaism,²⁸ the attitudes and opinions of some scholars toward Jewish language and culture began to change. In Northern Europe this return to the past was more closely tied to religion than it had been in Italy, and the importance of Hebrew for the study of Scripture made it doubly desirable to humanists like Johannes Reuchlin.²⁹ However, procuring the services of a

²⁸ The term anti-Judaism is used advisedly. While the argument can be made that such a thing as anti-Semitism has never existed since the subject of the prejudice has always been the Jewish people and not all Semitic peoples as the term would suggest, a functional distinction has come to be made by some whereby anti-Semitism is a racially or genetically based bias while anti-Judaism is a religiously and culturally based bias. Jerome Friedman, “Jewish Conversion, the Spanish Pure Blood Laws and Reformation: A Revisionist View of Racial and Religious Antisemitism,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18, no. 1 (1987): 3-30, argues lucidly that racially based anti-Semitism had been developing in Spain from the end of the fifteenth century, an attitude which influenced the rest of Europe including Luther. However, the lack of clarity regarding a specific point in time where Christian attitudes toward Jews can be identified as being primarily racially rather than religiously motivated, along with the more fundamental ambiguity regarding the use of the word ‘Semitism,’ is sufficient cause to avoid the term in the present work.

²⁹ Reuchlin was following in the footsteps of the less well known Dutch humanist and theologian Wessel Gansfort (1400? - 1489) (whom Reuchlin met) whose mastery of Hebrew led him to several significant criticisms of the Vulgate and accepted theological positions based upon it. See H. Oberman, “Discovery of Hebrew and Discrimination Against the Jews: The Veritas Hebraica as Double-Edged Sword in Renaissance and Reformation,” in *Germania Illustrata: Essays on Early Modern Germany Presented to Gerald Strauss*, ed. Andrew Fix and Susan C. Karant-Nunn (Kirksville, Mo.: Sixteenth Century Journal Press, 1992), pp. 25-30. Oberman concludes that Gansfort “was not merely a ‘forerunner’ of Reuchlin [Ludwig Geiger’s designation], he was a watershed in his own

Jewish tutor in Hebrew was not an easy task in the north and almost every Christian-Hebraist noted the difficulty or impossibility of his search.³⁰ Given the history of Jewish-Christian relations and the reduced number of Jews in Northern Europe, it was not surprising that those who remained were reluctant to associate with the “*Goyim*” who, for the most part, were interested in the study of Hebrew for the purpose of proving the veracity of Christianity and converting their teachers. Furthermore there were specific Talmudic prohibitions about teaching Torah to non-Jews. Rudimentary Hebrew might be taught but Torah and Cabala were generally forbidden.³¹ On the part of the Christians there was certainly a sense of shame at the thought of having to turn to the despised Jews for assistance.³²

Thus it was that Reuchlin found it necessary to travel to Italy to begin his study of Hebrew under the tutelage of prominent Jewish scholars. Relations between Jews and Christians in Italy had always been considerably better than elsewhere in Europe and the prohibitions were much less strictly enforced.³³ Having learned Hebrew grammar and having developed an interest in Cabala, Reuchlin returned to Germany to pursue and promote his interests. The progress in the study of Hebraica among Christians between the time of his return and the

right.” See L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland vom Ende des XV bis zur Mitte des XVI Jahrhunderts* (Breslau: 1870), pp. 22-23.

³⁰ Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 20.

³¹ Ibid., pp. 20-21; Baron, *Social and Religious History*, vol. 13, p. 165; E. Zimmer, “Jewish and Christian Hebraist Collaboration in Sixteenth Century Germany,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 71 (1980): 71 n.5.

³² This was a reality acknowledged by Sebastian Münster. See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 168.

³³ Ibid., p. 20. This would be due in part to the greater authority of the Papacy in the region and its ability to afford greater protection to the Jews of the region. Paradoxically, it would also be due to the less religious nature of the Renaissance movement in Italy.

middle of the century was remarkable. There was also a corresponding change in the number, if not always the nature, of encounters between Jews and Christians. By the 1520s there was substantially more cooperation than at any time in recent memory. There were many more Jews teaching Hebrew to Christian scholars and various signs of collaborative efforts between the two groups.³⁴

Different reasons have been given for this change, ranging from the coercive capabilities of the religious and political majority, to the mercenary motives of the Jewish educators.³⁵ Yet the fact remains that while there were considerable economic benefits in selling rare Hebrew texts and providing tutelage in the new area of study, such explanations do not adequately account for the fact that there were occasions where Jews loaned prized volumes to Christian scholars for their perusal. Nor was this done with any sense of coercion and at least some Jews displayed a certain amount of excitement in sharing these treasures.³⁶ There are two or three likely explanations for this kind of change. First might have been the hope that an interest in Torah, Talmud, and Cabala might moderate the ignorance and xenophobia of the Christian population, and perhaps even bring about the conversion of some. Second is the probability that the Jews were also caught up in the optimism and idealism of the Renaissance spirit which fostered a willingness to cooperate in the pursuit of ancient wisdom and beauty. Third was a

³⁴ Ibid. Friedman observed that in 1500 “fewer than one hundred Christians in Europe could read Hebrew and none could even imagine writing in that strange tongue” (p.13). However, “by the second decade of the sixteenth century Hebrew was available without travel to Italy. . . and in Paris, Wittenberg, Zurich, Basel, Heidelberg, Tübingen, Mainz, Liège, Louvain, and so many other places, Hebrew was being taught to large numbers of students” (p. 35).

³⁵ Baron, *Social and Religious History*, vol. 13, p. 165; Zimmer, “Jewish and Christian Hebraist Collaboration,” p. 81.

³⁶ Baron, *Social and Religious History*, vol. 13, pp. 168-169; Zimmer, “Jewish and Christian Hebraist Collaboration,” pp. 69-88.

heightened eschatological sense among the Jews, fostered in part by the expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula at the end of the fifteenth century. This anticipation of a radical shift in the social structure may have allowed some of the Jews to be receptive to these unusual overtures from their erstwhile oppressors as a sign that these cataclysmic changes were beginning to occur.³⁷

Despite this renewed interest in Hebraica and the record of cooperation between Christians and Jews, overall Christian attitudes toward Jews during the Renaissance showed little if any improvement.³⁸ Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (c. 1467 - 1536), the most prominent humanist and Catholic reformer of the Northern Renaissance, provides a notable example. His agenda for reform of the Church was based on what he termed the *Philosophia Christi*, a stripping away of the accretions of tradition and an escape from law back to the liberty of the gospel. This theological perspective has been used to explain that Erasmus' comments regarding the Jews have little to do with Jews and much more to do with

³⁷ Ibid., pp. 81-82; Baron, *Social and Religious History*, vol. 13, p. 195; Ben-Sasson, "Jews and Christian Sectarians," p. 370. Gershom Scholem, "Messianic Movements After the Expulsion from Spain," in *The Jewish People: Past and Present*, vol. I (New York: Marstin Press, 1946), p. 335, observes that "In particular it was the Spanish exiles who considered the Expulsion of 1492 as the beginning of the 'birth-throes of the Messiah.'"

³⁸ Oberman, "Discovery of Hebrew," pp. 23-24 provides three reasons why suspicion and hostility towards Jews and Hebraica remained and even grew at the same time that the study of the language was growing: first was the shocking foreignness of the Hebrew alphabet and language; the right to left writing was considered deviant by Leonardo Bruni who believed that it could not provide any help in the improvement of morals in the way Greek and Latin could; secondly, the forced conversions and expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492 led to considerable suspicion regarding the converts as pseudo-Christians with a subversive agenda against Christianity. Consequently the fear of "Judaizing" was heightened dramatically; thirdly, the two most prominent early proponents of Hebraica, Pico della Mirandola in Italy and Reuchlin in Germany, combined a respect for Rabbinic scholarship with passionate interest in Cabala so the study of Hebraica was tainted by this association in the minds of many.

Christians.³⁹ However, in a letter to the German humanist and Hebraist Wolfgang Capito (1478 - 1541) there seems to be more than theological concern in his comments:

I could wish you were more inclined to Greek than to that Hebrew of yours, with no desire to criticize it. I see them [the Jews] as a nation full of most tedious fabrications, who spread a kind of fog over everything, Talmud, Cabbala, Tetragrammaton, *Gates of Light*, words, words, words. I would rather have Christ mixed up with Scotus than with that rubbish of theirs. Italy is full of Jews, in Spain there are hardly any Christians.⁴⁰ I fear this [the new Hebrew language studies] may give that pestilence that was long ago suppressed, a chance to rear its ugly head.⁴¹

There is enough support elsewhere in the writings of Erasmus to convince the reader that his advocacy of religious toleration did not extend in any meaningful way to the Jews. Perhaps the most frequently quoted comment of Erasmus regarding the Jews is from a letter to Jacob of Hoogstraten, the Dominican Inquisitor of Reuchlin in the Pfefferkorn controversy: "If it is Christian to detest the Jews, on this count we are all good Christians, and to spare."⁴²

³⁹ See Hilmar M. Pabel, "Erasmus of Rotterdam and Judaism: A Reexamination in the Light of New Evidence," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 87 (1996): 14-16, where he identifies Gerhard Winkler, Cornelis Augustijn, Shimon Markish, and James Tracy as supporters of this theory. There is a legitimate and significant distinction between a theological position which believes that post-biblical Judaism does not have a soteriological value and outright hatred of the Jews. It would be unreasonable to expect current liberal standards of universal ecumenism to apply to people in the sixteenth century. There were a few Christians of that time who were able to allow the possibility of a soteriological value in post-biblical Judaism. However, by far the majority would not even be able to question the presupposition that redemption could be obtained only through Jesus and conversion to Christianity. It is entirely possible (though probably rare) for Christians to embark on a mission to the Jews out of unqualified love. In Erasmus' case, neither love of, nor mission to, the Jews was a possibility.

⁴⁰ This is after the expulsions in 1492. Erasmus is referring to Conversos – Jewish converts to Christianity. Such an observation could be seen as corroboration of the argument by Friedman about the development of a racially based anti-Judaism through the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. See above page 14, n. 28.

⁴¹ Desiderius Erasmus, *Collected works of Erasmus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), vol.5, p. 347 letter #798; P. S. Allen and others, eds. *Opus epistolarum; denvo recognitum et auctum per P.S. Allen* (Oxonii: In Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1906), vol.3, p. 253 (the letter numbers are the same in the Latin and English editions). Oberman, "Discovery of Hebrew," p. 25. This letter, written in 1518, predated Capito's commitment to the Reformation cause by five years.

⁴² Erasmus, *CWE*, vol.7, p. 49 #1006; Allen and others, eds. *OE*, vol.4, p. 46.

Pfefferkorn brought out the worst in this otherwise commendable advocate of *humanitas* and toleration, and in a series of letters from November of 1517, Erasmus' attack extended to the religion and race of his adversary's birth. In one letter he described Pfefferkorn as "a man utterly uneducated, of the most brazen impudence, whom no amount of misdemeanour could make worse than he is." Erasmus then continued beyond personality insults:

I would not cast the words 'half a Jew' in his teeth if he did not behave like a Jew and a half. . . . My life upon it, he had not other motive in getting himself dipped in the font than to be able to deliver more dangerous attacks on Christianity, and by mixing with us to infect the entire folk with his Jewish poison. What harm could he have done, had he remained the Jew he was? Now for the first time he is playing the part of a real Jew, now that he has donned the mask of a Christian; now he lives up to his breeding. . . . He could render to his fellow Jews no service more welcome than to pretend he is a turncoat and betray the Christian polity to its enemies.⁴³

While Erasmus articulated no program for the decimation of the Jewish community in Northern Europe as Luther had done, and there is no clear evidence that he sought a Europe free from Jews, there can be little doubt that Erasmus both hated the Jews and despised their religion.⁴⁴

⁴³ Erasmus, *CWE*, vol.5, pp. 167-168, #694; Allen and others, eds. *OE*, vol.3, pp. 117-118. See also letters 700, 701, 703, and 713 where Erasmus addresses the same subject with the same kind of venom. Letter 713 is addressed to Reuchlin in which he says of Pfefferkorn: "That product of the circumcision, who started as a criminal in the ghetto and is now a greater felon since he became, I will not say a Christian but a Christian ape, is said to have published a book – and that too in his native tongue, for fear his cronies the pimps and the bargemen might not understand him. . . . This half-Jew Christian by himself has done more harm to Christendom than the whole cesspool of Jewry" Erasmus, *CWE*, vol.5, pp. 203-204; Allen and others, eds. *OE*, vol.4, p. 143. One of the clearer themes for Erasmus in these diatribes is his conviction that Pfefferkorn, despite his conversion to Christianity, remained a Jew and worked for the benefit of Judaism and the detriment of Christianity. This is a particularly clear example of the suspicion that Christians maintained regarding Jewish converts – one of the reasons Oberman provided for the growth of anti-Jewish sentiment at the same time that Hebrew studies were developing among Christian scholars. See above p. 17, n. 38.

⁴⁴ Pabel, "Erasmus of Rotterdam and Judaism," p. 21, 35-36. J. Wallmann, "Luther on Jews and Islam," in *Creative Biblical Exegesis: Christian and Jewish Hermeneutics Through the Centuries*, ed. Benjamin Uffenheimer and Henning Graf Reventlow (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), p. 150, says

Reuchlin himself, the one Renaissance Humanist who did more than any other to establish the Christian study of Hebraica in Europe, had an attitude toward the Jews which bears closer scrutiny. Recently scholars have suggested that Reuchlin's controversy with Pfefferkorn and the Dominican inquisitors was primarily a battle between the anti-Jewish censors and the great defender of toleration of the Jews and preservation of their religious books. However, while there may be an element of truth in such an assessment,⁴⁵ Reuchlin expressed in his writings a fairly consistent hostility to the Jews as Jews and, perhaps more surprising, hostility to the Talmud. In *De verbo mirifico*, published in 1494 in the form of a dialogue between an Epicurean, a Jew and Reuchlin himself, Reuchlin makes it clear that Baruch the Jew must abandon the Talmud and convert to Christianity. His final assessment of the state of Judaism and the relationship of Jews to Christianity is far removed from the perception of him as an advocate of religious toleration: "You Jews have perverted the holy mysteries, and for this reason you murmur your prayers in vain; in vain you call on God, whom you fail to venerate as he would have you. You flatter yourselves with your concocted ceremonies and persecute us, who truly serve God, with immortal hatred."⁴⁶ Such a comment extends beyond a theological assessment of the soteriological value of Judaism to hostility towards Jews themselves.

"Erasmus' tolerance was an inner-Christian tolerance and excluded the Jews."

⁴⁵ When considering the question of human motivation, it is inappropriate to speak in terms of any single motive for a particular course of action. In the case of Christian attitudes and actions toward the Jews in the sixteenth century the question of motive can get particularly complex. The tendency of the historian is to identify the motive or motives which lend credence to his or her thesis.

⁴⁶ "... vos legitima sacra mutastis: ideoque frustra murmuratis, frustra deum invocatis quem non ut ipse vult colitis, sed inventionibus vestris blandientes etiam nos dei cultores livore immortali oditis . . ." Johann Reuchlin, *De verbo mirifico*. 1494 ; *De arte cabalistica*. 1517 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: F. Frommann Verlag, 1964), fol. b 5 v. Translation in Heiko A. Oberman, *The Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Age of Renaissance and Reformation*, trans. James I. Porter (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), p. 28.

In the midst of his battle with Pfefferkorn and the Dominicans, Reuchlin published the *Augenspiegel* in 1511 in defense of his position regarding the rights of the Jews and against the confiscation of the Talmud. In it he defended his judgement that the Jews were indeed co-citizens with Christians and their books could not be confiscated without prior inspection. However, he also observed that if the Jews inflicted any damage on society with their usury they would have to either correct their ways or be expelled.⁴⁷ Clearly, even for Reuchlin, there was ambiguity regarding the value of Jews as Jews in Christian society.

C. *The Reformation and the Jews*

Insofar as the Reformation was interconnected with the Renaissance, it reflected both the enthusiasm and ambivalence toward Jews and Hebraica that was evident in the Renaissance. Early in the Reformation period, apparently motivated by Luther's 1523 missionary tract, *That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew*, Protestant attitudes appeared to be somewhat sympathetic to the Jews and their situation under Catholicism. A contemporary account by Rabbi Abraham Farissol (1451-1526?) described encounters between early Protestants and Jews: "All the

⁴⁷ "essent per superiores nostros emendandi et reformandi seu expellendi. . ." Johann Reuchlin and Josef Benzing, [Augenspiegel] : Doctor Johannsen Reuchlins ... Warhaftige Entschuldigung gegen und wider ains getauften Iuden genant Pfefferkorn vormals getruckt ussgangen unwarhaftigs Schmachbüchlin Augenspiegel, Quellen zur Geschichte des Humanismus und der Reformation in Faksimile-Ausgaben ; Bd. 5 (Tübingen; München: T. Anshelm; J. Froben, 1511), fol. H 2 v. Oberman concluded that Reuchlin's "defence was not meant for impenitent Jew or the Jewish Talmud, but rather for the gaining unblocked access to the sources of the Christian cabala. Reuchlin linked the Jewish right to individual protection with the Christian right to protect his own society. Required were, therefore, repentance, conversion, and 'signs of improvement.' For the obstinate, there remained expulsion." Oberman, *Roots of Anti-Semitism*, p. 31. Heiko A. Oberman, "Three Sixteenth-Century Attitudes to Judaism: Reuchlin, Erasmus and Luther," in *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, ed. B. Cooperman (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), pp. 330-35 concluded that Reuchlin's animosity toward the Jews had become thematic by 1504 (p. 332). Baron, *Social and Religious History*, vol. 13, p. 184, believed that Reuchlin was "by no means a friend of the Jews."

gentiles in all the lands. . . affected by the influence of this noble man [Luther] exalt the Jews. Whereas before there were lands [= districts?] wherein any wayfaring Jew would be put to death, as also a land [= district?] wherein they would extract a pound of flesh from any passing Jew, now they invite him into their worship, joyously and with a pleasant countenance.”⁴⁸

The later Protestant mission to the Jews assumed a much less pleasant countenance. Luther’s apparent change in attitude toward the Jews is well known⁴⁹ and there were any number of Protestants who were very much opposed to the Jews and things Jewish. The former Dominican Martin Bucer (1491 - 1551), a notable Hebraist in his own right, was one of the irenic Strasbourg reformers. However, Bucer’s advice to Landgrave Phillip of Hesse (1504 - 1567) in 1538 regarding the Jews indicates that they were seen as a singular threat to Christian

⁴⁸ Quoted in H. H. Ben-Sasson, “The Reformation in Contemporary Jewish Eyes,” *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 4 (1971): 266-67. Oberman, *Roots of Anti-Semitism*, p. 101, states categorically that “Philo-Semitism does not exist in the sixteenth century.” For Oberman the only two Reformers who could be considered at all friendly to the Jews were Andreas Osiander and Justus Jonas. Oddly enough Jonas was a disciple of Luther in Wittenburg, not exactly a hotbed of sympathy for the Jews. Klaus Deppermann, “Judenhass und Judenfreundschaft im frühen Protestantismus,” in *Die Juden als Minderheit in der Geschichte*, ed. Bernd Martin and Ernst Schulin (Munich: DTV, 1981), p. 128 identifies Osiander and Capito as “Judenfreundschaft.”

⁴⁹ The old Luther was particularly nasty. Jerome Friedman summarized the last two works of Luther concerning the Jews in this fashion: they “are so vicious, so hate-filled, and so completely devoid of any concept of human decency that they are best left untreated, especially since they ramble and are also incoherent” (Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 204). For a brief survey of the scholarship on Luther and the Jews, see Scott H. Hendrix, “Toleration of Jews in the German Reformation: Urbanus Rhegius and Braunschweig (1535-1541),” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 81 (1990): 189, n. 2. See also H. Bornkamm, *Luther and the Old Testament*, trans. Ruth C. Gritsch Eric W. Gritsch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), pp. 1 ff. where the distinction between the Jews of the Old Testament and Luther’s Jewish contemporaries is clarified. An unsettling characteristic of Bornkamm’s work is his disinclination to distance himself in any way from even the most rabid of Luther’s anti-Jewish opinions. Wallmann, “Luther on Jews and Islam,” p. 150, makes a useful point that to be fair Luther’s anti-Judaism must be seen within the context of all his other “anti-” attitudes – which included the Pope, the *Schwärmer*, and the Turks.

society.⁵⁰ While endeavouring to present both sides of an argument regarding toleration of the Jews, it was clear that his personal sympathies leaned toward intolerance. He maintained that Jews expelled from any given place were treated justifiably because of their “severe blaspheming of our Lord Christ and his sacred religion.”⁵¹ Bucer suggested that if toleration was to occur, the authorities should assure that the Jews would not blaspheme Christ and Christianity, that Talmudic teaching should not be tolerated, that no new synagogues should be erected, that Jews may not dispute with Christians concerning religion, and that the Jews be forced to come to special Christian sermons prepared for them with their conversion in mind.

Bucer also elaborated on the economic harm created by toleration of the Jews:

For the Jews are also burdensome to the Christians in the economic sphere, and with their usury and other financial tricks, like unscrupulous buying and selling, they make themselves into the Christians’ lords and masters on the basis of the Christians’ work and sweat. This is against the law of God and of the Christian emperors, for they are to be the Christians’ servants and are to be subservient to them. Thus every authority is responsible to see to it that this offense is regulated and eliminated.

Consequently Bucer suggested that Jews be prohibited from engaging in usury and involvement in all types of trade. Rather, Jews should be relegated “to the most despicable, burdensome, and unpleasant jobs: mining, other kinds of digging and making of fortifications, breaking stones and chopping wood, making charcoal, cleaning out chimneys and latrines,

⁵⁰ 1538 was a turning point in Protestant attitudes toward the Jews as Luther published the first of his increasingly violent and hostile tracts regarding the Jews in the same year that Bucer’s advice was published. See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 195-202. Luther’s *Aganist the Sabbatarians* was, despite the title, a sweeping anti-Jewish polemic (p. 196).

⁵¹ J. Kleiner, “The Attitudes of Martin Bucer and Landgrave Philipp Toward the Jews of Hesse (1538-1539),” in *Faith and Freedom: A Tribute to Franklin H. Littell*, ed. Richard Libowitz (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987), pp. 221-30. The quotations from the letter are Kleiner’s translation of the German original which can be found in Robert Stupperich, ed. *Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften, Vol. 7: Schriften der Jahre 1538-1539* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1964).

being flayers, and the like.” All these socio-economic concerns were expressed under the guise of Christian charity. Christians were expected to express love for the Jews – but as their undisputed masters. Whether Bucer really believed in a legitimate mission to the Jews is questionable. Like Erasmus, Luther, his co-religionist Capito, and others, he referred to converts from Judaism only as “Jewish-converts,” emphasizing thereby their continued Jewishness despite conversion.⁵²

There were many other Protestant scholars who enthusiastically took up the study of Hebraica, and Strasbourg, Basle and Zurich became prominent centres for the study of Hebrew with noteworthy scholars such as the German student of Reuchlin and professor at Basle and Zurich, Conrad Pellican (1478 - 1556), the German Humanist and Basle Reformer Johannes Oecolampadius (1482 - 1531), and the Strasbourg professor of Hebrew Paul Fagius (1504 - 1549) contributing significantly to the advancement of the discipline. Two further examples of Protestant Hebraists will be sufficient to clarify something of a pattern regarding attitudes toward the Jews.

An illuminating example of the complexity of attitude, opinion and motive can be discerned in the words and actions of the Lutheran pastor and reformer Urbanus Rhegius (1489 - 1541). Rhegius received a humanist education at the universities in Freiburg (1508 - 1512) and Ingolstadt (1512 - 1518 – he was in Ingolstadt at the same time that Hans Denck studied there). Along the way Rhegius developed a facility in Hebrew that enabled him to familiarize himself with Rabbinic exegesis which he displayed in a debate which he, Melanchthon and

⁵² Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 213. Hastings Eels, “Bucer’s Plan for the Jews,” *Church History* 6, no. 2 (1937): 127-35 sought to moderate the severity of Bucer’s attitude toward the Jews but his arguments were not overly convincing.

Lutheran reformer Johannes Brenz (1499 - 1570) had with a certain Rabbi Isaac Levi of Prague at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. Following that encounter, Reginus exercised something of a mission to the Jews of northern Germany. He had at least one encounter with a Rabbi in Hanover, probably in 1535, which produced no positive missionary results. In the same year he wrote a letter to the Jews of Braunschweig in Hebrew, inviting them to dialogue and the opportunity for conversion to Christianity. It is clear from his writings that, although he was willing to dialogue, Reginus believed in the intrinsic superiority of Christianity and the soteriological ineffectiveness of the Jewish faith and, therefore, the necessity of a mission to the Jews. There is no record that his missionizing efforts had any effect, and he was disappointed in his lack of success.

While Reginus did repeat some of the standard criticisms about the stiff-necked nature of the Jews and the justice of the persecutions they experienced, he never became bitter and vituperative as Luther had done. Indeed, he is one of the few Christians of the sixteenth century who acted to defend and benefit Jews. In 1539 and 1540 he interceded with the mayor and council of Braunschweig on behalf of a Rabbi Samuel who taught Hebrew to the Jews of the city. His first request was to let the Rabbi live outside the city and come in to teach Hebrew. Later he requested that the Rabbi be allowed to live in the city since the travel was dangerous and a hardship, particularly in the winter. Around the same time, in response to calls to expel the Jews from the city, he wrote to the pastors of the city pleading for tolerance for the Jews and requesting that they abandon their hatred and work for the conversion of the Jews through "clemency, charity, mercy, and the other fruits of Christian teaching." He argued that Jews were more likely to experience conversion while among Christians, than when banished from

their midst. In his writings Rhegius repeated and accepted many of the standard accusations against Jews and seemed to be motivated primarily by a desire for their conversion.

In some ways his position sounds like the young Luther before he became concerned about the perceived Jewish influence on Christians groups like the Sabbatarians. The significant difference here is that Reginus' position of tolerance and hope comes after a decade of unsuccessful missionary efforts to the Jews. Compared to his contemporaries, Reginus represented a rare voice of tolerance and compassion.⁵³ A telling point in favour of Reginus' tolerant attitude was that his actions on behalf of the Jews in his community came in the years immediately following the strongly anti-Jewish publications of Luther and Bucer which dramatically altered the tone and nature of Protestant attitudes toward the Jews.

Despite his tolerance and relative compassion, it is clear that Reginus had difficulty with Jews as Jews in a Protestant Christian society. He was disinclined to advocate their expulsion but he was convinced of their need for conversion from Judaism to Christianity. Unlike Augustine who anticipated the conversion of the Jews at the *eschaton*, Reginus believed in the need for their immediate conversion.⁵⁴

Sebastian Münster was the greatest Christian Hebraist of the first half of the sixteenth century. He published almost sixty books on various aspects of Hebrew study. He worked closely with Elias Levita, the greatest of the Jewish grammarians of his time, translating some

⁵³ Hendrix, "Toleration of Jews," pp. 189-208. Reginus was recognized for his tolerant spirit in his own time by none other than the greatest advocate for toleration in the sixteenth century, the French Humanist and, at least for a time, Calvinist reformer Sebastian Castellio (1516 - 1563), (p. 208, n. 90).

⁵⁴ This raises the question about the possibility of any relationship between Christian eschatological expectations and the mission to the Jews. Such a line of enquiry might prove instructive.

of his works to Latin, publishing others in their original Hebrew. He actively defended Christian Hebraists against the charge of Judaizing and defended the use of Jewish non-biblical sources by Christians. He also participated in the mission to the Jews. In 1537 he published *Torat ha-Mashiach: The Gospel According to Matthew in Hebrew with a Latin Version and Notes by Sebastian Münster*. This was the first New Testament Scripture translated into Hebrew and the most significant missionary publication for the Jews ever produced by a Christian scholar. The Gospel translation was preceded by a 120-page missionary treatise which strove to communicate Christian belief in a Jewish idiom. Interestingly enough, and for a number of possible reasons, Münster appropriated the old Augustinian view of Judaism by presenting normative Judaism in terms of the ancient biblical Judaism rather than medieval Rabbinic Judaism with which he was very familiar. He concluded his treatise with two sections which he specifically addressed to Christians rather than Jews. The first was titled “A Censure of the Faith and Errors of the Jews,” in which, in his own words, Münster “wanted here briefly in both the Latin and Hebrew languages to respond to these blind and obstinate people so that Christians can frankly elude their false arguments and opinions.” The final brief section was entitled “Errors, Fabrications, and Vain Opinions Against Christians.” In the introduction to the section he argued that from the earliest days of Christianity Jews had persecuted true Christians and continued that persecution with their propagation of their errors regarding religion and Scripture. He described Jewish interpretation as “depraved and corrupted” and perpetuated with the deliberate intent of harming Christian truth. In the body of the section he listed a number of factors which prevented the Jews from converting to Christianity, few of

which were matters controlled by the Jews themselves.⁵⁵ In his glosses to the Matthew translation, Münster included accusations of lewdness by the Jews and veiled threats of punishment of the Jews by Christians. On the whole, however, the work was respectful of the Jews and fairly irenic in spirit.

Two years later, however, Münster published another “missionary” work of a very different sort entitled *Mashiach*, in separate Hebrew and Latin editions, with a substantially different tone regarding the Jews. Significantly this publication came only one year after the publication of Luther’s first emphatically anti-Jewish work and Bucer’s similarly hostile advice to the landgrave concerning the Jews. In the introduction to the Latin edition, quite clearly published for a Christian audience, Münster was the first Christian Hebraist to call for the mass expulsion of all Jews in Europe: “These perfidious people should have been eliminated from all Christian boundaries long ago.”⁵⁶ In the text of the treatise itself, which differed little from the Hebrew to the Latin editions and which he presented as a dialogue between a Christian and a Jew, he encouraged the all too common Christian biases that Jews were not quite human, ugly and prostituted their women in order to obtain favourable living conditions among the larger Christian society – and that they had always been this way. Jewish religion was presented as encompassing a superstitious belief in ghosts and a foolish cosmology. Münster managed to establish all of this prior to addressing the central issue of the treatise – the question of the Messiah, at which point the subject matter appears to take a more serious and

⁵⁵ For example: “Jews take usury because they love money more than God.” However, prohibitions by the Christians prevented the Jews from making a living in very many other ways. Or “Jews do not wear Christian clothing.” However, in many cases when Jews wore distinctive clothing, they were required to do so by Christian law. See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 226-27.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 243.

academic tone. However, in response to the Jew's arguments against Jesus as the Messiah, the most significant of which was the continued exile and oppression of the Jewish people, Münster trotted out the traditional Christian argument that the continued suffering of the Jews was justified because they had rejected and slain the Messiah. Münster proved the ongoing culpability of the Jews for the actions of their ancestors by causing the Jewish antagonist in the dialogue to express repeatedly his own murderous hatred of Jesus, implying thereby that the Jews of the sixteenth century would do the same to Jesus that their ancestors ostensibly had done. The sum of Münster's indictment of the Jews was that they were guilty, not for their beliefs or actions, but for what they were – Jews.⁵⁷

It is quite certain that Münster had several possible motives for these “missionary” publications and it is probable that the actual conversion of the Jews was nowhere near the top of that list of motives. Nevertheless he actively participated in the renewed Christian mission to the Jews, he willingly expressed many if not most of the anti-Jewish biases current in his society, his animosity extended beyond the Jewish religion to the Jews themselves and, ultimately, he advocated the complete expulsion of the Jews from all lands in Christian

⁵⁷ Paul Fagius, too, published very similar “missionary” treatises in 1542 in which he was able to incorporate many of the standard criticisms of the Jews such as the stupidity of the Jews and that Jewish converts to Christianity are not really Christian but remain Jews (which in itself would invalidate any real mission to the Jews since converts are less desirable and more dangerous to a Christian society than Jews themselves – however, logic is not integral to racial or religious hatred). Friedman, *ibid.*, pp. 249-50, concluded that these publications by Münster and Fagius do not “present either scholar as possessing vast quantities of personal or scholarly integrity. . . . Both authors used prevalent anti-Semitic feelings, and their ability to pander to this sentiment, as a guise behind which to carry out their own scholarly pursuits.” On Fagius as a Hebraist see *ibid.*, pp. 99-117, 48-64. For his “missionary” treatises, the possible variety of motives, and the anti-Jewish sentiments expressed, see *ibid.*, pp. 244-54.

Europe.⁵⁸

Summary

While a survey of these periods of history shows a rise in the Christian study of Hebraica, it also reveals that there was no corresponding improvement in Christian attitudes toward the Jews. In fact the rise in Christian Hebraica in the medieval, Renaissance and Reformation periods brought about the demise of the Augustinian theological justification for the existence of Jews in Christian society. Once Christians could deal with the Hebrew text of the Bible without depending on the assistance of Jews, the Jews were no longer needed as the keepers of the Book. Once Christians became quite aware of the dynamic and evolving nature of Rabbinic Judaism, Jews could no longer be perceived to be a static and mute witness to the new covenant under Christ. And once Christians discovered that there was an active and lucid anti-Christian polemic in Jewish literature they concluded that, rather than blind and deceived, the Jews were willfully and wickedly rejecting Christ. With Augustine's theological defence ceasing to have authority, the very existence of Jews in Christendom came into doubt and persecutions, expulsions and missions to the Jews became legitimate means of dealing with the Jewish problem.⁵⁹ Consequently, as a rule, Christian Hebraists themselves actively participated

⁵⁸ Depperman, "Judenhass," p. 127 observes: "*Die meisten deutschen und schweizerischen Reformatoren votierten in der Judenfrage ähnlich wie Luther.*" He mentions Melanchthon, Bucer, Ambrosius and Thomas Blaurer and Urbanus Rhegius who "*sah wie Luther die geistige Verwandtschaft zwischen Juden und Täufern.*" He also mentions Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin who "*unterschieden sich von Luther wohl im Ton, nicht aber in der grundsätzlichen Einstellung gegenüber den Juden.*"

⁵⁹ The mission to the Jews was a curious thing. Apparently there was a very real suspicion among many Christians that Jewish converts had only become baptised in order to subvert Christianity from within. (See, for example, the comments of Erasmus *supra* p. 19.) From this perspective there could be nothing more dangerous to Christianity than a successful mission to the Jews. This may help

in these measures against the Jews. In the medieval period scholars with nominal Hebrew skills such as William of Auvergne, Albert the Great and Hugh of St. Cher could make use of rabbinic sources for their biblical interpretation yet participate in good faith in the burning of the Talmud. In the Renaissance period Reuchlin on the one hand made the single greatest contribution to the development of the discipline of Christian Hebraica, delving even into the arcane pathways of Cabalistic wisdom, yet on the other hand he was capable of suggesting expulsion for Jews who did not reform. Among the Reform Hebraists there is an almost universal antipathy toward the Jews. Reginus may not have been motivated by hatred for the Jews but he still had no room for Jews as Jews in his vision of a Christian society. The other Hebraists had a much sharper edge in their observations and attitudes regarding the Jews, advocating persecution, expulsion and the harshest of measures. It has been argued, rather wistfully, that the Renaissance and Reformation periods represented a new age of enlightenment and tolerance which included the Jews and led directly to the emancipation of the Jews. It can also be argued, however, that attitudes toward the Jews in the Renaissance and Reformation periods contained within them the seeds of the holocaust.⁶⁰

Having identified the dominant patterns of Christian attitudes toward Jews and Hebraica in the medieval, Renaissance and early Reformation periods, it is time to investigate more

explain both the unusual nature of much of the Christian mission literature and the singular lack of success of the mission.

⁶⁰ See the works by Oberman on the subject: "Three Sixteenth-Century Attitudes," pp. 326-64; *Roots of Anti-Semitism*; "The Stubborn Jews. Timing the Escalation of Anti-Semitism in Late Medieval Europe," *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 34 (1989): xi-xxv; "Discovery of Hebrew," pp. 19-34. Luther's anti-Jewish treatises were reprinted by the Nazis in conjunction with *Kristallnacht* on November 9, 1938 – the night when homes, shops and synagogues of Jews throughout Germany were destroyed. Both the publication and the vandalism were done in commemoration of Luther's birth, with Luther's treatises apparently providing the moral authority for the actions. See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 210-11 n. 33.

closely the attitudes of Anabaptists and other sixteenth century radical groups on the same subject. This is the subject of the next chapter.

II. Anabaptists and the Jews: Encounters and Attitudes

A. Limitations of opportunity for encounters

As noted earlier, by the first quarter of the sixteenth century Western Europe had managed to eliminate or displace most of its Jews. From the time of the persecutions of the first Crusade in 1096 a pattern of persecution and expulsion of the Jews had been established throughout Europe. The Holy Roman Empire alone among the major political powers of Western Christendom experienced no general expulsion of the Jews during the Late Middle Ages.⁶¹ The reason for this, however, was not due to a greater toleration of the Jews but to the fact that after 1273 the authority of the Emperor was no longer effectively centralized and many cities and states within the empire exercised considerable autonomy.⁶² The result was that numerous expulsions occurred locally and while the effect on the Jewish communities of Germany was severe, it was never ubiquitous as it had been in England and the Iberian Peninsula. For example, the Jews expelled from Cologne simply established their own community outside the city walls so that they could continue their business endeavours with the residents of the city. Early in this period there were about 85 cities and towns in the western German empire with identifiable Jewish communities. However, the *Rindfleisch* massacres of 1298, riots in 1336

⁶¹ England expelled her Jews in 1290, France followed suit in 1306 and again in 1394, Austria in 1491, Spain and Sicily in 1492, and Portugal in 1493. See Elie Barnavi and Miriam Eliav-Feldon, *A Historical Atlas of the Jewish People: From the Time of the Patriarchs to the Present* (London: Hutchinson, 1992), pp. 104-6, 21, 26 and Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 17. For the edict of expulsion from England see Chazan, ed. *Church, State, and Jew*, pp. 317-19. For a contemporary Jewish account of the expulsion from Spain see *ibid.*, pp. 319-22.

⁶² Italy, as a part of the Holy Roman Empire, experienced a similar decentralization of power to the various city states. The Italian city states, however, tended to be considerably more tolerant of the Jews than did the German factions of the empire.

and the massacres during the Black Death (1348-49)⁶³ eliminated most of these communities so that by the time the Jews were expelled from Regensburg in 1519, the only Jewish communities of any size remaining in Germany were in Frankfurt am Main and Worms.⁶⁴

The Anabaptist community of Worms will be addressed in detail below. Frankfurt, on the other hand, was one of the few south German cities where there was no significant Anabaptist presence. The only name with any identifiable Anabaptist associations was Dr. Gerhard Westerburg (d. 1558), brother-in-law of Carlstadt, who was in Frankfurt from late fall of 1524 to May 17, 1525 when he was expelled from the city for his leadership role in “a little civil rebellion” some years prior to his official commitment to the Anabaptist cause.⁶⁵ At this stage of research there is no identifiable connection between Westerburg and the Jews of Frankfurt nor any record of his attitudes regarding the Jews.⁶⁶

The cycles of persecution and expulsion of Jews from Western Europe gave rise to a series of waves of emigration to Eastern Europe and beyond to the Ottoman Empire and the

⁶³ The Rindfleisch massacres started in Röttingen with an allegation of host desecration and spread through southern Germany and parts of Austria. By the time it was over 150 Jewish communities were decimated or destroyed and at least twenty thousand Jews had been killed. See Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, vol. 7, p. 60 n. 57. During the plague of the Black Death, the Jews were accused of being responsible, usually by poisoning the wells, and suffered severe persecutions as the Christian population sought an acceptable reason for the devastation around them.

⁶⁴ Moses A. Shuvass, *The History of the Jewish People*, vol. 3; *The Late Middle Ages* (Chicago: Regnery Books, 1985), pp. 6-7; Heinrich Graetz, *History of the Jews*, vol. 4 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1974 [c.1891]), p. 417.

⁶⁵ *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Westerburg, Gerhard,” by Ernst Crous; *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Frankfurt am Main,” by Christian Hege. Westerburg later became a leader of the Anabaptist community in Cologne.

⁶⁶ Westerburg has not been the subject of much recent research. Calvin Augustine Pater, “Westerburg: the Father Of Anabaptism. Author and Content Of the Dyalogus Of 1527,” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 85 (1994): 145 n. 22, lists four sources for biographical information on Westerburg, all published between 1870 and 1876.

Holy Land. There were several waves of emigrations from the tenth through the fourteenth centuries with the result being that a significant Ashkenazic Jewish community grew up in the more tolerant countries of Eastern Europe, particularly Poland, where there were more than sixty Jewish communities by the end of the fifteenth century.⁶⁷ When the Radical Reformers began to experience similar persecution, many of them set their eyes eastward seeking greater freedom. When they arrived, they found a thriving and well-established Jewish community.

South of the Alps, in present-day Italy, an area for the most part beyond the scope of this study, the history of the Christian treatment of the Jews is somewhat gentler and there is record of much productive collaboration between Jews and Christian scholars and reformers. Ashkenazi Jewish communities were established in Northern Italy between 1350 and 1430 after expulsions from Germany and France, and many Sephardic Jews found their way to Italy after the expulsion from the Iberian Peninsula and the Spanish territories in 1492-93. While there were periods of persecution, most notably a ritual murder trial in Trent in 1475, the period of the Renaissance still represented the demographic and cultural zenith of Italian Jewry.⁶⁸ When Anabaptism as a movement stirred in Italy, it too found there a thriving and active Jewish community with which to interact.

B. Anti-Judaism

The subject of the Jews does not arise frequently in the writings of the major Anabaptist leaders. The leader of Dutch Anabaptism Menno Simons (c. 1496 - 1561), for example,

⁶⁷ Barnavi and Eliav-Feldon, *Historical Atlas*, pp. 118-19.

⁶⁸ Ibid., pp. 126-27.

appeared to have no strong feelings regarding the Jews. Fond of typological exegesis, he consistently applied to the Church the biblical promises made to Israel. However, he did so without overtly denying that they might yet apply to Israel as well. Twice in his pre-Anabaptist writings, however, he did make negative comments regarding contemporary Judaism. The most critical was that the Jews “were often punished and at last cut off from the olive tree as unfaithful branches.” He also opined that eventually all Jews would return to Christ, implying that there was no salvific value in post-biblical Judaism. Menno never returned to the theme again in his writings, so it is safe to say that the question of the value of post-biblical Judaism in the economy of salvation was of little lasting concern to him.⁶⁹ There is no evidence in his writings of a hostility to Jews themselves.

Like Menno, Dirk Philips’ (1504 - 1568) *Enchiridion* and the *Great Chronicle* of the Hutterites were both inclined to a typological interpretation of the biblical Israelites, seeing in their faithfulness or faithlessness various members of the Church. The Tyrolean Anabaptist leader Pilgram Marpeck’s (c. 1495 - 1556) references to the Jews were almost exclusively to the Jews at the time of Christ, and those he referred to entirely in negative terms. In his rare references to contemporary Jews, Marpeck spoke of them as being under punishment, greedy, usurious, and their religion without redemptive value.⁷⁰

Balthasar Hubmaier’s (1480/85 - 1528) participation in the expulsion of the Jews of

⁶⁹ Liechty, *Andreas Fischer*, p. 102. Liechty points out in Menno’s defence that he was writing in the light of the Münster scandal. Again the distinction needs to be made between a theological position on the soteriological efficacy of post-biblical Judaism and hatred for the Jews. See above p. 18 n. 39.

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 102-03.

Regensburg in 1519 is well known.⁷¹ There seems to be no concrete evidence regarding his attitude following his conversion to Anabaptism. While he left no further record of incendiary or hostile references to the Jews, neither did he leave any evidence of remorse for his actions in Regensburg or a change in attitude toward the Jews. In fact, his comments as an Anabaptist on the events at Regensburg seem to imply that the Jews themselves were responsible for the events which befell them. Any other references to contemporary Jews in his Anabaptist writings, always in the context of religious issues, were negative though the subject became increasingly peripheral for him with the passage of time.⁷²

Clement Ziegler, a Strasbourg gardener and Anabaptist, wrote an early pamphlet as a contribution to the then current debate on images. In it he made the comment: "How do we want to give account before God, since we clearly know that the Jews are supposed to be

⁷¹ An anonymous popular rhyme about the expulsions contained this tribute to Hubmaier:

Jewish malignity was foretold
by the prophet Isaiah in days of old;
And if further evidence you desire,
Ask Doctor Balthasar Hubmair
To tell you why it is that we
Treat the Jews with such hostility.
He'll waste no time convincing you
(By quoting God's own Gospel, too)
That there's no punishment too painful
For a tribe so openly disdainful
Not only of Christ, their adversary,
But of his mother, the Virgin Mary. [the synagogue was converted to a Marian chapel]
For a Christian there's no sin so great
As to merit a Jew's love, not his hate....
No city therefore can fare well
Until it's sent its Jews to hell.

Gerald Strauss, *Manifestations of Discontent in Germany on the Eve of the Reformation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971), pp. 127-28.

⁷² Liechty, *Andreas Fischer*, pp. 103-04. The irony of Hubmaier's anti-Jewish attitude is that he was one of the most articulate proponents of religious toleration in the Reformation. Evidently his tolerant spirit did not extend to the Jews.

converted before the Day of Judgement? Mal. 4[:5f.]. Now they still don't want to join us: because we have not put away images, thus we are a cause of their stumbling and a hinderance before God.”⁷³ While Ziegler clearly rejects any possibility of a soteriological value in post-biblical Judaism, his comment contains no further criticism of Jews, instead placing the blame for their rejection of Christianity on the idolatry of his Christian contemporaries.

At one point in his encyclopaedic tome, *The Radical Reformation*, G. H. Williams suggests that there were to be found traces of antipathy for the Jewish community, particularly among the German Anabaptists. He explained that this attitude could be traced in part to the social aspirations reflected by the Peasants' War and the radical protest against usury as well as a theological sense of distance from the spiritual milieu of the Old Testament. Unfortunately Williams provides no specific examples or references for his tantalizing comment.⁷⁴

Of these examples only Hubmaier and Marpeck display a record of overt hostility to contemporary Jews. Menno, Dirk Philips, the *Great Chronicle* of the Hutterites and Clement Ziegler focus either on biblical Judaism only or, if they do speak of contemporary Judaism, it is with the conviction (an almost universal belief in Christian Europe at that time) that salvation is through Jesus alone and that their Jewish contemporaries needed to convert to Christianity.

The relative dearth of references to the Jews among the Anabaptist leaders does mean, however, that they were not repeating the slanderous and incendiary accusations such as ritual murder, host desecration and demonic activity which had become common in late medieval

⁷³ My thanks to Travis Moger for making available a copy of his unpublished translation of this obscure pamphlet. Malachi 4:5-6 reads: “Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. And he will turn the hearts of fathers to their children and the hearts of children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the land with a curse” (NRSV).

⁷⁴ Williams, *Radical Reformation*, p. 1264.

Europe.⁷⁵ In fact many of the Anabaptists grouped the Jews together with the Catholics and Magisterial reformers as legitimate subjects of the Anabaptist mission, which represented a dramatic improvement in religious status.⁷⁶ There may be some explanation for this tendency toward silence regarding the Jews by the Anabaptists. The first and most obvious explanation is that few of the Anabaptists in West and Central Europe ever encountered Jews and would therefore have little cause to give them much thought. Secondly, the Anabaptists were in a precarious position in sixteenth-century Europe so that any arguments justifying the persecution of the Jews would have been turned back on them by their own persecutors.⁷⁷ Likewise, any expressions identifiable as being in defence of the Jews could lend credence to the accusation against the Anabaptists of Judaizing apostasy and further intensify persecution. Whatever their attitudes may have been regarding their Jewish contemporaries, silence on the subject was a wise course of action.

C. Sabbatarianism and other Judaizing Reforms

There were a number of Anabaptist and other radical groups who exhibited an interest in

⁷⁵ The charge of *Ritual murder*, also called the “blood libel,” alleged that Jews routinely kidnapped and murdered young Christian children and drained them of their blood which they used either in making Passover bread or otherwise consumed in order to mask their telltale “Jewish” smell. The accusation of *Host desecration* alleged that Jews stole consecrated host and desecrated it in an effort to slay Jesus again (an accusation which makes sense only if everyone – including the Jews – accepted the doctrine of transubstantiation). Tales about the alleged *demonic* nature of Jews abounded and often artistic renderings of Jews placed horns on their heads to remind the viewer that the Jews were demonic.

⁷⁶ Including the Jews in the Anabaptist mission to the world is another sign that the Augustinian formulation regarding the place of Jews in a Christian society no longer held the authority it once had.

⁷⁷ Liechty, *Andreas Fischer*, p. 103.

Jews and Judaism. There is record of occasional positive encounters and even efforts at rapprochement between some radicals and Jews. There were also some who sought to establish an agenda of reform which was consciously patterned after biblical or, more rarely, contemporary Judaism.

In Esslingen in 1528 a local youth of the Anabaptist community tried to convince the rest of the community that Christ was exclusively human and merely a prophet. He went on to suggest that the Jews were still God's chosen people and their faith was superior to that of institutionalized Christianity. Such ideas had been expressed on a number of occasions among the early South German Anabaptists and most thoroughly explored by the German weaver and, at least briefly Anabaptist, apocalyptic visionary Augustine Bader (d. 1530).⁷⁸

The messianic apocalypticism of the German Anabaptists Bader, Hans Hut (c. 1490 - 1527), and Melchior Hofmann (1495? - 1543) lent itself readily to an identification with similar Jewish movements. Bader's group in particular had identifiable contacts with, and attitudes toward, the Jews. Oswald Leber, an elderly preacher from Baden who participated in the Peasants' War and the most learned and prominent of the followers of Bader, had been in Worms at the same time as Denck and Hätzer, at which time he imbibed of both Anabaptist spiritualism and Jewish messianism. According to Bader, Leber had been instructed regarding the *eschaton* by a Jew of Worms in Hebrew and had been invited by one of these Jews to meet him in Jerusalem within the year in preparation for the apocalypse. Encouraged by Leber, Bader's group sought out Jewish communities in an effort to learn Hebrew and depended on the Rabbis in their interpretation of the Old Testament and its Apocrypha. Bader, anticipating

⁷⁸ Werner O. Packull, *Mysticism and the Early South German-Austrian Anabaptist Movement 1525-1531* (Scottdale, Pa: Herald Press, 1977), p. 144.

the beginning of the end on Easter 1530 based on Jewish predictions – and possibly astrological assistance – hoped that the overthrow of the morally bankrupt Christian society by the Turks would bring about the final conversion of the Turks and Jews. His eschatology included the elimination of all sacraments offensive to Jews and Muslims. Convinced that his newly born son was the long anticipated messiah, Bader made contact with the Jewish communities of Leyphayn, Gyntzburg, Bühel, and Würzburg to announce the event. Though there is no record of an enthusiastic reception of this news by the Jews, when the authorities stamped out the movement, the Jews implicated by Bader's contact were also arrested.⁷⁹

Melchior Hoffman expressed the opinion that the converted Jews would occupy a place of high honour in the future “*himmlischen Jerusalem*.” Efforts at rapprochement with Alsatian Jews failed because of Hoffman’s monophysite Christology.⁸⁰

Melchiorite apocalypticism found its most extreme social and religious expression in the brief but notorious Davidic kingdom of Münster. Unlike most other Anabaptists, the Münsterites looked not to the early church for its program of restoration, but back farther to the Apocrypha and Old Testament, identifying their mission much more with the Exodus from Egypt and the rebuilding of Jerusalem after the Babylonian exile – with Münster as the new Jerusalem. The Pentateuch was the “law book” of this new Jerusalem: the Davidic kingship was restored under the baker Jan Matthijs of Harlem (d. 1534) and his successor Jan Beukels of Leyden (1509 - 1536), a tailor by trade. With the restored kingdom they also reinstated

⁷⁹ Williams, *Radical Reformation*, pp. 297-99, 1265-66; Packull, *Mysticism*, pp. 135-36, 219 n.142; Alastair Hamilton, “The Apocryphal Apocalypse: 2 Esdras and the Anabaptist Movement,” *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 68, no. 1 (1988): 8.

⁸⁰ See Depperman, “Judenhass,” pp. 128-29.

Polygamy and a number of other less spectacular reforms culled from the pages of the Old Testament. The citizens of the new kingdom were referred to as Israelites. There were even military forays based upon Old Testament and Apocryphal narratives. There is, however, no evidence that this particular group of reformers had any contact with contemporary Jews or was influenced by Rabbinic Judaism.⁸¹

One type of Judaizing reform which has a pedigree considerably closer to the circle around Hans Denck was the Sabbatarian reform of the Anabaptists Oswald Glaidt (1490 - 1546) and Andreas Fischer (1480 - 1540). Glaidt, formerly a Franciscan, had been baptized by Hubmaier and then became a supporter of Hans Hut before his reforming zeal impelled him into even more radical territory. Fischer, a Bohemian by birth, had been converted to the Anabaptist cause by Glaidt late in the 1520s in upper Austria. According to Hut's prognostications, based on the perennially evocative span of seven years, Christ would return on Pentecost 1528. When this did not occur, Glaidt and Fischer sublimated the significance of the seven years into an eschatological expectancy based on the seventh day, now their day of worship. Valentin Crautwald (1465 - 1545), German Humanist and colleague of the spiritualist reformer Caspar Schwenckfeld (1490 - 1561), while in the midst of a controversy with Glaidt and Fischer over the validity of the Mosaic law, wrote a letter to Capito and Bucer in Strasbourg warning them and other supporters of the magisterial reform that Christians should depend more on the omnipresent Spirit of Christ than on Rabbinic instruction on Hebrew philology. Evidently Crautwald was motivated not only by Judaizing trends and Rabbinic influence which he observed in the Reformation generally, but more directly by the extreme

⁸¹ Williams, *Radical Reformation*, pp. 553-88, 1265.

efforts at reform by Glaidt and Fischer, his immediate theological challenge.⁸² It is clear that Fischer in particular sought a degree of rapprochement with the Jews. He believed that Christians and Jews have much in common theologically and while Christians were not Jews he did hold that salvation has come through the Jews.⁸³

In 1530 official warnings were issued against Glaidt and Fischer accusing them of being secret Judaizers and agents of foreign powers. The two reformers separated. Glaidt went with John Spittelmayer and John Bünderlein (c. 1498 - 1533) to Bohemia⁸⁴ while Fischer continued eastward, often just ahead of a judiciary with deadly intent, and coordinated a radical Sabbatarian community in Moravia where he and his followers practised circumcision as a token of their conviction that the Old Testament law was God's unalterable covenant with humanity. Fischer viewed Judaism as a valued and equal religion, and in his Christology he, not surprisingly, subordinated what he believed to be a purely human suffering Jesus to the Father. Fischer ended his life as a martyr in Slovakia in 1540.⁸⁵

⁸² Ibid., pp. 623-27.

⁸³ Liechty, *Andreas Fischer*, p. 56. Though Fischer's writings did not survive, his perspectives are ascertained by Liechty based on a rebuttal by Crautwald.

⁸⁴ However, Liechty, "Origins of Sabbatarianism," pp. 336, n. 13, believes that the Oswald who went to Bohemia was a different person and that Glaidt went to Moravia, probably in early 1529, where he joined the Hutterites and subsided to a position of relative obscurity. See also Liechty, *Sabbatarianism*, pp. 33f. for more detail on this interpretation of Glaidt's later years. Bünderlein was a spiritual Anabaptist who was influenced by the thought of Denck.

⁸⁵ Williams, *Radical Reformation*, pp. 627, 30-32; Liechty, *Sabbatarianism*, p. 41. For some earlier work on Glaidt and Fischer see G.F. Hasel, "Sabbatarian Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 5-6 (1967-1968): 101-21, 19-28. Jerome Friedman, in his discussion on the accusations of Judaizing, concluded that "the rejection of a Christian position in favour of a clearly Jewish position did not occur" (Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 185). He went on to suggest that even Sabbatarianism was a poor example of Judaizing. The present discussion and particularly the discussion in the following section would suggest that Friedman has generalized to the point of being inaccurate. Christian individuals and groups were influenced by Jewish thought and

Italian Anabaptism has not been a subject of much study and its known history is particularly sketchy.⁸⁶ Williams speculates that the movement appears “to have arisen from the confluence of Germanic Anabaptism via the Grigioni and the Southern Tyrol (Ch.21.3), of popularized and radicalized Valdesianism (Ch.21.4), and of Judaism or philo-Hebraism from whatever source, possibly Marranos.”⁸⁷ In Padua in particular there was an Anabaptist conventicle with Judaizing tendencies. Associated with this group to varying degrees were men like the Hebraist Jerome Busale and the Cistercians Lawrence Tizzano and John Laureto. Following his conversion to Anabaptism in 1550, Busale, possibly of Jewish ancestry, was elected bishop of the Paduan Anabaptist community out of respect for his profound knowledge of Hebrew. Even prior to his rebaptism, it is clear that Busale was inclined to reject the divinity of Christ. The record of his trial leaves the pages of history when, fearful of persecution, he set sail for relatives in Alexandria in 1551.

Tizzano’s theology, drawn out in recantation in 1553, appeared to have a number of doctrines influenced by Judaism. He was inclined to describe rebaptism in terms similar to the ablutions of a Jewish proselyte. His Christology, like many of the Paduan Anabaptists, was primarily adoptionist, evolving, at least for a time, to the point that he held that Jesus was but a prophet and the Messiah was yet to come. Following his recantation, Tizzano returned to the

practice and some did abandon some or all of traditional Christian belief and custom in favour of Jewish belief and practice.

⁸⁶ Werner Packull has done work on Anabaptism in southern Tyrol. However, his interest in the subject is primarily within the context of the rise of the Hutterite movement so his narrative takes him north-east to Moravia rather than further south to places such as Padua. See Werner O. Packull, “The Beginning of Anabaptism in Southern Tyrol,” *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 717-26; idem, *Hutterite Beginnings: Communitarian Experiments during the Reformation* (Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

⁸⁷ Williams, *Radical Reformation*, p. 851.

Catholic fold.⁸⁸ His erstwhile Cistercian companion, Laureto, had an even more dramatic career which will be studied below.

D. Unitarianism, Anti-Trinitarianism and beyond

John Laureto, among the most controversial of the Italian Anabaptists, was excommunicated from the Paduan Anabaptist community for his seemingly endless capacity for verbal conflict. Following his separation from his companion Tizzano in 1551, Laureto sailed to Thessalonica where, despite the presence of a substantial Anabaptist community, he cultivated the company of the Sephardic Jewish community with the intent of continuing his Hebrew studies under the Rabbis. After some time he converted to Judaism and submitted to circumcision, though he did not accept the offer of a Jewish wife. His extended stay with the Jews of Thessalonica eventually caused his disillusionment with what he perceived to be their superstition (the same criticism he levelled against the Paduan Anabaptists). He eventually fled to Venice where he surrendered himself to the Inquisition in order to recant and return to Catholicism in 1553, the same year and city in which Tizzano recanted.⁸⁹

Among the Minor Churches of the Polish Brethren there was a wide range of belief and praxis and therefore they are difficult to categorize effectively. While the initial reforming impetus was Calvinist, regarding baptism, most were antipedobaptist, some even Anabaptist.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 860-64.

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 862-63.

⁹⁰ L. Szczucki, "The Beginnings of Antitrinitarian Anabaptism in Lithuania and Poland in the Light of a so-far Unknown source," in *Anabaptistes et Dissidents au XVI Siecle*, ed. Jean Georges Rott and Simon L. Verheus (Baden-Baden: Editions Valentin Koerner, 1987) discusses "Antitrinitarian Anabaptism" based on a report of a debate written by Marcin Czechowic in 1564-65 but not published

Regarding the Trinity, belief ranged from tritheists still comfortable with the Nicene terminology to strictly non-adorant Unitarians. Among them was a rediscovery of the wholly human Jesus the Messiah. It is possible to suggest that there may have been contemporary Jewish influence in this particular theological development based on a medal that was struck in sixteenth-century Raków which on one side depicted the human teacher Jesus with a hair style suggestive of a Polish rabbi and, on the other, the royal inscription in Hebrew.⁹¹

Summary

Although there is less than might be expected in the writings of the Anabaptists on the question of the Jews, there is clear evidence that a number of the Anabaptist and Radical

until 1578. In his *Discourse*, while refuting pedobaptism and defending immersion as the “true” baptism, Czechowic makes only one reference to the writings of classical Anabaptism: an approving quote of a statement by Hubmaier on the baptism of children (p. 354). He also probably visited the Moravian Hutterites at some point in his life (p. 357) but it seems unlikely that such a visit would be a sufficient source for the formulation of his doctrinal positions. So while Czechowic and those he influenced can be called “Antitrinitarian Anabaptists,” the spiritual and theological link between them and earlier Anabaptism is tenuous.

⁹¹ Williams, *Radical Reformation*, p. 1080. The logical conclusion of the Judaizing tendencies of some of the Transylvanian Sabbatarians unfolds many years later in a small group in Hungary which remained steadfastly Sabbatarian through the centuries despite severe persecutions. In 1867 the Hungarian Parliament decreed the emancipation of the Jews. Shortly thereafter, a group of about 40 families in the area of Bozodujfalu, coming from the Catholic, Reformed and Unitarian Churches, requested legal recognition of their conversion to Judaism. After an investigation, the request was granted and an unusual relationship slowly developed between these new converts and the newly emancipated Jews. The converts held their services in Hungarian with the most important Hebrew prayers recited phonetically. They married only among themselves. Their end came with the Nazi occupation of 1941. Not being racially Jewish they were given the option of reconverting to Christianity or being deported as Jews. A significant number chose deportation with their coreligionists and experienced the same end in the ovens of the death camps. Those who remained, at least 90 people, chose to reconvert. As proof of the sincerity of their actions they were required to burn down their synagogue. The act demoralized the small group and while the older generation continued to live as secret Jews within the Reformed Church, the youth abandoned their traditional faith, bringing to an end a poignant footnote in the long and largely hostile history of Jewish Christian relations. See Liechty, *Sabbatarianism*, pp. 78-84. For Liechty’s analysis of the history of the Transylvanian Sabbatarians see pp. 45 ff.

groups were influenced by various aspects of biblical and post-biblical Judaism. Sharing the experience of being an oppressed religious minority did not automatically lead the Radicals to sympathy with the Jews and there was evidence that they were not immune from the prejudices and stereotypes of their time. However, there were a number of Anabaptists and other radicals with varying degrees of positive encounters with and attitudes toward the Jews and Judaism. Oswald Leber, for example, received eschatological instruction from Jews in Worms. One Anabaptist who stands out for his respect for Judaism and his efforts at Judaizing reform is Andreas Fischer. Fischer not only respected the Jews but, unlike the vast majority of his contemporaries, he was convinced of the soteriological efficacy of post-biblical Judaism. Not surprisingly, the majority of the serious Judaizing reforms among the Anabaptists took place outside western and central Europe – specifically in eastern Europe and northern Italy – places where Jewish communities rebuilt themselves after expulsions from the rest of Europe.

This survey of Radical Reformation attitudes toward the Jews reveals some continuity with attitudes deeply embedded in the world view of both medieval and sixteenth-century European Christians. However, probably for a variety of reasons, there are much fewer overt expressions of hostility toward the Jews to be found in the writings of the Radicals. Only among the writings of Radical Reformers can one discover any expression of the soteriological validity of contemporary Judaism or conscious and deliberate programs of Judaising reform. These attitudes and reforms were dramatically out of step with the rest of European Christendom in the sixteenth century. Unlike most of the rest of their contemporaries, people like Fischer were able to leave behind the Augustinian justification for the presence of Jews in a Christian society and still make room for Jews as Jews in that society. Fischer and those like

him accomplished this by seeing Judaism as an elder sibling to Christianity, a belief system related to Christianity and from which Christians could and should learn. Such an opinion was dangerous to the small minority that held it and received no wider consideration and dissemination until much more recently in the history of Jewish Christian relations. The Hebraists among the Radicals were more likely to appropriate elements of Judaism into their theology than they were to condemn Jews and Judaism.

Now that the patterns of continuity and discontinuity between medieval, Renaissance, Reformation and Radical Reformation attitudes toward Jews and Hebraica have been identified, it is appropriate to investigate more closely the careers of Hans Denck and Ludwig Hätscher in order to identify their encounters with and attitudes toward Jews and Hebraica. This is the burden of the following chapter.

III. Denck, Hätzer, Hebraica and the Jews

A. Hans Denck and the Jews

1. Hebrew Language

Hans Denck most likely began his study of Hebrew while at the University of Ingolstadt from 1517 to 1519. There were a number of students of Hebrew associated with the city and the University at that time. Johannes Eck was the most prominent figure at the University and he had studied Hebrew under Reuchlin prior to his move to Ingolstadt. Johannes Reublin, an active proponent of the study of Hebrew language and literature, lectured at the University. Urbanus Rhegius, another Hebraist, was doing graduate work at Ingolstadt at the time (see above page 24).⁹² Early during Denck's stay, Johannes Böschenstein (1472 - 1540) spent some time in Ingolstadt, though not as a lecturer.⁹³ Though Denck had probably left for Augsburg by the time Reuchlin arrived in the fall of 1519, he may well have returned to hear the great Hebraist lecture in 1520 or early 1521.⁹⁴ After a period of wandering and unsatisfactory employment, Denck travelled to Basle early in 1523 and was received by Oecolampadius, whom he had known from his days in Augsburg. Basle had become a prominent centre for the study of Hebrew and the publication of the linguistic tools of the language (along with its many other academic and publishing accomplishments). There had been some presence of Christian

⁹² Henry George Krahn, "An Analysis Of the Conflict Between the Clergy Of the Reformed Church and the Leaders Of the Anabaptist Movement In Strasbourg, 1524-1534" (Ph.D, University Of Washington, 1969), p. 239 and n. 4.

⁹³ Geiger, *Studium der hebräischen Sprache*, p. 51.

⁹⁴ J. Kiwiet, "The Life of Hans Denck," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 31 (1957): 230-31. It is worth noting that Denck's early Humanist interests were Latin and Greek, with his focus on Hebrew coming later in his life. This may imply that somewhere in his journeys, after his university days, he developed an increased interest and facility in Hebrew.

Hebrew scholarship in Basle from the beginning of the century and Hebrew printing began at least as early as 1516 with the publication of Conrad Pellican's *Hebraicum Psalterium*. Pellican also taught Hebrew in Basle from 1523 to 1526 and presumably Denck would have had the opportunity to study with him though there is no direct evidence that he did so. Though Sebastian Münster, a student of Pellican, did not take up his teaching position at the University of Basle until 1528, Froben of Basle had been publishing his Hebrew grammars from the early 1520s and it is possible that Denck met him there. Oecolampadius himself knew Hebrew and used the Hebrew text for his famous lectures on Isaiah which commenced in the spring of 1523.⁹⁵ Ludwig Hätzer was also working on translation at the time under the guidance of Oecolampadius and it was likely that the two young Hebraists became acquainted at this time.⁹⁶ However he acquired his knowledge of Hebrew, Denck became sufficiently proficient in the language that he was known among European academic circles as a gifted tri-linguist, who collaborated with Hätzer to provide the first translation of the Prophets from Hebrew into German.

2. *Encounters with Jews*

Given the dispersed and decimated state of the Jewish community in Europe at the beginning of the sixteenth century (noted above page 32), Denck's opportunities for contact with Jews would have been limited. In the *Reflections on the Book of the Prophet Micah*, he

⁹⁵ Ibid., pp. 233-34; Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 31-33, 44-45.

⁹⁶ G. Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (London: Epworth Press, 1969), p. 24. F.L. Weis, *The Life, Teachings and Works of Ludwig Hetzer 1500-1529* (Dorchester, Mass.: 1930), p. 127 n. 259 says that Denck and Hätzer encountered one another at Nuremberg in 1524 and again at Augsburg in the spring of 1526.

observed that “in the fewest of cities one finds any Jews among the Christians.”⁹⁷ In Ingolstadt where he attended university from 1517 to 1519, the Jews were arrested and ordered to leave in 1450, and for the next 400 years Jews desiring entry to the city required passes which were valid for one day only.⁹⁸ The city of Augsburg, which he visited a number of times from 1519 to 1527, had been the location of one of the oldest Jewish communities in Germany. After a series of persecutions and expulsions, the Jews were expelled in 1440, and from 1456 no Jews were permitted to dwell in the city. Despite these laws, there were numerous Hebrew books printed in Augsburg from 1514 to 1543, many for religious rather than academic use, indicating that the expulsion might not have been as total as the city records would suggest.⁹⁹ It should be pointed out that these expulsions rarely were permanent or unequivocal. The records indicate a pattern of expulsion followed by a slow relaxation of the edict over a period of time until there were a sufficient number of Jews in the community to incite a new round of persecutions and expulsions.

Following his formal education, Denck became a tutor in the town of Stotzingen near Ulm. In 1499 the Jews were expelled from Ulm and no Jews were permitted to live in any town in the district of Ulm until 1526 when one Jew was allowed to settle in Albeck and others joined him.¹⁰⁰ In 1522 Denck went to Regensburg to become a schoolmaster. The Jews had

⁹⁷ E.J. Furcha, ed. *Selected Writings of Hans Denck 1500-1527* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1989), p. 78.

⁹⁸ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. “Ingolstadt.”

⁹⁹ *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Augsburg,” by A. Freimann.

¹⁰⁰ *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Ulm,” by Schulim Ochser.

been expelled from that city in 1519 with the help of Denck's alleged baptizer, Hubmaier.¹⁰¹

Early in 1523 Denck visited Basle for the first time. There is some debate about the presence of Jews in Basle but clearly the expulsions of the fourteenth century were not final as the Jews were expelled from the city again in 1543.¹⁰² Nuremberg, where Denck taught briefly in 1523, dealt with its Jewish problem in 1499 when the Jews were expelled and not permitted to return.¹⁰³ Denck visited the town of St. Gall in the summer of 1525. There the Jews had been burned or driven out in 1349 and not permitted to settle there again until the nineteenth century.¹⁰⁴ In the fall of 1526 Denck went to Strasbourg which had a record of a Jewish population from the time of Charlemagne. However, after a history of particularly gruesome persecutions, the Jews were expelled in 1388 and the fifteenth century has little record of the Jews. From 1520 they were allowed to enter the city only during the usual hours for strangers and on the condition of wearing a yellow badge for easy identification.¹⁰⁵ Early in 1527 Denck visited Landau. The Jewish community had been decimated in 1349 but was slowly rebuilt and

¹⁰¹ H.H. Ben-Sasson, "Jewish-Christian Disputation in the Setting of Humanism and Reformation in the German Empire," *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966): 387. *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Ratisbon," by A. Eckstein. On the question of whether Hubmaier baptized Denck, see Werner O. Packull, "Denck's Alleged Baptism by Hubmaier. Its Significance for the Origin of South German-Austrian Anabaptism," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 47 (1973): 327-38.

¹⁰² *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Basel," by Moritz Kayserling. For a more radical opinion on the expulsions of the Jews from Switzerland, see *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Switzerland," by Benjamin Sagalowitz.

¹⁰³ *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Nuremberg," by Schulim Ochser.

¹⁰⁴ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Saint Gall,".

¹⁰⁵ *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Strasburg," by A. Ury. The Nazis with their yellow star were doing no more than reviving an age-old tradition in European Christendom. See Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, vol. 8, under "badge" in the subject index for the disconcertingly long list of references to the subject.

in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries they were frequently threatened with expulsion, which finally occurred in 1545.¹⁰⁶ Of these communities visited by Denck in his wanderings, only Augsburg, Basle and Landau were likely to have any remaining Jewish presence.

There were, however, at least two occasions where it is known that Denck did encounter members of the Jewish community. Early in 1527, while wandering down the Rhine as a travelling evangelist, Denck spent some time in Bergzabern, about 20 miles southwest of Speyer.¹⁰⁷ While there he had opportunity for a three-day discussion with the local Jewish community. The reporter of the meeting noted that they discussed the law and many good things were addressed, though no converts were made.¹⁰⁸ Upon his arrival in Worms shortly thereafter, Denck set to work with Hätscher to translate the Old Testament prophets from the Hebrew. In about two months the difficult task was completed in a manner that revealed the

¹⁰⁶ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Landau," by Chasia Turtel.

¹⁰⁷ Though not a large community, Bergzabern was near the Speyer-Worms-Mainz corridor that represented the heart of Ashkenaz. It is no surprise then, that an active Jewish community would be found there. In fact there was a pattern of movement where the Jews, when expelled from one of the more major cities, would move to nearby villages so they could continue their commerce with the inhabitants of the city.

¹⁰⁸ Kiwiet, "Life of Hans Denck," 251; C. Bauman, ed. *The Spiritual Legacy of Hans Denck: Interpretation and Translation of Key Texts*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought. Vol. 47 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), pp. 14-15. Williams, *Radical Reformation*, p. 261, says that Denck "vociferated" with the Jews. However, the actual text of the letter from Nikolaus Thomae to Oecolampadius, identifying Denck as "*hominus literatus*," describes the meeting in these terms: "*Cum Judeis nostris tribus diebus de lege disceptans multa auditu suavia in medium protulit, nihil tamen omnio profecit,*" Ernst Staehelin, ed. *Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads*, reprint ed., vol. 2 (New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971). Apparently in the course of the discussion, Denck had grown critical of Lutheran pastors whom he considered hypocrites regarding the flesh (a frequent criticism which Denck levelled against the Lutheran reformation). Because of the Christian lay audience, Thomae suggested that Denck desist his criticism, to which Denck responded "vociferously" that the "pseudoprophets" should not be protected: "*Hec me admonete iratus vociferabat, pseudoprophetis nunquam parcendum*" (emphasis mine). In Williams' defence, the Latin is obscure with a number of grammatical anomalies and the subject and object are not always clear.

remarkable linguistic capabilities of the translators. Luther believed the translation to have been accomplished with the aid of the Jews of Worms and therefore suspect (See above page 4).¹⁰⁹ It is the contention of this work that there was substance to Luther's suspicion regarding Jewish assistance on the translation as it is almost certain that Denck and Hätscher were in contact with some of the Jews of Worms. Who these Jews might have been will be considered later.

3. Internal Evidence

In Denck's corpus there are twenty-five readily identifiable references to Jews.¹¹⁰ These references reveal an ambivalence regarding the Jews which suggest a person of his time who is prepared nevertheless to question some of the presuppositions of his surrounding culture. Of the twenty-five references, nine refer to the Jews of biblical times. Denck was quite prepared to be critical of both the Jews of the Bible and contemporary Jews: of the Jews of biblical times he says that "they were an exceedingly stubborn and faithless people with few true believers among them," and "ceremonies are an external order, given for the betterment of the coarse people Israel, for whom all spiritual speech was foreign."¹¹¹ Speaking of the Scripture as no

¹⁰⁹ Kiwiet, "Life of Hans Denck," pp. 252-53; Packull, *Mysticism*, pp. 45, 194 nn.81, 82; Bauman, ed. *Spiritual Legacy*, p. 16.

¹¹⁰ This includes nine references in the Micah Commentary, the authorship of which is still disputed. I believe that it would be safer to attribute authorship to the circle around Denck. Anabaptists believed in the interpretive community and from that perspective it would be reasonable for biblical commentary to arise from a community. Nevertheless Denck was a man of powerful character and intellect and it seems likely that much of the content of the commentary, particularly the theology, can be traced back to Denck. Consequently, with this caveat in mind, the Micah Commentary will be treated here as a part of Denck's corpus.

¹¹¹ Bauman, ed. *Spiritual Legacy*, "Whether God is the Cause of Evil (1526)," p. 95; "Concerning the Law of God (1526)," p. 135.

more than a witness to the truth, Denck levels criticism at Jews both past and present: “whoever holds the testimony higher than the truth itself perverts the order, which is an abomination in the eyes of God. That is what all perverse Jews (*alle verkerde Juden*) do and have done, who denied the Law which God with his finger has written in their heart, and sought it [rather] in the book written by human hands.”¹¹² While he does not say that all Jews are perverse as might many of his contemporaries, his definition of perversity of necessity would include most practising Jews. Nor was Denck loathe to identify the Jews as those who rejected Jesus and caused him to suffer and die; in the Micah Commentary we read, “Christ was banished unto death by the Scribes and Jews.”¹¹³

Denck also appeared inclined to believe in the intrinsic superiority of Christianity over Judaism¹¹⁴ and that the Jews needed to be converted to Christianity. In his letter to Oecolampadius near the end of his life he said: “I require no other fruit (the Lord knows) than that as many persons as possible, whether circumcised or baptized or neither, might glorify with one heart and mouth the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. I disagree greatly with those, whoever they might be, who excessively bind the Kingdom of God with ceremonies and elements of the world.”¹¹⁵ In “Concerning True Love (1527),” written in Worms after his encounter with the Jewish community of Bergzabern, he expressed something of a mission

¹¹² Ibid., “Whether God is the Cause of Evil (1526),” p. 95.

¹¹³ Furcha, ed. *Writings of Hans Denck*, p. 172.

¹¹⁴ See Bauman, ed. *Spiritual Legacy*, “Concerning the Law of God (1526),” p. 133; “Concerning True Love (1527),” p. 189, where he says “Not that the contract which the Lord made with his people in the Law of Moses was wrong, but it becomes wrong to those who contradict the Lord’s intention to direct his people in a yet higher way according to the Spirit of Jesus.”

¹¹⁵ Ibid., “Denck’s Letter to Oecolampadius (1527),” p. 244.

strategy regarding the Jews: “It is unnecessary to reject ceremony for the Jews if one desires to proclaim Love to them.”¹¹⁶ In other words, “do not debate the ceremonial law but proclaim Christ.”

Yet the general tone of Denck’s comments regarding the Jews was sympathetic and even reflected some respect for their religion. Often when he did criticize the Jews Denck would level the same criticism at Christians as well.¹¹⁷ While he was prepared on occasion to identify the Jews as being in some way responsible for the death of Christ, he was just as likely to place greater responsibility with the religious leaders of the day – making a polemical point regarding the religious leadership of his own day.¹¹⁸ He was convinced that the Jews continue to be a part of the plan of God for the world. Speaking of the mediatorial function of the Lamb, he identified the people for whom the Lamb fulfills this role as “all people whom God has given [him] as inheritance. Has he not, however, given him all pagans and Jews?” And just as there was the promise of restoration for Christians, the same promise was equally valid for the

¹¹⁶ Ibid., “Concerning True Love (1527),” p. 193.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., “Whether God is the Cause of Evil (1526),” p. 95; “Concerning the Law of God (1526),” pp. 145, 159, 187; “The Order of God (1527),” p. 233.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., “Concerning the Law of God (1526),” p. 145: “that is the reason the most learned always take most offense at the truth, for they suppose that their understanding, which they have so cleverly and delicately extracted from the Holy Scripture, will not fail them. Should perchance a carpenter’s son come along, who had not gone to school, and take them to task for their lies, where would he have been instructed? Therefore, they supposed he rejected the Law because he would not concede their literal misunderstanding. Oh brethren, such happens even today. Blessed is the one who is not offended at Christ. Whoever genuinely has the truth can discern it without any Scripture; [however], the scribes could not do so because they do not receive the truth from the truth but steal from the witness of truth.” He also was capable of speaking of those who “persecuted Christ unto his death” Furcha, ed. *Writings of Hans Denck*, p. 136, without any reference to the Jews, something many of his contemporaries would have had a hard time doing.

Jews.¹¹⁹ Though Denck did suggest at times that Jews needed to be converted to Christianity, he also implied that Judaism still had a certain soteriological efficacy. In “Concerning the Law of God” he suggests that Jews who reject Christ are in a better spiritual state than Gentiles who do the same: “Whoever does not truly follow Christ, if he is a Jew, still remains under the Law; if he is a Gentile, then he remains one and can claim neither the Gospel nor the Law.”¹²⁰ Elsewhere he identified the Word of God proclaimed by Moses and Paul to be the same Word and went on to explain: “The Spirit of God has given them [the Jews] testimony that God alone is to be loved because he alone is good. . . . Now, what is this Word other than what both Moses and Paul have preached, although with a difference? But this difference is only external, which is not the truth itself but rather only a testimony of the truth.”¹²¹ Denck’s vision of religious toleration, implicit in his understanding of the true Gospel, included the Jews as well as the Turks:

Such confidence, even in externals, would be found with the right gospel that everyone would let the other travel through and dwell in his land securely, be he Turk or heathen, whatever he might believe, owing obedience to one authority. Can one want more? I rest my case with what the prophet says here, “Each one of the nations shall be able to walk in the name of its God. [sic] In other words, no one shall take it out on the other for being a gentile, Jew or Christian, but allow everyone to travel in the name of his God. Thus, we should enjoy God’s gifts in peace.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Bauman, ed. *Spiritual Legacy*, “Whether God is the Cause of Evil (1526),” p. 89. See also in the same work where Denck says that God “is still the God who wills that all Israel be saved,” p. 115; Furcha, ed. *Writings of Hans Denck*, pp. 82,97-98, 176-77. It is unclear whether Denck believed that this restoration of the Jews would occur through conversion to Christianity.

¹²⁰ Bauman, ed. *Spiritual Legacy*, “Concerning the Law of God (1526),” p. 135.

¹²¹ Ibid., “Whether God is the Cause of Evil (1526),” p. 95. See also ibid., “Concerning the Law of God (1526),” p. 133, “Moses not only interpreted the Law but was enabled to keep it through the power of the Word inscribed in Jewish hearts.”

¹²² Furcha, ed. *Writings of Hans Denck*, p. 128.

There is only one non-hypothetical reference to contemporary Jews in Denck's corpus.

The Micah Commentary contains a discussion on the practice of usury:

Among us Christians it was customary that for a time the Jews only, as they are called, used to practice usury, since they were not allowed to work. Now, however, it has come to this that the Jews too are granted [to work]. This did not bring diminishment to usury, but as one can readily sense, it has more and more increased. In the fewest of cities one finds any Jews among the Christians, but plenty of usurers, nonetheless.¹²³

This passage is interesting for two reasons. First is the author's comment on the rarity of Jews in central and western Europe. Second is his knowledge of the status of the Jews in Christian lands – the fact that in the past Jews had not been allowed other forms of employment but currently had greater opportunities. This information is extraneous to the point being made in the commentary and reveals not only a greater knowledge of Jews and their history among the Christians but a certain sympathy for them in their history with Christians. The Jewish practice of usury was one of the most frequently cited causes of Christian hostility toward the Jews and many, if not most, of Denck's contemporaries would not have passed up this opportunity to include the standard condemnation of the Jews and their abuse of Christians.¹²⁴

Overall Denck was less anti-Jewish than many of his contemporaries. Like almost all of his Christian contemporaries, he still believed Christianity to be superior to Judaism, he implied that Jews should be converted to Christianity, and was willing to blame the Jewish race for the death of Christ. Yet he did not discount totally the validity of the Jewish faith, he believed as much in their restoration as in the restoration of Christians, his work contained no

¹²³ Ibid., p. 76.

¹²⁴ Remember Reuchlin's solution for usurious Jews (above p. 21 and n. 47). On the Jews and usury see Simonsohn, *Apostolic See*, vol. 8 in the index under "usury" for another long list of references.

anti-Jewish polemic, and he displayed a surprising level of knowledge of Jewish relations to Christians and sympathy for the condition of the Jews. Nowhere did he defend or justify persecution of the Jews but neither did he condemn it. Neither do his writings show a significant change in attitude toward the Jews following his known encounters with them. Anti-Jewish polemic did not begin to appear but neither did any hint that Judaism was a religion equal to Christianity. Denck continued to be a man of his time regarding the Jews, yet his gentleness of spirit and tolerant outlook included the Jews in a way that many of his Christian contemporaries were unable to do.

B. Ludwig Hätzer and the Jews

1. Hebrew Language

Ludwig Hätzer was born some time around 1500 in the Swiss town of Bischofszell in the canton of Thurgau. In the fall of 1517 he matriculated at the University of Basle in the philosophical faculty. Though he never received an academic degree and concluded his formal education by about 1520, by 1523 he was considered a tri-linguist in the classical languages of Latin, Greek and Hebrew. From 1523 to 1526 Hätzer spent a considerable portion of his time in either Zürich or Basle. As mentioned above (p. 48), there had been some presence of Christian scholarship in Hebrew in Basle from the beginning of the century and Hätzer would have had opportunity to associate with, and develop his Hebrew skills with the likes of Pellican, Münster and especially Oecolampadius for whom he had done considerable translation work during those years.¹²⁵ However, it seems most likely that the greatest

¹²⁵ Apparently Hätzer did not know Oecolampadius prior to the fall of 1525 when, banished from Augsburg, friends wrote letters of recommendation on his behalf to Oecolampadius. See Weis,

responsibility for the development of Hätzer's Hebrew skills can be attributed to Wolfgang Capito. From 1515 to 1520 Capito was a professor in Old Testament at the University as well as dean of the faculty of theology from 1518, the same year in which he published his Hebrew grammar. He had a part in the education of Oecolampadius, being one of the examiners for his friend's licentiate in 1516. It is clear that Hätzer knew and respected Capito, and a close teacher/student relationship would help explain why, when Hätzer found himself in trouble with the judiciary of Basle because of a moral indiscretion with a maid of that city in 1526, he fled to Strasbourg and the hospitality of Capito.¹²⁶

Zürich was a significant centre of Reformation Hebrew study and Ulrich Zwingli was a primary reason why. When he moved to Zürich in 1519, he secured the services of Andreas Böschenstein in order to improve his Hebrew language skills and he returned to the study of the language on a regular basis until he could be considered competent in the language as evidenced by his exegetical works. Also at Zürich at the time was the former priest and close associate of Zwingli Leo Jud (1482 - 1542), possibly of Jewish heritage though he himself did not know. Jud was a truly prominent Hebraist in Europe. Hätzer could have learned much in the company of such a collection of Christian Hebraists.¹²⁷

Hetzer, p. 90.

¹²⁶ James Matthew Kittelson, *Wolfgang Capito: From Humanist to Reformer*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought ; v. 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 24-25; Ernst Staehelin, "Wolfgang Fabricius Capito," in *Professoren der Universität Basel aus fünf Jahrhunderten: Bildnisse und Würdigungen*, ed. Andreas Staehelin (Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt, 1960), p. 20. Capito received instruction in Hebrew from the Jewish convert Matthäus Adrianus (see Geiger, *Studium der hebräischen Sprache*, pp. 41-42), though apparently Adrianus was less than enthusiastic as an educator (see Kittelson, *Capito*, pp. 21-22). Note that Hätzer's formal education at Basle came to an end about the same time that Capito left the University there.

¹²⁷ G. Lloyd Jones, *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983), pp. 48-50, 67-71.

When Hätzer fled to Strasbourg in disgrace in 1526, he was received by Capito.

Strasbourg was becoming a significant centre of Hebrew studies with Capito, Bucer and a young Paul Fagius forming the core of a powerful Humanist/Hebraist circle. The degree to which Denck would have been welcome into this circle with his reputation as a radical is open to conjecture. Nevertheless Hätzer gained access through his relationship with Capito and, at the same time, he also entered into a closer relationship with Denck. One or more of these Hebraists convinced Hätzer to turn to the original Hebrew as he worked on his translation of Oecolampadius' commentary on Isaiah. No doubt this is when the idea of the translation of the Prophets began to take shape in Hätzer's mind.¹²⁸ He had begun, a year earlier, with a translation into German of the prophet Malachai along with the commentary of Oecolampadius and then proceeded from that to the Isaiah project. When he was convinced to turn to the Hebrew rather than the Latin, he realized his limitations in the language and gratefully accepted the help of Denck, whose skills by all accounts, including Hätzer's, were superior to his own.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ J. F. Gerhard Goeters, "Ludwig Haetzer: A Marginal Anabaptist," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 29 (1955): 257.

¹²⁹ Ludwig Hätzer and Hans Denck, *Alle Propheten nach Hebräischer Sprach verteutscht*, first folio ed. (Worms: Peter Schoffer, 1527), p. ii r: "Es ist wissend wie ich gar nahet bei eym jar den propheten Maleachi verteutscht hab/ mit außlegung Johan. Ecolampadii/ darinn ich meldung thet/ wo Gott hülff bewise/ so wölt ich auch Jesaia mit ehegedachts Johan. Ecolampadii außlegung verdolmetschen/ dīß hab ich mich nit lang darnach undernomen zü leysten/ und aber grosse sorg gehebt/ wie ich zum ersten den text zum aller besten möchte/ nach Hebräischer sprach/ herfür thün/ und den eynfältigen den selbigen anzeygen. Hat es ja Gott aus gnaden (dass ich sol bekennen) also verfügt/ mir schwachen solicher mühe und arbeyt eynen ghülffen gesandt/ Hans Dengken/ der mir von Gots wegen zü willen ward/ mir in disem zü verhelffen." A number of earlier scholars were inclined to give most if not all of the credit for the translation to Denck rather than Hätzer. See, for example, Georg Baring, "Die "Wormser Propheten," eine vorlutherische evangelische Prophetenübersetzung aus dem Jahre 1527," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 31 (1934): 23-24 where he described Denck as the "Hauptübersetzer." See also J. F. Gerhard Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529: Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier: Eine Randfigur der frühen Täuferbewegung* (Gütersloh: Bertolsmann, 1957), p. 99

2. Encounters with Jews

Ludwig Hätzer would have had limited opportunities for encounters with Jews during much of his early life. Though there had been Jewish communities in Bischofszell, Basle, Zürich, and elsewhere in Switzerland, by the end of the fifteenth century they had been expelled from all those communities and the only Jewish communities in the country were limited to a few towns in the county of Baden until the eve of the French Revolution.¹³⁰ Of the cities that Hätzer visited outside Switzerland, Augsburg expelled her Jews in 1439,¹³¹ Memmingen's Jewish community no longer existed by 1500,¹³² what was left of Strasbourg's Jewish community was expelled in 1388 and by 1512 the city had established a hefty tax on any Jew who might wish to enter the city. Nuremberg had effectively dealt with its Jewish problem by 1499,¹³³ and Regensburg, with the help of Balthasar Hubmaier, had expelled its Jewish community in 1519.¹³⁴ The only places visited by Hätzer which may have had any remnants of a Jewish community were Constance, which he visited briefly in 1525 and again in

n. 2 where he attributes similar opinions to U. Heberle, L. Keller, F. E. W. Roth, Christian and Albrecht Hege. However, based on the above quotation from Hätzer's Foreword as well as other evidence, Goeters restored Hätzer to the position of the primary author with Denck as an expert and valued helper (pp. 99-104).

¹³⁰ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Switzerland," by Sagalowitz. On the question of Jews in Basle see above n. 102.

¹³¹ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Augsburg," by Zvi Avneri. However, see above p. 50, regarding hints of an ongoing Jewish presence in Augsburg.

¹³² *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Memmingen."

¹³³ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Nuremberg."

¹³⁴ Ben-Sasson, "Jewish-Christian Disputation," p. 387.

1528 when he was arrested and executed,¹³⁵ Baden, where he was sent in 1526 to participate in a disputation,¹³⁶ and Worms, where, together with Denck, he translated the Prophets in 1527. He may have returned to Worms in 1528 in order to get the first part of his final publication to press. This final publication is of considerable significance and will be addressed later.

3. Internal Evidence

In 1524 Hätzer's translation of *Ein Beweis, dass der wahre Messias gekommen sei, auf den die Juden noch ohne Ursache in der Zukunft warten, geschrieben durch Rabbi Samuel (Maroccanus)*¹³⁷ was published. It is one of the more popular tracts written ostensibly to aid in the conversion of the Jews, with a long history in many languages.¹³⁸ The Rabbi Samuel in question may have been a Jew from Fez, Morocco who had converted to Christianity in the latter part of the eleventh century and written this "proof" of the "correctness of the medieval church doctrine against the Jews" based on Old Testament texts.¹³⁹

¹³⁵ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Constance," by Toni Oelsner. See Goeters, "Haetzer: A Marginal Anabaptist," pp. 251-62 for a chronology of Hätzer's life.

¹³⁶ *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. "Switzerland," by Sagalowitz. If Hätzer actually went to Baden there is no record that he participated in the disputation. See Goeters, "Haetzer: A Marginal Anabaptist," p. 256.

¹³⁷ Roughly translated as *A proof that the true Messiah, for whom the Jews still wait vainly in the future, has come, written by Rabbi Samuel*.

¹³⁸ Apparently originally written in Arabic and subsequently translated into Greek, Latin and other languages. The document, translated into English, continued to be used in a bowdlerised form by Missionary Societies until the end of the last century! See A. Jukyn Williams, *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae Until the Renaissance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935), pp. 228-32.

¹³⁹ Goeters, "Haetzer: A Marginal Anabaptist," p. 25, suggests that Samuel is from Toledo while Williams, *Adversus Judaeos*, p. 228, and the title of the document identify Fez, Morocco as his city of origin. The question about the authorship of the document continues to generate discussion. A number of modern scholars consider it to be a forgery by the man who ostensibly translated the work

There may have been a number of reasons why Hätzer translated such a document.

Goeters suggests without further explanation that the work probably was done on commission.¹⁴⁰ It is possible to defend this suggestion based on the record of publication and translation of this little document at that time. In 1523 Johann Herwagen published the Latin text in Strasbourg.¹⁴¹ Then, in the following year, there were no less than three translations into German. Hätzer's translation was printed in Augsburg by Sylvan Ottmar and in Zurich by Hans Hager.¹⁴² Wenceslaus Link also made a translation which Jörg Gastel, the Zwickau printer, put through at least two printings.¹⁴³ The third translation into the German was done anonymously and printed by Amandus Farckall in Colmar.¹⁴⁴ Clearly there was a significant popular demand for this document. The publication of at least three German translations in one year suggests that printers may well have been commissioning translations of a Latin text which had proven popular the previous year. The popularity of this document at this particular time is something of a mystery. Given that it was translated into German and that of the above mentioned cities,

from Arabic into Latin. The question remains open. There were two R. Samuel's of Fez who converted from Judaism, one to Christianity, the other to Islam, and wrote against their former religion, either of which could have been the author of the document.

¹⁴⁰ Goeters, "Haetzer: A Marginal Anabaptist," p. 253.

¹⁴¹ Rabbi Samuelis Morochiani, *Quod iudaei messiam, qui venit, ceu venturum temere exspectent* (Strasbourg: Johann Herwagen, 1523).

¹⁴² Rabbi Samuelis Marochitanus, *Ein bewysung, das der war Messias kummen sei, des die Juden noch on ursach zum künftig sin, wartend*, trans. Ludwig Hätzer (Zürich: Hans Hager, 1524); Idem, *Ein bewysung, das der war Messias kummen sei, des die Juden noch on ursach zum künftig sin, wartend*, trans. Ludwig Hätzer (Augsburg: Silvan Ottmar, 1524).

¹⁴³ Idem, *Das Jhesus Nazarenus der ware Messias sey. Derhalben die Juden auff kaynen andern warten dörffen*, trans. Wenceslaus Link (Zwickau: Jörg Gastel, 1524).

¹⁴⁴ Idem, *Ein Epistel rabbi Samuelis des Juden, darinn er anzeigen und bewerlich vernicht die öden und unfruchtbarn hoffnung der Juden die sye haben von Messia, daß der selbig noch kommen sol*, trans. Anonymous (Colmar: Amandus Farckall, 1524).

only Augsburg may have had anything resembling a Jewish community (see above p. 50), it seems clear that the intended audience was Christian rather than Jewish. It has been suggested that Hätzer's translation represented a legitimate effort to participate in the Protestants' renewed effort to convert the Jews. It will be remembered that only the year previous Luther had published his own missionary treatise *That Jesus Christ was Born a Jew*,¹⁴⁵ in which he was relatively sympathetic to the Jews, apparently fully convinced that they would convert *en masse* once they heard the Gospel presented without Catholic accretions. There were other renewed efforts by Protestants, including Hebraists, to bring about the conversion of the Jews and it is quite possible that these translations fit into this trend.¹⁴⁶ If a goal of the document was the conversion of the Jews, it was intended to accomplish that indirectly as a source for Christians to use in conversation with Jews, rather than as something to be read by Jews themselves. However, by 1519 most of the Jews had been expelled from western Europe (see above p. 32), so if this was truly intended as a part of a renewed missionary effort to the Jews, it came about at a time when the Jewish population in Europe was the smallest it had been in a thousand years. But once the Augustinian understanding of the Jews in a Christian society was lost, many came to believe that there was no room for Jews in a Christian society. Furthermore, the strong eschatological sense that pervaded the sensibilities of many Christians might lead

¹⁴⁵ Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther: An Introduction to His Life and Work*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), p. 89. Christian efforts to convert the Jews have a much longer, and on occasion, much more forceful history. See Chazan, ed. *Church, State, and Jew*, pp. 239-76, and David Berger, "Mission to the Jews and Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Polemical Literature of the High Middle Ages," *American Historical Review* 91, no. 3 (1986): 576-91.

¹⁴⁶ Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529*, p. 36. On the Reformation mission to the Jews and the role of the Hebraists in that mission, see Jerome Friedman, "Sebastian Münster, the Jewish Mission, and Protestant Antisemitism," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 70 (1979): 238-59; Armas K. E. Holmio, *The Lutheran Reformation and the Jews: The Birth of the Protestant Jewish Missions* (Michigan: Finnish Lutheran Book Concern, 1949).

them to the conclusion that the time for the conversion of the remnant of the Jews was present.

Hätzer himself, in the subtitle of his translation, suggests that the Christian reader was the intended target of his efforts and he points to another reason for the work. He thought it possible that weak Christians would experience a strengthening of their faith from such a clear demonstration of Old Testament prophecy fulfilled.¹⁴⁷ For Hätze, the document was translated at least as much for the spiritual benefit of Christians as for the Jews.

It is also possible that Hätzer had other matters in mind that had little to do with the Jews. In the first edition of the translation, published in Augsburg, many of the overtly Catholic statements in the text that Protestants would find particularly offensive, Hätzer softened with marginal notes. In the second edition, published March 12, 1524 in Zürich, Hätzer inserted in a new Foreword a very Zwinglian critique of the content and structure of the Catholic mass which was still in force in the city. It is possible that Hätzer was addressing more than one concern with his one document, i.e. his concern for Christians of weak faith, his desire for the conversion of the Jews and his desire for the advancement of the Reformation, but the possibility does exist that the document had less to do with the Jews than with the Catholic-Zwinglian debate in Zurich.¹⁴⁸ Indeed, the very facts that the document was translated into German and published in communities with little or no recent history of a Jewish presence

¹⁴⁷ Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529*, p. 36. The subtitle reads: “*Nutzlich für die schwachgleubigen/ dann hierinn ein yetlicher Christ sinen glouben wol stercken mag/ in dem/ so er findet die lkare zügnus aller Propheten. etc.*” Roughly translated as: “Useful for the weak in faith, for here one of many Christians who might desire to strengthen his faith will find the clear testimony of the Prophets. etc.” (Samuelis Marochitanus, *Ein bewysung*, [Zürich]).

¹⁴⁸ Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529*, pp. 36-37; Goeters, “Haetzer: A Marginal Anabaptist,” p. 253. On the possible complexity and subtlety of motives displayed by Christian Hebraists on the question of missionary efforts toward the Jews see Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 214-15.

(Augsburg, Zurich, Zwickau and Colmar), suggest that the intended primary audience for all the editions and translations was Christian.

Regardless of the motive or motives for the translation, such a publication would not qualify one as a friend of the Jews and there is no reason to believe that at that time in his life Hätzer's attitude toward the Jews was any more charitable than most sixteenth-century European Christians.

Hätzer made another particularly significant reference to the Jews in his writings which will be addressed in the final chapter.

Summary

Neither Hätzer nor Denck had much opportunity to encounter Jews in their wanderings, though it is clear that eventually both did. They both learned Hebrew in the course of their formal or informal educations, and while it would not be unreasonable to speculate that Hätzer was taught primarily by Capito, there is no clear evidence about who might have taught Hebrew to Denck. By all accounts Denck was the superior Hebraist despite the lack of clarity regarding his academic lineage. In their writings both men reflected a number of the presuppositions of their time regarding the Jews. Yet, like many of the Anabaptists, their reservations were more theological and philosophical than personal or racial. Neither of them repeated the standard denunciations of contemporary Jews, and Denck in particular showed an ability to step beyond the anti-Jewish presuppositions of his day and allow for the possibility of some redemptive role in contemporary Judaism. He expressed a sympathetic understanding of the history of the Jews in Christian Europe, and his gentleness of spirit and tolerant vision

easily included the Jews. It is possible to see in some of Denck's perspectives on Jews and Judaism ideas which found their fullest expression in the life and thought of Andreas Fischer. Denck was beginning to move away from the Augustinian understanding of Jews and Judaism toward a respect for Judaism as a dynamic and valuable faith in its own right.

It would appear that both Denck and Hätzer participated at least nominally in the renewed Protestant mission to the Jews – Denck with his three-day debate in Bergzabern and Hätzer with his translation of a popular missionary pamphlet. It is significant that when Denck got angry in his debate, it was with Protestant religious leaders and not the Jews, and that Hätzer's translation clearly was directed more to a Christian audience than it was to the Jews.

However, the lack of hostile references to the Jews by both Hebraists, while admirable, must be placed carefully within the history of the Protestant mission to the Jews. This was the earliest and friendliest stage of that mission, the tone dictated by Luther's first treatise on the Jews. There was considerable hope for a successful mission at this early stage, and relations between Protestants and Jews were relatively friendly. The truly hostile Protestant polemical literature only began to surface in 1538 and beyond, by which time both Hätzer and Denck had been dead for more than a decade.

In the first chapter of this study the pattern of the development of Christian Hebraica through the medieval, Renaissance and Reformation periods was compared with the persistent hatred of the Jews by Christians which increased at the same time that Hebraica was becoming increasingly accessible to scholars. The argument has been made that this increase in intolerance was brought about at least in part by the dissolution of Augustine's theology of the Jews which had held sway in Europe until the development of Christian Hebraica had proved

his theory untenable. The second chapter investigated more closely the same patterns in the Radical Reformation. Here it was discovered that, for a number of possible reasons, the radicals were less inclined to repeat the standard anti-Jewish polemic. Among Anabaptists and other radicals in western Europe there was little at all about the Jews, notable exceptions being Andreas Fischer, Melchior Hoffman, Augustine Bader and his disciple Oswald Leber. In eastern Europe and northern Italy, however, the locations in Europe where the Jewish communities were most populous and active, there is a record of considerable conscious Judaizing reform among the radicals, with a number of instances of individuals and even whole communities converting to Judaism. The one place in western Europe where there was a significant record of interaction between Anabaptists and Jews was the city of Worms. Therefore the next chapter will investigate the history of the Jewish and Anabaptist communities in Worms as well as the existing record of Jewish-Christian encounters in that city.

IV.External Evidence: Jews and Anabaptists in Worms

This chapter will provide the external evidence for Jewish cooperation in the translation of the “Worms Prophets,” including names of prominent Jews in Worms with a record of collaboration with Christian Hebraist contemporaries of Denck and Hätzer. The unusual nature of the Anabaptist community of Worms will also be revealed. The first section in this chapter will summarize the history of the Jewish community in Worms. The second section will investigate the record of Jewish-Christian encounters and collaboration in Worms, identifying a pattern of Jewish willingness to cooperate with Christians who were developing their Hebrew skills. And the third section will investigate the history and unusual makeup of the Anabaptist community in Worms – a community with a much briefer history than that of the Jews.

A. History of the Jewish Community

The Jewish community in Worms was one of the oldest in Europe and its history fades back into the mists of legend with stories placing Jews in the city at the time of the Romans. The first truly historical reference to Jews in Worms dates from around 1000, the synagogue was founded in 1034 and in 1074 the emperor provided the Jews of the city, already living in separate quarters, with exemptions from port duties. This was the first in a series of imperial privileges as the emperor established sole authority over the Jews of his empire.¹⁴⁹ The persecutions of the First Crusade of 1096 eliminated the entire Jewish community of Worms. About 800 were murdered by the crusaders, some committed suicide and others were forcibly converted (these were allowed by the Emperor to return to Judaism in the following year). The

¹⁴⁹ For examples of these imperial privileges see Chazan, ed. *Church, State, and Jew*, pp. 63-66 and 123-26.

community slowly rebuilt itself, and, like many of the other communities in Germany, experienced cycles of taxation, persecution and relative prosperity. The community was destroyed completely again with the persecutions surrounding the Black Death in 1349, and Jews were not allowed to return until 1355. In 1377 the community consisted of only 36 members. A period of relative peace followed so that by 1495, in a city of six to seven thousand residents, the Jews numbered about 250. Of these, only fifty-seven were adult men. It would be from among these men that prospective Hebrew tutors would be found for Christians interested in the language.¹⁵⁰ Once the Jews were expelled from Regensburg in 1519, the only two Jewish communities of any size in all Germany were Frankfurt and Worms, and it was left to the members of these communities to maintain the religious and cultural life of the Jews of northern Europe.¹⁵¹

B. Prominent Jews in Worms and their encounters with Christians

This section will establish the pattern of collaboration between the Jews of Worms and Christian students of Hebrew who came to them for assistance.

As early as the second half of the fifteenth century there is a record of radicalized Christian scholars consulting the Jews of Worms in order to learn Hebrew. John of Wesel, an active Hussite leader, was known to have “consorted” with the learned Jews of Worms in order to learn Hebrew. These two facts were sufficient for him to find himself on trial for heresy in

¹⁵⁰ Fritz Reuter, “Worms,” in *Germania Judaica*, ed. Arye Maimon, Mordechai Breuer, Yacov Guggenheim, vol. 3.2 (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995), pp. 1671-72. For the general history of the community see *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, s. v. “Worms,” by Zvi Avneri and *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Worms,” by Schulim Ochser.

¹⁵¹ Graetz, *History of the Jews*, p. 417.

1479.¹⁵² Two rabbis who lived in Worms at the time were Rabbi Isaak Eisik ben Abraham Reutlingen who moved to Worms as early as 1470, and a judge, known only as Rabbi S., who served the Jews of Worms in the third quarter of the fifteenth century.¹⁵³ While there is no direct evidence that either of these men actually instructed John in Hebrew, options would be limited in such a small community.

A less radical religious figure with an interest in Hebrew was Johann von Dalberg (1455-1503), the bishop of Worms. He and his friend Rudolph Agricola had learned Hebrew from a converted Jew who lived with them in Heidelberg in 1484. The bishop was known and praised for his knowledge and promotion of the study of Hebrew, but even more important was his well known and much praised library of Hebrew books (to which Reuchlin had access). There is no direct knowledge of any contact with the Jews of Worms, but an extensive library of Hebrew books could not have been obtained without contact with Jews.¹⁵⁴

In the fall of 1525 William Tyndale (1494? - 1536), fleeing from the authorities in Cologne, arrived in Worms with a few sheets of the interrupted printing of his newly translated New Testament in hand. In the spring of 1526 he was able to see his project to completion at

¹⁵² Newman, *Jewish Influence*, pp. 437-38. Interestingly enough, there was a Jewish perception that the early Hussite movement was a movement of return to Judaism. The burning of Hus is described in a contemporary Jewish account as a martyrdom, concluding the account with the traditional Jewish phrase: "for the sanctification of the Lord's name." The Christian account of Hus' execution includes this imprecation of Hus by the bishops at his defrocking: "Woe unto thee, accursed Judas, since thou hast forsaken the counsel of peace and hast adhered to the counsel of the Jews. . . ." See Ben-Sasson, "Reformation," pp. 245-49. Ben-Sasson attributes this perception of the Judaizing nature of the movement to wishful thinking on the part of the Jews (p. 249). However, the presence of a Hussite leader among the Jews of Worms suggests that there may be cause to investigate this area further.

¹⁵³ Reuter, "Worms," pp. 1680-82.

¹⁵⁴ Bernhard Walde, *Christliche Hebraisten Deutschlands am Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1916), pp. 183-84.

the press of Peter Schöffer, the same press used on more than one occasion by both Denck and Hätscher. As a fugitive throughout his stay on the continent, Tyndale was remarkably successful at hiding his tracks and there are few sure signs of where he was at any given time and it is unknown when he left Worms or where he went.¹⁵⁵ He may still have been there when Denck and Hätscher arrived early in 1527.¹⁵⁶ There is considerable debate about where Tyndale learned his Hebrew and how proficient he became in the language. While the latter question is not an issue in this study,¹⁵⁷ the former is, though no firm conclusions can be made. One firm source regarding his stay in Worms and his knowledge of Hebrew, comes from the diary of the Lutheran Georg Spalatin (1484 - 1545), in which he recorded a report by Cologne professor Hermann Buschius (c. 1468 - 1534) on August 11, 1526 about an Englishman he had met in Worms who was “so skilled in seven languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English, French, that whichever he spoke you would suppose it his native tongue.”¹⁵⁸ This text

¹⁵⁵ Because there is no external evidence regarding Tyndale and the Jews of Worms, the question of the probability of his relationship with this community requires a detailed analysis of the internal evidence.

¹⁵⁶ John Rothwell Slater, *The Sources of Tyndale's Version of the Pentateuch* (Chicago: University Press, 1906), pp. 11-12, 17. Apparently he published his introduction to Romans in Worms late in 1526. See William A. Clebsch, *England's Earliest Protestants 1520-1535* (New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1964), p. 140.

¹⁵⁷ Perhaps the most critical of Tyndale's Hebrew skills was Dahlia M. Karpman, “William Tyndale's Response to the Hebraic Tradition,” *Studies in the Renaissance* 14 (1967): 110-30 who concluded that it was more likely “that the Hebrew Bible wasn't Tyndale's primary version and was only consulted on some points” (p. 115) and that while he used Hebrew scholarship in his translation effort, his fluency in Hebrew was questionable (pp. 129-130). Others have held substantially different opinions. J.F. Mozley, “Tyndale's Knowledge of Hebrew,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1935): 396, concluded that “in essential accuracy to the Hebrew he is superior to Luther, the Vulgate, and the LXX, and not inferior to Pagninus.” This is neither the time nor place to make an original contribution to this debate but the truth is probably somewhere between these two extremes.

¹⁵⁸ Quoted in Slater, *Sources of Tyndale's Version*, p. 17. The original can be found in Johann Georg Schelhorn, *Amoenitates literariae : quibus variae observationes, scripta item quaedam anecdota & rariora opuscula exhibentur*, 14 v. in 7 vols., vol. 4 (Francofurti & Lipsiae: Apud Daniel.

requires a number of comments. First and most obvious, Tyndale was still in Worms as late as the summer of 1526. Secondly, Buschius would have to be equally competent in each of these languages to be able to make such a judgement, and while he was a humanist, there is no record that he knew any Hebrew at all. Clearly the comment requires a healthy scepticism. Having said that, the fact that Buschius considered Tyndale to be competent in Hebrew at this stage would indicate, if his comment has any historical value, that Tyndale must have begun his Hebrew studies prior to his arrival in Worms only a few short months earlier, the most likely location being the university in Wittenberg where he may have matriculated in 1524.¹⁵⁹ The fact, however, that Tyndale could converse in Hebrew would seem to indicate that at least some of his training would have come from Jews who would be much more likely to teach oral as well as written Hebrew than the Christian Hebraists in Wittenberg. A number of scholars believe that it is reasonable to speculate that Tyndale did receive instruction and assistance from the Jews of Worms so that he was able to complete his translation of the Pentateuch by the end of 1529.¹⁶⁰

Bartholomaei, 1725), p. 431 and reads: “*Id operis versum esse ab Anglo, illic cum duobus aliis Britannis divertente, ita VII. linguarum perito, Hebraicae, Graecae, Latinae, Italicae, Hispanicae, Britannicae, Gallicaee, ut, quam cunque loquatur, in ea natum putas.*”

¹⁵⁹ See P. Smith, “Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century,” *English Historical Review* 36, no. 143 (1921): 422-23, though Smith’s presentation of a supposed record of Tyndale’s matriculation at the University based on an anagram of his name is not very convincing. Sir Thomas More, *The Dialogue Concerning Tyndale*, The English Works of Sir Thomas More, vol. 2 (London; New York: Eyre and Spottiswoode; Lincoln Mac Veagh, 1931), p. 315 was convinced that Tyndale went straight to Wittenberg upon his departure from England. However, More’s concern was more polemical than historical.

¹⁶⁰ See Slater, *Sources of Tyndale’s Version*, p. 18; Robert Demaus, *William Tindale, a Biography: Being a Contribution to the Early History of the English Bible*, revised popular ed. (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1904), pp. 169-70; E. I. J. Rosenthal, “Rashi and the English Bible,” in *Studia Semitica*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 58.

There are a few internal hints that Tyndale did make use of the assistance of Jewish Rabbis. In his translation of the word תְּטוּفֹת – *totafot* – in Deuteronomy 6:8 and 11:18 (known now in English as phylacteries – small black boxes containing parchment scrolls which are used in prayer), Tyndale deviated from the known Christian tradition and described them as “papers of remembrance.” Apparently this bit of information about the nature and content of phylacteries was obtained from a Jewish contact. Another instance where Tyndale appears to have made use of Jewish assistance is in Genesis 2:13 where he identified the location of the garden of Eden, “Kush” in the text, as being next to India. Typically Kush was identified as Ethiopia, but there was a Jewish interpretive tradition which allowed that Kush could be a neighbour of India, which would be a less unlikely location of Eden.¹⁶¹ In the translation of 1 Samuel 20:4, Tyndale followed the reading in the Targum rather than in the Hebrew text. E. I. J. Rosenthal suggested that “perhaps Tindale owes this acquaintance with the Targum to personal instruction from Jews.”¹⁶² Again it must be emphasized that there is no certainty that Tyndale received instruction in Hebrew from the Jews of Worms; nevertheless the fact that he could converse in Hebrew and the few telltale signs of his independent reliance on the Jewish interpretive tradition make the suggestion a reasonable one, particularly when there is a record of Jews in Worms at that time who were cooperating with Christians in their pursuit of Hebraica (see immediately below).

In the first part of the sixteenth century, there is an exciting record of prominent Jewish

¹⁶¹ Michael Weitzman, “On Translating the Old Testament: the Achievement of William Tyndale,” *Reformation* 1 (1996): 168-69.

¹⁶² Rosenthal, “Rashi and the English Bible,” p. 77. He does follow the comment with a question mark because there is as yet no external confirmation of this possibility.

scholars in Worms cooperating with Christians in their pursuit of Hebrew language studies and more arcane areas of Hebraica. Caspar Amman, a humanist who travelled in some of the same circles as Hätzer and especially Denck,¹⁶³ had been in correspondence with the notable scholar, Rabbi Naftali Hirtz ben Rabbi Eliezer Treves, when he was probably still in Worms.

Apparently Amman undertook this correspondence by requesting a letter of recommendation to the great man by a student of his, Rabbi Raphael Wolf of Hagenau, who was the brother of Rabbi Samuel ben Eliezer Mi'sai, Rabbi of Worms and “*Reichsrabbiner*” of the Empire.¹⁶⁴ Rabbi Raphael’s recommendation was effective and the relationship between Amman and Rabbi Naftali developed to the point that R. Naftali had loaned Amman a punctuated¹⁶⁵ Pentateuch and was willing to send him other rare books which would aid Amman in his pursuit of Cabalistic knowledge (but only after the Pentateuch was returned). The probable

¹⁶³ Denck had stayed with the legendary monk Veit Bild in 1519 and subsequently maintained a brief correspondence with him. Kiwiet, “Life of Hans Denck,” p. 232. Amman corresponded with Bild between 1521 and 1523 regarding the acquisition of certain Hebrew and Christian works at a book fair and made mention of the activities of Denck in one of his letters written in 1523. Zimmer, “Jewish and Christian Hebraist Collaboration,” p. 80; Kiwiet, “Life of Hans Denck,” p. 235 n.63. One should not make too much of this fact by itself as the extant correspondence between Denck and the monk all dates from the spring of 1520 (available in Bauman’s translation of Denck’s works pp. 272-274). However, they were both Hebraists and Amman did know of Denck.

¹⁶⁴ The “*Reichsrabbiner*” was a member of the local council, possibly selected by the council and then affirmed, originally by the Emperor, later by the Bishop of the diocese. He was also called the “bishop of the Jews.” For Rabbi Samuel’s political career see Moritz Stern, *Die Wormser Reichsrabbiner Samuel und Jakob 1521-1574* (Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1937), pp. 1-14. See also Eric Zimmer, *Jewish Synods in Germany During the Late Middle Ages (1286-1603)* (New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1978), pp. 61-62 for the confirmation of Rabbi Samuel as the Chief Rabbi at the time by the convert from Judaism Antonius Margaritha.

¹⁶⁵ The Hebrew alphabet contains no vowels. The vowels, developed by the Masoretes in the early Middle Ages, are added with a series of dots and dashes above and below the letters. In modern Hebrew, children’s books include this punctuation but it is assumed that anyone else should be able to read the text without the aid of the vowels. So a “consonantal” text would be without the aid of the vowels while a “punctuated” text would have the vowels included.

date of this correspondence was anywhere from 1521 to Amman's death in 1524.¹⁶⁶

A third member of this community with known positive contacts with Christian scholars was a Rabbi Liva of Worms. His surviving correspondence with a certain Magister Johann Reinhart reveals his enthusiasm regarding Christian interest in Hebrew and his willingness to be of assistance to Reinhart as a mentor and to loan him books. The probable date of this correspondence, based on internal evidence, lies between 1508 and 1513.¹⁶⁷

The Jews of Worms had a history of cooperation with Christian students of Hebraica that dated back over half a century. In the period currently under consideration, there were three Jewish scholars in Worms, two of them prominent indeed, who had some form of congenial contact with Christian Hebraists. Records of the nature and extent of the contacts of two of these rabbis with Christian scholars have been preserved in their correspondence. This record provides clear evidence of active support of the efforts of the Christian scholars by the Jewish Rabbis. This is the community to which Hätzer and Denck repaired briefly to translate the Prophets.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ The bit of popular verse quoted above (p. 36, n. 71) made mention of Amman as one who approved of the expulsion of the Jews from Regensburg in 1519. See Strauss, *Manifestations of Discontent*, p. 125. There were few Christians of the day with a recorded encounter with, or opinion on, the Jews who did not also leave a record of some form of anti-Jewish attitude or action.

¹⁶⁷ See the fascinating and illuminating article by Eric Zimmer, "Jewish and Christian Hebraist Collaboration," pp. 69-88, in which he publishes for the first time the Hebrew texts of the correspondence. See too, the prosopographical section of Reuter, "Worms," pp. 1679-82, which contains references to these men.

¹⁶⁸ About the year 1500 Conrad Pellican said that he could not find anyone among the Jews of Alsace, Worms, Frankfurt or Regensburg to answer his preliminary grammatical questions (see Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 31). One could conclude that either there were no Jews in these communities able to answer his questions, or, much more probably, the Jews were disinclined to help him in his quest. The record shows that the Jews of Worms were considerably more forthcoming with their assistance to other Christians.

C. *The Anabaptist Community in Worms*

Luther had appeared before the imperial diet in Worms in 1521 and made his famous “here I stand” declaration. Not surprisingly, interest in reform remained high despite the efforts of the local bishop. There is no record of an Anabaptist community prior to Denck’s visit but Jacob Kautz, one of the existing clerics of the city, had a radicalizing inclination and had already persuaded the other pastor Hilarius to abandon infant baptism before Denck arrived. Kautz was thoroughly won over to the cause and on June 9, 1527 he posted seven theses, clearly influenced by Denck, which were subsequently defended publicly by Kautz and two others, the identity of whom remains open to question.¹⁶⁹

From this short lived Anabaptist community in Worms three other names, Melchior Rinck (c. 1493 - 1553?), Oswald Leber and Gerhard Geldenhouwer (1482 - 1542), are worthy of comment. Leber’s interesting sojourn in Worms – and his contact with the Jews of Worms – has already been outlined above (p. 39). Geldenhouwer, a Dutch Humanist, poet and, by 1525, Lutheran Reformer, did not formally embrace the Anabaptist cause but clearly was comfortable in the company of Denck and Hätzer. Gendenhouwer was a noteworthy advocate for religious toleration and it would appear that his opinions were influenced substantially by his association with the Anabaptists. As an indication of the esteem in which he held the thought of Denck, he

¹⁶⁹ John S. Oyer, “Anabaptism in Central Germany: I. The Rise and Spread of the Movement,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 34 (1960): 231, and John David Derksen, “Strasbourg’s Religious Radicals From 1525 to 1570: a Social History” (PhD, The University Of Manitoba, 1993), p. 58, say that Kautz collaborated with Hätzer and Denck on the translation of the Prophets but provide no primary source for this observation. Kautz was a Hebraist (see above n. 5) but Hätzer mentions only Denck’s assistance in his forward to the translation “*Hat es ja Gott aus gnaden (dass ich sol bekennen) also verfügt/ mir schwachen solicher mühe und arbeit eynen ghülffen gesandt/ Hans Dengken/ der mir von Gots wegen zü willen ward/ mir in disem zü verhelffen.*” Hätzer and Denck, *Alle Propheten*, p. ii r.

translated Denck's *Von der waren lieb* into Latin during his stay in Worms. At the same time he was engaged in another translation project which will be addressed below.¹⁷⁰ Rinck too was a scholar, nicknamed "the Greek" in recognition of his command of that language. He came to Anabaptism by way of Lutheranism and the Peasants' War. Apparently won to Anabaptism by Denck in Landau shortly before moving on to Worms, Rinck may have had an active hand in the conversion of Hilarius and Kautz to the Anabaptist cause while Hätzer and Denck were busy with their translation. While only Kautz's name is attached to the original of the seven articles, another version of the text, transmitted by the chronicler of the city, includes the names of Hätzer, Denck and Rinck. It is also quite possible that Rinck was one of the unnamed disputants. Whoever assisted Kautz in the disputation they failed to sway the authorities to their cause, and shortly thereafter all the pastors of the city were dismissed along with Rinck, the Reformation was renounced, and the Anabaptist community disappeared when Denck and Hätzer moved on.¹⁷¹

This particular "Anabaptist" community had an unusual flavour. Of the names mentioned above, four (Hätzer, Denck, Kautz and Leber) were Hebraists, while the other two (Rinck and Geldenhouwer) were scholars with considerable language skills. Geldenhouwer, though influenced by Denck's thought, never formally embraced Anabaptism, and if Hätzer ever was

¹⁷⁰ Cornelis Augustijn, "Gerard Geldenhouwer und die religiöse Toleranz," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69 (1978): 145-46. He was influenced enough by Anabaptist ideas that he tried to convince his friend Cranvelt to give up his position of public office. The source is a letter from Geldenhouwer to Cranvelt. See Henry De Vocht, ed. *Literae Virorum Eruditorum ad Franciscum Craneveldium 1522-1528: A Collection of Original Letters Edited from the Manuscripts and Illustrated with Notes and Commentaries* (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire Uystpruyst, 1928), pp. 594f., letter # 230.

¹⁷¹ Kiwiet, "Life of Hans Denck," p. 253. On Rinck see Erich Geldbach, "Toward a More Ample Biography of the Hessian Anabaptist Leader Melchior Rinck," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 48 (1974): 371-84.

an Anabaptist, he identified himself with Anabaptists only when it suited him. It is safe to say that this circle was as much Humanist as it was Anabaptist.

Summary

The Jewish community of Worms, one of the oldest in Europe, had a history of collaboration with Christians interested in pursuing Hebrew studies which dated back to the last quarter of the fifteenth century and continued up to the time of Hätzer and Denck. Caspar Amman, an older Humanist contemporary of Hätzer and Denck (and known to Denck), was one of two Christian contemporaries with an extant record of profitable contact with Jews in Worms. Of the remarkably erudite members of the Anabaptist community in Worms, Oswald Leber had a profitable and warm encounter with this same Jewish community where he received Jewish insight on the *eschaton* as well as an invitation to Jerusalem in anticipation of the event. The evidence of Humanist collaboration with Jews of Worms, combined with the certain knowledge that a member of the Anabaptist community was in dialogue with Jews of this same community while Hätzer and Denck were engaged in their translation efforts, while no more than circumstantial evidence, is strong evidence that Hätzer and Denck were in touch with these Jews as well. The internal evidence from the annotations of the “Worms Prophets” and the Foreword to *Baruch der Prophet* will provide an even greater degree of certainty while at the same time identifying the degree and nature of Jewish influence on the “Worms Prophets.” This is the task of the final chapter.

V. Internal Evidence: The “Worms Prophets” and *Baruch der Prophet*

This final chapter will begin with a summary of the development of the tools of Hebrew study up to the time that Hätzer and Denck embarked on their translation effort. Thus the reader will be clear about what texts and grammatical tools were available to the Christian Hebraist by the beginning of the second quarter of the sixteenth century. The second section will address the printing history of the “Worms Prophets,” identifying which editions were available for the current study and the degree of continuity between editions, particularly regarding the annotations. The third section will make some general observations about the translation, identifying, by its structure, its place within the Jewish-Catholic-Protestant complex of biblical texts. Having established in the second section the continuity of the annotations from one edition and printer to another, and thereby their authority as an integral part of the publication, the fourth section engages in a detailed textual analysis of the annotations in an effort to determine more precisely the degree and nature of Jewish influence on the translation. Following the publication of the “Worms Prophets,” Ludwig Hätzer continued his translation efforts in the prophetic theme by moving to the Old Testament Apocryphal books. In 1528 he published the first (and only) installment of that project. In the Foreword to *Baruch der Prophet* he made specific and significant reference to Jews. This reference provides unsolicited and unequivocal evidence of contact and cooperation with Jews in the process of translation.

A. The Hebrew Bible and the Early Reformation:

The Development of the Tools of Hebraica

I. The Hebrew Text of the Bible

As Christian students of Hebraica, impelled by Renaissance and Reformation ideals, relentlessly pursued the original and “pure” text of the Bible, the tools to accomplish such a task slowly became available. The most important tool was the Hebrew text of the Scriptures. While manuscript texts would have been available to the Jewish communities throughout the Middle Ages it would have been very difficult for interested Christians to gain access to those manuscripts and it was not until the advent of printing in Hebrew in northern Italy that the text would become more readily available to them. A consonantal Psalter with Kimchi’s commentary was printed in Bologna in 1477 and a punctuated Pentateuch with the *Targum of Onkelos* in 1482.¹⁷² In 1485 -86 the Soncino press printed the first edition of the Prophetic Books and by 1488 it had produced the entire text of the Old Testament with vowels but without a commentary. A second edition of the text appeared without place or date but possibly in Naples 1491-93. Conrad Pellican had a copy of this edition. The Soncino press moved to Brescia and issued its next edition in two parts 1492 and 1494. It was this edition from Brescia that Luther used in preparing his translation of the Old Testament.¹⁷³ About 1510 the Soncino press, by this time in Pesaro, produced a new edition of the Former Prophets (the historical books) with the commentary of Isaac Abravanel.

The Complutensian Polyglot, produced under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes, was the

¹⁷² B. Hall, “Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S.L. Greenslade, vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 49. On vowel punctuation in Hebrew see above p. 75 n. 165. A Targum is an Aramaic translation of the Bible.

¹⁷³ Ibid., pp. 49-50. It may be significant that Luther chose a Hebrew text without Rabbinic commentary given his feelings about Rabbinic exegesis.

first Christian publication of the Hebrew text. The Old Testament text included the Vulgate with interlinear Septuagint and Latin translations. It also contained the Hebrew text and the *Targum of Onkelos* with a Latin translation. The apocryphal or deuterocanonical books were printed in the text of the Septuagint with the Vulgate interlinear. While the project was begun as early as 1502 and printed 1514-17, it was not issued until 1522.¹⁷⁴

Perhaps the greatest achievement of Hebrew printing in the first quarter of the sixteenth century was the Bomberg Bible. In 1516-17 Christian printer Daniel Bomberg (d. between 1549 and 1553), with the assistance of Felix Pratensis, a converted Jew, printed the first rabbinical Bible which contained the Hebrew text accompanied by the targums and rabbinical commentaries. The second edition was printed by Bomberg in Venice in 1524-25. This edition represented the greatest advancement in obtaining the best text of the Hebrew Bible. This dramatic improvement came about because of the remarkable research on the *Massorah* by the Tunisian refugee, Jacob ben Chayim (c. 1470 -1538).¹⁷⁵

2. Grammars, Lexicons, and Concordances

Interest in Hebrew grammar goes back to the Massoretes and their passion for an accurate biblical text, and more or less scientific works on grammar came out of Hebrew scholarship from the tenth century onward. Names significant to the study of Hebrew grammar

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., pp. 50-51.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 52-53. The Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library has a first edition copy of the Bomberg Bible. The *Massorah* is the body of traditions regarding the correct spelling, writing, and reading of the Hebrew Bible. Bomberg's publications were so good and error free that his press soon became the standard of excellence for all subsequent Hebrew printing presses, whether Christian or Jewish (see Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 36).

and the Christian appropriation of that study are Gaon of Saadi (892-942), Abraham Ibn Ezra (1092-1167), Joseph Kimchi and especially his son David (12th and 13th C.).¹⁷⁶

The first real Christian grammar was Reuchlin's *De rudimentis linguae Hebraicae una cum Lexico* (1506). Conrad Pellican had published his *De modo legendi et intelligendi Hebraea* in 1503 but it can be considered only a preliminary step towards a grammar. The most prominent Jewish grammarian of the period was the German Jew Elias Levita (c. 1468 - 1549), and it was he more than any other who spread the knowledge of Hebrew among Christians. His most famous Christian pupil was Sebastian Münster who published his *Epitome grammaticae Hebraicae* in 1520 and his *Institutiones grammaticae* in 1524. In 1525 he published an even more complete grammar entitled *Sefer ha-Dikduk: Grammatica Hebraicae Absolutissima* which in fact was a translation of Levita's *Sefer ha-Bahur*. He also published an Aramaic grammar in 1527. Wolfgang Capito relied on the works of Pellican and Reuchlin for his *Institutiones Hebraicae* published in 1525, as did the Italian Dominican Sanctes Pagninus (1470 -1536) for his work of the same name published the following year.¹⁷⁷

The first lexicon produced by Christian Hebraists was included in Reuchlin's *De rudimenta linguae Hebraicae* (1506). Volume six of the Complutensian Polyglot consisted of Alfonsus Zamorensis' *Vocabularium Hebr. et Chald. V.T.* and was published in 1523. Pagninus' *Thesaurus linguae sancte* was published in 1529 and therefore would have been too

¹⁷⁶ D. R. Jones, "Appendices: Aids to the Study of the Bible; Commentaries," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S.L. Greenslade, vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 520.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., pp. 520-21. See also Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 44-47 for a description of some of the most important of Münster's almost sixty publications on various aspects of Hebraica. Pagninus was a convert from Judaism. The Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies has a copy of Reuchlin's *De rudimentis linguae Hebraicae*, as does the Fisher Library.

late for the use of Hätzer and Denck in their translation efforts. Most of this Christian work was founded upon the very influential *Sefer ha-Shorashim* (Book of Roots) of the medieval Jewish scholar David Kimchi.¹⁷⁸

Concordances were much less common in medieval and Renaissance times. In 1496 Sebastian Brant (1457 - 1521), German Humanist and poet, produced a Latin concordance titled *Concordantiae maiores bibliae tam dictionum declinabilium quam indeclinabilium* which may have been the only Latin concordance of substance available in the sixteenth century. Isaac Nathan b. Kalonymus of Arles borrowed the idea of a concordance from the Christians and compiled one for the Hebrew Bible in 1437-45 and it was published by Bomberg at Venice in 1523. It was designed to aid in anti-Christian polemic and probably would not have been very welcome in most Christian circles.¹⁷⁹

Thus it was that by the time that Hätzer and Denck set themselves the task of translating the Prophets into German they had a reasonable set of tools to accomplish the job with some degree of sophistication – tools that had not been available a generation (and in some cases a couple of years) earlier. They had a number of consonantal and punctuated texts of the Hebrew Bible from which they could choose. The grammars of Pellican, Reuchlin, Capito, Pagninus and Münster were available. The lexicons of Reuchlin, Alfonsus Zamorensis and Münster had all been to press by 1523. And the concordances of Brant (for the Latin text) and Isaac Nathan were also available if Hätzer and Denck had any inclination or felt any need to make use of

¹⁷⁸ Jones, "Appendices," p. 524. Both the Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies and the Fisher Library have a copy of Pagnini's *Epitome thesauri linguae sancte*. The Fisher Library has a copy of David Kimchi's *Sefer ha-Shorashim*.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 526.

them. For the first time in the history of the Christian study of the Hebrew language, it was now possible to engage in substantial translation projects without the aid of the Jews. Significantly, Hätscher and Denck chose not to take this course of action and instead engaged themselves with the Jews of Worms as they undertook their project.¹⁸⁰

B. Printing history of the “Worms Prophets”

Although Luther began his translation of the Old Testament a number of years earlier, the “Worms Prophets” predated Luther’s translation of the prophets by a few years. While Luther’s busy schedule and voluminous writings provide ample justification for the years that his Old Testament translation lay incomplete, lacking only the Prophets, there may also be some truth to the thought that Luther found the Hebrew in the Prophets a little overwhelming for his own skills.¹⁸¹ Whatever the reasons for Luther’s delay, the intervening years allowed the “Worms Prophets” a brief period of significant popularity. From 1527 to 1531 there were 12

¹⁸⁰ This in comparison to the inclinations of the Wittenberg Hebraists who made every effort to avoid the Jews – usually to the detriment of the development of the discipline among the Lutherans. See for example the account of the lexicon created by Johannes Forster (he had been a student of Reuchlin but his scholarship did not redound well on his teacher). The title of this lexicon, a minor polemical work in itself, read: *New Hebrew Dictionary: Not Arranged Out of the Comments of the Rabbis Nor Out of the Foolish Imitations of Our Native Doctors But Out of Our Own Treasures of Sacred Scripture and Developed by an Accurate Collation of Biblical Passages, Annotated with Passages and Phrases from the Old and New Testaments*. The effort was universally panned by his Hebraist contemporaries and a professor at Tübingen accused him of impeding rather than aiding Hebrew studies by this public demonstration of his gross incompetence. See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, pp. 170-73.

¹⁸¹ Luther never considered himself a real Hebraist, and in an assessment of how he would proceed with a program of learning Hebrew, he concluded that the final and most difficult text to tackle would be “the prophets who use much obscure wording and speech.” Quoted from the *Tischgespräche* in Frank Rosenthal, “The Rise of Christian-Hebraism in the 16th Century,” *Historia Judaica* 7 (1945): 177. It is also true that the Prophets were not Luther’s greatest priority or love among the Old Testament books – that distinction belonged to Genesis and especially the Psalms. See Bornkamm, *Luther*, pp. 8-9.

separate editions of the translation from presses in Worms, Augsburg and Hagenau. The analysis which follows is based on a comparative study of a first edition folio from the press of Peter Schöffer in Worms, April 13, 1527, a 1527 folio edition from the press of Sylvan Ottmar in Augsburg in June of the same year, and an octavo edition from Schöffer's press in June of the following year.¹⁸²

In addition to these monograph publications of the Prophets, part of the translation appeared in three editions of the complete Bible published at Strasbourg 1529-30, 1530-32, and 1535-36. Gerhard Geldenhouwer, while in Worms with Hätzer and Denck, translated their translation from the German into Dutch.¹⁸³ Two concordances cite the Worms translation: Leonhard Brunner's (Worms, 1529), and Köpfl (Strasbourg, 1530). The commentary on Micah of 1532, attributed to Denck, also uses it rather than the Vulgate.¹⁸⁴

A comparison between the three editions revealed that there was considerable continuity between the editions apart from variations in contractions and spelling – especially in the Augsburg edition. The first edition contained a page of corrections at the back of the volume which would have been incorporated into the text of subsequent editions and therefore not

¹⁸² The first, the primary working copy, was obtained as a microfiche of a copy in Amsterdam. The other two editions are available, and were perused, in the Menno Simons Historical Library at Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, Virginia.

¹⁸³ Augustijn, "Gerard Geldenhouwer," p. 146. Geldenhouwer accomplished his translation "mit Hilfe sehr gelehrter und rechtschaffener Männer, die sie auf vorzügliche Weise aus dem Hebräischen ins Deutsche übersetzt haben." The Latin reads: "Verto prophetas omnes in linguam nostratem ex lingua germanica, adiuuantibus doctissimis et integerrimis viris, qui eos ex hebraica lingua foelicissime in germanicam verterunt." Vocht, ed. *Craneveldium*, pp. 595, letter # 230. Apparently this translation was never published.

¹⁸⁴ *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Worms Prophets," by H. S. Bender. Walter Fellmann, "Die Wormser Propheten von 1527: Ein Forschungsbericht," *Mennonitische Geschichts-Blätter* 24 (1967): 83.

necessary. Both the first edition from Worms and the Augsburg edition included Hätzer's motto "*O Gott erlöß die gefangnen*" on the title page as well as a Foreword by Hätzer. The Worms octavo had neither motto nor Foreword. Whatever the reasons for this absence, one consequence is that there is nothing in this particular edition to link it to Hätzer. The text itself has chapter and paragraph divisions, but no verse numbering. *Alle Propheten*¹⁸⁵ was an annotated or glossed translation and the notes were signified by an asterisk (*) in the text with the note following at the bottom of the paragraph in a smaller font. In paragraphs where there were two notes (there were never more than two) the Worms editions followed the convention of superscripted ^a and ^b while the Augsburg edition used an asterisk for the first note and a cross for the second note.¹⁸⁶

These notes would seem to represent a significant and as yet untapped example of early Anabaptist writing. They provide insight on many questions, such as the intended audience of the translation, the exegetical priorities and principles of the translators, and the sources used by the translators. This last question in particular falls within the parameters of the current study and the observations and conclusions of the following sections will be based primarily on a study of the annotations.

¹⁸⁵ Having introduced the document, the popular title, "Worms Prophets" will be replaced by the first two words of the actual title of the translation, which reads *Alle Propheten nach Hebraischer sprach verteutscht*. Weis, *Hetzer*, p. 141 believed that the title page included the phrase "*von Ludwig Hetzer und Hans Denck*," however none of the editions identify an author on the title page (see Baring, "Wormser Propheten," 24-32 where he provides the titles of all twelve editions of the translation). Authorship is established by Hätzer's motto on the title page ("*O Gott erlöß die gefangnen*") and the Foreword to the translation in which he identified himself and mentioned the assistance of Denck.

¹⁸⁶ All of these notes, and the phrases of the biblical text to which they refer, have been collected and presented in Appendix A along with a detailed analysis of the notes.

C. General observations regarding Alle Propheten

There are a number of bibliographic articles which provide fairly detailed descriptions of the translation under consideration¹⁸⁷ so the comments here will be restricted to observations which can be made based on the chosen book order, chapter divisions, and the general implications of the notes. First a comment on the notes.

There are 155 annotations in the translation with only six differences of any significance from one edition to another based on the three editions examined. The first difference is a note in Isaiah chapter 3 where the 1528 Worms octavo replaces the word “gewisse” with the word “bewisse”¹⁸⁸ and slightly changes the word order (all Scripture references are to Appendix A). There is no real change in the meaning. The next difference is found in the note in chapter eight which explains the meaning of the name Emmanuel. This note, present in the Worms and Augsburg folios, is absent in the Worms octavo (see Appendix A, note 6). However, since the same explanation was provided in a note in the previous chapter, this note was redundant and legitimately eliminated in the later edition, particularly an octavo where efforts to save space may have been a consideration. The next variation occurs in Isaiah 65 where the 1528 Worms octavo replaces “mir gang” with “mirs gebe” (see Appendix A, n. 40). This does represent a change in meaning from the other two editions. In the note to Jeremiah 15[:7] the Worms octavo again replaces a word: this time “zürstrewet” is replaced with “zü schanden,” and again

¹⁸⁷ Baring, “Wormser Propheten,” pp. 23-41; Ernst Crous, “Zu den Bibelübersetzungen von Haetzer und Denk: Eine bibliographische Nachlese,” in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mennoniten: Festgabe für D. Christian Neff zum 70. Geburstag*, ed. Walter Fellmann (Weirhof: Mennonitischen Geschichtsverein, 1938), pp. 72-82; *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Worms Prophets,” by Bender; Fellmann, “Wormser Propheten,” pp. 81-89.

¹⁸⁸ According to Jacob Grimm and Wilhelm Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 16 vols. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1854-1960), Bd. 1, p. 1787, *bewissen* is “ein seltnes, wichtiges wort, das zu wissen novisse.”

the meaning of the note is changed (see Appendix A, n. 45). In the note to Zephaniah 1[:9], once again, the Worms octavo changes a word from “*beschah*” to “*geschach*” (see Appendix A, n. 86). The final change worthy of comment is the note to Zechariah 9[:9] where the Worms octavo changes the word order of the note in order to make it clearer (see Appendix A, n. 93). Despite these few differences, it is clear that the annotations were considered a significant part of the translation and were transmitted with care from one edition and city to another. Indeed, the Augsburg folio, printed in another city at a different press and with numerous variations in spelling, had no differences of substance in the annotations. Consequently it is safe to work with these annotations with the conviction that they were essentially static in their content and, therefore, significant to the authors and printers and an integral element of the translation.

The first observation to be made is that this is specifically a **Christian** translation. The Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible is divided into three sections: the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. The Prophets are divided into two sections, the former Prophets which are the historical books, and the latter Prophets which contain all the Christian Prophetic books with the exception of Lamentations and Daniel which are included in the Writings rather than the Prophets. Hätscher and Denck, however, chose to include Lamentations in the Prophets immediately following Jeremiah, and Daniel immediately following Ezekiel, after the traditional Christian order as established in the Vulgate.¹⁸⁹ So to call the translation *Alle Propheten*, while excluding the Former Prophets and including Lamentations and Daniel clearly indicates a Christian orientation on the part of the translators. While this is a Christian

¹⁸⁹ The Septuagint, too, places Lamentations after Jeremiah, but otherwise the book order in the Septuagint is substantially different from either the Hebrew or the Vulgate. For example, the Major Prophets follow rather than precede the Minor Prophets.

translation there is very little in the notes that is explicitly Christian. In the note to Jeremiah 15[:8]¹⁹⁰ the translators allow that the “mütter” in the biblical text could be identified as “die mütter der kirchen.” While the translators make reference in the notes to other passages of Scripture on fourteen occasions, only three of those references are to New Testament passages.¹⁹¹ And that is the extent of the overtly Christian content in the notes. Interestingly enough, there are no Christological references in the notes at all. Indeed, in Hätzer’s Foreword to the translation, the three references to Christ are all invocations of the Divine, with no reference to the need for a Christological interpretation of the Prophets. By comparison, Luther sets out a method of Christological interpretation of the Prophets in his introduction,¹⁹² and, of his 167 marginal glosses in Isaiah, nine contain references to Christ. The Micah Commentary, regardless of the authorship question, also serves as a useful comparison. In the Commentary there are 167 Christological references, many of which are comparisons of what the prophet says to what Christ says in the Gospel. However, in addition to one place where the commentator explicitly articulates a principle for a Christological interpretation of the Old

¹⁹⁰ Here and elsewhere the verse numbers are supplied from the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* except in places where there are chapter and verse conflicts.

¹⁹¹ The note to Isaiah 23[:1] makes general reference to the “Euangelio”; the note to Isaiah 28:16 refers to Romans 10; and the note to Daniel 2[:15] refers to Matthew 11.

¹⁹² Luther, *Biblia* (reprint ed.), p. 2 r: “Darumb sollen wir Christen nicht solche schendliche/ überdrüssige/ undanckbare/ klüglinge sein/ Sondern die Propheten mit ernst und nutz lesen und gebrauchen/ Denn erstlich verkündigen und bezeugen sie Christus Königreich/ darinn wir itzt leben und alle Christgleubigen/ bis her gelebt haben/ und leben werden/ bis an der welt ende/ Denn das ist uns gar ein starcker trost/ und tröstliche stercke/ das wir für unser Christlich leben/ so mechtige und alte zeugen haben/ dadurch unser Christlicher glaube gar hoch getröstet wird/ das er der rechte stand sey für Gott/ wider alle andere unrechte/ falsche/ menschliche heiligkeit und rotten/ Welche umb ires grossen scheines und der menge willen/ so dran hangen/ widerumb auch/ umb des Creutzes und wenige willen/ so am Christlichen glauben halten/ ein schwach hertz/ gar hoch ergern und anfechten/ wie zu unser geit/ des Türcken/ Bapsts/ und andere Rotten/ uns grosse/ gewaltige ergernis geben.”

Testament,¹⁹³ there are five actual Christological interpretations of Old Testament passages, two of which are of passages in Micah itself.¹⁹⁴ So, while it is true that *Alle Propheten* was meant to be a Christian translation, it is by no means a Christianized text in the way that Luther's Old Testament translations were, and any discernment of Christological foreshadowing was left to the reader.

Furthermore, it is clear that *Alle Propheten* was a Protestant Christian translation. While the Septuagint and Vulgate include Apocryphal books among the Prophets,¹⁹⁵ such books were deliberately excluded from the canon of the Prophets by the translators, though Hätzer continued on with a translation of the Apocryphal books under separate cover in the following year (see below p. 107). This was in keeping with the general Protestant attitude toward the Old Testament Apocrypha. Because these books were not included in the Hebrew canon, Luther and most other Protestants relegated these books to a lower category, suitable for edification but not authoritative for disputation. When they were included in the Bible, they

¹⁹³ Furcha, ed. *Writings of Hans Denck*, p. 125, "For they [the patriarchs and the prophets], too, believed the promise of the Lord. The prophet therefore must speak not only of temporal Jerusalem under Hezekiah, but also of the heavenly Jerusalem which is the congregation now assembled in the name of the Lord. . . . He [Micah] says, 'In the last days,' i.e., at a time when God shall no longer speak to humankind through his prophets or in some other way, but only through his eternal son Jesus Christ our sole mediator."

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., "Mountain and rock often mean Christ in both Testaments"; p. 129 is a Christological reference to Ezekiel 34; p. 136 contains the comments on ch. 5:2 which is quoted in Matthew's birth narrative (ch. 2), our commentator defers to Matthew's interpretation; p. 137 contains a Christological reading of Genesis 59:8 f. and Isaiah 7; p. 180 the commentator identifies the shepherd as Christ.

¹⁹⁵ In the Vulgate, Baruch follows Lamentations and I and II Maccabees follow Malachai. In the Septuagint, Baruch follows Jeremiah, the Epistle of Jeremiah follows Lamentations, Susanna follows Ezekiel, and Bel and the Dragon follows Daniel.

were collected in a separate section between the Old and New Testaments.¹⁹⁶ The Anabaptist position on the Apocryphal books, if we can speak of an Anabaptist position at all, is less clear. Most of the Anabaptist leaders showed considerable enthusiasm for the Apocryphal books and often seemed inclined to quote them at critical points in their arguments. There is an ongoing debate among recent scholars about whether sixteenth-century Anabaptist leaders considered these books to be on an equal level of inspiration as the rest of the Old Testament. Certainly by the seventeenth century Anabaptists were making arguments against their canonicity, but the opinions of their earlier brethren remains open to debate.¹⁹⁷ Ludwig Hätzer, in the forward to his translation of three of the Apocryphal books, responded to the criticism that these books were not in the Canon:

Canon this, Canon that, the books have no blemish and give honest (proper) witness, how one may and should come again into the One, as well as other books, even if they do not in all matters agree with other books, which is also often the case in the biblical books. For this reason beloved scribes (learned in the Scriptures) one should not force (ban) and lock the holy Spirit into a dungeon.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁶ See Roland H. Bainton, "The Bible in the Reformation," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S.L. Greenslade, vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 7; S.L. Greenslade, "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S.L. Greenslade, vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 168. In Luther, *Biblia* (reprint ed.) they are found between the Old and New Testaments with a new set of signatures and a title page with the title reading: "*Apocrypha. Das sind Bücher: so nicht der heiligen Schrift gleich gehalten: und doch nützlich und gut zu lesen sind.*"

¹⁹⁷ Hamilton, "Apocryphal Apocalypse," pp. 1-16 passim. Among the sixteenth-century Anabaptists who quoted 2 Esdras, regarded as the most apocryphal of the Apocryphal books, were Melchior Hoffman, leader of the Swiss Anabaptists and martyr Michael Sattler (c. 1490 - 1527), Moravian Anabaptist leaders Jacob Hutter (1500? - 1536) and Peter Riedemann (1506 - 1556), Augustin Bader, Münster theologian Bernhard Rothmann (1495? - 1535), Menno Simons, Dirk Philips and the martyrologies. Hamilton also points out in passing that Hans Denck was particularly fond of quoting the books of Baruch and Wisdom (p. 2).

¹⁹⁸ Ludwig Hätzer, *Baruch der Prophet. Die histori Susannah. Die histori Bel zü Babel* (Worms: Peter Schoffer, 1528), p. iii r.: "Canon hin/ Canon her/ die bücher haben keynen fel/ und

Hätzer's argument for the value, authority and inspiration of the Apocryphal books, regardless of the Canon, continues at length, summarizing his argument with the assertion: "Every student of Christ, who does not wish to be deceived, should, as a general rule, neither accept nor reject any text that has not already been disclosed to him through Jesus Christ's revelation, with the exception of the Canon. . ."¹⁹⁹ (See Appendix B)

Despite the clearly Protestant nature of the translation, the notes contain no polemic against the Catholic Church. Nor do they contain any overt reference to the Magisterial Reformation or any overt evidence that the translators are Anabaptist. There is, however, in Micah chapter 7, one relatively long note which explains in detail the means by which the princes and judges colluded to their mutual benefit and the detriment of the poor.²⁰⁰ The note is unique among the notes and seems to contain considerable emotional force as though the biblical passage was confirmed by the personal observation or experience of the translator. Certainly both Hätzer and Denck had remarkably bad records in their encounters with the judiciary. This concern with injustice toward the poor is characteristic of much of the Anabaptist movement, particularly those influenced by the events and people surrounding the

geben recht geschaffene zeugnuß/ wie man wider in das Eynig kommen mag und sol/ so wol alß andre bücher/ ob sie gleich nit allenthalben mit andern büchern ubereyn kommen/ welchs auch offt inn den Byblischen büchern geschihet. Unnd darumb lieben Schriftgelerten/ giltes nit den heyligen Geyst darumb in eynn zwingart also zü verbannen und zü schliessen." Translation by Dr. Werner Packull.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., p. iii r.: "Eyn ieder schüler Christi/ der nit betrogen werden wil/ sol uberal keyn schrift noch annemen noch verwerffen/ die im nit züor/ durch die offenbarung Jesu Christi entschlossen ist/ unangesehen den Canon/ . ." Translation assistance by Dr. Victor Thiessen.

²⁰⁰ Micah 7[:3] "Der fürst heyschet/ so richtet der richter auff widergeltung* vnd der gewaltig redt was sein hertz lustet"

* Es hat dise meynung: Der fürst oder der oberst bringt eynen handel für den richter/ der richtet im nach seinem beger/ auff widergeltung/ hiemit er im hienach in seiner sach auch volgen helffe/ darzü stimpt denn auch der redner/ alles der meynung/ volge du mir jetzt/ so volge ich dir hie nach auch.

Peasants Revolt. Apart from this oblique reference, however, there is nothing to identify the translators as Anabaptist.²⁰¹

The chapter divisions in *Alle Propheten* reveal loyalty to no one tradition. In Isaiah, both the Septuagint and the Vulgate begin chapter 9 several verses earlier than the Hebrew text while Hätzer and Denck begin chapter 9 two verses later than the Hebrew. The Hebrew, Septuagint and Vulgate all have the same chapter division between Isaiah 63 and 64. *Alle Propheten* begins chapter 64 a paragraph earlier following none of the others. The Hebrew and Septuagint agree on the chapter division between Ezekiel 20 and 21 whereas Hätzer and Denck follow the Vulgate by beginning chapter 21 five verses later. The Hebrew text divides Joel into four chapters while the Septuagint and the Vulgate divide it into only three. In this case *Alle Propheten* follows the four chapter divisions of the Hebrew. While the Hebrew and Septuagint agree on the division between chapters one and two of Zechariah, the Vulgate begins chapter two five verses later and again *Alle Propheten* follows the Vulgate. On one occasion Hätzer and Denck side with the Hebrew text against the Septuagint and Vulgate, on two other occasions they side with the Vulgate against the Hebrew and Septuagint, and on two occasions they agree with none of them. From a standpoint of physical structure at least, it appears that the Hebrew and the Vulgate held substantial weight in the decision making process for Hätzer and Denck.²⁰²

²⁰¹ Weis, *Hetzer*, p. 142 comments on the objectivity of the translators and the absence of dogmatic bias in both the text and the notes.

²⁰² For the sake of comparison, the Luther Bible follows the divisions of the Hebrew text for chapters 8 and 9 of Isaiah, begins chapter 64 much earlier than any of the others, begins Ezekiel 21 a paragraph earlier than *Alle Propheten*, divides Joel into 3 chapters, and agrees with the Vulgate and *Alle Propheten* on Zechariah chapters one and two. See Luther, *Biblia* (reprint ed.).

So *Alle Propheten* is a translation that is neither Jewish nor Catholic though it was informed by both. To the credit of its translators, it is nothing more than a translation. Remarkably for the time it is neither confessional statement nor polemic. The notes provided ample opportunity for either but they were not used to that end.²⁰³ Instead the notes were used overwhelmingly to provide clarity to the people of sixteenth-century Germany for ambiguous texts written in the Middle East a couple of millennia earlier. Hätzer and Denck were inclined to a literal translation of the Hebrew and the notes enabled them to try to clarify the text without moving toward paraphrase. For example the phrase “*das ist*” occurs 52 times in the course of the annotations. Twenty-two of the notes provide clarification on points of Middle Eastern geography or the customs of the time, both religious and secular.²⁰⁴

As noted above (page 90), the annotations made reference to other passages of Scripture on fourteen occasions in order to clarify a passage.²⁰⁵ On thirteen occasions they made reference in the notes to the meaning of a particularly troublesome word or phrase in the Hebrew text of the Bible. Seven of those references were to the meaning of proper names or

²⁰³ There were two tendencies and underlying motives for biblical translation at this time. One was for the purpose of pastoral or emotional edification which was what primarily motivated Luther and those like him. The other school of translation was motivated by a desire to produce accurate translations of the text based on strict linguistic lines. This latter school was less common at this time of intense confessionalism but it did exist, the most famous example being the strictly literal translation into Latin by Sanctes Pagninus in 1528. The translation was so literal that the Latin left much to be desired and was described by others as “barbarous.” (See Jones, *Discovery of Hebrew*, pp. 40-44). Hätzer and Denck’s translation clearly agrees with Pagninus’ concept of translation rather than Luther’s.

²⁰⁴ For clarification of points of geography (including botany, etc.) see Appendix A: Is 8[:7]; 11[:14]; 22[:8]; 23[:1]; 23[:3]; 27[:12] Ezek 47[:19]; Dan 10[:4]; Jonah 4[:6]. For clarification of points of religious and secular custom see: Is 28[:27]; 41[:15]; Jer 3[:2]; 31[:21]; Lam 2[:1]; Ezek 21[:22]; 36[:7]; 43[:15]; Amos 5[:12]; Ob [v.20]; Nahum 3[:19]; Zech 8[:19].

²⁰⁵ See Appendix A: Is 23[:1]; 28[:16]; 44[:2]; 44[:8]; 51[:3]; 65[:3]; Jer 3[:2]; Ezek 4[:16]; Dan 2[:15]; Amos 3[:12]; 8[:5]; 9[:13]; Zeph 1[:9]; Mal 2[:15].

other transliterations.²⁰⁶ By comparison, four references were made to the Latin text and two to the Greek. The two references to the Greek text occurred in the same note as a reference to the Latin text. In three of those references a German translation was provided for an alternative reading found in the Vulgate or Septuagint.²⁰⁷ By far the most frequent reference to a source for an alternative reading of the text was the otherwise unidentified “*etlich.*” Twenty-one times a note is introduced with the words “*etlich lesen.*”²⁰⁸ The note to Ezekiel 40[:10] makes reference to an interpretation of a difficult Hebrew word by Nicolas of Lyra, which interpretation was judged by Hätzer and Denck to be “*nit ungeschickt. . . und im wol (unsers bedunckens) zü glauben.*” On eight occasions the annotations identify “*Die Juden*” as a source for a particular reading of the text or an interpretation of a word or name.²⁰⁹ This latter is the most readily available internal evidence which lends support to Luther’s assertion of Rabbinic influence on the translation.

In the course of the translation process, *Alle Propheten* made use of other passages of Scripture, both Old and New Testaments, earlier translations, and both Jewish and Christian traditions of interpretation in order to clarify the text for the readers. However, because much

²⁰⁶ See Appendix A: Is 7[:14]; 33[:9]; 53[:1]; Jer 1[:11]; 20[:3]; Ezek 39[:11]; 40[:10]; Hos 2[:16]; 2[:23]; Amos 8[:2]; Jonah 4[:6]; Zech 3[:1]; 9[:9]. The Jonah note is an interesting explanation of the troublesome “Kikaion” plant, to which we will return. These references to the Hebrew text are in addition, of course, to the title of the translation.

²⁰⁷ For the Latin see Appendix A: Ezek 38[:8]; Joel 1[:17]. For the Latin and the Greek see: Is 28[:13]; Dan 2[:15].

²⁰⁸ See Appendix A: Is 3[:12]; 19[:6]; 30[:8]; 30[:20]; Jer 5[:8]; Ezek 2[:2]; 23[:23]; 27[:11]; 28[:23]; 32[:30]; 40[:43]; Hosea 6[:3]; 8[:10]; 10[:10]; Joel 1[:17]; 4[:21]; Amos 2[:6]; 7[:14]; Nahum 2[:3]; 2[:5]; Hab 1[:12]. In addition Ezekiel 34[:16] has “Andere lesen”.

²⁰⁹ See Appendix A: Is 28[:13]; Jer 17[:16]; 25[:26]; 51[:11]; Ezek 21[:23]; Dan 11[:17]; Ob [v.20]; Jonah 4[:6].

of what is in the annotations has no identified source, the extent to which they depended on these various sources is not yet fully clear. This is the task of the following section.

D. The internal evidence regarding the “Jewishness” of the translation

This section will constitute a summary of the research into the annotations in an effort to identify possible sources to which Hätzer and Denck turned in order to clarify the text. The annotations and the sources which may have informed them, are collected in Appendix A which is an indispensable reference for the following narrative. Hätzer and Denck themselves made reference to the Septuagint,²¹⁰ the Vulgate, Nicholas of Lyra and the Jews. Consequently those two translations as well as the *Glossa ordinaria* and Lyra’s *Postillae* have been considered.²¹¹ Among the possible Jewish sources are the Aramaic Targumim and the major medieval Rabbinic commentators: *Rashi*, *Redak*, *Ibn Ezra*, *Abarbanal* and *Joseph Kara*²¹². A

²¹⁰ The Septuagint was given less attention than it deserved in the sixteenth century. Hätzer (and presumably Denck), was in keeping with his time in his low opinion of the Septuagint. In the Foreword to his translation of the Apocryphal books, he said: “... dunckt mich eygentlich/ die Latiner haben vil eyn besser Bible weder die Griechen/ die auch dem Hebraischen vil vil malen (so vil das alt Testament betrifft) neher und gemässer ist” (Hätzer, *Baruch der Prophet*, p.ii v).

²¹¹ The *Glossa ordinaria* was an interlinear and marginal gloss of the whole Bible carried out by Anselm of Laon and his school in the twelfth century. By the end of the century Peter Lombard and the other Paris masters had accepted the *Glossa* as their standard guide. In the first half of the fourteenth century Nicholas of Lyra published the results of his Hebrew scholarship, particularly his study of *Rashi*, in the *Postilla litteralis*. See Beryl Smalley, “The Bible in the Medieval Schools,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe, vol. 2: *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969), pp. 205-19. By the beginning of the sixteenth century the *Glossa* and the *Postilla* tended to be published together with the biblical text. The text used in the following study was Strabo Walahfrid, Nicholas, and Pablo, eds. *Bibliorum sacrorum tomus quartus cum glossa ordinaria, & Nicolai Lyrani expositionibus, additionibus & replicis* (Parisiis: 1545); apparently there are no modern editions or English translations of these important medieval works.

²¹² *Ibn Ezra* is Abraham Ibn Ezra, (1087-1164), Spanish grammarian and commentator. After 1140 he travelled about Europe, living in Italy, France, England, and perhaps the Holy Land. *Kimchi*, also known as *Redak*, or *Radak*, is Rabbi David Kimchi, (1160? - 1235?), born in Provence, son of

comparable reading in another text does not assure our translator's dependence on that text, or even their access to it. Furthermore, since the *Glossa ordinaria* and especially Lyra made use of the Rabbinic tradition, especially *Rashi*,²¹³ there are a number of occasions where Hätzer and Denck could have relied on either the Rabbinic or Latin traditions, or both. However, these inconclusive instances aside, it should still be possible to identify which schools of translation or interpretation were more likely to be depended upon by Hätzer and Denck.

The first point that needs to be made about the sources upon which Hätzer and Denck may have depended in order to clarify the biblical text for their readers is that there was no slavish dependence on any source or group of sources. What information they learned they made their own, and there are very few occasions where the readings or explanations in their annotations could be considered exact quotations of any given source. Even in cases where they are reporting variant readings they frequently seem to be more like paraphrases or summaries of other sources rather than exact quotations. Furthermore on more than one occasion the explanations provided are decidedly out of step with the interpretation of all of the rest of the possible sources which have been considered.²¹⁴

Of the 23 times when Hätzer and Denck identify “*etlich*” as the source for an alternate reading, four of those times the source or sources remain unidentified, indicating as yet

Joseph and brother of Moses, grammarian and exegete. *Abarbanal* is Dom Isaac Abravanel, (1437-1508), born in the Iberian Peninsula, moving to Italy after the expulsion of the Jews in 1492. His commentary on the Later Prophets was published around 1520. For the other rabbis see above p. 9, note 19

²¹³ Though Lyra's tendency was to quote *Rashi* and then refute him. See Oberman, “Discovery of Hebrew,” p. 21.

²¹⁴ Most notable are their comments on Jeremiah 15[:8] and Habakuk 3[:11], and their translation of the word *ruach* in Ezekiel 2[:2].

undiscovered sources.²¹⁵ For Hätscher and Denck, “*etlich*” could be any combination of the previously identified sources. In the case of Ezekiel 2[:2] (to which we will return again), it is all of the sources. On two occasions “*etlich*” refers to the Septuagint and the Vulgate (Ezek 34[:16]; 40[:43]), and on two other occasions it was a reference to a suggested emendation to the text by the Masoretes (Jer 5[:8]; Hos 6[:3]). Of the remaining fourteen occasions, eleven times “*etlich*” includes the possibility of a Rabbinic source.²¹⁶

One of the most evocative possible resources for Hätscher and Denck is the Syriac translation of the Bible. The only parallel that has been found to date for one of the variant readings provided for Isaiah 28[:13] is from the Peshitta, and in Amos 7[:14], one of the few occasions where the Hebrew text was not followed closely, again the only parallel reading is found in the Peshitta. However, given the fact that there is no corroborating external evidence for the presence of the Syriac Scriptures or the ability of anyone to read them in Northern Europe for another quarter of a century (see Appendix A, n. 26), it may be best to leave that as a remote possibility and consider the origins for these readings unknown.

More than forty of the annotations contain elements which could have been gleaned from both Jewish and Christian sources.²¹⁷ This comes as no surprise given that the *Glossa*

²¹⁵ Is 3[:12]; 30[:20]; Amos 2[:6]; Hab 1[:12]. Possible areas for further research would be Oecolampadius’ commentaries on Malachi and Isaiah with which Hätscher was very familiar, Capito’s commentary on Habakuk published in 1526 and his commentary on Hosea (though published in 1528 it is possible that Hätscher discussed the subject with Capito while he stayed with him in Strasbourg in 1526), Jerome’s commentaries on Scripture which Erasmus had edited and made popular, and Luther’s early work on the Prophets, such as his lectures and early translations of individual books.

²¹⁶ Is 19[:6]; Ezek 23[:23]; 27[:11]; 28[:23]; Hos 8[:10]; 10[:10]; Joel 1[:17]; Amos 5[:11]; 7[:14]; Nahum 2[:4]; 2[:6].

²¹⁷ Is 4[:1]; 14[:9]; 19[:6]; 22[:1]; 23[:3]; 27[:12]; 29[:1]; 30[:8]; 33[:9]; 41[:2]; 45[:13]; 47[:11]; 48[:10]; 49[:12]; 51[:9]; 65[:3]; Jer 1[:11]; 2[:11]; 11[:15]; 13[:19]; 25[:26]; 31[:19]; 49[:20]; Lam 3[:13]; Ezek 2[:2]; 43[:15]; 43[:26]; 47[:8]; 47[:19]; Hos 5[:11]; 8[:10]; Amos 5[:12]; Nah

ordinaria and especially Nicholas of Lyra made use of Rabbinic sources to create their glosses.

In his comments on Zephaniah 1[:9] and Zechariah 1[:5] and elsewhere, we find Nicholas of Lyra quoting *Rashi*. Among these examples, however, there are a number of cases where one source seems to be much closer to the content or wording of our annotation. Of these instances, five seem closer to the wording of a Jewish source while two seem more akin to a Christian source.²¹⁸ In addition there are fifteen annotations which could owe their origin to more than one Rabbinic source but have no recognizable parallels in Christian sources,²¹⁹ fifteen more which sound most like *Rashi*,²²⁰ six which sound similar to the comments of *Redak*²²¹ and two which may have their origin in the commentary of *Ibn Ezra*.²²² By comparison there is only one note that could owe its origin to both the *Glossa ordinaria* and Nicholas of Lyra,²²³ four which could be attributed to *Lyra*,²²⁴ and one more that could be attributed to the *Glossa ordinaria*.²²⁵

The ratio of agreement is more than 6 to 1 in favour of the Rabbinic tradition. There can be no

3[:19]; Zeph 1[:5]; 1[:9]; Zech 1[:5]; 4[:14]; 8[:19]; 9[:7]; Mal 2[:15].

²¹⁸ Ezek 2[:2] is particularly close to *Redak* and Ezek 21[:10]; 47[:8]; Zech 4[:14] and 9[:8] most closely resemble *Rashi*. On the other hand, Ezek 43[:26] bears more than a passing resemblance to the *Glossa ordinaria* and Zech 8[:19] could well owe its origin to *Lyra*.

²¹⁹ Is 1[:31]; 22[:8]; 22[:23]; 30[:6]; 32[:4]; Jer 3[:24]; 51[:11]; Ezek 27[:11]; 28[:13]; 28[:14]; Hos 4[:8]; 6[:3]; Joel 1[:17]; Amos 9[:13]; Nahum 2[:4].

²²⁰ Is 15[:5]; 24[:5]; Dan 11[:17]; Hos 4[:16]; 10[:10]; Amos 3[:12]; 5[:11]; 7[:14]; 8[:5]; Ob vs 20; Nah 2[:6]; Zech 3[:9]; 9[:16]; Mal 2[:3].

²²¹ Is 8[:23]; 10[:12]; 20[:5]; 24[:18]; Hos 9[:8]; and especially Jon 4[:6].

²²² Is 16[:14]; 24[:23].

²²³ Hos 2[:16].

²²⁴ Jer 15[:7]; 20[:17] Ezek 32[:30]; Hos 2[:23]. This last reference is a translation of a Hebrew name and it is unlikely that *Lyra*'s comment would have been needed for that.

²²⁵ Zech 3[:1].

doubt that the greater authority for Hätzer and Denck was the Rabbinic interpretive tradition as opposed to the Christian.

There are a number of instances where the similarities between an annotation of *Alle Propheten* and a particular potential source become striking enough that they might be considered a direct reference or even a quotation. The annotation to Ezekiel 32[:30] provides an alternate reading from the Vulgate and then an explanation of that reading which is almost a quotation of Nicholas of Lyra, down to the same biblical reference. While the explanation in the annotation to Ezekiel 43[:26] bears a resemblance to sources both Jewish and Christian, the description of the sacrifice as a gift is uniquely akin to the *Glossa ordinaria*. The annotation for Daniel 11[:17] parallels the commentary of *Rashi* by making the same identification of the “daughter” and quoting the same phrase of Scripture from the Song of Solomon, and in this case, the identification is radically different from the *Glossa ordinaria* and *Lyra*. Again, in the note to Amos 8[:5], *Alle Propheten* makes reference to the same passage of Scripture as *Rashi* did in his commentary. In Amos 9[:13] both *Rashi* and *Redak* refer to the same passage of Scripture as Hätzer and Denck in providing essentially the same explanation of the passage. The annotations in Obadiah verse 20 are very interesting because they explain that according to the Jews the place names in the text refer to France and Spain. The parallel for this is found in *Rashi* and is very much removed from the traditional Latin identification of these places. *Alle Propheten*’s description of the “*kikaion*” plant in Jonah 4[:6] depends, without question, on the exposition of *Redak*. The variant reading provided for Nahum 2[:6] is a quotation from *Rashi*. The explanation in the annotation of Zephaniah 1[:9] is a case where *Lyra* has quoted *Rashi* and *Alle Propheten* has quoted one or the other of them. The detailed note to Zechariah 8[:19]

in which the significance of various fasts is explained is a virtual quotation of *Lyra* who obviously got his information from Rabbinic sources. When *Alle Propheten* gets closer to quoting a source, that source is usually Rabbinic and most often *Rashi*.

Yet it is unclear what Jewish sources Hätzer and Denck had access to. They never identify a specific Rabbinic source though both the *Glossa ordinaria* and Nicolas of Lyra do so. If they had a specific Rabbinic text to which they referred, there would have been no reason not to identify it. There are occasions where they clearly did not have the Rabbinic Bible or another Jewish commentary available to them as they did their translating. The note to Isaiah 7[:22], for example, runs counter to everyone in both the Jewish and Christian interpretive traditions. In Isaiah 11[:14] an annotation is provided to clarify which direction the sea was in Israel while the truly obscure part of the phrase, and the focus of all the Rabbinic discussion, remained unexplained. The note for Isaiah 52[:5] provides a reading that cannot be supported by the Hebrew and differs from the reading found in The Targum and *Rashi*. And in Lamentations 2[:1] *Alle Propheten* identifies the “glory of Israel” as the Temple, while both *Rashi* and the Targum identify God’s “footstool” as the Temple. When *Alle Propheten* identifies “*die Juden*” as a source, that source could be the Hebrew text, the Targum and one or more of the Rabbis (Jer 17[:16]), just one or more of the Rabbis (Jer 25[:26]; Ezek 21[:23]; Dan 11[:17]; Ob vs.20), or, in one interesting case (Jer 51[:11]), the Targum and one of the Rabbis while another of the Rabbis reads the text the same as *Alle Propheten*’s original reading. Furthermore, given the infrequency of anything resembling a direct quotation from a Rabbinic source, the impression is that, as a rule, they were not working with a written source at all. What more readily fits the evidence is an oral communication of the Rabbinic

interpretive tradition by a person or persons very familiar with that tradition, as would be the case if Hätzer and Denck were receiving assistance from one or more of the learned Rabbis of Worms.

There is no question that *Alle Propheten* was a translation with a substantial Jewish influence. One of the consequences of that influence was the level of sophistication that the translators were able to display regarding their facility with the Hebrew language and their ability to create a comprehensible literal translation from an, at times, extremely difficult Hebrew text. Though there were occasional errors in handling the Hebrew, the over all impression is that these were gifted Hebraists indeed. And when the brevity of time spent on the project is taken into consideration, this becomes a remarkable effort.²²⁶

Another, and perhaps the most significant consequence of the Jewish influence on this translation can be discerned in the complete lack of a Christological element in the annotations. While the medieval Latin glossators had Christological references which were almost ubiquitous, and Luther's annotations, and especially his introduction, had a soundly Christological interpretive agenda, there were none in *Alle Propheten*. In fact there is more than one occasion where the annotations are decidedly non-Christian. Among the most dramatic instances is the translation and explanation of Zechariah 9[:9] where the translators vary from the Hebrew (one of the few times they do) to agree with the Septuagint and Vulgate – and the Christian Messianic interpretation of the text. However the note, in providing the Hebrew reading, deliberately subverts the Christian reading of the text (see Appendix A). There were other instances where Hätzer and Denck avoided the heated debate between

²²⁶ For example Pagninus spent twenty years on his new Latin translation of the Bible.

Rabbinic and Christian exegetes regarding Christological interpretations of the text. In Is. 53: [5] no effort is made to identify the “*im*” in the text though the pattern elsewhere had been to do just that (see Is 41[:2]; 45[:13]; Ezek 21:(28); Mal 2[:15]). In this case the Rabbis understood the text to be about the nation Israel while the Christians read it as a prophecy of Christ. Hätzer and Denck refused to participate in the debate.²²⁷ This active opposition to the Christian Messianic interpretation of these prophetic passages by the Jewish exegetes was the primary reason why very few Christian Hebraists were prepared to make use of Jewish exegetical texts on the Prophets.²²⁸ This makes Hätzer and Denck’s willingness to depend primarily on the Jewish sources for their translation even more significant. Questions have been asked from time to time about the theological orthodoxy of both Hätzer and Denck.²²⁹ This translation and these annotations do nothing to put those questions to rest. What is unclear

²²⁷ See also their silence regarding “EmmanuEl” in Is. 7: [14]. Walter Klaassen, in an unpublished paper entitled “Anabaptist Hermeneutics,” discusses the Christocentrism of the Anabaptist biblical hermeneutic, but he points out that the historical awareness of Marpeck, the Swiss Brethren and Menno prevented them from finding Christ everywhere in the Old Testament. However, he did say in his doctoral dissertation, “Word, Spirit, and Scripture in Early Anabaptist Thought” (D. Phil, University of Oxford, 1960), p. 184, that for many of the early Anabaptists “the Old Testament had [Christ] in promise.” John J. Klassen, “Scriptural Authority Among the Anabaptists: A Study of Implicit Obedience” (M.Th., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966), pp. 57-58, dealing primarily with the Swiss Anabaptists, stated that the Anabaptists accepted the Old Testament as far as it witnesses to Christ and “they accepted the prophets insofar as they proclaimed Christ.” From this perspective the absence of any Christological reference in this translation is even more dramatic.

²²⁸ For example Martin Bucer was willing to use Kimchi’s exegetical work for clarification of the text “except where they are hemmed in by prophecies of the spiritual kingdom of Christ and true inner righteousness, which rests upon the faith of the saviour.” (See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 127).

²²⁹ See, for example, W. Klassen, “Was Hans Denck a Universalist?,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 39 (1965): 152-54. Fellmann, “Wormser Propheten,” p. 84 summarizes the conclusion made by J. B. Renninger in his 1949 S.T.M. thesis that Hätzer’s use of the indefinite article rather than the definite article in the translation of the Messianic passages in the Prophets was a choice that probably was influenced by his anti-Trinitarian theology. This in comparison to Luther’s use of the definite article in the same places which was seen to be a clear Messianic statement.

is whether Christological references are absent from this work out of deference to the Jews with whom they were working on the translation, or whether the translators were heading toward anti-Trinitarianism themselves (these are not mutually exclusive possibilities). Denck died within a few months of the completion of this project and Hätzer was executed within a year. Had they lived, it would have been interesting to see where their spiritual pilgrimages might have led them.

It is also possible to speculate on the purpose and intended audience of the translation. It would be reasonable to assume that a translation of the Prophets by two Anabaptists would be accomplished with the purpose of providing a biblical text in the vernacular for that majority of Anabaptists who could not read Latin. The choice of the Prophets as the subject for translation might suggest that the translators sought to provide a text which supported the charismatic and eschatological inclinations of the Anabaptists.²³⁰ While these motives cannot be ruled out, the annotations point to a different motive and audience. The fact that the annotations contain such a significant number of variant readings suggest that Hätzer and Denck may have been acting as much in their capacity as Christian Humanists as they were acting as Anabaptists and that the intended audience was as much the academic community as it was those among the

²³⁰ Weis, *Hätzer*, pp. 143–44 suggested such motives for their interest in the Prophets. On the charismatic tendencies in Anabaptism see K.R. Davis, “Anabaptism as a Charismatic Movement,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 53 (1979): 219–52. In 1527 Hans Leupold of Augsburg said that his community considered God’s Word primarily to be the Gospel and the Prophets. See *Mennonite Encyclopedia*, s. v. “Old Testament,” by W. Klassen. Among Anabaptism generally, there was a clear distinction between the Old and New Testaments, with a much greater significance and authority given to the New Testament and particularly the life and teachings of Jesus in the Gospels. There were, of course, exceptions to this rule as witnessed by the Münster community and, less dramatically, Hans Hut and his school. See William Klassen, “Anabaptist Hermeneutics: The Letter and the Spirit,” *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 40 (1966): 86; Dale R. Schrag and Lois Barrett, “Anabaptists and the Bible: From Sola Scriptura to Solus Christus,” *Mennonite Life* 44, no. 3 (1989): 15–16; Klassen, “Word, Spirit, and Scripture,” p. 184.

Anabaptist who could not read Latin.²³¹ Certainly annotations which undermine accepted Christian Messianic readings of a text (see above p. 103) would not be intended for an uneducated and easily swayed lay person. Furthermore, the complete lack of eschatological and Christological references in the annotations, coupled with the unusual, and decidedly un-charismatic interpretation of the Hebrew word רוח – *ruach* in Ezekiel 2[:2] and elsewhere in Ezekiel, also suggest that the primary audience may not have been the charismatically and apocalyptically inclined Anabaptist community, or if it was, the translation was intended as a corrective to what Denck would have seen as the excesses of some of the Anabaptist communities.²³² One must also recall that the community of which Denck and Hätzer were a part in Worms while they were engaged in their translation efforts was unusual for an Anabaptist community and resembled more a humanist circle particularly interested in the art of translation than it did a conventicle of Anabaptists (see above p. 77).

E. The Foreword to Baruch der Prophet

After the translation of the Prophets was completed, Hätzer continued his translation endeavours on his own and he turned to the Old Testament Apocryphal books as a continuation of the prophetic theme. In 1528 Peter Schöffer of Worms, the same man who published the

²³¹ J.M. Lenhart, "Protestant Latin Bibles of the Reformation from 1520-1570: a bibliographic account," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 8, no. 4 (1946): 425f., argues that the vernacular translations of the Reformation period were for the uneducated lay people and that the educated continued to read the Bible in Latin, for which purpose Protestants provided their own Latin texts of the Bible. However, this example of the translation presently under consideration may raise doubts about the universality of Lenhart's thesis.

²³² He had spent some time in St. Gall where some extreme charismatic incidents took place among the Anabaptists and it may have given him cause for concern. Denck's opposition to apocalyptic speculations is well known.

Worms Prophets, published the first part of Hätzer's German Apocrypha. It was entitled *Baruch der Prophet. Die Histori Susannah. Die Histori Bel zü Babel. Alles newlich auß der Bybli verteutscht. O Gott erlöss die gefangnen. Anno M.D. XXVIII.*²³³ It is in this last publication that Hätzer himself provides evidence not only of contact with Jews but collaboration in the translation process. In the third paragraph of the Foreword he indicated that he would try to deliver the completed translation of the Apocrypha for the upcoming harvest mass (*nechstkünfig herbstmeß*), hoping to secure some Hebrew texts which he could use as the basis for his work. He had already made contacts with Jewish authorities, presumably while he was engaged in translating the Prophets, and was now again in contact with "several Hebrews," who had promised, among other things, to let him use a manuscript copy of the Books of the Maccabees.²³⁴ This admission is significant because it comes at a time when Jews – and Christians who collaborated with them – were under such suspicion that most Christians, regardless of how much Jewish assistance they received, were loathe to admit that assistance.²³⁵ The full text of this rare work has been reproduced in Appendix B.

Summary

By his own admission Hätzer had been in contact with "several Hebrews" in the

²³³ *O Gott erlöss die gefangnen* was Hätzer's personal motto.

²³⁴ See Hans R. Guggisberg, "Jakob Würben of Biel, a Thoughtful Admonisher Against Ludwig Hätzer and the Anabaptists," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 46 (1972): 248, for his summary. The German reads: "*Mich haben auch deß etliche Hebreer verträst/ unnd mir darzü an eym ort anzeygung geben/ die mich auch gereydt die bücher Michabeorum/ Hebraisch geschriben/ sehen liessen,*" Hätzer, *Baruch der Prophet*, p. ii v.

²³⁵ See Friedman, *Most Ancient Testimony*, p. 39.

translation process. The nature of that contact becomes clearer through an analysis of the annotations in *Alle Propheten*. The Rabbinic reading of the biblical text held a much greater authority for Hätzer and Denck than did traditional Christian readings. The way in which they appropriated the Rabbinic tradition suggests that it was mediated to them by a Jewish scholar well grounded in that tradition (presumably one of the Rabbis of Worms) rather than culled directly from the pages of the medieval Jewish commentators. Although the translation was clearly intended to be a Protestant Christian translation, the translators opted for a historical/grammatical translation rather than a pastoral one and consciously avoided any Christological interpretation of the text. Most of the messianic passages which were sources of controversy between Jews and Christians received no comment from Hätzer and Denck and in subtle ways they abandoned or subverted traditional Christian readings of messianic passages. The result was a well translated, theologically neutral text of the Prophets, at once respected in Wittenberg and Zurich for its scholarship and despised because of the confessional position of its translators and the non-Christological (perhaps to some, anti-Christian) tone of the translation itself.

Conclusion

The rise of Christian Hebraica in the medieval and Renaissance periods, rather than contributing to an increased understanding and appreciation between Christians and Jews, instead undermined the Augustinian theological justification for the existence of Jews in a Christian society. With the demise of the theological authority of Augustine's position on the toleration of Jews, some religious and intellectual leaders, Hebraists included, began to give theological justification for calls to eliminate the Jewish presence from Christian Europe either by expulsion or conversion. Among early Reformation scholars the study of Hebraica flourished as did a renewed mission to the Jews. The early Protestant mission wore a friendly countenance; however, after 1538 attitudes became increasingly hostile toward the Jews and an almost hysterical anti-Jewish polemic became commonplace for most Protestant leaders. Like their predecessors, the Protestant Hebraists contributed to this polemic, apparently unable or unwilling to articulate a theological justification for the continued existence of the Jews in a Christian society.

Among the writings of the Anabaptist leaders there is surprisingly little said about the Jews and it seems likely that the Jews were as much on the periphery of their consciousness as they were on the periphery of society. Despite entering into a similar existential experience of religious isolation and persecution, the Hubmaiers and Marpecks of Anabaptism showed no greater sympathy for the Jews because of it. There were, however, significant Judaizing reforms among a number of the Anabaptist groups and a Sabbatarian Anabaptist like Fischer stands out for his admiration and respect of Judaism and his willingness to learn from Judaism in his efforts to reform Christianity. Overall the impression is that the Anabaptists were less

hostile to the Jews than their Christian contemporaries. Possible reasons for this range from being a persecuted minority themselves, and therefore more sympathetic to the plight of another persecuted minority, to being more diligently restitutionist in their reform than other reform movements, and therefore closer in spirit to biblical Judaism and, by extension, more sympathetic to post-biblical Judaism.

Ludwig Hätzer's attitude toward the Jews is difficult to clarify. He was willing to translate and publish an anti-Jewish polemical/missionary document, but he was also quite willing to acknowledge contact and cooperation with Jews on his biblical translations. Denck's attitude is easier to identify – largely because of the accessibility of his body of writing. Denck was clearly a sixteenth century Christian in his occasional willingness to endorse some of the long standing anti-Jewish stereotypes. However, unlike many of his Humanist and Hebraist contemporaries, Denck's tolerant spirit extended to the Jews. While he was ambivalent about the soteriological efficacy of post-biblical Judaism, he still had respect for it and for Jews themselves and considered Judaism a superior spiritual state to paganism or Christians who did not live in obedience to Christ. Unlike the Protestant Hebraists of a decade later, Hätzer and Denck displayed no shrill anti-Jewish polemic in their writings. While it is possible to speculate about whether they would have followed the lead of Luther, Bucer, Münster and others toward a much harsher attitude toward the Jews, there is little in their lives and writings which would suggest such a direction. Instead the movement of both was much more in the direction of toleration and perhaps even universalism than toward the shrill intolerance which came to dominate most of the other Protestant attitudes toward the Jews.

The study of the Jewish community of Worms and its history of collaboration with

Christians, some of whom were known to Denck, combined with the internal evidence of the annotations to *Alle Propheten*, and Hätzer's own unsolicited admission in the Foreword to *Baruch der Prophet*, support Luther's assessment that Jews had a hand in the translation. It seems clear that Hätzer and Denck did not hesitate to ask one or more of the Rabbis of Worms about the Rabbinic tradition of interpretation for obscure words and phrases in the Hebrew text. Consequently, the translation possessed "plenty of skill and craftsmanship" in Luther's words, despite the speed with which the translation was done. The more significant and thought-provoking consequence of the Jewish assistance in the translation is the total absence of any Christological element in the annotations.²³⁶ While it is not possible to draw conclusions on the theological positions which Hätzer and Denck held following their interaction with the Jews of Worms, it is tempting to speculate that their incipient inclinations away from Christian orthodoxy were reinforced by the experience.

While the lives of Hätzer and Denck and their collaboration with the Jews on the translation of *Alle Propheten* do not represent an example of Christians completely free from the prejudices of their time – indeed it would be shocking if they did – they do represent an encouraging deviation from the suspicion and hostility which have characterized Jewish-Christian relations for most of their history. For that all too rare example of deviation from the norm, as well as the quality of the translation which resulted from the cooperation, subsequent generations can be grateful.

This study is only the first step in a much larger study on Anabaptists and the Jews. The relationships with the Jews of Anabaptists like Augustine Bader, Oswald Leber, Melchior

²³⁶ As Luther said (page 4) "Jews had a hand in it, and they do not show much reverence for Christ."

Hoffman, Andreas Fischer and the entire Paduan Anabaptist community promise much fruitful material for study and provide the hope that this particular blank space in the history of Jewish Christian relations would begin to assume substance and shape – a shape, it would seem, with a less malignant visage than many of the other narratives on relations between Christians and Jews.

Appendix A

This collection of the Annotations of *Alle Propheten nach Hebraischer sprach Verteutscht* are based upon the first Worms folio edition of 1527 and collated with the Augsburg folio edition of 1527 and the Worms octavo edition of 1528. Heretofore little attention has been given to *Alle Propheten* and even less to the annotations. The annotations represent a valuable but underappreciated resource for the general study of Anabaptist exegesis. More directly they provide the opportunity for insight into the interpretive priorities and values of Hätzer and Denck as they went about the business of translation. The primary purpose of this appendix is to identify which of the various available Christian and Jewish sources were most likely to be used by the translators to help clarify the text. To that end the annotations have been collected here along with the phrase(s) from the text to which the annotations refer. Since verse numbering is a later innovation, the verse numbers are supplied silently based upon the verse divisions in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. The Schwabacher font corresponds closely to the German fonts used in these editions. The footnotes record all the textual variants in the annotations from the three editions of *Alle Propheten*. The footnotes also contain comments on the Hebrew text which explain choices made and variants provided in the translation process. They also contain translations or interpretations from various sources which parallel readings in the text or notes currently under consideration and which may have provided guidance for Hätzer and Denck. All translations from the Septuagint and Vulgate are mine; all translations from the Aramaic Targumim and the Rabbinic commentators are from Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg, ed., *Mikra'ot Gedolot: A New English Translation of the Text, Rashi and a Commentary Digest by Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg*, 29 vols. (New York: The Judaica Press

Inc., 1969 -) and Martin McNamara, Kevin J. Cathcart, and Michael Maher, eds., *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*, 18 vols. (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987 -) unless otherwise identified. The quotations from the *Glossa ordinaria* and the *postillae* of Nicholas of Lyra are from Walahfrid, Strabo, Nicholas, and Pablo, eds., *Bibliorum sacrorum tomus quartus cum glossa ordinaria, & Nicolai Lyrani expositionibus, additionibus & replicis* (Parisiis, 1545) of which there are no modern editions or English translations available.

Jesaja

Jes 1.(31) und die stercke* wirt zu bast

* stercke: Sie mit versteet er den götzen oder das bilde.¹

Jes 2.(2) und alle heyden werden zu jm fliessen* vnd vil völcker werden gehn vnd sagen"

* Das ist/ eilends vnd ungezwungen Lauffen.

Jes 2.(9) Der mensch* hat sich geneygt/

* Mensch vnd man/ nach der sprach art/ beschleuft meniglich on vnderscheyd.

Jes 3.(12) Die treiber meines volck* seind kinder/

* Etliche lesen/ meines volcks treiber ersuchen es gar: Treiber aber seind/ die das volck beschweren vnd plagen.

Jes 3.(23) die brustücher vnd sommerkittellin*.

* Sie kan man nit bald gewisse anzeygung der weibischen zier geben/ dann sie nit breuchig ietz vnd von tag zu tag sich verendern.²

Jes 4.(1) und vns mit vnseren eygen fleydern befleyden/* alleyn das dein vber vns angerüfft

¹ Ibn Ezra and Redak explain הָסֹן – hason as the strong one, denoting the idols constructed of strong wood.

² Worms, 1528, octavo [hereafter W-8] reads: ‘Hie kan man nit bald bewisse anzeygung der weibisschen zier geben, dann sie ietz nit breuchig, vnd sich von tag zu tag verendern.’

* Daß ist/ Läßt vns nur deine weiber genent werden.³

Jes 7:14) desz namen wirt heyffen Imanu~~E~~l (no *)

* Imanu~~E~~l hebraisch/ heyft: Gott ist mit vns.

Jes 7:22) werden butter vnd honig essen*

* Er wil sprechen/ Zü so großer armüt werden sie kommen/ das sie nichts dann allerschlechteste speiß zu essen haben werden.⁴

Jes 8:7) so wirt der Herr vil vnd starcke wasser desz fluß* über sie führen/

* Desz fluß/ das ist der Euphrates.

Jes 8:8) Ursach* Imanu~~E~~l

* Das ist/ Gott ist mit vns.⁵

Jes 8:23)⁶ jensid dem Jordan inn Galilea^c der heyden/

^a Das ist/ grenz.⁷

Jes 9:2)⁸ Unnd weil du die heyden merest/ ^b so machest auch der freuden vil/

^b Der text mag auch also gelesen werden: Und die weil du die heyden merest/ so minderst du die freud/ etc. mir gefellt die ander lection baß.⁹

³ Rashi, Redak and Abarbanel all made reference to the Midrash Aggadah, which explained that Nebuchadenzar had commanded his armies not to rape married women, lest the soldiers be punished. These women, therefore, begged to be married nominally to avoid such humiliation. Nicholas of Lyra reads: ‘simus [sic] uxores tuae’ – like your wives.

⁴ Augsburg, 1527, folio (hereafter A-f) reads: ‘Er will sprechen: zü so grosser armüt werden kommen, das sy nichts dann allerschlechteste speyß zu essen haben werden.’ W-8 reads: ‘Er wil sprechen: Zü grosser armüt werden sie kommen, das sie nichts dann allerschlechteste speyß etc. zü essen haben werden.’

⁵ Note omitted in W-8.

⁶ The chapter division here is quite fluid from one translation to another.

⁷ “Redak notes that all these places mentioned are on the borders of Eretz Israel.”

⁸ This is still the final paragraph of chapter eight in *Alle Propheten*; the chapter break comes after 9:2 in the Hebrew text.

⁹ When the Massoretes encountered what they perceived to be an obvious scribal error in the text, rather than change the consonants of the text, they provided vowel pointing for what they

Jes 10.(12) Und als bald der Herr sein gantz werct* am ber Zion vnd Jerusalem aufgericht hat/

* sein gantz werct/ Verstehe das werct des künigs aus Ussyrien.¹⁰

Jes 11.(14) sie werden den Phälistinern auff eyn schulter fliegen/ den meer zu* vnd werden mit eynander die Morgenlender berauben/

* Das ist/ gegen abent.

Jes 13.(1) Das ist der last* Babel/

* Last/ ist eyn schwere prophecei

Jes 14.(9) und alle Böc* der erden/

* Böc/ das seind die fürfsten.¹¹

Jes 15.(5) dero Rigel* bisz gen Zoar drei jährige kälber waren/

* Rigel/ Das seind/ die jung/ starcke vnd beste manschafft.¹²

Jes 16.(14) das eben mietling jar* seind/

believed to be the correct reading, and then wrote the corrected consonants in the margin. A person reading the text would notice the improbable vocalization and refer to the correction in the margin. The uncorrected word in the text is identified as *Ketibh* “it is written”, and the corrected reading in the margin is identified as *Qere* “to be read”. The consonants of the text for the word in question read לֹא - ‘lammed aleph’ which would mean ‘no’ while the vowels suggest that the text should read לָו ‘lammed waw’ which would read ‘for him’. Our translators have chosen the reading as vocalized rather than the consonantal text which was provided as an alternative reading in the note. Our translators agreed with the Massoretes (or *Rashi*) and chose the *Qere* as the more likely of the readings, but they did place the *Ketibh* in the note as an alternate reading.

¹⁰ Redak reads: – אַת כָל מְעַשָּׂהוּ בָנָוִים וּבִשְׂרָאֵל עַל יְדֵי מֶלֶךְ אֲשֶׁר בָּהָר צִוָּן וּבִירוּשָׁלָם: – all the deeds in the nations and in Israel by the hands of the king of Assyria on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem. (translation mine).

¹¹ LXX reads: ‘πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἀρξαντες τῆς γῆς.’ Vulgate reads: ‘suscitavit tibi gigantas omnes principes terrae.’ *Rashi* points to Psalm 22:13 and Amos 4:1 as examples of animals used as symbolic references to princes and leaders. *Ibn Ezra*, in M. Friedländer, ed., *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*, second ed. (New York: Philipp Feldheim, Inc., 1964), p.70, reads “the chiefs” and refers to Prov 30:31 for a comparable use of the word.

¹² *Rashi* explains it thus: “For the entire strength of Moab shall my heart cry, as far as Zoar, which is a third born heifer; it is their main strength, like a heifer born third to its mother.” The editor further clarifies: “According to *Rashi*, the bars are symbolic of the strength of Moab.”

* Das ist/ Darnach wirt alle gnad auf sein/ vnd ich wil jnen vrlaub geben.¹³

Jes 18.(2) zu eynem volck eyner richtschnür* vnd der vertrettung/
 * Richtschnür/ das ist/ dem man all seine gebew abbricht.

Jes 19.(6) so werden die stettgräben* seicht vnd truden/
 * Etlich lesen/ Die wasser Egypti.¹⁴

Jes 20.(5) Und sie* werden erschrecken vnd zu schanden werden vom Morenland iher
 zuversicht/
 * Verstehe hic bei die¹⁵ zwey geschlecht/ Juda vnd BenJamin.¹⁶

Jes 22.(1) Das ist der last der Gsichttals*.
 * Gsichttal/ ist Jerusalem.¹⁷

Jes 22.(8) alda wirdstu auff die rüstung des waldhaufz* sehen.

¹³ Friedländer, ed., *Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*, p.80, *Ibn Ezra* reads: “As the years of a hireling, who daily counts when the end will come.” This is reference to a person in servitude who is waiting for their liberty. Our note is making reference to the year of Jubilee (or the Sabbath year) when persons in servitude are set free. It is not clear *prima facie* that *Ibn Ezra* is making the same reference.

¹⁴ The Hebrew word in question is מַצּוֹר - *matzor*. *Rashi* thought the word to mean “a seige” and the deep canals of the text were “like the ditches of the sieges of cities.” *Redak*, on the other hand, explains מַצּוֹר as another form of מִצְרָיָם - *mitzrim*, the Hebrew word for Egypt. In this case, it would appear that our translators followed *Rashi* in the text and suggested *Redak*’s rendering as an alternative in the note. Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951) (hereafter designated as *BDB*), pp.596, 849, agrees with *Redak*, suggesting the word as a poetic form and identifying three other similar biblical passages. The *Glossa ordinaria* interlinear note reads ‘Qui de turbidis aquis Nili implebantur.’

¹⁵ W-8 does not have “die.”

¹⁶ *Redak* reads: “He is referring only to Judah and Benjamin, since the ten tribes had already been exiled in the sixth year of Hezekiah, and when the king of Assyria led away the captivity of Egypt and the exile of Cush, it was already the fourteenth year of Hezekiah.”

¹⁷ *Rashi* reads: “This is Jerusalem, the valley concerning which most prophecies were prophesied.” *Ibn Ezra* and *Redak* agree. Nicholas of Lyra reads: ‘*Licet enim Ierusalem quantum ad unam partem sit in monte, tamen una pars eius est in valle.*’

* Das ist/ das von dem wald Libanon gezimmert ist.¹⁸

Jes 22.(23) Ihn wil ich aufhefften zu eym nagel *an eym vortrawten ort/

* Er wirt trewlich vnd redlich handeln/ vnd alle ding wirt bei vnd mit ihm wol versorgt sein.¹⁹

Jes 23.(1) Das ist der last der stat *Zor

* Das ist Tyrus von welcher jm Euangelio geschrieben steht.²⁰

Jes 23.(3) unnd der som Sichor* auff vil wassern/

* Sichor/ Das ist der flug Nilus jm Egypten.²¹

Jes 24.(5) und das erdtrich hat gehesichtet* für ire in woner/

* Das ist/ Es hat sich fruchtbar gestellt/ vnd ist doch nichts dachinder gewesen.²²

Jes 24.(18) dann die fenster* seind obenherab auffgethon/

* Das ist/ wolckenbruch²³

Jes 24.(23) Der Mond wirt sich beschämen* vnd die sonn wirt schamrot/

* Das ist/ Es werden finsternuß.²⁴

¹⁸ Rashi reads: “... and the king placed them in the house of the forest of Lebanon (I Kings 16f.).” Kara and Redak read: בֵּית יָעָר הַלְּבָנָן – *beit yaar ha’levnon* – *house of the forest of Lebanon* (translation mine).

¹⁹ Rashi reads: “[Targum] Jonathan renders: And I will appoint him a faithful trustee, serving in a sure place. Jonathan renders **מִזְרָח** as sure, i.e. a place that is faithful to those who lean on it, for it shall not move.” The Targum reads: “And I will *appoint* him a faithful *officer ministering* in an *enduring* place.” [Italicized words in the Targum translation represent variations from the Hebrew text].

²⁰ LXX transliterates ‘Τύπον’; the Vulgate transliterates ‘Tyri.’

²¹ The Vulgate reads: ‘semen Nili’. Rashi reads: “Sihor – This is the Nile. . .”

²² Rashi reads: “This is a sort of deceit; it produces grass but does not produce growing grain; it shows growing grain, but there are not wheat kernels in its stalks.”

²³ Redak reads: “it is as though the rain that caused the flood in Noah’s time is descending from heaven. This expression is used in that context.”

²⁴ Ibn Ezra reads: “when the earthly kings are ashamed and confounded, the moon and the sun will become dark.”

Jes 27.(I) Auf die selbig zeit wirt der **ΣΕΑΝ** Leuiathan die Rigel schlangen* vnd Leuiathan die Krummschlangen mit seinem herten/ grossen vnd starcken schwert heymsuchen/
 * Das ist/ Den starcken vnd langen wie eyn rigel.

Jes 27.(II) vom anlauff des flus* bisz zu den bâchen des lands Egypti/
 * Das ist/ vom Euphrate an bisz zum Nilo/ das ist/ von Dan bisz gen Beerschabe/ das ist/ durchs gantz land hinauf²⁵

Jes 28.(III) Derhalben wirt jnen des **ΣΕΑΝ** wort/ gebott vber gebott/ gebott vber gebott/ schnür vber schnür/ schnür vber schnür/ eyn wenig da eyn wenig da* auff das sie gangen vnd zûruck fallen/

* Also lesen die Juden/ so man jm Latein liset/ heyz vnd heyz/ heyz vnd heyz/ wart vnd wart/ wart vnd wart/ eyn weil da/ eyn weil da. Wie wann man lese? Wüst vber wüst/ lotzet vber lotzet/ eyn wenig da/ eyn wenig dort. Er wil aber sagen: Diese trunckene haben verdruz vnd vnlust ab des Herren wort/ vnd gedunckt sie alles vbrig vnd wüst sein/ was erleret vnd gebeut. Die Griechen lesen: angst vber angst/ hoffnung vber hoffnung/ noch eyn wenig/ etc.²⁶

Jes 28.(IV) welcher glaubt der wirt nit eilen*.

* Das ist/ Er wirt nit vbereilet vnd zu schanden werden. Wie es Paulus aufzlegt.
 Rom. p. ²⁷

²⁵ The Targum reads: “from the rock of the river *Euphrates* to the brook of Egypt.” *Rashi* reads: “the river – Euphrates. They are those in Assyria who live by the Euphrates.” The commentary of some of the other Rabbi’s gets a little more creative here. *Redak*, for example, suggests that the river is the Sambatyon, the Sabbath river, which, according to Rabbinic tradition, sprays rocks during the week and rests on the Sabbath. Beyond this river was said to be the home of the ten lost tribes. The *Glossa ordinaria* interlinear notes read: ‘ab Euphrate’ regarding the text ‘ab alveo’ and ‘Nilum’ regarding ‘ad torrentem Aegypti.’

²⁶ The Vulgate reads: ‘Et erit eis verbum domini manda, remanda, manda, remanda, expecta, reexpecta, expecta, reexpecta, modicum ibi, modicum ibi, ut vadant et cadant retrorsum.’ LXX reads: Καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς τὸ λόγιον τοῦ Θεοῦ, θλίψις ἐπὶ θλίψιν, ἐλπίς ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι, ἔτι μικρὸν ἔτι μικρὸν, ἵνα πορεύσωσι καὶ πέσωσιν ὅπισσω. The Syriac Peshitta reads: “So the word of the Lord was to them filth upon filth, filth upon filth, vomit upon vomit, vomit upon vomit; a little here, a little there.” This represents a surprising possibility since there has been no record of the presence of the Peshitta – or knowledge of Syriac – in Northern Europe until considerably later in the sixteenth century. See Hall, “Biblical Scholarship” pp.72-6, where any serious presence and knowledge of Syriac in Europe is said to have taken place after 1550.

²⁷ Rom 10:11, quoting Is 28:16, reads: λέγει γαρ ἡ γραφή, πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυνθήσεται

Jes 28.(27) so wirt auch die wic̄ nit mit dem stampff aufgedroſcht* vnd das wagen rad
wirt auch nit auff dem kūmich herumbgefūrt/

* Er redt vom droſchen nach lands brauch.

Jes 29.(1) Oh Uriel Uriel* du stat/
* Jerusalem/ heyzt Uriel.²⁸

Jes 30.(6) Im land der trūbsal vnd angst* werden junge vnd alte Lewen/
* Das ist/ durch die wüste auff der stras Egypten zu.²⁹

Jes 30.(8) in ewigleyt^c so lange die welt stehet/
c Etlich lesen hie: Zu eym gezeugnuz/ so lang die welt/ etc.³⁰

Jes 30.(10) dann sie sagen zu den sehern: Ir soll vnd nichts sāhen^b Vnd zu den weissagern:
Ir soll nit so strack mit vns reden/
^b sāhen: ist weissagen/ leren vnd predigen.

Jes 30.(20) vnd deine lerer* werden nimmer mer verhindert/
* Etlich lesen: Deine zeit regen.

²⁸ *Ibn Ezra*, Friedländer, ed., *Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*, p.133, reads: “According to some, Ariel is the name of Jerusalem, on account of the altar therein, which is called הַרְאֵל and also אָרִיאֵל ‘Harel’ and ‘Ariel’ (Ez. xlivi. 15,16); for the letters ‘א’ נ’ interchange; according to others, on account of her planet being the lion; but this is absurd. [Ariel means ‘lion of God’] The *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘ad Ierusalem compatientis affectu: quasi cognouisses et tu, Ariel, leo, Leo eum de Ierusalem potentissima et fortissima suit.’ Lyra reads: ‘scilicet Ierusalem.’”

²⁹ Redak comments: “He prophesied that the beasts of the desert would devour those who were going to Egypt for aid.” Rashi reads: “The burdens on their beasts on the way to the southland (Jonathan), for Egypt is in the south of Eretz Israel, and this is the insult and the derision that they would insult them: See these people, whose burdens of money are laden on their beasts to transport bribes to Egypt for nothing, and they imperil themselves in the deserts, in a land of trouble and anguish.” *Ibn Ezra*, Friedländer, ed., *Ibn Ezra on Isaiah*, p.138, reads: “This refers to those who went down to Egypt.”

³⁰ The difference in these two readings lies in the way in which the vowels are added to the Hebrew consonants. The Massoretes read לְעַד – *la-ad*, “for eternity”; the Targum Jonathan read לְעַד – *l-ed*, “to witness”. The Vulgate, the Syriac, and several of the Greek manuscripts, but not the Septuagint, followed the Targum; the Rabbis followed the Massoretes. The Vulgate reads: ‘in testimonium usque ad aeternum.’ The Syriac reads: “for a testimony for ever and ever.” For the Greek manuscripts (Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotius) see the apparatus for the verse in A. Alt et al., eds., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, secunda emendata ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984).

Jes 32.(3) vnd der hörenden oren^c werden aufflossen.

^c Er wil sagen/ Die obern werden from vnd gerecht/ vnd die vnderthonen werden in geuolgig vnd gehorsam sein.

Jes 32.(4) Der gähen^b hertz wirt die kunst versteen/

^b Das ist/ der thoren vnd vnlügen.³¹

Jes 33.(9) Saron* ist eyner wüste gleich/

* Saron/ heyzt sunst nach Hebraischem auff teutsch/ eyn ebne.

Jes 41.(2) Wer ists der ihnen* von Orient erweckt/

* Sie redt er vom Abraham/ den er zur gerechtigkeit berüfft hat.³²

Jes 41.(15) sihe ich hab dich zum dröschkarren* vnd zu eym newen gezanteu stampf gmacht/

* Er redt aber nach lands brauch vom dröschwerck.

Jes 44.(2) vnd Jessyrun* den ich erwelet hab/

* Jessyrun ist eyn zünam Israels/ mag richtig verteutscht werden. Deut. xxxii.³³

Jes 44.(8) vnd es ist leyn velfz* den ich nit lenne.

* Velfz/ ist eyn zünam Gottes/ welchs im Psalter Hort verteutscht ist.

Jes 45.(9) spricht der leym zum haffner: was machst doch? deinem werck mangeln händ.³⁴

* Das ist/ dein werck ist nit gut gemacht/ vnd sol nichts.

³¹ *Ibn Ezra* and *Redak* read: “hasty in a foolish way, rash.”

³² The Targum reads: “Who brought Abraham openly from the east.” *Rashi* reads: “Who aroused Abraham to bring him from Aram, which is in the East.” *Redak* and *Ibn Ezra* agree with *Rashi* in identifying this as a reference to Abraham. By comparison, *Kara* reads: מטורח לבוא ולצורך על בבל – *mi ha'ayr ruach coresh mimizrach lavoa oulatso al babel* – Who roused the spirit of Cyrus from the East to come and besiege Babylon (translation mine). The *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘*Quidam Hebraeorum hoc ad Cyrum regem Persarum referunt. . . Alii Hebraeorum hoc ad Abraham referunt.*’ *Lyra* agrees with the dominant Rabbinic interpretation, reading: ‘*id est Abraham.*’

³³ LXX translates γέρων – *yishurun* as Ἰσραὴλ – *Israel*. *Redak* reads: “*Israel* is given this appellation because it is the straightest of the nations.”

³⁴ The Septuagint and Vulgate also translate this unusual phrase literally: LXX reads: οὐδὲ ἔχεις χεῖρας; the Vulgate reads: ‘*opus tuum absque manibus est.*’

Jes 45.(13) Ich wird ihnen* zu der gerechtigleyt erwecken/
 * Sie bei versteet er den Cores/ den man Cytum den künig aus Persia heyst.³⁵

Jes 47.(11) deß morgenröte* du nit wissen wirst/
 * Morgenröt/ das ist/ du wirst nit wissen so es daher bricht vnd außgehet.³⁶

Jes 48.(10) sonder auf dem ofen des elends* wil ich dich erwelen.³⁷
 * Dises mag auch also gelesen werden: sonder dich wil ich im ofen deß elends
 versuchen.³⁸

Jes 49.(12) vnd sihe ihene von mitternacht vnd vom meer* vnd die anderen vom land sinim.
 * Das seind die vier ort der welt.³⁹

Jes 49.(23) Vnd die künig werden deine* zuchtmeyster/
 * Das ist: sie werden künds⁴⁰ sein.

³⁵ Redak reads: "I aroused Cyrus that he commit righteous acts." Both *Ibn Ezra* and *Kara* identify "him" as – כּוֹרֵש – *coresh* in their comments on the passage. The *Glossa ordinaria* interlinear note reads: '*Christi non Cyri.*' However Lyra reads: '*scilicet Cyrum eadem potestate.*'

³⁶ The Vulgate reads: '*et nescies ortum eius.*' The editor summarizes *Ibn Ezra* and *Redak*: "*Ibn Ezra* renders: You shall not know its dawn, i.e. you shall not know the moment you will have light, because there will be no light. *Redak*, too, derives it in this manner, but renders: You will not know when it will suddenly occur. The prophet compares the calamity to dawn, which comes about suddenly."

³⁷ LXX reads: ἐξειλάμην δέ σε ἐκ καμίνου πτωχείας. The Vulgate reads: '*elegi te in camino paupertatis.*' *Rashi* reads: "I have chosen for you the crucible of poverty." *Redak* reads: "I chose for you the crucible of affliction."

³⁸ The Syriac reads: "I have purified you in the furnace of affliction." *Ibn Ezra* and *Redak* quote others who read: "I refined you." In the Hebrew, the difference between the two readings is one consonant. The Massoretic text, followed by the majority, reads בְּחַנְתִּיקָה – *b'hartika* – *I have chosen you.* The alternative reading is בְּחַנְתִּיקָה – *b'hantika* – *I have tried you.* The apparatus to the verse in Alt et al., ed., *Biblia Hebraica* finds this alternate reading in the Isaiah scroll from Qumran! The *Glossa ordinaria* read: '*Purgando per paupertatem.*'

³⁹ Redak reads: - זֶכֶר אֶרְבָּע הַפָּאוֹת שִׁיחָרָאֵל מִפּוֹרִים בְּכָלָם – remember the four corners, that Israel scattered to all of them (translation mine). The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* reads: '*Quasi ab omnibus mundi partibus.*' Lyra reads: '*id est de omni parte terrae habitabilis aridae et insularum maris.*'

⁴⁰ A-f reads: '*kindtßmägt.*'

to the reading in this note.
 same time as the possessive suffix. Not surprisingly, no translation or Rabbinic comment corresponds
 which has a very similar suffix but cannot be contained within the structure of the noun itself at the
 „von ihm“ in the note would require the presence of another word: **לְיַחַד – מִתְמָנָע** – of him or of us
לְיַשְׁמֻעָתָנוּ – in our report, has the first person plural suffix *nu* and can be read no other way. The
 In Hebrew, the possessive is created by the use of a pronominal suffix. In this case, the word **לְיַחַד** –
 43 This suggestion is in error. The construct of the Hebrew text could not bear such a reading.

Rashi or the Targum on this verse.
 unlikely that our translators would have drawn the conclusions they did in their note had they seen
 multiparim – to glorify oneself, in order to clarify the meaning of the word as they understood it. It is
 mishrabhin – to boast, in its translation, and Rashi used another word in his comment, **לְנֶאֱמָן** –
 readings but not the reading provided in our note. The Targum used a different word, **לְנִצְפָּן** –
 yala' – to wait. Apparently the structure of the word allows for one of the other of the Rabbinic
 praise (the reflexive of the verb would mean ‘to boast’), while Redak believed the root to be **לְלָא** –
 42 The word in question is **לְלָא – יְהִלֵּלָה**. Rashi understood the root to be **לְלָא – halal** – to

dragon as Pharaoh.
 for the word *dragon* reads: „Pharoneum vel diabolum.“ Yara identifies both the superbum and the
 (Track in our text, **לְלָא – lamia** in Hebrew) as Pharaoh. The intermediate note of the *Glossa ordinaria*
 ‘They are haughty (**לְלָא – rahav**), idlers.’ Rashi, Ibn Ezra, Kara and Redak all identify the monster
 were strong as the dragon.” Rashi reads: „Rahab – Egypt, about whom it is written: (supra 30:7)
 41 The Targum reads: “I shattered the mighty men, destroyed Pharaoh and his armis, which

warren.
 Ges 53:5) Die Rücktägung nutzlos ist aber im und durch eine bulle jeden zweit

getreibt soon im gejüngt
 „Es läuft sich im Überfliegen aufgehen man mög es aljo lefen. Wer bat mitern
 gefoffnet?
 Ges 53:1) Wer bat aufgem getreibt gelaubt/ und welche ist der arm des **צְבָא**

* Man möcht lefen. Dno feine berlcher baben gehöret.
 Ges 52:5) und feine berlcher es bulen gemacht haben“ redet der **צְבָא**.

* Zappyd ist die ägypten land/ und der **Trat** ist der flügig **Dabar**.
 bewundert bat
 Ges 51:9) am wortlich zu blits der Zappyd“ aufgerückt und den traten zum töd

* Leben heißt luft/ Luft ist das parabolische gemeint warben Genet.
צְבָא/
 Ges 51:3) der wirt ist die wüsten machein wie Leben“ und ic ennen wie eyn gartien des

⁶ Das ist/ Dadurch wir friid mit Gott haben/ vnd mit jm eyns vnd versunt seind.

Jes 56:5) denen wil ich teyl vnd namen geben in meinem haus/ besser weder den sūnen noch den tōchtern/* ja eynen ewigen namen wird ich jm geben/

* Das ist/ Ich wil jnen bessern teyl vnd namen geben/ weder denen/ die vil fūn vnd tōchter haben.

Jes 65:3) Es ist eyn volck das mich allweg vor* mir erbittert/ vnd in den garten opffert.⁴⁴

⁴⁵ * Das ist/ vor dem gnadenstūl im temple/ da Gott zūgsagt hat zū antworten. Exo. xxv.

Jes 65:5) Es sagt: bleib dort bei dir/ vnd kom nit zū mir/ das ich dich nit heylig* mache.

⁶ Das ist/ Du bist vns nit güt gnüg darzū das du vns etwas lernen solt.

Jes 65:15) Ir werdet auch ewern namen meinen auferwelten zū eym schwür* lassen/

* Das ist souil gsagt: welcher etwas seiner red bestetigen wil/ der wirt sagen: Wolan/ ists das ich disz oder shens thon oder nit thon hab etc. so geb Gott das es mit gang⁴⁶ wie es shenen gangen ist.

Jeremia

Jer I.(II) Ich antwurtert: Ich sihe eyn mandel rūten*

* Mandel rūt/ heyzt auff Hebraisch saked/ darumb das sie eilends vnd bald aufschlecht.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ In this paragraph, while the notes at the end are distinguished from each other with the superscripted letters, the corresponding markings in the text are asterisks. This error is not repeated in the other editions.

⁴⁵ Redak reads: "This alludes to the Holy City of Jerusalem, even to the Temple itself, where they worshipped Idols." The *Glossa ordinaria* interlinear note reads: '*In templo meo scilicet. idola posuerunt, in quo saepe exhibui praesentiam meam.*' Lyra reads: '*qua etiam in loco divini cultus exercebant idolatriam tempore? Manasse, et aliquorum aliorum regum, ut patet iiiii.Reg. [2 Kings] et ii Para.[2 Chronicles].*'

⁴⁶ W-8 reads: 'mirs gebe.'

⁴⁷ Our translators provide the note to explain that in the Hebrew there is a play on words in this and the following verse. The almond branch תְּבַשֵּׁ – *shaked* – is from the same root as God's hastening (תְּקַדֵּם – *shakida*) of His word in verse twelve. Redak reads: "Indeed, the almond is called תְּבַשֵּׁ"

Jer 2.(II) seit mein volck sein ere vmm eyn vnhülflichs* verändert.
 * Vnhülflich nennt der prophet götzen/ vnd götzen werct.⁴⁸

Jer 3.(2) vnd wie eyn Arabischer hirt* in der wüste/
 * Arabisch hirten ziehen daraffter mit aller heerd/ hab vnd leuten wo sie weyd
 finden. Jesa. viii.

Jer 3.(24) Darumb hat die schand* vnserer väter arbeit von vnser jugent auff gefressen/
 * schand ist abtreten von Gott/ vnd mit abgötterei behafft sein.⁴⁹

Jer 5.(I) vnd dem glauben^c nachforsche/
^c Glauben hie/ ist nach züsgung handlen/ wie recht vnd billich ist.

Jer 5.(8) sie seind frū wie die gefütterten pferd^b vnd eyn ieder wihelet gegen seins nechsten
 weib/

because of its quick ripening period. The word נִירַע denotes hastening and endeavoring.” Rashi comments: “This almond tree hastens to blossom before all other trees. I, too, hasten to perform My word.” The Vulgate translates ‘virgam vigilantem ego video.’ The *Glossa ordinaria* provides the reading from the Septuagint as an alternate and continues: ‘Vigilia enim et vigil et vigilare, Hebraicae seched dicit, et nux seded.’ Despite the errors in the Hebrew, the point is made. Lyra provides an exposition of the phrase according to ‘aliquæ’ and then continues: ‘Sed istud dictum processit ex ignorantia Hebraici sermonis, qui sic habet hic Baculum amygdalinum ego video. Et dicit baculum, ad designandum percussionem civitatis futuram. Amygdalinum, ad designandus huius percussionis accelerationem, eo quod inter alias arbores amygdalus multum accelerat emittere flores. Et ideo cum subditur. Bene vidisti: quia vigilabo ego In Hebreo habetur: Quia festinabo ego etc. Et eadem sententia est in litera nostra, cum dicitur: Virgam vigilantem.’

⁴⁸ The Vulgate reads: ‘populus vero rneus mutavit Gloriam suam in idolum.’ The Targum reads: “they are *idols in which there is no profit*.” Rashi reads: “for an idol that does not avail.” The Rabbis understood the word “their glory” to be a euphemistic reference to God’s glory. See Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg, ed., *Mikra’ot Gedolot: Jeremiah, Volume One: A New English Translation of the Text, Rashi and a Commentary Digest by Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg*, 29 vols., vol. 14 (New York: The Judaica Press Inc., 1989), p.12 and Robert Hayward, ed., *The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of Jeremiah*, vol. 12 (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987), p.51, note 12.

⁴⁹ Rashi reads: “The idolatry with which we occupied ourselves, as Scripture states: ‘And they turned aside to the shameful thing’ (Hosea 9: 10).” Redak reads: “This expression is a pejorative for ‘Baal,’ for Baal worship is indeed a shameful thing for those who engage in it. In several other places also, ‘boscheth’ is substituted for ‘Baal.’” These “other places,” apart from the verse mentioned by Rashi, are: Judges 6:32; 2 Samuel 2:8; 11:21; 1 Chronicles 8:33; Jeremiah 11:13.

^b Ettlich lesen sie seind alß die kürlich pferd⁵⁰

Jer 11.(15) derhalben man auch von dir das heylig fleyfch* nemen wirt/
 * Das ist opffer fleyfch.⁵¹

Jer 13.(19) Die stett gegen mittag* seind beschlossen/
 * Das seind die stett Juda/ gegen Babylon zürechnen.⁵²

Jer 14.(3) sonder brachten gerad also ire gschirr lärre heym*
 (no corresponding note)⁵³

Jer 14.(18) propheten vnd priester haben in eyn vnbelant land gehandlet*
 * Das ist/ mit vnbelanten göttern gehäusiert.

Jer 15.(7) Ich wil sie auch mit der wurffschauffel durch die thor desz lands^c verstreuen/

⁵⁰ This is another *Qere/Ketibh* situation. The letters מיזנים – *mizanim* suggest a word that, based on an Arabic comparison, may have something to do with weight. *BDB*, p.402 further suggests that if the comparison with the Arabic is accurate, the weight may have something to do with heavy testicles, given the context of the word. The vowel pointing, however, suggests a word with the root letters זון – *zon* which would mean feed. In our text, the translators have followed the *Qere* suggestion of the Massoretes. The alternate reading in the note may well be based on the observations of *Rashi* who wrote: “Like these stallions who are armed with erect membra. . .” Evidently *Rashi*’s reading is drawn in some manner from the *Ketibh* – the text as written. *Redak*, however, follows the Massoretes and agrees that the word means feed.

⁵¹ *Redak* reads: בָשָׂר קְדֻשָּׁה וְבָשָׂר – *and the holy flesh is the flesh of the altar* (translation mine). *Mezudath David* reads: “The holy flesh that you sacrifice there will be removed from you.” By comparison, *Rashi* and *Joseph Kara* understand the holy flesh to be a reference to the covenant of circumcision. The *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘At nunc publicae offerentium nomina recitantur, et redemptio peccatorum in laudem muratur, nec Evangelicae viduae memoria celebratur, quae plus omnibus in gazophiliatum misit.’ *Lyra* reads: ‘scilicet sacrificiorum mihi oblitorum.’

⁵² Rosenberg, ed., *Mikra'ot Gedolot: Jeremiah, Volume One*, p.118: The editor summarizes *Redak* and *Mezudath David*: “Judah was the southern part of Eretz Israel; hence, the cities of the South were the cities of Judah. They are called ‘cities of the South’ in contrast to ‘those coming from the north,’ mentioned in the following verse.” The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘Iudea et Jerusalem quae ad austrum versa est.’ *Lyra* reads: ‘Prae timore Nabuchodonosor venientis contra Sedeniam: et dicunt hic civitates regni Iudea civitates austri qua regnum Iuda respectu regni Israel est in parte australi.’

⁵³ If a note was intended by the translators it was never recorded and the asterisk was expunged from the later editions.

^a Das ist/ wo irtgent eyn straß aus dem Land gehet/ da müssen sie zürstrewet⁵⁴
werden.⁵⁵

Jer 15.(8) vnd bei hellem tag wil ich vber die mütter^b der besten manschafft eynen ver
wüster komen lassen/

^b Mütter/ das ist/ vber die gemeyn/ oder haussen. Da her kompts/ achtlich/ das man
sagt: die mütter der kirchen/ das ist/ die gantze gemeyn.⁵⁶

Jer 15.(15) nit nim mich auf nach deiner Langmütileyt.*

* Das ist/ verzeuch die rach gegen meinen feinden nit lang.

Jer 17.(11) der ist wie eyn Rebhün* welches ditz so es nit gelegt aufzbrütet.

* Ob es eben der vogel sei/ kan man nit sicher anzeygen.⁵⁷

Jer 17.(16) so hab ich auch des menschen tags* nie begert/

* Die Juden lesen also: Ich hab auch nie leynts siechtagens begert etc. das es die
meynung hette sie schreien vmb jr eygen vnglück/ das ich lieber fürkomen wölte.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ W-8 reads: ‘zü schanden.’

⁵⁵ Lyra reads: ‘Eiiciendo eos ad diversas partes et longinquas.’

⁵⁶ Rashi reads: “Upon Jerusalem, which is a city and a mother in Israel.” Mezudath Zion reads: “Jerusalem was a metropolis about which smaller towns were clustered.” Joseph Kara reads: זְרוּשָׁלָם – zo yirushalem – that is Jerusalem (translation mine). Lyra reads: ‘Et haec mater dicit Ierusalem, quae erat mater totius terrae.’

⁵⁷ The Vulgate reads: ‘perdix fovit quae non peperit.’ The Targum reads: ‘Behold, like the partridge which gathers eggs which are not his own.’ However, the Septuagint reads: Εφώνησε πέρδιζ, συνήγαγεν ἀ οὐκ ἔτεκε – The partridge calls, she gathers what she did not lay. Among the Rabbinic commentators, Redak has a reading similar to that of our translators, but Rashi understands the phrase to mean “the cuckoo calls.” The Hebrew phrase that sparked the debate reads קָרָא קָרָא קָרָא – kora dagar. Part of the problem is that the first word appears only twice in this particular form in the biblical corpus and the second word appears only three times. While the first word has been taken to be a noun meaning partridge, the exact construct is the participle of the verb “to call.” This may explain the desire of the Septuagint and Rashi to have the bird, however they may define it, calling, when the verb in the Hebrew phrase has been interpreted normally as “to gather together.” Rashi’s interpretation continues to perplex because, having identified kora as the cuckoo, he has no verb that could resemble “to call.”

⁵⁸ The Hebrew word in the Massoretic text is עֲנָש – anush. The Septuagint reads ἀνθρώπου – of man, which in Hebrew would be עֲנָש – enosh. The consonants are identical and only the vowels differ, which were added long after the translations of the Septuagint and Vulgate. For whatever

Jer 18.(18) Wolauff lafft vns jn mit der zungen schlchen* vnd seiner reden allersamen leynt
acht haben.

* Ist nach vnserm gmeinen teutschen souil/ alß/ wolher wir wöllen jm das wort
thün/ das ersein nit genießen müß.

Jer 20.(3) da sprach Jeremia zu jm: der **ΣΕΑΡ** hat dich nit Pashur* sonder vmb vnd
vmb forcht genennt/

* Pashur/ ist hebreisch eyn mehrung der freiheyt.⁵⁹

Jer 20.(17) Das du mich nit gerad von mütter Leib an getödt hast/ das sie mein grab
gewesen were/ vnnnd jr Leib eyn ewige entpfengnuß.*

* Ewige entpfencnuß/ das ist/ das sie immerdar mit mir schwanger gangen were/
vnnnd mich nimmer mer geboren hett.⁶⁰

Jer 25.(26) Der künig Sesach* aber tranc̄l nach disen allen.

* Sesach ist eyn verborgner nam/ dabei die Juden Babel gmeynt haben.⁶¹

reason, the reading in the text follows the Septuagint and the Vulgate rather than the Hebrew, Targum and the Rabbis, which is provided as an alternate reading in the note, and which reading the translator “lieber fürkomen wölte.”

⁵⁹ *Rashi* provided several possible etymologies for the name Pashur: ““Not Pashhur did He call your name, for the expression of Pashhur means a great man and the son of nobles. Passhur. Pash [root – פַשׁ] denotes expansion and hur [root – הָר] nobility. But for this reason your name was called Pashhur, Pashah shahor. ‘Pashah’ [root – פַשׁה] means ‘cut off,’ and ‘shahor’ [root – שָׁחֹר] means ‘black.’ Another explanation: Pashah [root – פַשׁה] sehor [root – סְחֹר]. Many will be around you to slay you.” Of these three interpretations of the name Pashhur by *Rashi*, none corresponds to that given by our translators. While they agree with *Rashi* that the root of the first word is פַשׁ – *pasa* – meaning spread or expansive, they take the root of the second part of the name to be שָׁחֹר – *harr* – to be or become free. Neither the available Rabbinic comentators nor the *Glossa ordinaria* or Nicholas of Lyra correspond to this interpretation. Given the context, however, our translators’ rendition may be the best. Both the *Glossa ordinaria* and *Lyra* focus on the ‘black’ possibility for the etymology of the name. *Lyra* reads: ‘*Phassur enim in Hebraeo sonat os nigri, vel os nigrum.*’

⁶⁰ *Lyra* reads: ‘*Ita quod nunquam processissem ad ortum.*’

⁶¹ The Targum actually reads Babel in its translation, and the Rabbis all agree that the name in the Hebrew text is a code called *Athbash* in which the order of the alphabet is reversed for a word so that the aleph in this code would actually stand for the taph, the beth for the shin and so on. When the code is applied to בָּבֶל – *Sheshach*, it becomes בָּבֵל – *babel*. See Hayward, ed., *Targum of Jeremiah* pp.118 and 119 note 10. Both the *Glossa ordinaria* and *Lyra* make reference to this code and identify

Jer 31.(19) hab ich auff meine diech geschlagen*

* Auff die diech schlagen/ ist eyn zeychen der traurigleyt gewesen.⁶²

Jer 31.(21) Richt dir warten auff/ vnd setz dir trawr steyn*

* Warten vnd traursteyn seind/ die man verlauffnen traurigleyten zur gedencknuß auffricht.

Jer 49.(20) Gewiß werden sie die hirten knaben zürschleypfen/ vnd jre hütlin da selbst auffrichten*

* Man möcht lesen (wie auch etzliche thünt) Vnd jnen jre wonung zerstören.⁶³

Jer 51.(11) Polieret die pfeil/ vnd stoffen die löcher voll*

* Die Juden lesen/ vnd rüstet die schillt zu.⁶⁴

Die Klagen Jeremia (Lamentations)

Lam 2.(1) Er hat die eer Israels* von himel herab auffs erdtrich geworffen/

Sesach with Babel.

⁶² Redak reads: “after I thought of the evil deeds I had committed, and I recognized that I had committed grave sins, I smote upon my thigh as one who feels pain and mourns, and I was ashamed of the deeds I had committed.” The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘*Signum dolentis et plangentis errorem pristinum.*’

⁶³ In the Hebrew, the difference between “auffrichten” and “zerstören” is relatively minor. The Hebrew verb in question is the imperfect יָשַׁם – *yashim*. Apparently our translators understood the root to be שָׁמַע – *sum* – *put, place, set*. The alternate reading is based on the root word שָׁמַמּ – *shamam* – *be desolated, appalled*. The Rabbinic commentators, the Septuagint and the Vulgate all agree with the reading in the note. Redak reads: “God will make their dwellings desolate with them.” Rashi reads: “שָׁמַמּ an expression of desolation (*גְּמַמֵּת*).” LXX reads: κατάλυσις. The Vulgate reads: ‘*dissipaverint.*’ To date, there has not been found a reading corresponding to the translation in our text.

⁶⁴ The reading in the text follows the Septuagint and Vulgate (LXX reads: [ch 28:11] Παρασκευάζετε τα τοξεύματα, πληροῦτε τας φαρέτρας – *Prepare the arrows, fill the quivers.* The Vulgate reads: ‘*acuite sagittas implete faretras*’ – *sharpen the arrows, fill the quivers (pharetras)* while the note follows the Targum, Redak and perhaps the Hebrew. According to the *BDB* lexicon, the Hebrew word probably means shield but also may mean quiver; it occurs ten times in the Bible and the context varies enough to make the meaning unclear. It is worth noting that Rashi believes the word to mean quiver so despite the implication of unanimity in the Jewish interpretive tradition by the phrase “*die Juden lesen,*” there were Jews who read the text in the same way as the Septuagint, the Vulgate and our translators.

* Die eer Israels/ ist der temple zu Jerusalem.⁶⁵

Lam 3.(3) Er hat die sün seins köchers* in meine nieren hinein geschoffen.

* Deß köchers sün/ seind die pfeil die darinn stecken.⁶⁶

Jeheskiel

Jehes 2.(2) Vnnd wie er mit mir geredt hett/ da kam eyn lufft an mich* der stellte mich auff meine füß/

* Man findet ettliche die lieber lesen. Da kam eyn geyst jnn mich/ wie auch an anderen hie nachfolgenden orten.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ The Targum reads: תְּזִבְחַתָּה דִּיְשָׁרָאֵל וְלֹא דִכִּיר בֵּית מֹזֶה שָׂא דְתֹתָה בְּלֹאֵדָקָא דְרֻגְלֹאֵהי – he cast from heaven to earth the glory of Israel, and did not remember the Temple which is his footstool (translation mine). Rashi reads: שְׁרָפָרֶךְ מְרֻגְלֹוּתוֹ. וְהִיא בֵּית הַמִּכְדָּשׁ – His footstool: a stool for his feet, and that is the Temple (translation mine). Nicholas of Lyra, too, understood ‘Inclytam Israel’ to be ‘Ierusalem, quae erat metropolis et nobilissima in regno Iuda,’ and, in keeping with the Rabbinic interpretation, interprets ‘scabelli pedum suorum’ as ‘templi quod incenderunt Chaldae, et dicitur scabellum pedum dei, quia intra ipsum erat arca testamenti et propitiatorum quod erat quasi sedes dei, et arca quasi scabellum illius sedis.’

⁶⁶ LXX reads: Εἰσήγαγεν ἐν τοῖς νεφροῖς μου ῥοὺς φαρέτρας αὐτοῦ – He has brought the arrows of his quiver into my kidneys. The Targum reads: בְּצִירֵי קְרִיקִיה – arrows of his quiver (translation mine). Rashi reads: בְּנֵי אֲשָׁפָחָה: חֲצִים שְׁנוֹתָנִין בְּתוֹךְ אַשְׁפָחָה – Sons of his quiver: arrows which he put into the quiver (translation mine). See *The Five Megilot with all the Commentaries of the Mikraot Gedolot: Eica, Kohelet, Ester*, vol. 15, pt. 2 (Jerusalem: Even Yisrael Institute, 1999), p.28. Lyra reads: ‘ist sagittas quae dicuntur pharetræ secundum modum loquendi Hebraicum.’

⁶⁷ The Hebrew phrase reads בַּי רֹוח וְתַבָּא – va-tavoh vi ruach – and a spirit came into me. The Hebrew word *ruach* has a wide range of meaning which includes wind, breath and spirit. In this case, and the other similar cases which are found in Ezekiel, this has been understood to be a description of an ecstatic experience and the *ruach* has been rendered “spirit” in virtually the entire history of biblical interpretation and translation, both Jewish and Christian. LXX reads: Καὶ ὑλθεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐξῆρε με. Πνεῦμα can also mean wind but has the primary meaning of spirit. The Vulgate reads: ‘et ingressus est in me spiritus postquam locutus est mihi.’ *Spiritus* has similar shades of meaning to *ruach* and *πνεῦμα*. The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* identifies ‘spiritus’ as ‘sanctus.’ Of the Rabbinic commentators, Rosenberg, ed., *Mikra'ot Gedolot: Jeremiah, Volume One*, p.14, Redak says – בַּשְׁעָה שָׁדָבָר אֲלִי בָּא בַּי רֹוח שְׁחוּקָה אַיוֹתִי וְהַעֲמֹדָתִי עַל רַגְלִי – at the time that he spoke to me a spirit came into me that strengthened me and stood me on my feet (translation mine). The “hie nachfolgenden orten” in the note are 3[:12], [14], [24]; 8[:3]; 11[:1] and [24] where *ruach* is translated “wind.” The only places in Ezekiel where *ruach* is translated “geyst” are when the context clearly implies either the Divine or human spirit: 11[:5], [19], [24]; 13[:3]; 18[:31]; 36[:26], [27]; 37[:1]. See, however, Furcha, ed., *Writings of Hans Denck*, p.100, note 29, where ‘einer, der mit lufft umgierge’ is rendered ‘an erring spirit.’ Furcha, at least, believes that ‘lufft’ may bear a similar range of meaning

Jehes 4.(16) Vñm war o menschen sun/ ich wird den stab des brots* zu Jerusalem
zürbrechen/

* stab des brots ist die auffenthaltung/ wie es Jesaia nennt Jesa. iii.⁶⁸

Jehes 21.(15)⁶⁹ weil doch leynd holtz nichts gilt gegen der rütten meines suns*

* Das ist: Uller heyden straff werden gar leicht sein/ gegen der straff der
Israeliten.⁷⁰

Jehes 21.(22) Das er Wider^a an die porten richte/

^a Wider seind kriegisch instrument so man vor zeiten gebraucht hat/ die statt porten
mit auffzüstoßen.⁷¹

Jehes 21.(23) Ihener^b aber vermanet jn an die missethat/

^b Die Juden verstehen hie bei die Ammoniter/ die haben dem künig weifgesagt/ vnd
jn wider Hierusalem zu ziehen gehetzt.

Jehes 23.(23) vñnd alle Chaldeer/ die von Pekod⁷²/ Schoa vnd Roc* sampt allen denen
auf Ussyrien/

to ruach.

⁶⁸ Is 3[:1] reads: “auffenthaltung des brots.” LXX reads: στήριγμα ἄπτον – support of bread. Rashi reads: “the support of bread.” Lyra reads: ‘id est sustentamentum cuiuslibet cibi, qui nomine panis intelligitur in scriptura.’

⁶⁹ Alle Propheten follows the Vulgate rather than the Hebrew in the break between chapters 20 and 21; the note here is in paragraph 2 (verse 10 in the Vulgate) of chapter 21.

⁷⁰ Rashi reads: “The rod with which I strike My son to chastise him is the hardest of all rods, and it distains the blow of every staff and every stick, for they are like nothing to it.” The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* identifies ‘filius’ as ‘Israel.’

⁷¹ The Vulgate translated the phrase “ut ponat arietes contra portas” – and place a battering ram against the gates. Nicholas of Lyra clarifies the phrase with the comment: ‘contra portas ad frangendum eas.’ Redak reads “place battering rams against the gates; i.e. when the people would close their city gates, the enemy would use battering rams against them to break through and enter.” By comparison, Rashi reads “station officers over the gates.”

⁷² The text of the first edition has Peked which is corrected to Pekod in the page of corrections, p. cliii r.

* Ettliche lesen hie also. Vnd alle Chaldeer/ v̄ōgt/ reiche vnd gewaltige herren.⁷³

Jehes 23.(45) Derhalben werden die frommen mānner sie* straffen/

* Die fromme menner seind die Chaldeer/ so gegen jro⁷⁴ z̄u rechnen from waren.⁷⁵

Jehes 27.(II) vnd die zwergen* auff deinen thūrnēn.

* Ettliche lesen: deine Teucher/ das weren die ihenigen/ die sich hinab ins meer ließen/ die āncker z̄u lösen.⁷⁶

Jehes 28.(I3) das werct deiner Baugken^c vnn̄d Löcheren an erschaffen/

^c Baugken vnn̄d Löcher/ bedeuten bauch vnd derme.⁷⁷

⁷³ LXX reads: καὶ πάντας τοὺς Χαλδαίους, Φακοὺς, καὶ Σουὲ, καὶ Ὑχουὲ. The Vulgate reads: ‘et universos Chaldeos nobiles tyrannosque et principes.’ Rashi comments: “[Targum] Jonathan rendered [these as] the names of states, and Scripture supports him in the Book of Jeremiah (50:21); . . . [But] the Commentators say that they are an expression of appointees, princes, and rulers.”

⁷⁴ A-f reads: ‘ir.’

⁷⁵ Rashi reads: “Judges, the princes of the king of Babylon and the king of Assyria.” Lyra reads: ‘Hic consequenter ponit poena, cum dicit: Viri ergo iusti sunt. ist aliquae viriles et potentes, quae in comparatione Iudeorum sunt iusti. Et per istos intelligunt Assyrii, quae destruxerunt Samariam, et Chaldae, et alii, quae suerunt cum eis in exercitu contra Ierusalem.’ Neither Rashi nor Lyra, however, actually identify the ‘Judges’ as the Chaldeans.

⁷⁶ The Vulgate reads ‘et Pigmei qui erant in turribus tuis,’ and Lyra further identifies them as ‘homines sunt cubitalis magnitudinis.’ Rashi provides an interesting etymology for these mysterious people: “I heard in the name of Rabbi Menachem that because they dive into the sea as far as the deep and estimate (גָמַד) the cubits of its depth, they are called Gammadim. Others explain that they are dwarfs and fit into the measure of a cubit.” Redak follows the dwarf interpretation. “Kara explains that they would dive into the sea to retrieve articles lost from the ship. Before they dove they would estimate the depth, in cubits, of that spot and be able to know whether they were capable of holding their breath until being lifted out of the sea.”

⁷⁷ There is no hint at bodily parts or functions in the translations of the Vulgate and Septuagint. LXX reads: καὶ χρυσίου ἐνέπλήσας τοὺς θησαυρούς σου καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας σου ἐν σοὶ – you have filled your treasures and your stores in you with gold. Vulgate reads: ‘et foramina tua in die qua conditus es praeparata sunt.’ The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* clarifies that ‘foramina’ ‘Mentis capacitatem significat.’ The Targum, however, paraphrases the passage in this manner: “however, you did not reflect wisely on your body, which consists of orifices and organs of which you have need, for it is impossible for you to survive without them.” Rashi comments: “I knew that you would become haughty, and I made in you the work of the perforated drums that let out wind with an instrumental sound like a drum, and these are what you should have contemplated.”

Jehes 28.(14) vnd du bist mitten vnder den feursteynen⁶ vmbgangen.

⁶ Feursteyn: ist eyn zünam der englen⁷⁸ / bei dem die kinder Israël verstanden werden.
⁷⁹

Jehes 28.(23) also das sie sich selbs des mordes verwegen * weil das schwert rings vmb sie her ist/

* Ettliche lesen: Also das die erschlagenen in jr fallen werden.⁸⁰

Jehes 32.(30) Daselbst seind auch alle fürsten von mitternacht *sampt allen Zidonier/

* Ettliche lesen hie: sampt allen jägern/ darbei sie tyrannen verstehen/ wie Genes. x. vom Nimroth geschrieben ist.⁸¹

Jehes 34.(16) was aber feyst vnd stark ist/ wil ich verderben* vnd sie mit gericht weyden.

* Undere ettliche lesen hie also: Was aber feyst vnd stark ist/ wil ich bewaren.⁸²

⁷⁸ A-f and W-8 read: ‘engeln.’

⁷⁹ Rashi reads: “You acquired for yourself a memorial with the kings of Israel, who are like the ministering angels.” Redak reads: “You walked among Israel, called stones of fire because of their holiness.”

⁸⁰ The cause for the variant readings is the Hebrew word פְּלִיל – ve-niflal. If the root word is understood to be פָּלַל – palal – to judge, then the text could be rendered in a fashion akin to that of our translators. If, however, the root word is נָפַל – nafal – to fall, then the meaning would resemble the reading in the note. The Septuagint, Vulgate and the Targum all have translations which would come close to the reading in the note. LXX reads: καὶ πεσοῦνται τετραυματισμέμοι μαχαίραις ἐν τοῖς περικύκλῳ σου – and those wounded with the sword will fall in you and around you. Vulgate reads: ‘et corruent interfecti in medio eius’ – and the murdered will fall in the midst of her. The Targum reads: “when the slain shall be flung within her.” Rashi, however, believes that the Hebrew word in question is from the root פָּלַל – palal – to judge. Redak prefers the other reading but in his Sefer Hashorashim he also suggests Rashi’s interpretation.

⁸¹ The Vulgate reads: ‘et universi venatores’ – and all hunters. Lyra reads: ‘ist homicidae et tyranni, eo modo loquendi quo dicitur. Gene.x.b. [verse 9] ‘Quasi Nemroth venator robustus coram domino.’

⁸² The Hebrew word translated as “verderben” is אֲשִׁמֵּד – eshmid – I will destroy. The Hebrew word for the alternate reading would be אֲשִׁמֵּר – eshmir – I will protect. The difference in the two words is the last letter, ד – daleth and ר – resh, which are so similar visually that it would be very easy to see how a scribal error could occur. Two Hebrew manuscripts do have the second reading and it is that reading that is followed by the Septuagint and the Vulgate. Nicholas of Lyra, in his comments, provides the dominant Hebrew reading as an alternative: ‘In Hebraeo autem habetur: Et quod pingue et forte consumam.’ The variant does not appear to be discussed by the Rabbis.

Jehes 36.(7) Ich hab mein hand auffghebt* das die heyden die vmb euch her ligen gwifz jr schmach selbs tragen müssen.

* Hand auffheben: braucht die geschrift vndertweilen f^{or}⁸³ schweren.⁸⁴

Jehes 38.(8) Man hat vor langen tagen* von dir gemeldet/

* Sie lesen die lateiner gemeynlich: Du wirst nach vil tagen heymgesucht/ Wie sie dann auch den spruch hieuor im Jescaia am xxviii. Cap. lesen/ also lautende: Und nach vberaus langer zeit/ werden sie widerumb heymgsucht. Den man sunst also lesen möchte: Wie dann vor vil tagen/ oder langer zeit/ gemeldet ist.⁸⁵

Jehes 39.(11) vnnd die statt wirt man heißen: Ge hamon Gog*.

* Das ist auff teutsch: Das tal/ desz hauffens Gog.⁸⁶

Jehes 40.(10) so hetten die seulen* die auf beyden seitten stunden/ auch eyn gleich mesz

* Diz hebreisch wortlin hie/ Llim/ so wir für seulen verteutscht haben/ legt Nicolaus von Lyra aus/ für thürn/ welchs ja nit vngeschickt ist/ vnd jm wol (vnsers bedunkens) zu glauben.⁸⁷

Jehes 40.(43) Es waren auch inwendig ringsherumb haglen* die eyner zwerchhand hoch waren/

* Ettlich sagen/ es seien leisten vmb die tisch herumbher gewesen.⁸⁸

Jehes 41.(12) Der baw der vor dem stück* stünd/

⁸³ A - f and W - 8 both have 'für.'

⁸⁴ The Targum reads "I swear by My Memra [My Word]."

⁸⁵ The Vulgate reads: 'Post dies multos visitaberis.'

⁸⁶ The Vulgate reads: 'vallis multitudinis Gog.'

⁸⁷ Lyra reads: 'scilicet ostii portae.'

⁸⁸ The Hebrew word in question is מִשְׁפָּתִים – *vehashfatim*, the meaning of which is unclear. The Targum and *Rashi* agree with our translators' original rendering, while the Septuagint and Vulgate have translations which resemble the reading in the note. LXX translates the word in question as γεῖσος – *border, cornice*. The Vulgate renders it *labia – lip*. The *BDB* lexicon suggests that such a reading would be achieved by emending the Hebrew text to read מַעֲשָׂתִים – *usfatum* – not a great difference, particularly in an unpointed Hebrew text. See *BDB*, p.1052.

* stuck/ ist das gantze werck des tempels.⁸⁹

Jehes 43.(15) Der Uriel* aber ist vier elan hoch/

* Uriel/ ist das oberst stuck am alter/ auff teutsch eyn starcker lew/ daher die statt Jerusalem Uriel genennt ist/ Jesaia am xxix. Capitel⁹⁰

Jehes 43.(26) vnd jm die hend füllen*

⁸⁹ The Hebrew word translated “stuck” is הָגִזָּר – *hagizra*. Evidently, our translators understood this to be based on the word גֵּזֶר – *gezer* – *a part*, whereas the *BDB* lexicon identifies it as a separate noun with the general meaning of separation, in this context an open space or courtyard which separated buildings or portions of a building. The Septuagint translated it as “the dividing,” the Vulgate reads ‘*separatum*,’ the Targum and *Rashi* understood it to mean “the fortress,” while others in the Rabbinic tradition believed it to be “the chamber” or “the upper space on the building [balcony].”

⁹⁰ The Hebrew for this word is literally הַהֲרֵל – *ha-har-el* – *the mountain of God*. However, the Septuagint transliterates the word ἄριὴλ – *arial*, and Vulgate renders it ‘*arihel*.’ The Targum translated the word as “altar” and *Rashi*, agreeing with the Targum, explained that the reference was to “the height of the top of the altar, from the circuit and above,” which is in agreement with the remainder of the note in our translation. The reference to Is. 29 in this context is interesting as well, because the Targum reading and the Rabbinic commentary for Is. 29:1 would appear to be what informs both the reading in the text and the explanatory note for this verse. *Ibn Ezra*, in his comments on that verse, explained that *Harel* and *Ariel* both mean the altar in the Temple because the letters aleph, he, waw and yod are interchangeable (see Appendix note 24). This would help explain our translators willingness to agree with the Septuagint and Vulgate and insert *Ariel* into the text in the place of *Harel*. *Rashi*’s comments on the verse read: “[Targum] Jonathan renders: Altar of the Lord. Ezekiel, too, called it that, as it is said: ‘(43:16) And the altar (*הַהֲרֵל*)’ twelve [cubits] in length, [because of the heavenly fire that lay like a lion atop the altar, as we learned in Tractate Yoma (21b)]. Our sages, however, explained it in reference to the *heichal* (the Temple proper), which was narrow from the rear and wide in the front [like a lion].” The editor further clarifies *Rashi*’s comments: “Ariel is a combination of אָרֵל, *lion*, and אל, *God*, – hence ‘lion of God.’ *Jonathan* interprets it as alluding to the fire which descended from heaven and which reposed on the altar. Since this fire was in the form of a lion, the altar upon which it reposed was called Ariel. The Mishna interprets it as referring to the *heichel*, the main structure of the Temple. . . The length of the *ullum* [the porch] was set against the width of the *heichal*, extending fifteen cubits on each side, hence the appearance of a lion, wide in front and narrow in the rear. See *Tifereth Yisrael ad loc.*” It is also possible that much of this information was gleaned from the *Glossa ordinaria* and Nicholas of Lyra. The *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘*Lux mea debemus secundum quondam, secundum Hieronymus leo vel fortis dei. Quod ad altare proprie dicit, in quo vel illuminatio dei est vel leo et fortitudo eius. unde: Catulus leonis fili mi Iuda etc. Cubitorum autem quatuor est, et quatuor cornua habet, sive superiora quator cornuum uno cubito finiuntur, ut euangeliorum mensura, et in totum orbem fortitudo discurrens sub illuminationis dei et leonis fortitudine de monstrarentur, ad unumque cubitum praeveniant divinae confessionis.*’ Nicholas of Lyra’s comments read: ‘*id est superior pars altaris quae vocat Ariel, eo que in supiori superficie est locus cremationis holocaustorum, ut supra dictum est: et sic devorat illas carnes sive adipes, sicut leo fortis devorat carnes. Ariel autem leo fortis interpraetatur.*’

* H̄end füllen ist/ welchs wir handgiffet heyffen/ das ist das erst opfer.⁹¹

Jehes 44.(19) hiemit sie mit das vold mit jren Eleydern heyligen*

* Seyligen ist/ das sie sich am heyligen nit versündigen.

Jehes 47.(8) so werden andere wasser von jm gesund*

* Dieses gesund werden der andren wasser/ deutet/ das die verschuldeten meer flüß sollen werden.⁹²

Jehes 47.(19) vnd an den flüß dem grossen meer zu*

* Der flüß ist Nilus jm Egypten Land.⁹³

Daniel

Dan 2.(15) Er antwurret* vnnid sprach zu Urioch des künigs gewaltigenn:

* Antwortet hat in diesem propheten eyn sondere art/ das es der mehrer teyl auff Lautreden verstanden wirt/ desgleichenn auch Mattheus gebraucht hat/ Matthei am eylfftsten/ sagende: Zu der zeit antwurtert Jesus vnd sprach: O vatter/ eyn Herr des himmels vnnid der erden/ ich dank dir/ etc. wie es im Griechischen vnd lateinischen steht.

Dan 10.(4) was ich am gestad des grossen flüß Sydekel* geheyffen/

* Sydekel ist eyn flüß in Ussyria/ den man sunst Tygris nennet.⁹⁴

⁹¹ The Vulgate reads ‘*et implebunt manum eius*,’ and the interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* identifies ‘*eius*’ as ‘*Altaris*.’ The marginal note of the *Glossa ordinaria* clarifies further: ‘*Donis scilicet sacrificii pro pontifice, pro sacerdotibus, pro populo, ut nemo stet vacuum coram domino.*’ Nicholas of Lyra comments: ‘*id est locus cremationis dictis sacrificiis: et dicit manum, eodem que capit supposita sacrificia.*’ The Targum reads: “and offer up its sacrifices,” and Redak, agreeing with the Targum, explains that “the pronoun refers to the altar, and the clause means as Jonathan renders: and they shall offer up their sacrifices. The pronoun may also be referring to the priest, meaning that he will fill his hands with the parts of the sacrificed animal.”

⁹² Rashi elaborates on the Rabbinic tradition which said that the water would flow to the Galilee, the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean “to heal their salty waters and to sweeten them.” Lyra reads: ‘*Et sanabuntur aquae. A salsedine et amaritudine.*’

⁹³ Both Rashi and Redak agree that this is a reference to the “stream of Egypt.” Lyra reads: ‘*torrentis Aegypti. ii. Paral. vii*’ [verse 8] which reads ‘*ad torrentem Aegypti.*’

⁹⁴ LXX reads: τιγρης – *tigras*, the Vulgate has ‘*Tigris*.’

Dan II.(17) vnd jm die tochter vndern weibern* zü verwüsten vberantwurten.

* Die tochter vndern weibern/ Der lust der weibern (wie hienach volgt) Vnd die schönst vndern weibern/ am ersten ca. der hohen liedern salomo/ ist nach der Juden aufzlegung/ Israël.⁹⁵

Hosea

Hos 2.(16) wirstu mich nennen: Mein man/ nit: Mein Baal*

* Baal heyßt auff teutsch eyn meyster/ also werden auch die götzen genant: Nun wil Gott von seiner braut nit eyn meyster/ sonder mit vil fröntlicherm namen/ das ist/ ic man/ genent werden.⁹⁶

Hos 2.(22) Das erdtrich aber/ wirt das korn/ most vnd öl^a erhören/

^a Ec wil sagen: Es wirt niergents keyn mangel sein.

Hos 2.(23) vnnnd disē werden Jesreel erhören. Ich wil sie auch mir im Land besomen^b/

^b Mit disem wort: besomen/ zeucht er sich auff das Hebraisch wort Jesreel/ welches auff teutsch eynen somen Gottes heyßt.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ Rashi also identifies this daughter of women as “the nation of Israel, . . . ‘the fairest of women.’” Not only is the interpretation the same, but the same phrase is quoted from the Song of Solomon 1:8. By comparison, the *Glossa ordinaria* and Nicholas of Lyra identify her as Cleopatra!

⁹⁶ The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘Et si recte posset dici, tamen propter similitudinem nominis idoli debet vitari.’ The marginal note reads: ‘In memoriam beli consecratum est idolu, quod Bel dicit, et hoc nomine a prophetis idolum Babylonis saepe vocatur. Hunc sidonii saepe Baal dicunt vel Baalim. Et interpretat Baal, habens, Ballim, habens me. Unde et mulieres vocant maritos suos Baalim: is est vir meus sciviat habens me in coniugio. Hebraea vero lingua: vir, dicitur is: et uxor, issa. Unde hic dicitur: Plebs credens, volens me ostendere virum suum vocabit me is id est vir non Baalim: quod similiter interpretat vir meus: quia et si secundum Etymologiam posset dici, tamen idolorum odio non debet: ne in cultu dei recordemur nominis idolorum, ne dum virum nominet, idolum cogitet: quod potest esse propter ambiguitatem verbi. Ex hoc habemus ex solis vocibus inordinate prolatis haeresim posse incurri.’ Lyra reads: ‘Dicunt hic aliqui, quod Baalim idem significat quod vir meus, et tamen redeuntes de captivitate vitabant hoc nomen, eo quod erat simile nomini idoli: scilicet Baal. Rabbi Sa. hoc exponit magis catholice, quoram ad hoc, dicens quod vir meus hic accipitur id est sponsus meus, quae est nominatio amoris. Baalim vero secundum proprietatem Hebraici sermonis, idem est quod dominus meus: quae nominatio est timoris: secundum illud Malach.i.b [vs.6]. Si ego dominus, ubi est timor meus? Et sic est sensus, quod ex familiaritate cum deo, populus dius vocabit eum sub nomine amoris, et non timoris: et hoc proprie convenit statui novae legis, quae est lex amoris, secundum quod dicit Augu. Brevis differentia legis et Evangelii timor et amor. Sic initur timori successit amor.’

⁹⁷ Lyra reads: ‘Et haec exaudient Iezrael. id est semen dei.’

Hos 4:8 sie essen die sünd meines volcs* vnd warten auff seine missethat von hertzzen/

* Die sünd essen/ ist hie nichts anders/ weder die opffer für die sünd gebracht/ einnehmen/ geb die sünd gehe für wie vest sie woll/⁹⁸ doch das man satt daruon werde/ besserung vnangesehen.

Hos 4:16 deß wirtste der **SERÄR** ietz vnd weyden* auf der weite wie eyn schaf.

* Ditz weyden ist nit eyn benedeiung/ sonder der abtrünnigleyt eyn straf/ wie es auch die schaf auff der weite vil böser haben/ weyd halben/ weder die im stall gefüttert werden.⁹⁹

Hos 4:19 Gelt eyn wind werd jnen hinder ic gesider komen* das sie vor jren opfern zu schanden werden.

* Das ist/ wenn sie meynen sie¹⁰⁰ wollen da bleiben/ so werden sie fort müssen.

Hos 5:11 darumm das er hat nach dem gebott dörffen ziehen*

* Nach dem gbott/ das ist/ nach den götzen.¹⁰¹

Hos 6:3 das wir den **SERÄR** erkennen/sein aufzug ist fertig wie eyn morgentöte*

⁹⁸ The Targum reads: “*The priests have committed desecration by eating the sin-offerings of my people.*” Rashi reads: “The sin offerings of my nation shall be eaten by the false prophets.” While Redak agrees that this is a reference to the sin offerings, he believes that it is the priests who are eating them.

⁹⁹ In the Rabbinic tradition there was considerable debate about the meaning of the phrase but Rashi identified this as “a limited feeding, as a lamb who feeds in a wide [sparsely vegetated] area, rather than as a fattened ox which is stuffed with barley and vetch.”

¹⁰⁰ W-8 omits ‘sie.’

¹⁰¹ Rashi reads: “Now why does he suffer with all this? Because he wished and desired and followed the new commands of the prophets of Baal.” The editor Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg, ed., *Mikra’ot Gedolot: Twelve Prophets, Volume One: A New English Translation of the Text, Rashi and a Commentary Digest by Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg*, 29 vols., vol. 18 (New York: The Judaica Press Inc., 1986), p.213, summarizes: “Redak makes clear that the word תְּסֵא – *tsav*, an unusual word, is synonymous with מִצְוָה – *mitsva* – commandment. Since it is used to mean a command of idolatry, rather than a command of God, it is shortened to תְּסֵא, hence understood to have a derogatory sense. Indeed, the Talmud (*San. 56b*) interprets תְּסֵא as idolatry. This appears to be the generally accepted interpretation of the classical commentators.” The Vulgate translates the word in question as ‘sordes,’ and the interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘*id est idola.*’ Lyra reads: ‘*post idolum.*’

* Ettliche lesen also: Dann der jn findet/ wirt gerad wie eyn morgenrot/ etc.¹⁰²

Hos 8.(10) vnd ob sie schon vnder die heyden geben werden/ wil ich sie zü jter zeit widrumb versamlen*

* Ettliche lesen also: sie haben vnder den heyden sold aufzugeben/ die ich ietz versamlen wil.¹⁰³

Hos 9.(8) vnd haffung* ins haufz seines Gots.

* Haffung ist abgötterei/ deren Gott ja feind ist/ vnd vbel hafft.¹⁰⁴

Hos 10.(10) Die völcker werden vber sie versamlet/ so ich sie ein spann zü zweyen furchen*

* Etliche lesen: so ich sie anbind neben beyden augen.¹⁰⁵

Joel

¹⁰² LXX reads ὡς ὅρθον ἔτοιμον εύρήσομεν αὐτὸν – *we shall find him prepared like the dawn*. The Massoretes propose an alternative Hebrew phrase: וְאַצְמָנוּ כִּי כִּי – *we will find him just like our dawn* (translation mine). See the apparatus for the verse in Alt et al., ed., *Biblia Hebraica*.

¹⁰³ The Septuagint reads δια τοῦτο παραδοθήσονται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι – *therefore they will be given over among the nations*, which accords somewhat with the translation in our text. The Vulgate reads ‘*sed et cum mercede conduixerint nationes*’ – *even if they hire among the nations*, which is closer to the note. The Hebrew word in question is יִתְנַהֵן – *yitnu*. Apparently our translators, and the Septuagint, understood the root to be נְתָן – *natan* – *to give*. The other possibility that they presented in the note was that the root word is תָּנָה – *tana* – *to hire*. It is this latter reading that the Vulgate and *Rashi* appear to follow. *Rashi* reads: “Although they did this, that they paid for lovers of the nations.”

¹⁰⁴ *Redak* reads: “And he causes hatred in the house of his gods. [I.e. by preaching his false prophecies in the shrines of the golden calves, he causes enmity between himself and God.] According to this interpretation, this is not God’s Name, but a reference to the idols.”

¹⁰⁵ The Hebrew word in question is עֲוֹנָה – *onotam*, and is another *Qere/Ketibh* situation (see note 45). The consonants suggest the root word עֵין – *ain* – *eyes* and the vowels point to the corrected word in the margin עֲוֹנָה – *onotam* – *their iniquities*. The Septuagint and the Vulgate follow this reading (LXX reads: ἐν τοῖς δυσὶν ἀδικίας αὐτῶν – *in their two sins*. The Vulgate reads: ‘duas iniquitates suas’ – *their two injustices*. The only comment in either the *Glossa ordinaria* or *Lyra* is the succinct observation by *Lyra* that ‘*id est propter duos vitulos quos iniqueae coluerunt.*’ but it does not appear in either the text or note of our translation. In the Rabbinic tradition, *Rashi* follows the reading as written in the text (*qere*) and found in our note. An alternate reading according to a number of the Rabbis, including *Ibn Ezra* and *Redak*, is based on a noun מַעֲנָה – *maana* which in Hebrew is very rarely attested and has a dubious meaning but in Aramaic means furrow.

Joel 1.(17) Die vässer seind vnder den spunten schimmlig worden* die kornkästen seind verwüstet¹⁰⁶

* Ettlich lesen: Der som ist vnderm boden zu nicht wörden. Die lateinisch Bibel aber hat: Vnd das viech verfault in seim eygnen mist.¹⁰⁷

Joel 4.(21)¹⁰⁸ Vnd ob ich schon sonst alles nachlassen wolt* wil ich doch das blüt das sie vergossen haben/

* Ettlich lesen: Dann ich wil ic blüt welchs ich nit gereynigt hab/ noch reynigen.¹⁰⁹

Amos

Amos 2.(6) vnd den dürftigen der schüch * halben verkaufft hatt/

* Etliche lesen/ von wegen der beschließung/ das ist/ das sie jnen ic ligend güt abdringen/ vnd es zu jren in eynem zaun bringen.

Amos 3.(12) die in samaria eynn Bett stollen* in Damascon aber eyn spanbet haben/ dattuon grissen.

* Das ist/ die der mehrteyl in Damascon vnder dem künig auf syria wonten/ der sie

¹⁰⁶ This reading is based on the the translation efforts of the Targum and the affirmation of that translation by *Rashi*: “The bottles of wine [or casks] are decaying under their seals [or covers].”

¹⁰⁷ The reading attributed to the Vulgate is an accurate rendering of that translation. The Vulgate reads: ‘computruerunt iumenta in stercore suo’ – *the livestock rots in its own dung*. Such a different reading requires only a relatively minor emendation of the Hebrew from תְּחִתָּה מַגְנִיר פֶּתַח יְהָה – עַבְשׂוּ פְּרֹדוֹת הַחַת מִרְטְּבָנָתֵת יְהָה – *avshu frudot tachat mugresotihem* to תְּחִתָּה מַגְנִיר פֶּתַח יְהָה – *avshu fradot tachat madmanotehem*. The reading attributed to “Ettlich” is more problematic. For the most part it would represent a rendering of the readings of *Redak* and *Ibn Ezra*, with uncertainty arising over the word translated “zu nicht wörden.” The word in the Hebrew is עַבְשׂוּ – *avshu* and it occurs only once in the biblical corpus. The *BDB* lexicon provides the meaning “shriveled.” According to *Redak*, however, the word is identifiable with the Aramaic word עַפְוָשׁ – *yipush* – *mold* because the ב – *bet* in עַבְשׂוּ and the ב – *pe* in עַפְוָשׁ are both labials and therefore, in his estimation, interchangeable. This means that *Redak* and *Ibn Ezra* would read the text something like “the seeds have gone moldy under the clods.”

¹⁰⁸ Here the translators follow the Hebrew chapter divisions rather than the Septuagint or Vulgate.

¹⁰⁹ The note is an accurate translation of the Hebrew text. The Vulgate reads: ‘Et mundabo sanguinem eorum quos non mundaveram.’ As yet there is no clear precedent for the original reading of our translators.

vnder sich gebracht het/ Um andern künig büch/ am dreizehenden ca.¹¹⁰

Amos 5:11) vnd das getreyd nach dem last^a von jm nemen/

^a Men möchte lesen/ als dann etliche thünd/ vnd die das Lehen Korn von jm
nemen.¹¹¹

Amos 5:12) vnd sold nemen die dürftigen vnderm thor^b neben sich zu weisen/

^b Vnderm thor/ das ist am gericht vnd recht/ da Israel etwa gericht hieilt.¹¹²

Amos 7:14) sonder ich bin nun eyn viechman vnd brich * wilde feigen ab/

* Ettlich lesen/ Ich bin eyn viechman/ der die rechten eychen heum auf sucht.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ The word identified as “Damascon” has been cause for debate. The actual Hebrew spelling is קַשְׁתָּךְ – *d'meshek*. The proper spelling for Damascus would be דָמֵשֶׁק – *damesek*. While all the ancient texts have some form of Damascus, there is a debate among the Rabbis regarding the meaning of the word. *Redak*, with considerable linguistic elan, suggested that the word was based on the root קַשְׁתָּ – *meshek* with the *dalet* added to the beginning of the word. *Meshek* is synonymous with שָׁקָ – *shok* – a leg. A leg of a bed is its corner so this phrase is simply a repetition, in different words, of the previous phrase בִּפְאַת מִתָּ – *bifat mita* – on a corner of a bed. *Rashi*, on the other hand, accepted the reading as Damascus and explained the unusual phrase in this way: “This teaches us that only one eighth of them was left. And the rest of the couch – where was it? In Damascus, to fulfill what is stated: (below 5:27) ‘An I will exile you beyond Damascus.’”

¹¹¹ The *BDB* lexicon provides several possible meanings for the relatively rare word מָשָׁט – *masat*, among them *burden, portion, gift, contribution, offering*. Among the Rabbinic commentators, both *Rashi* and *Redak* render the word as burden, although *Rashi*'s explanation also seems to depend on a similar but unrelated word מָשָׁה – *masha* – *lending or usury*: “The settling of the balance as a loan, that you raised the market price for them immediately to sell them grain with interest, in order to take their estate from them.” The editor clarifies: “the vendors sell the poor people grain at exorbitant rates. When the purchasers are unable to pay immediately, they make it a loan, allowing them time to pay. When they do not pay in time, they charge them interest, and eventually take their property from them in payment.” If the word “*lehen*” in the reading in our note is taken to mean “loan,” then our alternate reading is in keeping with the interpretation of *Rashi*. For the range of meanings of “*lehen*” including “loan” see Peter H. Oettli, *A First Dictionary for Students of Middle High German* (Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1986), p.74.

¹¹² *Rashi* reads: “In the gates of your courts, they turned aside the judgement of the needy.” *Redak* reads: “The gate mentioned is always the gate of the court, where the judges sit to pronounce judgment.” The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* identifies the ‘*porta*’ in the text as ‘*Iudicio*.’ Interestingly enough, the Targum reads Synagogue in place of gate, which would be an anachronistic identification of the location of the seat of justice.

¹¹³ The Hebrew phrase is שִׂקְמִים וּבָזָלָס – *u voles shikmim*. The verb *voles* means to gather figs, but the noun *shikmim* is the sycamore tree. The Septuagint suggests a mulberry tree and others suggest

Amos 8:(2) Ich antwurtet: Eyn körblin/ mit vnzeitigen feygen. Do sprach der HERR zu mir: Das end^{*} kompt vber mein volk Israel/

* Seigen heyffen auß Hebraisch kaitz/ vnd end heyfset ketz/ darcuff der prophet sihet/ weil dise beyde wörtlín eynander so gleich seind.

Amos 8:5 Wenn wirt doch nun der monadt^{*} zu gesetzt/

* Im gesetz Mose war es verbotten von heurigen fruchten zu essen vor dem andren tag jm Osterfest¹¹⁴/ Leuit.xxi. der sich jm schaltjar eynen monat lang seumet/ die weil es dreitzehn monat hett. Item/ jm fibenden jar/ welchs man das rüw oder frei iat nennet/ ließ man alle felder ungebawet ligen/ Leuit.xxv. Dannen her die eygennützigen vrsach namen zu wüchern.¹¹⁵

Amos 9:13 vnd der trotter den sacer erreychen wirt*

* Diser segen stehet am dritten büch Mose am xxvi. capittel noch aufztrücklicher.¹¹⁶

Obadisch

Ob (v20) so werden auch die vertriebenen disi heers der kindern Israels/ die von Chanaan bis gen Zaphath^c kommen seind/ vnd die vertriebenen von Jerusalem die in sepharad^b komen

that the sycamore is a form of fig tree. The solution of our translators was to make Amos a herdsman who picks wild figs. The only corroborating reading found to date is in the Syriac. The Peshitta reads “I was a shepherd and a gatherer of wild figs.” See also the explanation of Redak: “one who selects the sycamore figs for his cattle, or one who mixes them with other foods.” The *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘*Non sum propheta, intellexit me. Sycomorus idem est quod rubus afferens mora, quae pastorum famem depellunt, et folia esuriem pecorum.*’ Apart from identifying the sycamore as an “eychen,” the alternate reading in the note has strong parallels in the Rabbinic tradition. Rashi reads that Amos was “one who searches the sycamores to see which one has reached its time to cut in order to increase the branches, and which one is fit for beams, for so was the custom to cut the virgin sycamores.” To date no precedent has been found for the rendering “oak trees”.

¹¹⁴ Lest this be thought an anachronism, Grimm and Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* Bd.7, col.1374, defines the word as “das fest der jüdischen oder christlichen ostern.”

¹¹⁵ Rashi, in his comments on the phrase, “alludes to the prohibition of eating new grain before the offering up of the Omer on the sixteenth of Nissan (Lev. 23:14). In a leap year, the Omer is offered up a month later, and grain becomes scarce. Therefore, those who store away grain can charge higher prices for it and compel the poor to surrender their fields in order to pay for it.”

¹¹⁶ Both Rashi and Redak refer to Lev 26:5. Redak reads: “They will have so much grain that they will be occupied with the harvest until the time of plowing, and the plowman will meet the reaper. This is similar to Lev. 26:5, but even more plentiful.”

feind/ die stett gegen mittag einnehmen/

^a Zarephath wirt von den Juden für Frankreich verstanden/ ^b sepharad aber für Hispania¹¹⁷

Jona

Jona 4:6) Der ḤEĀR Gott aber schüf jm Kikaion* das wüchſ vber Jona auff/

* Kikaion ist eyn geweckſ das Öl gibt (als die Juden daruon haben) imn unfern Landen vnbelant/ welchs man auff Hebraisch scheuen Eil nennet.¹¹⁸

Micha

Micha 7:3) Der fürst heyschet/ so richtet der richter auff widergeltung* vnd der gewaltig redt was sein hertz lustet/

* Es hat diſe meynung: Der fürst oder der oberſt bringt eynen handel für den richter/ der richtet jm nach ſeinem beger/ auff widergeltung/ hiemit er jm hienach in ſeiner ſach auch volgen helffe/ darzū ſtimpt denn auch der redner/ alles der meynung/ volge du mir ietz/ so volge ich dir hienach auch.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁷ Rashi reads “The exegetes claim that Zarephath is the kingdom called France in French. . . Sepharad – [Targum] Jonathan renders: Spain.” By comparison, the Vulgate reads: ‘Sareptam’ and ‘Bosphoro!’ Of the second name, Lyra reads: ‘Nomen est loci in regno Babyloniae.’

¹¹⁸ Redak’s explanation reads: “[Kikaion is] a plant with long branches, which grow high and afford shade. The Mishnah (*Shabbath* 20) states that we may not kindle the Sabbath lights with *kik* oil. The Gemara (21a) asks: What is *kik*? One of the definitions offered is that of Resh Lakish, who identifies it with Jonah’s *kikayon*. Said Rabbah bar bar Chanah: I, personally, saw Jonah’s *kikayon*, and it resembles the *צְלָלוּבָא* [*tsiluliba*]. It grows among the swamps and they raise it over the entrances of stores for shade, and from its kernels they make oil. Rabbi Shmuel ben Chofni identifies it with the *ricinus* plant. According to the responsa of the Geonim, *צְלָלוּבָא* is a tree which does not produce fruit. It is plentiful in our country. It produces seeds from which oil is extracted, and anyone who suffers from the cold drinks it.” By comparison, LXX reads *κολοκύνθη* – *kolokunthe* – gourd. The Vulgate reads ‘*hederam*’ – ivy. The comment in the *Glossa ordinaria* is interesting: ‘In Hebraeo קיקיון *kikaion legit, pro cucurbita quae cito surgit et cito areseit.*’ Identifying the item as a gourd is in line with the Spanish understanding of the word. There is, however, a slight misspelling in the Hebrew word. The letter נ – *nun* has a different form (נ), called *nun sofit*, when it appears at the end of a word; either the medieval commentators or the sixteenth century printers were unaware of this and the wrong form was used.

¹¹⁹ Rashi reads: “the prince asks for a bribe. . . and the judge who judges the case is also in the payment. When he is a robber and is liable according to law, he says to his fellow judge, ‘Do me a favor in this case, and I will vindicate you in another case.’” Redak’s comments are along the same

Nahum

Na 2.(4) sein reysiger zeug ist als die feur facklen/ am tag so er sich rüstet/ vnd ire glän erschüttlen sich^a

^a Ettliche lesen: Vnd ire hauptleut werden vmbgewunden sein/ das ist/ auffgebundne kopff haben.¹²⁰

Na 2.(6) so werden sie denn flugs der maur zu eilen/ vnd beschützung zurücksten^b

^b so lesen ettlich hie also: Vnd der beschützer/ das ist/ der künig/ wirt sich auch rüsten.¹²¹

line: "The judge, too, is in cahoots with them and has a share in the bribe. The judge perverts the verdict according to the orders of the king, for which he is compensated."

¹²⁰ *Reysiger zeug*, according to Grimm and Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch* Bd. 8, p.746, "bezeichnen die reiterei gegenüber den fuszknechten." Apparently our translators are thinking of the cavalry rather than charioteers. This is an odd translation of the Hebrew רְכָב – *rechev*, which is the standard Hebrew word for chariot, and though much of the rest of the Greek and Latin texts are different from the Hebrew, both the Septuagent and the Vulgate have rendered chariot for this word. The difficult Hebrew word in the phrase is פָּלֹדֹת – *pladot* which our translators rendered as "facklen" without further comment. Of this phrase, *Rashi* said "On the day that he [Nebuchadnezzar] is prepared to go out in the army, he polishes his iron chariots, but I do not know what פָּלֹדֹת means. I say that it is a material that polishes iron well. And some interpret פָּלֹדֹת as an expression of a fiery torch (לִפְנֵי), by transposing the letters." Evidently our translators followed the latter interpretation for their reading in the text. The phrase for which a variant reading has been provided in the appended note is 'vnd ire glän erschüttlen sich.' The literal Hebrew וְהַבְּרִשִׁים הָרֻעָלִים – *ve'ha'broshim haralu* would read *and the cypresses are made to quiver*. The word for cypresses can also be a figurative term for spear shafts so our reading is quite good. *Redak* "explains the cypresses as javelins of cypress wood, daubed with poison, with רָעָל originating from רָעֵל, poison. His father [Rabbi Joseph Kimchi], rendering הָרֻעָל as "trembled," sees the cypresses as the officers and the leaders of Nineveh, who quaked and trembled when they saw Nebuchadnezzar's army. Rabbi Joseph Kara explains that the soldiers would enwrap their spears of cypress wood in cloth until they were ready to battle the enemy." If Kara's interpretation was based entirely on the Hebrew text, then it seems likely that he understood הָרֻעָל to be based on the noun רַעֲלָה – *r'ala* – *veil* which otherwise appears only in Isaiah 3:19. The variant reading in the note reads 'Vnd ire hauptleut werden vmbgewunden sein, das ist, auffgebundne kopff haben.' This would appear to be a reference to the reading in the Targum. *Rashi* reads: "Jonathan renders: And the heads of the [Babylonian] camps are enwrapped in colored garments," however the further clarification in our note seems to want to explain the reading as soldiers wearing turbans on their heads!

¹²¹ LXX reads: καὶ ἐτοιμάσουσι ταξιροφυλακας αὐτῶν – *kai hetoimasousi tas profulakas auton* – *and they shall prepare their watches [or defences]*. The Vulgate reads: 'et praeparabitur umbraculum' – *and he will prepare shelter*. *Redak* reads: "the shelter is prepared." This probably

[12] According to our translators, this appears to be a reference to the miraculous light provided the Israelites during their desert wanderings. However, the Targum reads: "Moreover, when you merge formed signs for Joshua in the plain of Gibeon, the sun and moon stood still in their spheres." The Rabbinic commentaries are in agreement with the Targum regarding the incident to which the text alludes. Ezra, agreeing with the Rabbis, reads: "Hic propheta alludi historiae Iosue cum dictur: Sol ei Luna sic ut sterent pugnare Iosue contra Chamaneos in signum divinæ virtus sibi assistentis, sic assistet virtus die Mœdis et Persis. pugnantibus contra Chaldaeos ideo subditur."

¹² While many of the Rabbis' comments on this verse, none of them identify the "rock" with him, and it is unclear where such a reading would originate.

¹²² *Raschi* reads: “*to rejoice*.” The Tragum adds “*they rejoiced*” to the text. The *Glossa ordinaria* reads: “*ex gaudio insultantes ibi, plaudent manibus.*”

comics with *Lar Gunn Jonathian*. *Rashn* reads: "We can also explain [סְבִּירָה] [לְעֵחֶנֶּה]" hasochach; and the king shall be armed with his weapons." Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg, ed., *Mikraot Gedolot: Twelve Prophets, Volume Two: A New English Translation of the Text, Rashni and a Commentary Digest by Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg*, 29 vols., vol. 19 (New York: The Judaica Press Inc., 1988), pp. 246, 442.

viii

* 3-11) Sonn und mon blitzen in ster biebering lieben/ die wambleten nach dem Liebster
beiner pfell/ und nach dem liebster dichten gultigen den pfeife*
* als hilf/ die beoerfften webet fom nach mon/ dann der get gau in eyn
wundertbaerlich liebster/ daebt die wambleten/ nemlich eyn feutine feul/ die er hie pfell und
liepert nemmet.¹²⁴

„Gott zu ehm bessere Dellein gehörigkeiten hat.“
* „Pettlich sieben das wortlin seßt/ mit auf Gott/ fonder auff Lebuccalität/ das
Sagd (12) du bate in uns zum dritteß gehetet/ amm o bezig zuer Thatt gehörigkeit/ das

גַּתְּרָאָבָּא

* *Die nächsten 3-4 Jahre sollt alle Implementierungen direkt aus dem Projekt herausgeführt werden.*

* Das ist/ bei jrem abgott/ nach der gottlosen brauch/ denen Gott nit güt gnüg ist
zü eym zeug/ wie es dann noch bei der welt ist.¹²⁵

Zeph I.(9) Ich wil auff den selbigen tag/ alle jhenige die vber das geschwell springen*
heymsuchen/

* Dieses beschahē¹²⁶ dem abgott Dagon zü eerent in seinem tempel. i. sam. am v. Cap.¹²⁷

Saggai

Secharia

Sech I.(5) oder solten darum die Propheten allweg leben?*

* Das ist/ wie wol die propheten auch gefangen hingefürt vnd gestorben seind (wie
dann all menschen sterben) haben sie dennoch wargesagt etc.¹²⁸

Sech 3.(1) der Satan^a aber stünd jm an der rechten seiten in züuerhinderen/

¹²⁵ The Vulgate reads: ‘et iurant in Melchom.’ The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* identifies ‘Melchom’ as ‘Idolo Ammonitarum, et illos etiam destruam.’ *Lyra* reads: ‘quia simul cum domino colebant idola, et in eorum reverentiam iurabant per ipsa.’ The Targum reads: “and swear by the name of their idols.” *Rashi* reads: “who swear by the Lord – and go back and swear by their king, their pagan deity.” *Redak* agrees with *Rashi*’s reading.

¹²⁶ W-8 reads: ‘geschach.’

¹²⁷ Targum reads: “I will come in visitation upon all who walk by the laws of the Philistines.” *Rashi* reads: “Jonathan renders: who follows the customs of the Philistines, who would not step on the threshold of Dagon, as it is stated (I Sam. 5:5): “Therefore, the priests of Dagon. . . do not tread, etc.” *Redak* is in agreement with *Rashi*. *Lyra*, quoting *Rashi*, reads: ‘In Hebraeo tamenhabet: Super omnem transilientem limen: quia aliqui volentes sacerdotes Dagon et eius cultores imitari, que non calcant super limen templi Dagon i. Reg. v. Sic ingredientes templum domini limen transiliebant absque eium calcatione, sedim quod dicit hic Ra. Sa.’

¹²⁸ *Rashi* reads: “And if you ask, ‘the prophets, too – where are they? Have they not died?’ I [God] will answer you, ‘Should the prophets have lived forever?’ But their end proves that their words were true; for all My words, and the declarations of the decrees of My retribution that I commanded My servants, the prophets, concerning you – did they not overtake your fathers?” *Lyra* again quotes *Rashi* in his own comments.

^a Satan hebraisch/ heyst zu deutsch/ eyn widerfächer.¹²⁹

Sech 3.(9) ja auff eym eynigen steyn werden ^b siben augen stehn/
^b Das ist/ der tempel wirt siben malen grösser dann er angefangen ist.¹³⁰

Sech 4.(6) Weder mit heer noch mit macht/ sonder durch meinen geyst/* spricht der
HEXX Zebaoth.

* Er wil sagen/ gleich wie dieses gericht mit dem öle vnd leuchter alles ordentlich
 vnnid on mühe zu geht/ also wirt das Königreich Israel on mühe wider auffgericht werden.
 wie Jesa. am lii.

Sech 4.(14) Das seind die zwen sun des öls/* die vor dem **HEXXAN** der gantzen welt
 stehend.

* Dize zwen sun des öls seind der hohe priester/ vnd der König.¹³¹

Sech 8.(19) Der **HEXX** Zebaoth sagt also.* Die vasten im vierdten/ die vasten im
 fünfftten/ die vasten im fibenden/ vnnid die vasten im zehenden monat/ sol dem haufz Juda
 zu wunn vnd freud/ vnd zu glück saligen hochfesten/ werden/ Dann sie werden warheytt
 vnd frid liebhaben.¹³²

* Im vierden monadt am xvii. tag ist Jerusalem gewunnen/ am x. tag desz v.
 monadts ist der tempel verstöret/ am xii. tag desz v. monadts ist Gedalia erschlagen/ am x.
 tag desz x. monadts ist Jerusalem belagert worden. Darumb hielt man diese vasten zur

¹²⁹ This is an effort to explain the nuances of the Hebrew phrase: וְהַשְׁעָרָן עַמְדָ עַל־יִתְנַצֵּל ?יְהִי־נָזְרָן – ve'ha'satan omad al-yimino l'sitno – and the accuser stood at his right to accuse him (translation mine), where the noun ha'satan and the verb l'sitno are from the same root. The interlinear note from the *Glossa ordinaria* identifies Satan as ‘Addversarius diabolus.’

¹³⁰ Rashi reads: “It will eventually be widened seven times as much.”

¹³¹ Rashi reads: “The horns of the priesthood and the kingdom who are anointed with the anointing oil.” Redak says that this is a reference to the fact that Joshua the High Priest and Zerubbabel the governor of Judah were anointed with the anointing oil. See also Kevin J. Cathcart and Robert P. Gordon, eds., *The Aramaic Bible: The Targum of the Minor Prophets*, vol. 14 (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989), p.195 note 24 on the Rabbinic tradition regarding the phrase “sons of oil”. Lyra reads: ‘id est Zorobabel et Iesus pontifex, qui dicut filii olei.’

¹³² The Hebrew text contains no reference to months and the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Syriac and the Targum all translate these as numbered fasts rather than fasts in specific months as our translators have done.

gedächtniß¹³³

Sech 9.(7) sie werden wie eyn fürst aufz Juda/ vnnnd Uccaron wie Jebusi*
 * Jebusi/ das ist Jerusalem¹³⁴

Sech 9.(9) dann sihe dein künig/ der kompt zu dir/ der ist der Gerecht vnnnd "eyn Heyland/
 " Heyland. Diz wortlin noscha im Hebraischen heyssel¹³⁵ dem geholffen wirt/ das
 ist der mit seinem volck durch gottes krafft bestehen/ vnd die feind überwinden wirt.¹³⁶

Sech 9.(16) Der HERR ic Gott wirt sie auff den selbigen tag erretten/ wie die heerd
 seins volcks/ vnd die " steyn der kronen werden auff seinem Land erhöht werden/

¹³³ This sounds much like the gloss of Nicholas of Lyra: '*Ieiunium quarti scilicet mensis, in quo capta suit civitas Ierusalem, ut patet. iii.Re.vl. Et ieiunium quinti in quo templo et civitas Ierusalem suerunt combusta. Et ieiunium septimi in die exiationis: et propter mortem Godoliae, ut praedictum est. Et ieiunium decimi quia tunc Ezechiel et populus in Babylonia audierunt romores de subversione Ierusalem et templi.*' By comparison, the comments of the Rabbis are less informative, perhaps presuming that their Jewish readers would know the purpose of the fasts.

¹³⁴ Targum reads: "and Ekron shall be filled with the house of Israel like Jerusalem." *Rashi* reads: "like Jebusi – Jerusalem." *Redak* reads: "Ekron shall be as the Jebusite, the inhabitant of Jerusalem, for the Jebusite was dwelling in the midst of the children of Israel, and was their tributary servant," David Kimchi, *Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary upon the Prophecies of Zechariah. Translated from the Hebrew.*, trans. A. M'Caul (London: James Duncan, 1838), p.87. *Lyra* reads: 'quia ilam civitatem subiecit Iudeis, sicut Iebusaeus suit subdita per expungnationem David. ii.Reg.v.'

¹³⁵ W-8 reads: 'Diz wörtlin, Noscha, heysst im hebraischen, . . .'

¹³⁶ The use of the noun "Heyland" in the text is in keeping with the translations of the Septuagint and the Vulgate: the Septuagint reads σώζων – sozon – saving or a saviour (active participle); the Vulgate reads salvator (noun). However, the Hebrew is a passive participle and the reading in the note "dem geholffen wirt," is reasonably accurate. *Rashi* reads: "saved by the Lord," and *Redak* reads: "Because of his righteousness, he will be saved from the sword of Gog and Magog." The Rabbis also read this as a Messianic passage, but Jewish and Christian Messianism differ and the Jewish Messiah is not necessarily seen as fulfilling a redemptive role. Nicholas of Lyra, by comparison, makes reference to *Rashi*'s interpretation of the passage: 'id est ad salutem tuam, unde dicit hic Ra. Sa. qui scriptura ista non potest intelligi, nisi de rege Messia.' However he does not complete *Rashi*'s observation that the Messiah will be "saved by the Lord," and continues his own interpretation with the comment: 'Salvavit eumnos per viam iusticiae, seipsum morti offerendo.' In this way, Lyra is able to make use of some of the comment of *Rashi* in order to affirm traditional Christian Messianic interpretation.

⁶ Das ist die priester/ die Eleyder von küniglichen steynen gemacht tragen.¹³⁷

Maleachi

Mal 2.(3) mit ewrer festen mist* der wirt euch zu jm nemen/

* Das ist/ ic werdt noch so verachtet werden/ als der mist den man aus dem
opferviech nimpt.¹³⁸

Mal 2.(15) Hatz nit der eynig* auch gethon?

* Der eynig ist Abraham/ darumb das in Gott aus allen völkern sonderlich berüfft
vnd erwelet hat/ Jesa. li. vnd Iehes. ppxii.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Rashi reads: “For the priests, the sons of the Hasmoneans, who boast of the crown stones in the rows of the breast-plate and the ephod, will be exalted with miracles on their land.”

¹³⁸ Rashi reads: “The dung of your sacrificial animals will take you to itself to [make you] cheap and despised, as it is.”

¹³⁹ Targum reads: “Was not Abraham one alone from whom the world was made?” Redak reads: – אַבְרָהָם שֶׁהָיָה אֶחָד וְאֵב לְכָל הַבָּאים אֶחָדִיו – Abraham, who was one, and father to all who came after him (translation mine). The interlinear note of the *Glossa ordinaria* reads: ‘Qui ex Abraham omnium nostrum genus eligit.’

Appendix B

Ludwig Hätzer's final publication, again with Peter Schöffer's press in Worms, was in his mind a continuation of the translation project begun with the *Worms Prophets* which he had completed with the assistance of Hans Denck the previous year. These three apocryphal books were to be the first installment of this second part of the project. His goal was to continue with the remainder of the apocryphal books as time allowed and once he had gained access to Hebrew manuscripts of these books. The value of this Foreword to the current study lies in three areas. One is Hätzer's extended defence of the inspiration and value of the apocryphal books irrespective of their canonical status. The second point is Hätzer's candid and clear prioritization of the value of the various biblical texts, with the Latin Vulgate considered to be superior to the Greek Septuagint, and the Hebrew text superior to either of the other texts. The third and most significant point for this study is Hätzer's unsolicited acknowledgement that he had been, and continued to be, in contact with certain Jews and it was these Jews who had promised to give him a Hebrew manuscript copy of the books of the Maccabees. Because of the central significance to this thesis of Hätzer's admission, as well as the rarity of this work (see immediately below), I thought it worthwhile to reproduce the full text of this Foreword here.

Hätzer's translation of the Old Testament Apocryphal books is a rare work indeed. At one point, Frederick Weis, the first English biographer of Hätzer, believed it to be lost (*The Life, Teachings and Works of Ludwig Hetzer 1500-1529* [Dorchester, Mass.: 1930], p.225), however, both Gerhard Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529: Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier: Eine Randfigur der frühen Tuferbewegung* (Gütersloh: Bertolmann, 1957), and Hans Guggisberg, "Jakob Würben of Biel, a Thoughtful Admonisher against Ludwig Hätzer and the

Anabaptists," *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 46 (1972): 239-255, made reference to a copy at the Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek in Darmstadt, Germany. A brief e-mail exchange with the library disclosed the distressing news that the volume in question had been lost for many years. Upon advice provided by the librarian, inquiry was made at the Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, Germany. Unfortunately this, too, proved to be a dead end. However, upon perusal of Ernst Crous, "Zu den Bibelübersetzungen von Haetzer und Denk: Eine bibliographische Nachlese," in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mennoniten: Festgabe für D. Christian Neff zum 70. Geburstag*, Walter Fellmann ed., (Weirhof: Mennonitischen Geschichtsverein, 1938): 82, this cryptic line was found: "Darmstadt LB (V 1568). München SB (Catech. 224 [3])." Believing now that there may well be another copy of this work, I emailed the Munich Stadtbibliothek with my request. I was once again informed by Deputy Librarian Nora Hoelzinger, that no such volume was at that location. However, she also suggested that the library in question might be the Staatsbibliothek (Bavarian State Library). With that possibility in mind, she forwarded my request to that library. Almost miraculously, Dr. Edith Schipper of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek informed me that they did indeed have a copy of the volume for which I had been looking. After due process they were able to provide me with a photocopy of the Foreword to *Baruch der Prophet*. My deepest gratitude goes out to Edith Schipper, Nora Hoelzinger and the other librarians who assisted me so willingly in my search. The font is a good approximation of the Schwabacher font of the original. The signatures are provided in brackets with the added designations of 'r' for *recto* and 'v' for *verso*.

Baruch der Prophet.

Die Histori Susannah.

Die histori bel zu Babel.

Alles newlich auf der
Bybli verteuftscht.

O Gott erlöß die gefangnen.

Anno M. D. XXVIII.

(i v)

Vorrede.

Ludwig Härtzer begeret allen menschen
ware erlantnuß desz vatters/ durch
Jesum Christum den sun.

Es ist freilich vmm aller creaturen anschlag vnd fürnemen verlorn/ geb in was weise
oder gestaltes fürgenommen werde/ es sei dann das der meyster und Herr aller dingen
solichs auff die han bringe/ das es ins werck komme. Der HERR vnser Gott laßt vns
rathschlage er aber kerets vnd wendts nach seiner gelegenheyt. Wol dem menschen der solichs
in der warheyt erlante/ vnd mit geneyygtem hertzen anneme/ wie es dann alle menschen gar
nahet alleye mit mund vmbher schleypffen/ ietz zür zeit/ vnd darbet nit lernen wollen/ wie
es die vuentlich/ vnermeßlich/ vnd vnaufzprechliche gütte/ desz eynigen vnd obersten güts/
vnsers vatters imm himmel/ so hertzlich güt meynt/ in allem leyten vnsers fürnemens. Wer
das recht studierte/ der möcht leichtlich zu friden kommen/ vnd jm Gottes hinderen oder
volbringen gefallen lassen. Wer aber daran nit genüg wil haben/ der müß allweg summer
vnd samer leiden/ vnd vn frid zülön haben/ bisz er gantz matt wirt/ Oh wie müß aber eym
solchen halbstarrigen bock so wee geschehen/ ehe er darzu komme. Wer aber damit kan zu
friden sein/ wie es Gott/ desz aller will ist/ anschickt/ der hat versucht/ vnd eynen
vorschmack der ewigen freiheyt.

Mein anschlag war/ alle vbrige bücher auff diſe zükünftig vasteſtmeſz zu
verteutschen/ der (ij r) gantzen Christlichen gemeyn/ vnd aller dero so ſich deſz gebrauchen
wolten zu güt. Aber es hat nit wöllen noch mögen ſein/ der vilſaltigen trübsalen halb/ die
nun ſo gwaltiglich im ſchwank gehend/ alß von anſandie. Doch tröst ich mich deſz/ dz es
vil deſter ehe eyn end machen werd. Sie gildt nur gedult/ vnd iſt unz noth eyn
ernſthafftig/ fleißig auffmercken vff Gottes werck vnd rathſchlag/ der ſich inn diſen
letſten tagen offenbaret. Ich bin ſein auch wol zu friden/ das es nit geschehen iſt/ vnd ob
es ſchon in Kunſtigem auch nit geſchihet/ ſol darumb niemand zürnen/ Es muß nit imm
büch ſtaben noch in den worten/ ſonder in der kraft gottes erlernet werden. Der Satan
wirt ſich vnderſtehen alle ſchlupffwinckel zu verschließen das weder ich noch andere platz
haben mögen/ weder diß noch jehns zu verantwurten oder zu ſchreiben. Inn Gottes nammen/
Gott kan es wol mit wücher erſtatten. Bleibet es ſchon gar vnderwegen/ ſo wirt ſich eyn
ieder ſchüler Christi der predig deſz Lambs Gottes/ götlichs ſamens/ inn aller menschen
hertzen gelegt/ vonn mütter leib an/ aller Creaturen/ vnd der wercken/ ſo von den Gots
feinden geschehen/ imm gegenteyl erlernet vnd benügen laſſen/ ob ſchon leynd buchſtab inn
ewigleyt nimmer/ weder getruckt noch geschrieben würd.

Ich bin aber noch willens vff nechſt Kunſtig herbſtmeſz all vbrige bücher an tag
zegeben/ hie zwilſchen vorhoff ich ſie in Hebraiſcher ſprach zu überkommen/ darauf man ſie
am füglichſten (ij v) verteutschen mag/ dann ſie ie Hebraiſch geweſen ſind/ kan leichtlich
eyn ieder gemeynes verſtands wol abnemen/ Mich haben auch deſz etliche Hebreer vertröst/
vnd mir darzu an eym ort anzeigung geben/ die mich auch gereydt die bücher
Michabeorum/ Hebraiſch geschriben/ ſehen lieffen.

Das aber muß ich ſagen/ welches ſich auch wol erſinden ſol/ das/ wer vorſtendige
bücher alß da ſind: Thobia/ Judith/ Baruch/ die letſten zwey bücher Esra/ das büch der
Weisheit/ der Weiß man/ vnd Michabeus/ alleyn auf Griechiſcher ſprach/ in teutſche
zungen vertolmetschen würd/ der wirt eynn ſeler ſchiessen; vnd etwas machen das man
leichtlich bessern möchte/ ja meins bedunkens weger gar vnderlaſſen were. Ursach/ So vil
ich/ ſamt andern/ Griechiſche/ Hebraiſche/ vnd Latinische Bybli gegeneynander beſehlen
hab/ dunckt mich eygentlich/ die Latiner haben vil eyn better Bible weder die Griechen/
die auch dem Hebraiſchen vil vil malen (ſo vil das alt Testament betrifft) neher vnd
gemäßer iſt. Vermeynt aber iemandt ich red zu vil vermeſlich/ der versuch es ſelbs/ vnd

frag darnach/ so sol ers wol bald sehen vnd tasten/ Vnd es ist ja war/ das es eyn lauter spot ist/ etwas von den Griechen wöllen erfahren in dem fall/ also das ich glaub/ es hab eyner der Griechen damit gespottet/ etc. Nun jm sei wie jm wöll/ so ist das Hebraisch/ wo man es haben mag/ für alle andere sprachen anzunemen.

Es sagen alle gelehrte/ ob gemelte bücher sind nit imm Canon/ das ist/ sie sind nit recht noch war (iiij r) Byblisch/ die Kirch hab sie nit angenommen/ sie seien nit Hebraisch/ derhalb mög man auch mit jnen nichts aufzrichten/ bewerben/ noch erhalten/ So sag ich also: Canon hin/ Canon her/ die bücher haben Leynen fel/ vnd geben rechtgeschaffene zeugnuz/ wie man wider in das Eynig kommen mag und sol/ so wol alsz andre bücher/ ob sie gleich nit allenthalben mit andern büchern vbereyn kommen/ welchs auch offt inn den Byblischen büchern geschihet. Und darumb lieben Schriftgeleerten/ giltes nit den heyligen Geyst darumb in eynn zwingart also zu verbannen vnd zu schliessen. Was wolt daruor sein/ Gott der allmechtig HERR Israels geb noch heuts tages zeugnuz der warheyt/ durch seine Knecht/ als vorie geschehen/ Wolt ihs nitanne men? so lafftz faren/ jr könnt den heyligen Geyst ie nit gemeystern/ aber widerstehen/ das könnt jr wol/ wie ewere vorältern/ das thüt jr auch/ damit jr ewrer väter maß erfüllent. Giltes aber also kempffen/ so wil ich auch wol sagen: Jeheskiel sie auch nit imm Canon/ dann er schreibet in den letsten capiteln gestracks wider Mosen/ da er von den opffern vnd newen tempel schreibet/ oder aber Moses ist nit imm Canon/ der wider die propheten schreibt/ nach den buchstaben anzusehen. Es haben auch die Hebrewe lange darumb eynn span gehabt/ ob sie Jeheskiel für eynn propheten annemen wolten/ oder nit. Summa: Eyn ieder schüler Christi/ der nit betrogen werden wil/ sol vberal leynt schrift noch annemen noch verwerffen/ die jm nit zuuor/ durch die offenbarung Jesu Christi entschlossen ist/ (iiij v) vnangesehen den Canon/ oder dise oder ihene sprach.

Andere schriftgeleerte Magistri von den hohen sinnen/ nement leyne schrift für güt an/ in dero von den gesichten geschriben stehet/ Oh/ sprechen sie: es ist traum werck/ es stehend vil gesicht darinne/ niemandts weyzt was es ist/ mein geyst kan sich darein nit richten/ etc. Hört jr marten/ sanfften Schriftgeleerte/ wo her kommt euch der freuel/ das jr eyn ding vrteylet/ welchs jr doch nit verstehen? Ists nit eyn spott wenn der blind vonn farben redt? Ob jr gleich nit verstendig sein wöllen der gsichten vnd anderer schrifften/ die nit auff ewer weych reden vnd pulsterig Euangelion ja sagen/ noch schelten jrs schwermerisch/ rottisch/ aufrührisch/ letzterisch vnd widertaufferisch/ Gedenklet aber

darneben mit/ das ic mit der weiz alle schrifft/ news vnd als Testaments/ auff heben/ die nahet allsamen mit gesichten vmbgehen/ eyns meher weder das ander. Kurtz/ die bucher so euwere orenjucker schreiben/ die setzt ic in den Canon/ vnd ist gut geystig ding/ weil ic darinn gelobt/ geprisen/ hoch gelert vnd wolberümt werden/ was euch aber die warheyt sagt/ das möcht euch die juppen zereissen/ Gnug von dem.

Vnd also sol niemant keyn abschweren ab gedachten buchern haben/ sonder eyn ieder/ wer wil/ mag sie lesen/ vnnnd eyn gute zeugnuß desz somens Gottes darauf fassen/ damit steg vnd weg angezeigt wirt/ wie man zur eynigkeyt komen mög/ vnd wo man sie suchen sol. Wer aber schrifft/ sie sei heylig (wie man sie nent) oder nit/ (iiij r) darumb liset oder höret lesen/ das er Gott der auf woll lernen verstehen oder kennen/ der betreugt sich selbst/ vnd andere mit jm/ Dann das ist eyn warhaftige warheyt in Gott dem HERREN/ das Gott von nichts mag erkant noch erlernt werden/ weder alleyn von Gott/ das ist/ durch Gottes krafft/ die man den heyligen geyst nent/ vnd ist war/ Wer Gott nit bei Gott vnd mit Gott suchet/ der wirt allweg suchen/ vnnnd doch nichts finden. Wer das nit thüt/ der überkompt ja auch eyn wissen/ aber eyn vnnlitz wissen/ das Gott nit behagt/ vnd jn nit kennt/ alz dann allen denen widerfert/ die den glauben von lesen/ von hören sagen/ oder von spitziger kunst vnnnd meysterschafft der schrifft lernen wollen/ vnd gar vil wenien sie wissen diß vnd das/ so treschen sie doch allsamen eyn lät stro/ Vnd wenn man sie fragt: Lieben herrn/ wo her wissen ic das? so antwurten sie mit pracht: Ich hab es in der heyligen schrifft gelesen/ da vnd da/ an dem oder an jhem Capitel/ Sihe/ die betriegen sich selbst/ vnd verstehen gar nichts in der schrifft.

Darauff sag ich frei diße warheyt imm Herren Gott/ das keyn mensch/ er sei wie gelert er immer wölle/ eynige schrifft verstehen mag/ er hab sie dann zuvor selbst in der warheyt mit der that/ imm abgrundt seiner seelen erlernet. Hat eyner lang imm Creutzgang spatzieret/ so versteht er destomehr schrifft/ Ist aber eyner nie darein kommen/ so versteht er ja nitt eynen buchstaben/ sonder ist alles nun eyn vermessener wohn/ vnnnd redet von allen graden desz (iiij v) glaubens/ wie der blinde von der farben. Derhalben/ wer die schrifft woll verstehen/ der gehe in die rechte schül Christi/ da wirt er sie lernn/ er darf weder auff alter noch newer Papisten geschwürm vnd schulen studiren/ da man gar nichts götlicher kunst lernet noch ergreifft/ sonder ie lenger ie erger/ ie gelerter ie verkerter/ stöltzer vnd hohmütiger man drauß wirt/ desz seind leyder exempla gnug vorhanden. Det

schlüssel Davids müß dir alle schriftt auff schliessen/ Die züchtigung müß vorlesen/ die mag dir alleyn das hertz reynigen/ das du die lebendig stimm Gottes vernemen magst/ ja die müßt du hören/ wiltu etwas seiner reden verstehen/ dann weres mit vom vatter hört vnd lernt/ der kans nit.

Aufz disem fleynen büchlin/ o frommer Christ/ hast du grosse geheymnus zu mercken/ wer orn zu hören hab der höre/ auch eyn abcontrofeytische beschreibung der bilder vnd abgött/ deren alle windel vol stecken/ all egl der gassen vnd veldstrassen. O desz spots vnd gewlichen ablerens von Gott/ damit alle menschen höchlich in Gottes hand vnd strengs vrteyl fallen/ der grossen abgötterei halben/ mit den bildn vnd götzen/ damit sich auch gewaltige weise vnd erbare leut bethören lassen/ das sie eben mit den bildn spilen gehen/ wie die kind mit jten puppen. Pfuch der schandtlichen hürerei/ damit jr euch dem gesalbten vnzifer zu lieb/ besudlen/ vnd wider Gottes offentliche befelch vnd Mandat handlen/ Beker dich o erdtrich/ dein verwüstug kommt vom allmechtigen/ Amen.

Bibliography

Primary Sources and Language Tools

Allen, P. S., Helen Mary Allen, Heathcote William Garrod, and Barbara Flower, eds. *Opus Epistolarum; Denvo Recognitum Et Auctum Per P.S. Allen.* Oxonii: In Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1906.

Alt, A., O. Eißfeldt, P. Kahle, and R. Kittel, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. secunda emendata ed.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.

Augustine. *Concering the City of God Against the Pagans.* Translated by Henry Bettenson. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1972.

Bauman, C., ed. *The Spiritual Legacy of Hans Denck: Interpretation and Translation of Key Texts, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought.* Vol. 47. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

Brooke, Kenneth. *An Introduction to Early New High German.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.

Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Chazan, R., ed. *Church, State, and Jew in the Middle Ages.* New York: Behrman House, 1980.

Erasmus, Desiderius. *Collected works of Erasmus.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

The Five Megilot with all the Commetaries of the Mikraot Gedolot: Eica, Kohelet, Ester. Vol. 15, pt. 2. Jerusalem: Even Yisrael Institute, 1999.

Friedländer, M., ed. *The Commentary of Ibn Ezra on Isaiah.* second ed. New York: Philipp Feldheim, Inc., 1964.

Furcha, E.J., ed. *Selected Writings of Hans Denck 1500-1527.* Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1989.

Grimm, Jacob, and Wilhelm Grimm. *Deutsches Wörterbuch.* 16 vols. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1854-1960.

Hätzer, Ludwig. *Baruch der Prophet. Die histori Susannah. Die histori Bel zü Babel.* Worms: Peter Schoffer, 1528.

Hätzer, Ludwig, and Hans Denck. *Alle Propheten nach Hebraischer Sprach verteutsch.* first folio ed. Worms: Peter Schoffer, 1527.

_____. *Alle propheten nach Hebraischer sprach verteütschet.* fifth folio ed. Augsburg:

Silvanum Ottmar, 1527.

Hätzer, Ludwig, and Hans Denck. *Alle Propheten nach hebraischer sprach verteutscht*. ninth octavo ed. Worms: Peter Schoffer, 1528.

Kimchi, David. *Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary upon the Prophecies of Zechariah. Translated from the Hebrew*. Translated by A. McCaul. London: James Duncan, 1838.

Luther, Martin. *Biblia, Das Ist, Die Gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsche* Wittemberg: Hans Lufft, 1534; reprint ed., Frankfurt am Main: Röderberg-Verlag, 1983.

_____. *Luther's Works*. Translated by Gottfried G. Kodel. Edited by Gottfried G. Kodel and Helmut T. Lehmann. American Edition ed. 55 vols. Vol. 49. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

_____. *Luther's Works*. Translated by E. Theodore Bachmann, Charles M. Jacobs, Jeremiah J. Schindel, William A. Lambert. Edited by E. Theodore Bachmann and Helmut T. Lehmann. American Edition ed. 55 vols. Vol. 35. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.

McNamara, Martin, Kevin J. Cathcart, and Michael Maher, eds. *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums*. 18 vols. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987 -.

More, Sir Thomas. *The Dialogue Concerning Tyndale*. Vol. 2, *The English Works of Sir Thomas More*. London; New York: Eyre and Spottiswoode; Lincoln Mac Veagh, 1931.

Oettli, Peter H. *A First Dictionary for Students of Middle High German*. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1986.

Reuchlin, Johann. *De verbo mirifico*. 1494 ; *De arte cabalistica*. 1517. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: F. Frommann Verlag, 1964.

Reuchlin, Johann, and Josef Benzing. *[Augenspiegel] : Doctor Johannsen Reuchlins ... Warhaftige Entschuldigung gegen und wider eins getauften Juden genant Pfefferkorn vormals getruckt ussgangen unwarhaftigs Schmachbüchlin Augenspiegel*, Quellen zur Geschichte des Humanismus und der Reformation in Faksimile-Ausgaben ; Bd. 5. Tübingen

Rosenberg, Rabbi A. J., ed. *Mikra'ot Gedolot: A New English Translation of the Text, Rashi and a Commentary Digest by Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg*. 29 vols. New York: The Judaica Press Inc., 1969 -.

Samuelis Marochitanus, Rabbi. *Das Jhesus Nazarenus der ware Messias sey. Derhalben die Juden auff kaynen andern warten dörffen*. Translated by Wenceslaus Link. Zwickau: Jörg Gastel, 1524.

Samuelis Marochitanus. *Ein bewysung, das der war Messias kummen sei, des die Juden noch on ursach zum künftig sin, wartend.* Translated by Ludwig Hätzer. Augsburg: Silvan Otmar, 1524.

_____, Rabbi. *Ein Bewysung, Das Der War Messias Kummen Sei, Des Die Juden Noch on Ursach Zum Künftig Sin, Wartend.* Translated by Ludwig Hätzer. Zürich: Hans Hager, 1524.

_____, Rabbi. *Ein Epistel rabbi Samuelis des Juden, darinn er anzeyget und bewerlich vernicht die öden und unfruchtbar hoffnung der Juden die sye haben von Messia, daß der selbig noch kommen sol.* Translated by Anonymous. Colmar: Amandus Farckall, 1524.

Samuelis Morochiani, Rabbi. *Quod iudaei messiam, qui venit, ceu venturum temere exspectent.* Strasbourg: Johann Herwagen, 1523.

Schelhorn, Johann Georg. *Amoenitates literariae : quibus variae observationes, scripta item quaedam anecdota & rariora opuscula exhibentur.* 14 v. in 7 vols. Vol. 4. Francofurti & Lipsiae: Apud Daniel. Bartholomaei, 1725.

Simonsohn, Shlomo. *The Apostolic See and the Jews, Studies and texts.* Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1988.

Staehelin, Ernst, ed. *Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads.* reprint ed. Vol. 2. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971.

Stupperich, Robert, ed. *Martin Bucers Deutsche Schriften, Vol. 7: Schriften der Jahre 1538-1539.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1964.

Vocht, Henry De, ed. *Literae Virorum Eruditorum ad Franciscum Craneveldium 1522-1528: A Collection of Original Letters Edited from the Manuscripts and Illustrated with Notes and Commentaries.* Louvain: Librairie Universitaire Uystpruyt, 1928.

Walahfrid, Strabo, Nicholas, and Pablo, eds. *Bibliorum sacrorum tomus quartus cum glossa ordinaria, & Nicolai Lyrani expositionibus, additionibus & replicis.* Parisiis, 1545.

Secondary Sources

Augustijn, Cornelis. "Gerard Geldenhouwer und die religiöse Toleranz." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69 (1978): 132-156.

Encyclopaedia Judaica, S. v. "Augsburg," by Zvi Avneri.

Encyclopaedia Judaica, S. v. “Worms,” by Zvi Avneri.

Bainton, Roland H. “The Bible in the Reformation.” In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S. L. Greenslade, Vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, 1-37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Baring, Georg. “Die ‘Wormser Propheten,’ eine vorlutherische evangelische Prophetenübersetzung aus dem Jahre 1527.” *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 31 (1934): 23-41.

Barnavi, Elie, and Miriam Eliav-Feldon. *A Historical Atlas of the Jewish People: From the Time of the Patriarchs to the Present*. London: Hutchinson, 1992.

Baron, Salo Wittmayer. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. 18 vols. second ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958-1983.

Mennonite Encyclopedia, S. v. “Worms Prophets,” by H. S. Bender.

Ben-Sasson, H. H. “Jewish-Christian Disputation in the Setting of Humanism and Reformation in the German Empire.” *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966): 369-390.

_____. “Jews and Christian Sectarians: Existential Similarity and Dialectical Tensions in Sixteenth-Century Moravia and Poland-Lithuania.” *Viator* 4 (1973): 369-385.

_____. “The Reformation in Contemporary Jewish Eyes.” *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 4 (1971).

Berger, David. “Mission to the Jews and Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Polemical Literature of the High Middle Ages.” *American Historical Review* 91, no. 3 (1986): 576-591.

Bornkamm, H. *Luther and the Old Testament*. Translated by Eric W. Gritsch, Ruth C. Gritsch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Clebsch, William A. *England's Earliest Protestants 1520-1535*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press, 1964.

Cohen, Jeremy. “Scholarship and Intolerance in the Medieval Academy: The Study and Evaluation of Judaism in European Christendom.” *American Historical Review* 81 (1986): 592-613.

Crous, Ernst. “Zu den Bibelübersetzungen von Haetzer und Denk: Eine bibliographische Nachlese.” In *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mennoniten: Festgabe für D. Christian Neff zum 70. Geburstag*, edited by Walter Fellmann, 72-82. Weirhof: Mennonitischen Geschichtsverein, 1938.

Mennonite Encyclopedia, S. v. "Westerburg, Gerhard," by Ernst Crouse.

Dán, Róbert. "Judaizare - The Career of a Term." In *Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century*, edited by Róbert Dán and Antal Pirmát, 25-34. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1982.

_____. "The Works of Vehe-Glirius and Early Sabbatarian Ideology in Transylvania." In *Armarium: Studia ex Historia Scripturae, Liborum et Ephemeridum: Studien aus der Geschichte der Schrift, der Bücher und der Periodica*, edited by Piroska Dezsényi Szemzö and László Mezey, 87-94. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1976.

Davis, Kenneth R. "Anabaptism as a Charismatic Movement." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 53 (1979): 219-252.

Demaus, Robert. *William Tindale, a Biography: Being a Contribution to the Early History of the English Bible*. revised popular ed. London: The Religious Tract Society, 1904.

Deppermann, Klaus. "Judenhass und Judenfreundschaft im frühen Protestantismus." In *Die Juden als Minderheit in der Geschichte*, edited by Bernd Martin and Ernst Schulin, 110-130. Munich: DTV, 1981.

Derksen, John David. "Strasbourg's Religious Radicals From 1525 to 1570: A Social History." Ph.D., The University of Manitoba, 1993.

The Jewish Encyclopedia, S. v. "Ratisbon," by A. Eckstein.

Eels, Hastings. "Bucer's Plan for the Jews." *Church History* 6, no. 2 (1937): 127-135.

Eidelberg, Shlomo, ed. *The Jews and the Crusades*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1977.

Fellmann, Walter. "Die Wormser Propheten von 1527: Ein Forschungsbericht." *Mennonitische Geschichts-Blätter* 24 (1967): 81-89.

The Jewish Encyclopedia, S. v. "Augsburg," by A. Freimann.

Friedman, Jerome. "Jewish Conversion, the Spanish Pure Blood Laws and Reformation: A Revisionist View of Racial and Religious Antisemitism." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 18, no. 1 (1987): 3-30.

_____. *The Most Ancient Testimony: Sixteenth-Century Christian-Hebraica in the Age of Renaissance Nostalgia*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1983.

_____. "Sebastian Münster, the Jewish Mission, and Protestant Antisemitism." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 70 (1979): 238-259.

- Friedman, Jerome. "Sixteenth-Century Christian-Hebraica: Scripture and the Renaissance Myth of the Past." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 11 (1980): 67-85.
- Geiger, L. *Das Studium der hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland vom Ende des XV bis zur Mitte des XVI Jahrhunderts*. Breslau, 1870.
- Gelbach, Erich. "Toward a More Ample Biography of the Hessian Anabaptist Leader Melchior Rinck." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 48 (1974): 371-84.
- Goeters, J. F. Gerhard. "Ludwig Haetzer: A Marginal Anabaptist." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 29 (1955): 251-262.
- _____. "Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529: Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier: Eine Randfigur der frühen Tuferbewegung." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 70, no. 3-4 (1955): 344-345.
- _____. *Ludwig Hätzer, ca 1500-1529: Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier: Eine Randfigur der frühen Tuferbewegung*. Gütersloh: Bertolsmann, 1957.
- Graetz, Heinrich. *History of the Jews*. Vol. 4. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1974 (c.1891).
- Greenslade, S. L. "English Versions of the Bible, 1525-1611." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S. L. Greenslade, Vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, 141-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Guggisberg, Hans R. "Jakob Würben of Biel, a Thoughtful Admonisher Against Ludwig Hätzer and the Anabaptists." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 46 (1972): 239-255.
- Hall, B. "Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S. L. Greenslade, Vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, 38-93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
- Hamilton, Alastair. "The Apocryphal Apocalypse: 2 Esdras and the Anabaptist Movement." *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* 68, no. 1 (1988): 1-16.
- Hasel, G.F. "Sabbatarian Anabaptists of the Sixteenth Century." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 5-6 (1967-1968): 101-121; 19-28.
- Mennonite Encyclopedia*, S. v. "Frankfurt Am Main," by Christian Hege.
- Hendrix, Scott H. "Toleration of Jews in the German Reformation: Urbanus Rhegius and Braunschweig (1535-1541)." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 81 (1990): 189-215.
- Holmio, Armas K. E. *The Lutheran Reformation and the Jews: The Birth of the Protestant Jewish Missions*. Michigan: Finnish Lutheran Book Concern, 1949.

Encyclopaedia Judaica, S. v. "Ingolstadt."

Jones, D. R. "Appendices: Aids to the Study of the Bible; Commentaries." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. S. L. Greenslade, Vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, 520-35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Jones, G. Lloyd. *The Discovery of Hebrew in Tudor England: A Third Language*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1983.

Karpman, Dahlia M. "William Tyndale's Response to the Hebraic Tradition." *Studies in the Renaissance* 14 (1967): 110-130.

The Jewish Encyclopedia, S. v. "Basel," by Moritz Kayserling.

Kittelson, James Matthew. *Wolfgang Capito : From Humanist to Reformer*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought ; v. 17. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Kiwiet, J. "The Life of Hans Denck." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 31 (1957): 227-259.

Klaassen, Walter. "Word, Spirit, and Scripture in Early Anabaptist Thought." D. Phil, University of Oxford, 1960.

Klassen, John J. "Scriptural Authority Among the Anabaptists: A Study of Implicit Obedience." M.Th., Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966.

Klassen, William. "Anabaptist Hermeneutics: The Letter and the Spirit." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 40 (1966): 83-96.

Mennonite Encyclopedia, S. v. "Old Testament," by William. Klassen.

Klassen, William. "Was Hans Denck a Universalist?" *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 39 (1965): 152-154.

Kleiner, J. "The Attitudes of Martin Bucer and Landgrave Philipp Toward the Jews of Hesse (1538-1539)." In *Faith and Freedom: A Tribute to Franklin H. Littell*, edited by Richard Libowitz. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1987.

Krahn, Henry George. "An Analysis Of the Conflict Between the Clergy Of the Reformed Church and the Leaders Of the Anabaptist Movement In Strasbourg, 1524-1534." Ph.D., University Of Washington, 1969.

Krause, Gerhard. *Studien Zu Luthers Auslegung Der Kleinen Propheten*. Beiträge Zur Historischen Theologie; 33. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962.

Krey, August C. *The First Crusade*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1921.

- Lenhart, J. M. "Protestant Latin Bibles of the Reformation from 1520-1570: a bibliographic account." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 8, no. 4 (1946): 430ff.
- Liechty, Daniel. *Andreas Fischer and the Sabbatarian Anabaptists: An Early Reformation Episode in East Central Europe*, Studies in Anabaptist and Mennonite History; 29. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1988.
- _____. "The Origins of Sabbatarianism Amongst East Central European Anabaptists in the Sixteenth Century." In *Anabaptistes et Dissidents au XVIe Siecle*, edited by Jean Georges Rott and Simon L. Verheus, 325-336. Baden-Baden: Éditions Valentin Koerner, 1987.
- _____. *Sabbatarianism in the Sixteenth Century: A Page in the History of the Radical Reformation*. Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews University Press, 1993.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, S. v. "Hebraists, Christian (1100-1890)," by R. Loewe.
- Lohse, Bernhard. *Martin Luther: An Introduction to His Life and Work*. Translated by Robert C. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, S. v. "Memmingen."
- Mozley, J. F. "Tyndale's Knowledge of Hebrew." *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1935): 392-396.
- Newman, L. I. *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1925.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, S. v. "Nuremberg."
- Oberman, Heiko A. "Discovery of Hebrew and Discrimination Against the Jews: The Veritas Hebraica as Double-Edged Sword in Renaissance and Reformation." In *Germania Illustrata: Essays on Early Modern Germany Presented to Gerald Strauss*, edited by Andrew Fix and Susan C. Karant-Nunn, 19-34. Kirksville, Mo.: Sixteenth Century Journal Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Age of Renaissance and Reformation*. Translated by James I. Porter. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Stubborn Jews. Timing the Escalation of Anti-Semitism in Late Medieval Europe." *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* 34 (1989): xi-xxv.
- _____. "Three Sixteenth-Century Attitudes to Judaism: Reuchlin, Erasmus and Luther." In *Jewish Thought in the Sixteenth Century*, edited by B. Cooperman. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983.

- The Jewish Encyclopedia*, S. v. "Nuremberg," "Ulm," "Worms," by Schulim Ochser.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, S. v. "Constance," by Toni Oelsner.
- Oyer, John S. "Anabaptism in Central Germany: I. The Rise and Spread of the Movement." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 34 (1960): 219-284.
- Pabel, Hilmar M. "Erasmus of Rotterdam and Judaism: A Reexamination in the Light of New Evidence." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 87 (1996): 9-37.
- Packull, Werner O. "The Beginning of Anabaptism in Southern Tyrol." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991): 717-26.
- _____. "Denck's Alleged Baptism by Hubmaier. Its Significance for the Origin of South German-Austrian Anabaptism." *Mennonite Quarterly Review* 47 (1973): 327-338.
- _____. *Hutterite Beginnings: Communitarian Experiments During the Reformation*. Baltimore; London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- _____. *Mysticism and the Early South German-Austrian Anabaptist Movement 1525-1531*. Scottdale, Pa: Herald Press, 1977.
- Pater, Calvin Augustine. "Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt as the Intellectual Founder of Anabaptism." Ph.D., Harvard University, 1977.
- _____. "Westerburg: the Father Of Anabaptism. Author and Content Of the Dyalogus Of 1527." *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 85 (1994): 138-163.
- Reuter, Fritz. "Worms." In *Germania Judaica*, ed. Arye Maimon, Mordechai Breuer, Yacov Guggenheim, 1671-1697. Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1995.
- Rosenthal, E. I. J. "Rashi and the English Bible." In *Studia Semitica*, 56-85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Rosenthal, Frank. "The Rise of Christian-Hebraism in the 16th Century." *Historia Judaica* 7 (1945): 167-191.
- Rupp, G. *Patterns of Reformation*. London: Epworth Press, 1969.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, S. v. "Saint Gall."
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, S. v. "Switzerland," by Benjamin Sagalowitz.
- Saperstein, Marc. "Christians and Jews - Some Positive Images." *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 236-246.

- Scholem, Gershom. *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. Jerusalem: Schocken Publishing House, 1941.
- _____. "Messianic Movements After the Expulsion from Spain." In *The Jewish People: Past and Present*, 335-337. New York: Marstin Press, 1946.
- Schrag, Dale R., and Lois Barrett. "Anabaptists and the Bible: From Sola Scriptura to Solus Christus." *Mennonite Life* 44, no. 3 (1989): 12-18.
- Shulvass, Moses A. *The History of the Jewish People*. Vol. 3; *The Late Middle Ages*. Chicago: Regnery Books, 1985.
- Sigal, P. *The Emergence of Contemporary Judaism*. Vol. 3. Allison Park, Pennsylvania: Pickwick Publications, 1986.
- Slater, John Rothwell. *The Sources of Tyndale's Version of the Pentateuch*. Chicago: University Press, 1906.
- Smalley, Beryl. "The Bible in the Medieval Schools." In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe, Vol. 2: *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, 197-219. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Smith, Preserved. "Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century." *English Historical Review* 36, no. 143 (1921): 422-433.
- Staehelin, Ernst. "Wolfgang Fabricius Capito." In *Professoren der Universität Basel aus fünf Jahrhunderten: Bildnisse und Würdigungen*, edited by Andreas Staehelin, 20-21. Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt, 1960.
- Stern, Moritz. *Die Wormser Reichsrabbiner Samuel und Jakob 1521-1574*. Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1937.
- Strauss, Gerald. *Manifestations of Discontent in Germany on the Eve of the Reformation*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- Szczucki, L. "The Beginnings of Antitrinitarian Anabaptism in Lithuania and Poland in the Light of a so-far Unknown source." In *Anabaptistes et Dissidents au XVI Siecle*, edited by Jean Georges Rott and Simon L. Verheus, 343-358. Baden-Baden: Editions Valentin Koerner, 1987.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, S. v. "Landau," by Chasia Turtel.
- The Jewish Encyclopedia*, S. v. "Strasburg," by A. Ury.
- Volz, Hans. "Continental Versions to C. 1600: German." In *The Cambridge History of the*

Bible, ed. S. L. Greenslade, Vol. 3: *The West from the Reformation to the Present Day*, 94-109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Walde, Bernhard. *Christliche Hebraisten Deutschlands am Ausgang des Mittelalters*. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1916.

Wallmann, J. "Luther on Jews and Islam." In *Creative Biblical Exegesis: Christian and Jewish Hermeneutics Through the Centuries*, edited by Benjamin Uffenheimer. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Weis, F.L. *The Life, Teachings and Works of Ludwig Hetzer 1500-1529*. Dorchester, Mass., 1930.

Weitzman, Michael. "On Translating the Old Testament: the Achievement of William Tyndale." *Reformation* 1 (1996): 165-180.

Williams, A. Jukyn. *Adversus Judaeos: A Bird's-Eye View of Christian Apologiae Until the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1935.

Williams, George H. *The Radical Reformation*. 3rd ed. Kirksville, Mo.: Sixteenth Century Journal Publishers, 1992.

Zimmer, Eric. "Jewish and Christian Hebraist Collaboration in Sixteenth Century Germany." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 71 (1980): 69-88.

_____. *Jewish Synods in Germany During the Late Middle Ages (1286-1603)*. New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1978.