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CHAPTER ONE

THE TYNDALE–JOYE DEBATE IN THE LITERATURE

A Tumultuous World

It was a cold Saturday in late winter, the feast of the Conversion of Saint Augustine, the second-to-last day of the month of February, the vigil of the third Sunday of the Lenten season in the year of our Lord 1535. After the warm summer of 1534, winter arrived early, with violent storms, winds, and floods in Antwerp during November and the first snow already falling at the end of the month; winter lasted an unusually long time that year.¹ On that cold winter’s day a slim little book of barely forty-four small octavo pages emerged in Antwerp from the printing press of Catherine van Ruremund, widow of the late printer Christoffel van Ruremund from Endhoven.² The widow knew that the book was not going to be her best-selling publication, although it could certainly count on some interest, being clandestine, controversial, and scandalous. Such ingredients always spice up even the dullest stories and make even the worst books sell more easily, she knew. She also realized that the publication was not without risk; her own husband had lost his life while imprisoned in the Tower of London for the printing, smuggling, and sale of heretical books.³ But the author had been employed by the firm for some time, and as a widowed


² Christoffel van Ruremund often referred to himself by his place of origin, Endhoven; hence, he, and later his widow, are frequently mentioned as van Endhoven.

³ A placard from as early as 1529 bans “Nova Testamenta impressa per Adrianum van Berghen, Christophorum van Ruremundae et Ioannem Zeel” (J.M. De Bujanda (ed.), *Index
woman in the patriarchal mercantile world of printers and publishers, she knew that she still could make good use of the cheap labour of the immigrant refugee in the future, provided that the books on which he worked continued to sell as well as they had been selling.

The book had, indeed, remained mostly unnoticed—partly because the scandal that brought about the book died down due to the flight of the author from Antwerp and the imprisonment, and eventually the execution, of his opponent, and partly because contemporaries were occupied with affairs of much greater importance.

The world was at a turning point and history was in the making. On Monday 18 January, only forty days prior to the appearance of the Antwerp pamphlet, the city of Lima in the ‘West Indies’ was founded by the illiterate Spanish conquistador Francisco Pizzaro (c.1475–1541).4 In eleven days’ time, on Wednesday 10 March, the ship of the reverend bishop of Panama, Fray Tomás de Berlanga O.P. (c.1487–1551), would accidentally be set adrift on the sea and discover a strange set of islands off the coast of Peru. In his account to Emperor Charles V (1500–58), the bishop reports on the extraordinary flora; the unusually tame fauna, which showed no fear at all at the sight of humans; and the numerous galapagos (giant turtles) he and his men encountered on the islands.5 And in two months’ time, in the spring of 1535, the French navigator Jacques Cartier (1491–1557), the originator of the name of the present-day country of Canada, would discover the Iroquois city of Stadacona (now Quebec City) and the Huron city of Hochelaga, near the present-day city of Montreal (a name also originating from

---


Cartier, who named a mountain in the vicinity Mont Realis). Of course, these pieces of news would reach the ever-busy harbour of Antwerp only after months of delay, but similar reports about new discoveries in the Indies had been occupying public attention for decades.

This public attention was also concerned with other, less promising reports received from all corners of the world. From the East a continuously growing power was sending alarming signals to its contemporaries. The fall of Belgrade (1521), the Battle of Mohács (1526), the invasion of Hungary, the Siege of Vienna (1529), and the penetration into Styria (1532) left little doubt about the plans of Suleiman I (1494–1566)—the scourge of God, as his contemporaries saw him. In 1534 he conquered Tunis and marched into Persia. The following year he took Baghdad. The expansion of the Ottoman Empire in Europe as well as in Africa and in Asia threatened not only the profitability of the trade with the East or the possibility of conducting such a business at all, but menaced the very existence and survival of Christian Europe, a Christian Europe that at this crucial moment was weakening itself through political and religious divisions and wars.

On the European Continent the spread of the ‘New Belief’ brought about tremendous changes not only in religious principles and praxis, but also in the fabric of society. ‘Luther’s sect,’ as it was called by contemporaries, not only fractured the Western Church but was internally

---


7 The first account of the ‘New World’ in English was the anonymous compilation Of the newe landes and of ye people founde by the messengers of the kynge of portyngale named Emanuel: Of the. x. dyuers nacyons crystened. Of pope Iohn and his landes, and of the costely keyes and wonders molodyes that in that lande is, printed in Antwerp by ‘Iohn of Doesborowe’ around 1511. It was republished in 1885; Edward Arber (ed.), The First Three English Books on America, (1531)–1555 A.D.: Being Chiefly Translations, Compilations, &c. by Richard Eden from the Writings, Maps, &c. of Pietro Martire…Sebastian Münster…Sebastian Cabot …with Extracts, &c. from the Works of other Spanish, Italian, and German Writers of the Time, Birmingham: s.n., 1885.

divided into factions and parties hostile to one another. And these diverse religious upheavals (collectively known as ‘the Reformation’) had their political consequences, too. The followers of the ‘New Learning’ were determined to challenge and change the prevailing religious and political order. Luther’s stand against papal authority led, albeit against Luther’s own will, to the Peasants’ War in Germany in 1524–25, which left more than 100,000 dead according to contemporary estimates. When the peasants’ revolt spread into Alsace, true panic broke out: the Parlement of Paris believed that 14,000 Lutheran peasants intended to descend on France. For their contemporaries, this provided proof that the new doctrine endangered the social order. In Münster, the Anabaptists seized control of the city on 5 January 1534 and introduced their violent rule. On Easter Sunday, however, the Anabaptist Jan Matthys and his thirty followers were slain during a sortie against the troops of the expelled Bishop Franz von Waldeck (1491–1553). Matthys was followed by Jan Beukels from Leiden (c.1509–36), whose name has been immortalized by the Dutch proverb *zich met een Jan(tje) van Leiden van iets afmaken* because he justified his arbitrary and cruel actions (including the beheading of one of his sixteen wives by his own hand in the marketplace) with divine instructions received in visions. He carried on with the Anabaptist rule in the New Jerusalem, as they regarded Münster, until Saint John the Baptist’s Feast in 1535, when Bishop von Waldeck’s troops finally took the city and restored order. But the Anabaptists’ seemingly destabilizing and horrific movement was not confined to the city of Münster. The Antwerp

---


12 For the Anabaptist movement, see infra on p. 276.

pamphlets that recount the events in Münster were on the street within a few weeks’ time, both in English and in Dutch. By that time Antwerp had banned several individual adherents of the Anabaptist movement, and on 25 February 1534 all Anabaptists were banned from the town. Nonetheless, a year later the Schout (royal bailiff) would charge several individuals with Anabaptism, and on 17 February 1535, just ten days prior to the publication of the Antwerp pamphlet, Ieronymus Pael, “droogscheerder, van Keulen,” was executed in Antwerp. His execution would be followed by others in March 1535 and January 1536. In Amsterdam, only a week before the publication of the widow’s booklet, twelve Anabaptists, men and women, were detained after having stripped off their clothes—as a sign, they said, that they proclaimed the naked truth of the New Eden—and run naked through the streets crying, “Woe! Woe! The Wrath of God!”

They were beheaded.

The political conflicts on the European Continent, often a result of the split in Christianity, were no less distressing. In 1519 Spain invaded Navarre, a fief of France. This gave a pretext for Francis I of France (1494–1547) to enter into war with the Habsburg Emperor Charles V. After a series of defeats on the Italian peninsula, the French king was imprisoned in Madrid (1525) and forced to yield his Italian territories. But a year later, in 1526, he formed the League of Cognac with Venice, Florence, and the Papacy against Charles V. The Emperor gained the upper hand once again and conquered Florence, sacked Rome (1527), and imprisoned Pope Clement VII. Unfortunately, the Treaty of Cambrai (1529), which was supposed to put an end to the Italian wars, was short-lived. Francis I marched into Italy in 1535. In response, Charles V invaded Provence, and thus began the series of “Great Italian Wars,” which lasted until 1559.

Denmark was entangled in the Grevens Fejde (Count’s Feud, 1534–36). The rule of the Protestant pretender Christian of Gottorp (1503–59), proclaimed first as regent (1533) and then as King Christian III (1534), was contested by the count Christopher of Oldenburg (c.1504–66), who supported the imprisoned reconverted Catholic King Christian II (1481–1559).
The Swedish King Gustav Vasa (1496–1560)—the Swedish ‘Moses,’ as he liked to see himself—who owed his throne to a revolt leading to the imprisonment of Christian II (1523) and the dissolution of the Kalmar Union (1524), was keen to keep his recently acquired royal title (and the confiscated revenues of the monasteries). He entered the conflict on the side of Christian III and massacred, ravished, and ruined his way across a great deal of Denmark. Christian III would introduce royal absolutism, establish Lutheranism as the state religion, and confiscate all Catholic property to pay off his war debt.

The Polish-Lithuanian King Sigismund I the Old (Polish Zygmunt I Stary, Lithuanian Žygimantas II Senasis), a relative of and ally to the Habsburgs and the Hungarian and Bohemian royal dynasties, was engaged in wars on the eastern side of his territories. With his army led by the Grand Crown Hetman Jan Armor Tarnowski (1488–1561), Sigismund subdued (1521) and dissolved (1525) the Prussian Order of Teutonic Knights and successfully defended Poland in 1531 from the invading Moldavian forces of the belligerent voivode Petru Rareş (c.1487–1546) at Obertyn. Tarnowski with his 7000-strong force defeated the Muscovites at Starodub in January 1535—just a month before the publication of the Antwerp pamphlet—in the Fifth Muscovite-Lithuanian War. In response, the Russians defeated the 40,000-strong Lithuanian forces at Sebezh and destroyed the environs of Vitebesk on the Vitba River.

In Hungary the chaos was complete. After the disastrous defeat of the Hungarian army and the death of the young king Louis II (Lajos, 1506–26) at Mohács, the country, first partly occupied and then temporarily abandoned by the Turks, was divided between two pretenders to the throne: Archduke Ferdinand of Habsburg (1503–64), the younger brother of Emperor Charles V and a brother-in-law of the late king, ruled the north-
west of the country, while John Zápolya (János Zápolyai or Szapolyai, 1487–1540), Hungary’s most prominent aristocrat and voivode of Transylvania, established his power in the east. Such a division at such a crucial moment in history disheartened their contemporaries deeply: while awaiting his own execution as a prisoner in the Tower of London, Sir Thomas More composed *A Dialogue of Comfort in Tribulation*, which gives a vision of a Hungary on the verge of its collapse in 1526–27. Suleiman’s campaign in 1529 and the disintegration of Hungarian society would lead to the disintegration and tripartite division of the country, which would endure more than a century and a half, establishing Muslim rule in the heart of Central Europe. That this could happen was clearly, in contemporary eyes, the punishment of God.

Besides these disturbing pieces of news from the East and all over the Continent, the English, the potential readership of the widow’s book, were preoccupied with matters of grave significance happening closer to home. Six weeks prior to the appearance of the book, on Friday 15 January, Henry VIII (º1491, reigned 1509–47) declared himself the head of the English church. Since his appeal in 1527 for an annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon (1485–1536), the aunt of Emperor Charles V, after twenty-four years in wedlock, Henry’s marital escapades had been the laughing stock of Europe. John Coke, head of the English House in Antwerp, would remorsefully inform Cromwell about the “sondry obprobrius wordes” and mocking pictures by “naughty” Flemish and Spanish merchants about “his moost noble grace, & moost gracious quene his bedfelowe” at the famous Easter market at ‘Barrow’ (Bergen-op-Zoom). And the English merchant Robert Flegge would notify Cromwell on 5 September 1535 about a “slanderous sermon” of a certain Black Friar in Antwerp.

---


20 Arblaster, Cat. 17 in *TT*, pp. 71–73; Gergely Juhász & Gilbert Tournoy, Cat 18. in *TT*, pp. 73–74.

21 PRO, *Acta inter Angliam et Belgium (1531–1546)* Cotton Library MSS, Galba B.x. fo. 43. Published in *L&P* VI, p. 518.
on the previous Sunday, 29 August, the feast of the Decollation of St John the Baptist. The Dominican preacher, to illustrate the gospel for the day, Flegge reported, compared Henry and Anne Boleyn (c.1501/7–36) to Herod and the daughter of Herodias. But in England, too, the King's plans to divorce Catherine and marry Anne Boleyn, one of Catherine's former ladies-in-waiting, were openly criticized. Elisabeth Barton (c.1506–34), the 'Holy Maid of Kent,' claimed to have received prophecies from God about Henry's death if he were to leave his lawful wife for Anne. By spreading rumours about Elisabeth having sexual relationships with her priests, Henry undermined her reputation in order to be able to arrest and eventually execute her by hanging in 1534 at the Tyburn gallows in Westminster. But she was only the first to die as a consequence of Henry's pursuit of a male heir. In 1534, Parliament passed the Act of Supremacy declaring the English monarch the head of the English Church, and England officially broke with Rome. In the summer of the following year, the very year of the publication of the widow's pamphlet, some fifty-odd priests and lay brothers, including two prominent figures of the English Catholic Church, would be executed in England for failing to acknowledge the King's claim: on Tuesday 22 June, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, and a fortnight later, on Tuesday 6 July, the former Lord Chancellor Thomas More would both be beheaded for not taking the Oath of Succession, as it meant the abjuration of the Pope. A year and two months after the execution of More, on Monday 6 September, William Tyndale, the 'father of the English Bible' and More's former antagonist, would be put to death in the Flemish town of Vilvoorde, just north of Brussels. But the deaths of Elisabeth Barton, More, Fisher, Tyndale, and many others could not secure Henry a viable male heir. And, sadly, neither Catherine of Aragon nor Anne Boleyn would live to see the summer of 1536.
Henry’s attempts to forge alliances with the Germans turned out to be unsuccessful. While in Germany in 1531, the Augustinian monk Robert Barnes was sought out by an unknown agent of Henry’s in order to secure Luther’s opinion on the ‘King’s great matter.’ Although his efforts were ineffective because Luther, whom Henry had been fighting on the theological battlefield, was unwilling to support the divorce, in 1534 Barnes was commissioned again to lead the theological negotiations with Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560). At the time of the publication of the widow’s pamphlet, he was just on his way to Wittenberg, where he arrived a fortnight later. On his journey back to England in April 1535, he passed through Antwerp and might even have had the chance to pick up or read a copy of the pamphlet, which at one point mentioned him by name. Barnes’ stay in England did not prove to last long, as he set sail on 25 July 1535 to embark on yet another mission to forge diplomatic ties with Johann Friederich I (1505–54), Elector of Saxony (1532–47), and to conclude theological agreements with the Lutheran party. Neither the political negotiations nor the theological ones, the latter eventually resulting, among other things, in the 1536 Wittenberg Articles, achieved the intended union.

In October 1535, while Tyndale was still imprisoned and Barnes was negotiating with the Saxon Elector on behalf of Henry, the Flemish merchant Jacobus van Meteren (1510–55), father of the later historian and Consul of the Merchants of the Low Countries in London Emanuel van Meteren (1535–1612), financed the Antwerp publication of the first complete English Bible in print, gathered and edited by Myles Coverdale largely from the translations of Tyndale. The other backer of the Coverdale Bible was...

---


27 See infra on p. 344.


29 On the Antwerp origins of the Coverdale Bible, see: Guido Latré, *The 1535 Coverdale Bible and its Antwerp Origins*, in Orlaith O’Sullivan (ed.), *The Bible as Book. The..."
Bible was Jacobus van Meteren’s nephew, Leonard Ortels (d. 1539), father of Abraham Ortelius (1527–98), the famous Humanist geographer and cartographer. They were both arrested in the same year on suspicion of possessing heretical books. The English Bible, however, could not be stopped, and it was reprinted within a few months in England with royal privilege.

Henry’s efforts to establish and extend his authority were not confined to matters of religion and matrimony. In 1535 he annexed Wales, and his troops under the command of Sir William Skeffington (1465–1535), Lord Deputy of Ireland, bombarded Maynooth and retook Dublin from the insurgents of the 22-year-old Thomas FitzGerald (Tomás an tSíoda, 1513–37), 10th Earl of Kildare. To finance the wars and Henry’s excessive lifestyle, Thomas Cromwell was authorized by Parliament to draw up an inventory in preparation for the dissolution of the monasteries. The measures were met with some resistance (especially after a failed crop in 1534, the year in which the break with Rome became definite.
and another bad harvest the following year), but Henry was determined to carry out his plans. The closure of religious houses, convents, and abbeys, together with their schools, hospices, and charitable institutions, would result in England undergoing a tremendous social transformation. Overnight the country would lose more than 800 libraries, hospitals, and schools; 8000 religious men and women would be expelled from their homes; and many more individuals who used to work in or for the monasteries would become unemployed. Furthermore, the sick would be left unattended, and the poor and destitute would have no place to turn for alms, food, or clothing. The suppression of the monasteries undoubtedly played a significant role in the social instability of late Tudor England caused by the masses of “sturdy beggars.”

Due to the dissolution, Britain also became deprived of female teachers, and for the next half-century girls would receive little education unless their family could afford to pay private tutors, could send them abroad, or were willing to risk persecution and stiff penalties by supporting unlicensed schools. Centres of pilgrimages, where no other source of income was readily available for the locals, became devastated and impoverished.

The whole known world was in turmoil. Its inhabitants had more on their minds than taking notice of the publication of the van Ruremund Press. The widow’s pamphlet was received with hardly any interest at the time. The generations that followed essentially ignored the booklet, too. The fact that the Proclamation of 8 July 1546 listed the author among those writers whose works were forbidden did not help boost the recognition and the availability of the book either. Only one copy is known to have survived, and it is located in Cambridge University Library.

---


36 Shelfmark: Syn.8.53.75.
THE PAMPHLET AND ITS AUTHOR: THE DEBATE ON THE DOOM OF THE DEAD BETWEEN GEORGE JOYE AND WILLIAM TYNDALE

Having briefly described the worrisome and daunting world in which the book saw the light of day, it is time to reveal the title and the author of the widow’s pamphlet. The book is entitled An Apologye made by George Ioye to satisfye (if it maye be) w. Tindale: to pourge & defende himself against so many sclaunderouse lyes fayned vpon him in Tindals vncheritable and vnsober Pystle so well worthye to be prefixed for the Reader to induce him into the vnderstaning of hys new Testament diligently corrected & printed in the yeare of oure lorde. M. CCCCC. and xxxiiij. in Nouember. The author, as the title reveals, is a certain George Joye (c.1495–1553), an English Protestant writer and Bible translator, a refugee at the time, living and working in Antwerp.37 The occasion for the publication was his debate with another English Protestant Bible translator, William Tyndale (c.1494–1536), also living at the time in Antwerp.38 Their debate is the subject matter of this present work, for which Joye’s book (further referred to as: Apologye) will form one of the key sources.

William Tyndale

William Tyndale (also called Hutchins) is undoubtedly the better known of the parties. Therefore, his life will only be reviewed succinctly for the sake of introduction. He was born in Gloucestershire around 1494, was educated in Oxford where he was ordained as a priest, and may also have studied in Cambridge. His disappointing university experience, the ignorance and malice of his provincial fellow clergymen, and Luther’s works prompted him to answer Erasmus’ call for the preparation of a fresh

---

translation of the New Testament (NT) for the common people.\textsuperscript{39} He turned to Cuthbert Tunstall (1474–1559), the newly appointed bishop of London, for patronage. The bishop, who read Greek and Hebrew himself and who was friends with Erasmus (with whom he worked on the Greek NT), was reluctant to finance or give permission to the endeavour of Tyndale, who had been charged previously with heresy.\textsuperscript{40} During his year

\textsuperscript{39} Despite the \textit{ad nauseam} repeated claim that the Church forbade the translation or the reading of the Scriptures in the vernacular, translating (let alone reading) \textit{per se} was not forbidden at all. In fact, the Continent knew a wealth of vernacular Bible translations from the early Middle Ages on, the Bible had already been translated into Old English in the 8th century, and the Bible was translated into Anglo-Norman in the 11th century. Erasmus’ call for vernacular translations for the “ploughboy,” which inspired Tyndale so profoundly, was, in fact, pushing at an open door, at least where the Continent was concerned. In Germany, for example, the Mentel Bible, a High German version, had already been put out in 1466, before Luther was even born. There were altogether at least eighteen complete printed Low and High German editions of the Bible, ninety editions of the Gospels and the Sunday readings, and some fourteen German Psalters before Luther’s NT was published (Juhász, Cat. 57 in \textit{TT}, pp. 116–17). Some Provincial Councils, such as that at Toulouse in 1229, did locally regulate the dissemination and translation of the Bible where it was being used to attack the established religious and social order. This happened with the translations of John Wycliffe (c.1320–84), John Purvey (c.1353–1428), and Nicholas of Hereford (active 1370–1417) too (1380–84, 1396), and consequently episcopal approval was required by the Constitutions adopted by the Provincial Council at Oxford in 1408 for any new, unauthorized translations of the Bible. In practice it did come down to no new translation being made after that date, until Tyndale’s Cologne publication. (The text of the Constitution has been published: Alfred W. Pollard, \textit{Records of the English Bible. The Documents Relating to the Translation and Publication of the Bible in English, 1525–1611}, Henry Frowde, London: Oxford UP, 1911, pp. 79–80.) Thomas More attests to having seen acceptable English translations in manuscript form (Thomas More, \textit{A dyaloge of syr Thomas More knyght} [. . .] touchyng the pestylenct sect of Luther and Tyndale, London: John Rastell, June 1529, III, 14, fos. 88–90). These, according to the majority of scholars, were probably Wycliffite manuscripts. For further information, see: Ian C. Levy (ed.), \textit{A Companion to John Wyclif, Late Medieval Theologian}, (Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition 4), Leiden: Brill, 2006; G.W.H. Lampe (ed.), \textit{The Cambridge History of the Bible. The West from the Fathers to the Reformation}, vol. 2, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge UP, 1969.

\textsuperscript{40} In contrast to Tyndale, More, or Fisher, Tunstall was more of a pragmatist than an idealist and avoided conflict at all cost. He was the counsellor of Catherine of Aragon during the divorce, but he tried to dissuade her from appealing to Rome. Although he was not content with Henry’s break with Rome, he accepted Henry’s claim to be head of the Church and took the Oath of Succession. He banned Tyndale’s \textit{New Testament} and Simon Fish’s \textit{Supplication for the Beggers}, but he took no harsh steps against heretics and was renowned for being lenient in order to encourage recantation. During the reign of Edward VI, Tunstall was criticized by fellow bishop Stephen Gardiner (1483–1555) for his indulgent compliance with changes in religious and civil matters that they both despised. Eventually he voted against the King’s policy and was imprisoned, but when he was re-established in his bishopric under Mary I, he was reluctant to persecute Protestants. At the age of eighty-five, when Elizabeth I came to power, however, Tunstall refused to take the Oath of Supremacy, and he was imprisoned again, where he died within a few weeks. On Tunstall, see: Charles Sturge, \textit{Cuthbert Tunstal. Churchman, Scholar, Statesman, Administrator},
in London, Tyndale made new friends among the merchant community and the clerical colleagues sympathetic to Luther’s ideas and humanistic views. One of them, a wealthy merchant named Humphrey Monmouth, of the Company of Drapers, promised him financial backing. Around 1524 Tyndale emigrated to the Continent at Monmouth’s expense.

Tyndale supposedly went to Hamburg and met Luther in Wittenberg, though there is no undisputed contemporary evidence to corroborate this.41 The first trace of him on the Continent is in Cologne, where he started the printing of his unlicensed translation of the NT.42 His plans were discovered, and he had to flee to Worms, where he completed the publication of his English NT in 1526. Copies of this translation were smuggled into England, but some were seized, condemned, and burned publicly. Meanwhile, Tyndale moved to Antwerp, a major centre of book printing and trade, as well as the commercial capital of Northern Europe at that time, where a large community of English merchants lived.43 The city’s autonomy, its special arrangements for the merchant adventurers, its liberal attitude on religious matters, and the opportunity to smuggle books easily into England hidden among other, perfectly orthodox books or among other goods on some of the many ships sailing to and fro between the city’s booming harbour and England, were probably also influential in Tyndale’s choice of place of refuge.44

---

41 The matriculation-register of the University of Wittenberg contains an entry “Guillelmus Dalrici Ex Anglia 27 Maij 1524.” This has been suggested to refer to Tyndale. See: Preserved Smith, Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century, in EHR 36 (1921), pp. 422–33.

42 Richard Rex has correctly pointed out that the common opinion, which ascribes the abortive Cologne printing to Peter Quentell, the leading Catholic printer and publisher of the decade, is mistaken. (Richard Rex, The English Campaign against Luther in the 1520s. The Alexander Prize Essay, in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th Ser., 39 (1989), p. 103). Relying on secondary literature, I also followed this erroneous attribution in a former publication. (Juhász, Cat. 93 in TT, p. 149). With this note I would like to correct my earlier position. See also infra on p. 249.

43 The community of and around the English Merchant Adventurers was the largest foreign ‘natio’ in Antwerp. See Oskar de Smedt, De Engelse Natie te Antwerpen in de 16de Eeuw (1496–1582), 2 vols., Antwerp: De Sikkel, 1954.

In Antwerp, Tyndale set forth the work of Bible translation by publishing in English the five books of Moses as well as that of Jonah, all from the Hebrew text with the aid of Luther's German translation. Besides his translations, Tyndale wrote several religious tracts during his Antwerp years. In *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man* published (with the fictitious address “At Marlborow in the land of Hesse by me Hans luft”) by Merten de Keyser in Antwerp on 2 October 1528, Tyndale expounds upon the mutual duty of the authority and its subjects towards each other.45 This mutual duty is founded on the obedience every Christian person owes to God. To understand God’s will one has to read and obey the Bible.46 Tyndale’s *Parable of the Wicked Mammon*, published by the same printer and with the same fictitious colophon earlier in the same year, was the first to bear his name. The work was a treatise on justification by faith, but it also included a translation of a sermon by Luther on Lk. 16:1–13 (the parable of the unjust steward)—hence its commonly used title.47 Tyndale believed that justifying faith must be a ‘feeling faith,’ and the works must derive from love. In *The practyse of Prelates*, published anonymously in 1530 by Merten de Keyser (and again with a misleading address as printed at ‘Marboch’), Tyndale treats the problem of “Whether the Kinges grace maye be separated from hys quene, be cause she was his brothers wife.” He answers the question in the negative, but the subject gives him the opportunity to express his low esteem of the English clergy, especially Cardinal Wolsey (c.1474–1530), whom he suspects to be behind the divorce.48 His *A pathway into the holy scripture* is a short guide to instruct his readership how to understand the Bible (1530). He also composed two commentaries, one on the First Letter of John (1531) and the other on the Sermon on the Mount (1533).49 In 1531, Tyndale engaged in a literary battle with Thomas More by replying to the latter’s *A dyaloge of syr Thomas More knyghte […] touchyng the*
pestylent sect of Luther and Tyndale (London: John Rastell, June 1529). In his *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge*, from the press of Symon Cock in 1531, Tyndale defends his methods of biblical interpretation and his choice of words in the translation. After his clarification, he refutes More’s arguments chapter by chapter. Tyndale’s *Answer* was matched by More’s voluminous *The confutacyon of Tyndales answere*, but Tyndale left it unreciprocated. In April 1535 he was betrayed and arrested. He was charged with Lutheran heresy and was imprisoned at Vilvoorde. After more than a year in prison, Tyndale was strangled and his body burned, probably on 6 September 1536.

Although many of his theological stances were not followed by the Church of England (or any other later Protestant offshoot), there is no denomination among English Protestantism that would not claim its origin in one way or another in Tyndale’s efforts. Today, his legacy largely remains in his translations. They testify to Tyndale’s extraordinary linguistic talents: smooth, eloquent, rhythmic, and uncomplicated, his phrases sound well even half a millennium later. They influenced every single subsequent English Bible translation, and his effect on the development of the English language is inestimable.

*George Joye*

While William Tyndale needs little introduction, his opponent in the debate is much less celebrated. George Joye was born around 1495 to a well-off intellectual family at ‘Salpho Bury’ (Bedfordshire, about six kilometres northeast of Bedford), the only mentioned Renhold manor in the Domesday Book. Until the dissolution of the monasteries, the

---


manor together with the tithe of entire Renhold was held by the Prior of Newnham Abbey, the most ancient religious foundation in Bedfordshire.\textsuperscript{54} The wealth, loyalty to the King, and piety of the Joye family is exemplified by the foundation of ‘Joye’s Charity’ in the Parish of St Paul’s, Bedford, in 1503, established by the testament of the lawyer William Joye of Bedford, George Joye’s grandfather.\textsuperscript{55} George’s father, John Joye (d. 1521), was a yeoman of Renhold. Henry Joye, the brother of George, became attorney in the Common Plea to the Newnham Priory, Bedford.\textsuperscript{56} The mansion remained in the hands of the Joye family. In 1581, ‘Buryssteede’ or Salphobury was recorded to be occupied by William Joye of Renhold.\textsuperscript{57}

George Joye was educated at Cambridge. Around 1508 he entered Christ’s College, where he graduated as a Bachelor of Arts in 1513 or 1514. The following year, on 3 March 1515, “Georgius Ioye de Rownhall” was ordained subdeacon at the Augustinian Priory of Newnham, Bedford, and three weeks later he was ordained priest at the Benedictine Abbey of Humberston, Lincolnshire.\textsuperscript{58} In early 1517 he obtained the degree of Master of Arts and was “inceptor in arte.”\textsuperscript{59} He lost his father in 1521. On 27 April of the same year he was elected Fellow of Peterhouse. His name “Geo. Joye” appears on the mutilated list of “Artium professores” of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Page, The Victoria History of the County of Bedford, vol. III, p. 216.
\item “Joye’s Charity” provided for a priest to sing daily mass for the souls of Henry VII (\textsuperscript{\textdegree}1457, reigned 1485–1509) and his wife, Elisabeth of York (1466–1503), whose marriage on 18 January 1486 ended the Wars of the Roses and was responsible for the creation of the Tudor Rose (the joining of the white rose of York and the red rose of Lancaster). IS ASC Renhold.
\item IS ASC Renhold.
\item James Frederic Mozley, George Joye, or Gee, in N&Q 185 (1943), pp. 252–53.
\item The Register of the bishop of Lincoln is quoted by BC, George Joye, p. 17. Butterworth and Chester state that he was ordained for Humberston Abbey. This is unlikely, as he was in all probability a diocesan priest. They also present Joye as subject to the Augustinian prior Ashwell of Newnham Priory, which is almost as unlikely (p. 38). Cf. Thomas M. Parker’s review in EHR 79 (1964), pp. 838–39. When Newnham Abbey was suppressed, some of the estates were bought by John Drake, who was at the time steward of the abbey. (See: Louis Stoughton Drake, The Drake Family in England and America 1360–1895 and the Descendants of Thomas Drake of Weymouth, MA 1635–1691, Boston: private edition, 1896.) The stones of the abbey were probably used for other buildings, inter alia for the Willington Dovecote & Stables, a stone dovecote containing nesting boxes for over 1500 pigeons (IS Willington Dovecote). The dovecote was finished in 1541 and Joye still might have seen it, no doubt feeling somewhat contented about Ashwell’s priory ending as a stable and nesting boxes for doves. The abbey’s hall church still exists as St Paul’s in Bedford. On Newnham Abbey, see: Houses of Austin canons. The priory of Newnham, in Page, The Victoria History of the County of Bedford: vol. I, pp. 377–81.
\item BC, George Joye, p. 19.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Peterhouse in 1522. He kept this position at Cambridge for more than ten years (until he eventually fled to the Continent in 1528). Three years later, in 1525, Joye became Bachelor of Divinity. It is during his Cambridge years that Joye encountered the Reformation. Luther and the ‘New Learning’ were undoubtedly the topic of many a conversation among students and professors. Several of those who were present in Cambridge in those years became prominent figures of the Reform later; Joye knew quite a few personally. And even if Foxe’s romantic image of these students and scholars convening secretly on a regular basis in the White Horse Inn (or ‘Little Germany,’ as the opponents of reform called the inn, according to Foxe) is unsubstantiated, the mutual personal influence of these individuals on one another certainly played a decisive element in fomenting the Reformation in England. It did not take long before the religious authorities were notified that adherents of Luther were present in Cambridge. In 1526 Barnes was apprehended and tried for heresy. Around the same time, the premises of the university were searched, but the President of Queen’s College, Thomas Farman, was tipped off, and most of the books were hidden in time. Some persons were examined, Joye among them. His copy of Chrysostom’s exegetical sermons on Genesis in Oecolampadius’ (1482–1531) translation was discovered, but Stephen Gardiner ‘spoke for him,’ and apparently no action was taken against them. In 1527, however,
John Ashwell, Augustinian Prior of Newnham Priory at Bedford, denounced Joye as a heretic to John Longland, bishop of Lincoln (1521–47), Chancellor of Oxford, and confessor to King Henry VIII. The authorities had to act to stop the further spread of heresy in Cambridge. The three chief instigators—Thomas Bilney, Thomas Arthur, and Joye—were summoned before Cardinal Wolsey at Westminster in November 1527. As he was in the countryside when the Cardinal’s letters arrived, Joye arrived somewhat late, when the two others were already being questioned. Unaware of the precise charges against him, he was helped again by Gardiner, who showed him Longland’s and Ashwell’s letters. Having waited for several days in Wolsey’s antechamber to be received by the Cardinal, and having seen the interrogation of Bilney and Arthur, Joye deemed it safer to flee to the Continent. He possibly went first to Strasbourg, but by 1529 at the latest he must have moved to Antwerp, for reasons similar to Tyndale’s.

In Antwerp, Joye found an ever-increasing community of English Protestants who sought refuge there. A number of them, such as Myles Coverdale, were employed in the printing business. Printing was at that time a major enterprise, and Antwerp had a more than respectable share of the market. Antwerp printers were working for the English market even
before 1500.\textsuperscript{68} During the first four decades of the 16th century, the city had some sixty-odd printers active who were issuing high-quality works at relatively low cost in Latin, Greek, Dutch, English, French, Italian, Spanish, Danish, and German.\textsuperscript{69} As this type of work required accuracy, patience, and, not unimportantly, considerable intellectual and linguistic abilities, the cheap labour of well-trained illegal English immigrant clerics seeking some source of income was readily exploited. Their precarious position reassured the printer that they were not going to turn him in to the authorities for the lucrative black market publications. Furthermore, their new writings and translations could satisfy the demand for such clandestine books. Joye, too, seems to have earned his living by proofreading, translating, and writing for various Antwerp printers. During his first period of exile he wrote defences against his accusers, composed prayer books, and translated a considerable portion of the Old Testament (OT). His first publication was a primer, a popular devotional book containing prayers and guidance for piety.\textsuperscript{70} Though not the first English primer, Joye’s was certainly “the first Protestant devotional manual” ever published in the English language.\textsuperscript{71} No copy has survived, but based on its


\textsuperscript{70} The name ‘primer’ was originally used to denote the Book of Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary in the 14th century. Later, other prayers were added. “Compiled from materials used in church and monastery, the Primer was intended specially for the laity, to guide the devout layman in his private daily devotions or to help him bear his part in the services of the Church” (Charles C. Butterworth, The English Primers (1529–1545). Their Publication and Connection with the English Bible and the Reformation in England, Philadelphia: UP Pennsylvania, 1953, p. 2).

\textsuperscript{71} William A. Clebsch, England’s Earliest Protestants 1520–1535, (Yale Publications in Religion 11), New Haven: Yale UP, 1964, reprinted: Westport: Greenwood, 1980. See also Christopher Haigh, The English Reformation Revised, Cambridge: UP, 1987, p. 208. Earlier primers according the Salisbury (Salis) rite had been circulating in English in manuscript form. Henry Littlehales edited two such manuscripts for the Early English Text Society (Original Series 105 and 109): The Prymer, or Prayer-Book of the Lay People in the Middle Ages, dating about 1400 A.D., London, 1891, and The Prymer or Lay Folks Prayer Book, London, 1895–97. The first known primer to contain prayers in English was published in 1494 by Caxton. In 1523 Christopher van Ruremund published a primer which contained the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Creed, and “The x.v. ooes in englighe” (sic) (the Fifteen O’s were popular supplications ascribed to St Bridget), as well as various rubrics: headings and indulgences connected with the prayers and the number of aves, paternosters, and credos to be said: Hore beate marię virginis secundum usum Sarum: cum varijs orationibus/ cuilibet deuto commodis, [Christopher van Ruremund for] Peter Kaetz, 1523. For prim-
revised edition and on contemporary accounts, much of its content can be reconstructed.\(^{72}\) It contained the translation of the seven penitential psalms (and other “heavenly Psalms”) and “Mattens and Euensong” with the Commendations (Psalm 119), but omitted the Litany of the Saints, the hymns and anthems to the Blessed Virgin, and the *Dirge*.\(^{73}\) English Protestants now had their NT in their mother tongue in Tyndale’s translation and their vernacular prayer book in Joye’s edition. More than any others, these two books affected the development of English Protestantism in the first two decades.

After his *Primer*, containing perhaps as many as thirty psalms, the next logical step was to translate the rest of the Psalter. Psalms have always appealed to the faithful and have been widely used in devotion both by clergy and laity. Convinced that the afflictions and persecution the Reformers experienced were what Jesus foretold as signs of the perilous end times, Joye thought that the psalms were “the prayers most convenient for this time.”\(^{74}\) By offering the psalms as prayers the faithful could appease “Goddis wrath” and “be restored into his favour & grace.” Moreover, offering the psalms as prayers also “encresse[s] their [i.e. the faithful people’s] faithe & their deuotion.”\(^{75}\) Joye’s first complete version of the Psalter, published in 1530, was “faithfully & purely translated” after Feline’s text from the “Ebrue verite/ in the which tonge Dauid/ with the other syngers of ye Psalmes firste sung them,” i.e. Martin Bucer’s fresh Latin translation of the Hebrew.\(^{76}\) In the same year Joye published a revised version of his *Primer* with the title *Ortulus anime. The garden of the soule*. Joye regarded

---


\(^{73}\) The English word *Dirge*, referring to the *Office for the Dead*, is derived from the first words of the first antiphon of the Matins in the *Officium defunctorum: Dirige, Domine, Deus meus, in conspectu tuo viam meam* (Ps. 5:9(8)). Besides its tendentious omissions, the *Primer* was also criticized for propagating heretical positions. See *infra* on p. 296.

\(^{74}\) George Joye, *Ortulus anime. The garden of the soule: or the englisshe primers*, Argentinian: Francis Foxe [vere Antwerp: Merten de Keyser], 1530, K\(^7\)–K\(^8\). The only known copy in the British Library was discovered in 1949.

\(^{75}\) Joye, *Ortulus anime*, K\(^8\).

\(^{76}\) George Joye (trans.), *The Psalter of Dauid purely and faithfully translated aftir the texte of Feline: every Psalme hauyinge his argument before/ declarynge brefly thentente & substance of the wholl Psalme*, Argentine: Francis foxe [vere Antwerp: Merten de Keyser], 16 January 1530, A\(^t\). On Bucer’s Psalter published under the name Aretius Felinus, see *infra* on pp. 215ff.
the prophetic books of the OT as equally expedient for devout reading “in theis perellous daies” as the psalms.\(^77\) The *Ortulus anime* (and possibly his first *Primer*, too) had already contained prayers taken from Isaiah, Daniel, and Jonah, and thus Joye began to translate the prophets. It seems that in the beginning there was some kind of settlement between Tyndale and Joye about sharing the books of the OT between them: while Tyndale, after his Pentateuch (1530), translated Jonah into English, Joye translated Isaiah in 1531.\(^78\) In the same year, Joye published his defence against the charges of heresy made against him by the Prior of Newnham Abbey four years earlier.\(^79\) At the end of the year, on 3 December, Joye’s two *Primers* and his Psalter were publicly denounced in London as heretical.\(^80\) By 1532 at the latest, Joye got married.\(^81\) Probably in 1533 he published the translation of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes.\(^82\) That is also the year in which Joye’s position on the Eucharist was formulated in the anonymously published *The Souper of the Lorde*.\(^83\) In the beginning of 1534, Joye brought out a book attacking Thomas More’s “unwrytten verites” (Sacred Tradition) as a source of the Revelation and the principle that the Church cannot err.\(^84\)


\(^79\) Joye, *The letters which Iohan Ashwel Priour of Newnham Abbey besides Bedforde, sente secretely to the Bishope of Lyncolne/ in the yeare of our lorde M.D.xxvij. Where in the sayde priour accuseth George ioye that tyme beinge felawe of Peter college in Cambridge, of fower opinio[n]s: with the answer of the sayed George vn to the same opinions*, Strasburge [vere Antwerp: Merten de Keyser, 10. daye of June [1531]. (STC 845).


\(^81\) “George lay the preste, yt is wedded now” (More, *The confutacyon of Tyndales answere*, sig. Bb2’ (CWTM VIII, p. 11)).

\(^82\) Butterworth and Chester make the probable suggestion that Joye first published these books in Antwerp. They are only known from the undated copies (c.1535) printed by Thomas Godfray, a London printer who also reprinted Joye’s first Psalter in 1534 and put out an extended version of Joye’s *Ortulus anime* in the same year (BC, *George Joye*, pp. 135–43).

\(^83\) George Joye, *The Souper of the Lorde: wher vnto, that thou mayst be the better prepared and sueryer enstructed: haue here firste the declaracion of the later parte of the .6. ca. of S. Joha[n], beginninge at the letter C. the fowther lyne before the crosse, at these wordis: Uerely uere. &c wheryn incidently M. Moris letter agenst Johan Frythe is confuted*, Nornburg: Niclas twonson [vere Antwerp], 5 April 1533. On the much debated question of the authorship of the book, see Orlaith O’Sullivan’s decisive article: Orlaith O’SULLIVAN, *The Authorship of The Supper of the Lord*, in *Reformation* 2 (1997), pp. 207–32.

\(^84\) George Joye, *The Subuersion of Moris false foundacion: where upon he sweteth to set faste and show vnder his shameles shoris/ to vnderproppe the popis chirche: Made by George ioye*, Emdon: Jacob Aurik [vere Antwerp: Catherine van Ruremund], 1534.
Joye's translation of *Ieremy the Prophete*, appearing in May 1534, is the first known work by Joye from the press of the van Ruremund family. The volume included Joye's translation of Lamentations, too. All of these translations were the first of those books ever put into print in English. Only three months after his *Ieremy the Prophete*, in August 1534 Joye put forth a fresh version of the Psalms, this time from Zwingli's Latin Psalter with commentary, whose works had also served as a model for Joye's translations of the other books of the OT.

It is clear from what has been said that by 1534 Joye had definitely made his name with his biblical translations. Translating the Scriptures into English was no longer Tyndale's exclusive business. Around this time, Joye seems to have made a shift from the press of Merten de Keyser to one of his rivals, the van Ruremund family, which was run by the widow of Christoffel van Ruremund after the death of her husband in the Tower

85 George Joye (trans.), *Ieremy the Prophete/ translated into Englisshe: by George Ioye: some tyme felowe of Peter College in Cambridge.* ¶‡The songe of Moses is added in the ende to magnifie ye our Lorde for the fallof our Pharao the Bisshop of Rome, [Antwerp: Catherine van Ruremund], ¶Anno. M.D. and .xxxiiii. in the monthe of Maye.

86 George Joye (trans.), *Dauids Psalter/ diligently and faithfully translated by George Ioye/ with breif Arguments before euery Psalme/ declaringe the effect therof; [Antwepen:]* Martyne Emperowr [= Merten de Kesyer], 1534.

87 According to a letter by Tyndale preserved in Foxe's *Actes and Monuments*, Joye even intended to print a complete Bible and sent Henry and Anne Boleyn each a copy of "two leaves of Genesis in a great form" to obtain royal approval in 1533 (John Foxe, *A&M*, 1563, p. 521). If the information is correct, Joye's hopes were not completely unfounded, as Cardinal Wolsey had been dismissed from all of his posts of power, was charged with treason, and died in 1530. Henry, more and more under the influence of Cromwell, was clearly heading for a breach with Rome. In 1531 Cromwell's envoy, Stephen Vaughan (c.1502–1549), attempted to come to an accord with Tyndale about returning to England. Later he also reported about Joye to Cromwell that he "lerned of one George Gee fled out of Englond [. . .] who undoubtedly is a right honest and true subiect to the Kyng" (*State Papers*, vol. VII, p. 489). Only a year after Joye's alleged petition, in 1534, Joye's 1530 translation of the Psalms could already be reprinted by Thomas Godfray in London *cum privilegio regali* (although this did not mean that Henry licensed the book), and in 1541 it was printed again by Edward Whitchurch. On 19 December 1534, the English bishops petitioned for an English Bible (*Pollard, Records of the English Bible*, p. 177). Tyndale wrote frowningly to Frith that the result of Joye's petition was only a search for English books among the Antwerp printers and for an English priest who would translate the Bible. It is much more likely, however, that the search was not conducted for an English Bible or for Joye (who was in contact with Vaughan), but to seize the Franciscan William Peto of Greenwich (later Cardinal, d. c.1558) and a certain Elston of Canterbury, who were superintending a publication of a treatise defending Catherine of Aragon's rights under Catholic Canon Law. This bit of information was communicated to Cromwell precisely by George Joye through Stephen Vaughan. *State Papers* vol. VII, pp. 489 and 516. See also: *infra* on p. 316 and BC, *George Joye*, pp. 101–04.
of London. It is she who convinced Joye to take on the proofreading of Tyndale’s NT edition, which had been reprinted repeatedly by her firm without any English-speaking corrector. Joye, after much persuasion, accepted the job, and in the same month that Joye’s Psalter translated from Zwingli came out from the press of Merten de Keyser (August 1534), Tyndale’s NT was put out for the fourth time by the van Ruremund family, now with Joye’s corrections. Joye, however, took the job seriously, and he not only amended the typographical errors, but also revised the translation to improve comprehension. This revision also entailed the substitution of the term ‘resurreccion,’ as found in Tyndale’s text, with expressions such as ‘the lyfe after this’ for some occurrences of the word. Joye, as he later explained, was motivated by the conviction that the original term in the Bible in those places did not refer to the bodily resurrection but to the survival of the soul.

Tyndale reacted vehemently to what he regarded as meddling with his text. He brought out his own revised version of his NT in November 1534. In this version, Tyndale fulminated against Joye and his translation, especially in an unusual, second foreword, which was dedicated entirely to the business with Joye. Tyndale accused Joye of both instigating the heresy of the denial of the bodily resurrection and causing schisms, and he made Joye appear to be a presumptuous, greedy, light-headed second-rate imitator, a description that has unfortunately stuck with him.

Joye, who felt that Tyndale’s charges were unjust, sought every opportunity to clear his name from the imputations, especially that of denying the bodily resurrection. Although there was a chance for reconciliation at the beginning, for some reason their agreement was not respected. In January 1535 the van Ruremund press issued yet another edition of Tyndale’s original NT, again with Joye’s translation and a short epilogue by Joye about his motives. Tyndale’s third version of his NT translation appeared in the same month. At the end of February, Joye published his Apologye, in which he gives a detailed account of the controversy, explaining the reasons behind his actions.

When Tyndale was betrayed in April 1535, Henry Phillips intended to have Joye and Robert Barnes, the two other persons whom the English authorities regarded as leaders of the Reformers in Antwerp, arrested too. Barnes was in England at the time, and Joye happened to be more fortunate than Tyndale; probably notified of Phillips’ plans or of Tyndale’s arrest, Joye fled to Calais. Apparently, in light of his previous conflict with Tyndale, Joye’s prompt departure upon Tyndale’s detention triggered
rumours among the English merchants about Joye's involvement in the treachery. This, however, was denied by Phillips himself.88

Joye returned to England probably during the summer of 1535. Little is known about his years in England. The only trace from this period is his book *A compendyouse Somme of the very Christen relygyon*, a translation of an Antwerp pamphlet originally printed by Johannes Gapeheus two years earlier.89 In 1540 Joye fled once again to the Continent. He returned to Antwerp and most likely worked again for the widow of Christoffel van Ruremund during his second exile. In 1541 *A frutefull treatis of Baptyme and the Lordis Souper* came out.90 That same year he published a translation from Melanchthon and an original work of his (under the pseudonym James Sawtry), both defending clerical marriage and attacking Bishop Stephen Gardiner of Winchester, whom he held responsible for the execution of Barnes a year earlier.91 Gardiner answered Joye's book and was then confuted by Joye in yet another volume. Joye's son, George, was born around 1543.92

---

88 See infra on p. 423.
90 George Joye, *A frutefull treatis of Baptyme and the Lordis Souper/ of the vse and effect of them/ of the worthe and vnworthy receyuers of the Souper/ necessary to be knowne of all Christen men/ which yerely receyue the Sacrament*, Grunning [vere Antwerp: Catherine van Ruremund], 27 April 1541.
91 George Joye (trans.), *A very godly defense/ full of lerning/ defending the mariage of Preistes/ gathered by Philip Melanchthon/ & sent vnto the kyng of Englond/ Henry the aight/ traslatted out of latyne into englisshe/ by lewes beuchame: the yere of the Lorde.M.CCCCC. XLI. in Auguste, Lipse: Ubryght Hoff [vere Antwerp: Catherine van Ruremund] and George Joye, *The defence of the Mariage of Preistes: Agenst Steuen Gardiner bisshop of Wynchester/ William Repse bisshop of Norwiche/ and agenst all the bisshopes and preistes of that false popissh secte/ which a confutacion of their vnaduysed vowes vnaduysedly diffined: whereby they haue so wykedly separated them whom God cowpled in lawfull mariage. Made by James Sawtry, Auryk: Jan Troost [vere Antwerp: Catherine van Ruremund], M.D. XLI. in August.*
92 Butterworth and Chester speak of only one son, who was also named George. The website for All Saints Church in Renhold, however, mentions several children: “George, who was born about 1543, was the youngest of five sons and three daughters. He graduated BA from St John’s College, Cambridge, in 1563/64 and MA in 1567, having been created a Fellow in 1565. He further graduated BD in 1575 and was ordained Deacon at Ely on 21 December 1569, aged 26. He became Rector of St Peter’s, Sandwich, Kent, from 1570 to 1574 and Vicar of Higham from 1573 to 1575. In 1574, he became Vicar of St Clement’s, Sandwich until 1600 and, in plurality he was P.C. of St Mary’s, Dover from 1574 and Rector of Elmstone from 1580. He died in 1600 and was buried at Elmstone” (IS ASC Renhold).
ryghtwyseness (September 1544), Joye expounded upon the theme that Christ’s true church has always been persecuted. Joye was more and more convinced that they were living in apocalyptic times, that the Pope was the Antichrist, and that Henry was a prince in the Kingdom of the Anti-christ. Accordingly, his interest at the end of his life became increasingly focused on apocalyptic works. In August 1545 *The expisiccion of Daniel the Prophete* appeared. Joye’s books were condemned *en bloc* by the proclamation of 6 July 1546, and the copies that could be procured were burnt at St Paul’s Cross on 28 September of that same year. When Edward VI came to power upon Henry’s death (20 January 1547), Joye returned to England (around 1548). In May 1548 he published his *The Coniectures of the ende of the Worlde and of that godly and learned man, Andrew Osiander*. In this cabalistic reading of the Bible (based largely on the prophecies of Daniel) the end of the world is projected for between 1585 and 1625. In 1549 Joye entered into debate with a young Protestant writer on the judicial punish-ment of adulterers. This debate and his falling-out with Tyndale are probably the reason behind his infamy. His opponent, in fact, was John Foxe, the later Protestant propagandist and historian whose martyrrology was to constitute the foundations of the study of the early Reformation period. In September 1549 Sir Henry Grey of Flitton gave Joye the Rect-ory of Blunham, Bedfordshire, and half a year later, on 21 March 1550, Bishop Ridley appointed him Rector of Ashwell, Hertfordshire. George Joye died in 1553.

---


96 For the negative judgement of the majority of scholars on Joye, see *infra* on pp. 33ff.

97 IS ASC Renhold.
Joye's frequently neglected legacy lies foremost in his Psalms and Primers. These were reprinted in London more than once, and they were used by later compilers and editors, among them, not unimportantly, Thomas Cranmer for the compilation of the Book of Common Prayer. Being the most popular prayerbooks of popular piety, Joye’s texts influenced private Protestant devotion of the early Reformation period (partly through the Book of Common Prayer) more than any other publication. Secondly, Joye’s legacy can be found in his biblical translations. His translations of Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Lamentations were the first publications of these books of the Bible ever printed in English. These were perhaps of less poetic value and did not make it into later translations in such high proportions as Tyndale’s did. Nonetheless, some of Joye’s wordings were retained or rediscovered in later versions. Coverdale’s familiarity with and use of Joye’s translations is unquestionable. We also encounter some of his renderings in the Matthew Bible, in the Geneva Bible, and later in the King James Version, and even Tyndale himself followed a number of Joye’s alterations to the NT translation.

The Sources for the Tyndale–Joye Debate

Having met the main actors in the debate, let us now briefly introduce the sources of the controversy.

The discussion between Tyndale and Joye in Antwerp has five direct contemporary written pieces of evidence, the primary sources of the actual debate: (1) two letters from 1533 among the State Papers, originally written

98 E.g. The expressions "sauing helthe" (Ps. 67:2), “backslide” (Jer. 3:6.12.14.22), and “a mess of pottage” (Prov. 15:37), or the proverb “Pryde goth before a fall/ and a fall foloweth a proude mynde” (Prov. 16:18). It was Joye’s translation of Ps. 91:5 (Thou shalt not nede to be afrayde of nyght bugges) in his first Psalter based on Bucer that originated the famous “bugges” (bogies), or evil spirits, a peculiar expression, one that was copied by Coverdale (1535) and by Rogers in the Matthew Bible (1537) and survived until the Great Bible (1539). Based on this expression these Bibles are sometimes referred to as the “Bugge Bibles.” See BC, George Joye, pp. 139, 142, and 145, n. 25. R. Gerald Hobbs, Martin Bucer and the Englishing of the Psalms: Pseudonymity in the Service of Early English Protestant Piety, in D.F. Wright (ed.), Martin Bucer. Reforming Church and Community, Cambridge: UP, 1994, pp. 169–70.

99 E.g. Mk. 15:40; Lk. 2:19; Jn. 1:21, 6:23, and 12:25; 1 Cor. 4:3; and Rev. 22:2. See BC, George Joye, pp. 159–60.

by Joye but intercepted and copied by an agent of Cromwell. These are the first written proof of Joye's theological interest in issues concerning the afterlife. (2) Joye's first NT edition (August 1534), which incorporates the contested variations of the translation of Tyndale. (3) Tyndale's second edition of the NT (November 1534), particularly its unusual second foreword, a direct attack on Joye. (4) Joye's second NT editions (January 1535), again in the wording of Joye and with a short epilogue that explains Joye's motives. And finally, (5) the pamphlet of the widow, Joye's *Apologye* (February 1535), which will constitute the foremost source of information not only about Joye's motivations but also about the chain of events.

Indirectly, however, there are further sources: (1) Tyndale’s works in Antwerp, especially his *Exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon* (1531), in which Tyndale reflects on Joye’s position without mentioning Joye's name explicitly, and Tyndale’s *An answere to Sir Thomas Mores dialoge*. Finally, (2) the letters sent from Calais by the merchant Edward Foxe to Cromwell (June 1535), and the letters from Thomas Theobald to Thomas Cranmer, also sent from Calais (July 1535) just a few weeks after the arrest of Tyndale. In these, Cromwell was informed that Joye was lodging with Foxe in Calais and that he was wrongly accused by Tyndale’s friends of aiding Henry Phillips in the betrayal and capture of Tyndale.

All of these sources—direct and indirect—will be studied in detail. But before that, an assessment of the secondary literature on the topic can help to situate this present study.

### A Status Quaestionis

Joye’s falling-out with Tyndale has certainly had its consequences on his reputation, and as a result not only their debate but also George Joye’s person in general have been for the most part ignored by the scholarly world. The topic has never been studied satisfactorily. A survey of the literature available on the issue gives us the opportunity to familiarize the reader with the main stream of scholarship. I have divided the material into three sections: (1) the first biographical references by Joye’s contemporaries, (2) the conservative consensus and some exceptions to it, and (3) a shift in the study of Joye.

*The First Biographical References by Joye’s Contemporaries*

The first pieces of evidence on Joye's life and work come from his contemporaries. Some of them originate from his opponents, and some from his
fellow Protestants. These are scant, scattered, and circumstantial, except for Bale’s short account.

In *The Confutation of Tindales answere*, Thomas More discloses his hearsay knowledge about Joye being the author of the English Psalter as well as of the *Primer* in English. He knows about Joye’s “goodly godly pystle,” no doubt a reference to Joye’s reply to Ashwell’s accusations. More’s information on Joye’s wedding helps to determine the date of this marriage, and More provides the information on Joye’s alias ‘Clerke’:

Then haue we from George Iaye otherwyse called clerke, a goodly godly pystle/ wherein he teacheth dyuerse other heresyes, but specyally that mennyse vowes and promyses made of chasityte, be not lawfull nor can bynde no man in conscyence, but he may wedde when he wyll. And thys man […] determyned therfore wyth hym self that he wolde of his preachyng, shew hymself ensample. And therfore beynge preste, he hath bgylyed a woman and wedded her/ the pore woman I wene vnware that he ys preste.101

More also accuses Joye of teaching heresies “agaynst the blessed sacrament of the aulter” to Dick Purser, the son of one of More’s own servants.102 It is evident from the way More treated and described Joye in these works that he regarded him as an arch-heretic leader of the Reformers, equal or similar to Tyndale in significance.103 Cuthbert Tunstall, the bishop of London, also referred to Tyndale and Joye together as “children of iniquitie mainteiners of Luthers sect.”104

The first short biography of Joye was composed by John Bale (1495–1563), a one-time Leuven student and contemporary of Joye’s who probably met

---


102 Thomas More, *The apology of syr Thomas More knight*, London: William Rastell, 1533, sig. Dd4v. The following year Joye replied to the accusation, claiming that all he taught the child was the Our Father, the Hail Mary, the Creed, and the prayers before and after meals. (Joye, *The Subuersion of Moris false foundacion*, G3v). Joye is also accused by More of providing a ‘safe house’ for apostate nuns in Antwerp: “George laye or Gee otherwyse called Clerke, whych is a preste, and is now for yt wedded in Antwarpe/ into whose howse there, the two nonnys were brought, which Iohan Byrt otherwyse called Adryan stale out of theyr cloyster to make them harlottes” (More, *The apology of syr Thomas More knight*, sig. Dd4v).

103 Cf. Edward Halle, *The vnion of the two noble and illustre famelies of Lancastre & Yorke, beymg long in continuall discension for the crowne of this noble realme: with al the actes done in both the tymes of the princes, both of the one linage & of the other…*, London: Rychard Grafton, Prynter to the Kynges Maiesty, 1550, fo. 186v.

Joye in person while both of them were studying in Cambridge. The biography, together with a list of works by Joye, is contained in Bale’s *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum... summarium*, printed in Wesel in 1548, when Joye was still alive. Bale’s short account of Joye’s life is important for three reasons: (1) it gives the first biographical details of Joye (birthplace, studies, exile in “Germania,” marriage, etc.). (2) Bale, a contemporary of Joye, describes Joye in a positive light (with the famous expression “fidelis ac robustus ureritatis assertor”). By including him among the “major writers,” Bale testifies to Joye’s eminence in the early Reformation period. (3) Bale’s list of Joye’s works with their *incipit* made the identification of some of his anonymous books possible (e.g. *The Souper of the Lorde*, and his translations of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes).

Although Joye most likely died of natural causes, elements of his life and references to his works can also be found in the so-called *Book of

---


107 Bale, *Illustrium majoris Britanniae scriptorum summarium*, fo. 240v. Bale also claims that Joye was skilled in Latin and Greek.
Martyrs, the monumental work of John Foxe, entitled *Actes and Monuments of these Latter and Perillous Days, touching Matters of the Church*. After two Latin martyrologies, Foxe published his first English version of the book in 1563. Later, three ever-expanding reworkings (1570, 1576, and 1583) by Foxe appeared. The book became a classic during the lifetime of the author, shaped the general stance on the Reformation, has largely contributed to many mis(in)formed Protestant views on the Catholic Church, and has frequently been used as a trustworthy historical source. Leaving aside the question of the reliability of Foxe’s work as a whole, the treatment of Joye by Foxe is not quite adequate. Joye never earned the ambiguous honour of martyrdom and had earlier had a disagreement with Foxe on how adulterous people should be punished. The information on Joye therefore is only circumstantial and subjective. Foxe vaguely mentions Tyndale’s row with Joye in his 1563 edition without mentioning Joye’s name:

After that he [i.e. Tyndale] had finished that woorke, then toke he in hande to conferre the newe testament with the Greake. And that fynyshed and put forth, then was in hand to declare his mynde vpon a place in the newe Testament, where one had altered it, otherwise then maister Tyndall hadde translated it, or as he sayd was translated by any other translation, in any

108 In 1554 V. Rihelius published Foxe’s *Commentarii rerum in ecclesia gestarum* in Strasbourg. The *Rerum in Ecclesiâ gestarum, maximarumque per Europam persecutionum, ac sanctorum Dei Martyrum Commentarii* was put out in 1559 by Johannis Oporinus in Basel.


language, and so put it forth for maister Tyndals translation. Wherfore sayd he, if he wold haue altered the text, he should haue put it forth for his owne translation and not for myne. But this beyng endid and inpringed, he was betrayed and apprehended, the whiche apprehension was as hereafter foloweth.\footnote{Fo\-\footnote{Xe, A&M, 1563, p. 516 [vere 519].}e, A&M, 1563, p. 516 [vere 519].}

In the revised 1570 edition, Foxe ‘forgets’ to mention the dispute altogether.\footnote{Fo\-\footnote{Xe, A&M, 1563, p. 516 [vere 519].}e, A&M, 1563, p. 516 [vere 519].} However, in this second edition he mentions Joye’s books against Gardiner, and the bishop’s answer to Joye’s writings.\footnote{Fo\-\footnote{Xe, A&M, 1563, p. 516 [vere 519].}e, A&M, 1563, p. 516 [vere 519].} Foxe gives a detailed account of their controversy, together with the historical background and a short summary of Gardiner’s ‘Popish Articles.’ It is unnecessary to refute the arguments of these articles, we are told, because Joye has done it sufficiently in his books, and the reader is instructed to look there for the refutation.\footnote{These Articles, for somuch as they be sufficiently a\footnote{answered and replied vnto by George Ioye in his loynder, and Reioynder agaynst Wynchester, I shall not nede to cumber thyw worke with any new adoe therwith, but only referre ye reader to the bokes aforesayd: where hee may see matter enough to a\footnote{nesday these Popishe Articles}nswered to these Popishe Articles” (Fo\-\footnote{Xe, A&M, 1570, p. 1371.}e, A&M, 1570, p. 1371).}

Other interesting details in connection with the Tyndale–Joye controversy are also found in the second edition (1570), in which Foxe included a table of “Persons abiured with their Articles.” This contains the name of “Iohn Raymund, a Dutchman” with the date 1528, “For causyng fiftene hundreth of Tyndals new Testamentes to be printed at Antwerpe, and for bryngyng fyue hundreth into England.”\footnote{Fo\-\footnote{Xe, A&M, 1570, p. 1184.}e, A&M, 1570, p. 1184.} This is in all probability the Antwerp printer Hans van Ruremund, who is traditionally identified as the brother of Christoffel van Ruremund, also mentioned by Foxe in the same table: “Christofer a Dutche man of Antvverpe” with the date 1531. This man, Foxe writes, “for sellyng certeine new Tementes [sic] in Englishe to Iohn Row aforesayd, was put in prison at Westminster, and there dyed.”\footnote{Foxe, A&M, 1570, p. 1184. Foxe also mentions several people in his various editions who were condemned for the possession of The Primer in English, undoubtedly Joye’s first Primer of 1529. (Richard Bayfield in ed. 1563, p. 487; Walter Kiry and John Wyly, the elder, in ed. 1570, vol. 2, pp. 1188 and 1191; and Thomas Hitton in ed. 1583, p. 2136).}

Besides the random biographical traces of Joye’s career, the interest and importance of the evidence from the contemporary authors concern, as
has been said, their treatment of Joye as one of the key figures and authors of the early Reformation period. That Foxe is an exception to this rule can be explained by his personal agenda based on his own conflict with Joye. Unfortunately, Foxe’s disregard of Joye has been decisive in creating the conservative consensus on Joye.

The Conservative Consensus and Some Exceptions to It

The paucity of material on Joye’s life and achievement in the scholarly literature is astounding. There is only one monograph biography of Joye, that of Butterworth and Chester, which will be presented in the following section. All other references to Joye are mainly found in biographical works on Tyndale, or in general studies on the (early) Reformation or on the history of the English Bible. The general representation of the debate in these, if present at all, is rather clear-cut. Joye’s name is mentioned almost exclusively in connection with his debate with Tyndale.

---

and, as a rule of thumb, in a negative light. If his own translations are mentioned, they usually receive a derogatory note on their qualities or originality. His intellectual capacities are usually belittled and his character is demonized. To spare the reader from the tedious and unrewarding task of discussing all of these infinitesimal mentions of Joye separately, I will summarize their general view, which I call the ‘conservative consensus.’ Although not all of these works contain every detail of the stance described here, the tone, theme, and topics are common. The authors who vary from the overall portrait (generally those who consecrate more than a footnote or two to Joye) will be mentioned separately.

According to this ‘conservative consensus,’ “Tyndale's last days of freedom” before he was betrayed by the Leuven scholar Henry Phillips, “an agent of the Roman Catholic Church and the King of England, which sought to kill Tyndale as a heretic and traitor for translating the Bible into English,” “were darkened by a dispute with a fellow-Protestant, George Joye.” For when Tyndale had almost finished his revision of the translation of the NT, Joye secretly undertook the correction of a ‘pirated’ edition of the NT at the press of Catherine van Ruremund. Authors of

120 Cf. e.g. “Early associate of William Tyndale, who produced a translation of Martin Bucer’s Latin version of the Psalms (1530 and 1534), Isaiah (1531), Jeremiah (1534), Proverbs and Ecclesiastes (1535). Except for Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, most of his work was printed abroad, probably in Antwerp and such were his relations with Tyndale that it is not always clear just how much was his. Lacking scholarship and a nicety of taste he has been described as “an interesting minor figure in the story of the English Bible.” When there was increasing demand for Tyndale’s Translation some pirate printings took place, often with words altered. Joye was responsible for some of these and Tyndale admonishes him in the prologue to his revised New Testament 1534” (art. George Joye, in Alec Gilmore, A Dictionary of the English Bible and its Origins, (Biblical Seminar 67), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000, pp. 96–97).


the ‘conservative consensus’ believe that Joye volunteered to do the job knowing full well that Tyndale himself had been busy for some time with a thorough revision of his own work.125 This ‘pirated’ edition of the NT, eventually published in August 1534, contained Tyndale’s translation with substantial changes implemented by Joye.126 These “ungracious and ignorant interferences with Tyndale’s version” included the introduction of the false readings of the Vulgate; while Tyndale translated from the original Greek text, as published in Erasmus’ NT, Joye, being illiterate in Greek, worked on the basis of the corrupted Latin text of the even more corrupt Catholic Church.127 But worst of all, authors of the ‘conservative consensus’ argue, where Joye found the word ‘resurrection’ in Tyndale’s text, he changed it into ‘the life after this’ or some other similar expression. This is held to be the most intolerable arrogance on Joye’s part.128 These “foolish alterations” are explained by Joye’s “abstruse” and “bizarre” theological standpoint on the resurrection, as a result of “mere ‘curious speculation’ of a stupid and ignorant man.”129 It is argued that Joye’s position essentially

125 DEMAUS, William Tyndale, pp. 359 and 361.
128 The impression one usually gets from reading the literature is that Joye eradicated all occurrences of the word “resurrection.” E.g. DEMAUS, William Tyndale, p. 360. DEMAUS, however, specifies on the following page that “Joye did not, as has been sometimes said, discard the word resurrection altogether, neither did he intend to express any doubt as to the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; but he confined the use of the word to those instances in which it was unquestionably the resurrection of the body that was intended (e.g., Acts i. 22); and in all other cases, in order, as he supposed, to avoid instilling prejudices into the minds of the unwary readers, he employed such circumlocutions as ‘the life after this’ or ‘the very life’” (DEMAUS, William Tyndale, p. 361). Cf. MOZLEY, William Tyndale, p. 277.
came down to the denial of the bodily resurrection.\textsuperscript{130} Tyndale, understandably, was furious, and when he finished his own revision of the NT he inserted an impassioned second prologue in which he refuted Joye’s heresy. For some authors the story ends here,\textsuperscript{131} while others do mention that Joye replied in a pamphlet entitled \textit{An Apologye}.... According to these authors, this work is long-winded, rambling, repetitious, illegible, confused, incorrect, accusatory, and ill-tempered; it is a spiteful, furious tirade, an unjust, absurd, unsatisfactory, and extremely lame vindication by Joye, and an unfair, unjustifiable, abusive, intemperate, and unfeeling attack on Tyndale written in the most extravagant vehemence.\textsuperscript{132}

A common phenomenon in the literature is to pass judgement on Joye. Accordingly, Joye, in the eyes of the Tyndale scholarship, is guilty of several faults. (1) He has committed breach of friendship, since he was aware of Tyndale’s own revision.\textsuperscript{133} “Beyond all question Joye had acted dishonourably; he had injured and insulted Tyndale; and no human patience could have submitted unmoved to his proceedings.”\textsuperscript{134} (2) Furthermore, Joye was working anonymously, and “thereby giving the impression that it was Tyndale’s work.”\textsuperscript{135} “Had Joye put out this mistranslation under his own name,” Bruce proposes hypothetically, “he would have been welcome to

\textsuperscript{130} \textsc{Bruce, History of the Bible in English}, p. 44. \textsc{Demaus, William Tyndale}, p. 360.

\textsuperscript{131} Edgar, in his \textit{Plain Account for Plain People}, plainly claims that “George Joye […] took the liberty of amending the translation in several places. This liberty was keenly resented by Tyndale, and as it was never graciously apologised for, it was never altogether forgiven” (\textsc{Edgar, The Bibles of England}, p. 72).

\textsuperscript{132} Cf. \textsc{Anderson, The Annals of The English Bible}, vol. I, pp. 133 and 393–98; \textsc{Duffield, The Work of William Tyndale}, p. 309. \textsc{Demaus, William Tyndale}, pp. 130 and 376; \textsc{Parish, art. George Joye} in IS ODNB.

\textsuperscript{133} \textsc{Duffield, The Work of William Tyndale}, p. xxviii. Anderson (inaccurately) reproaches Joye for publishing his \textit{Apologye} after the imprisonment of Tyndale: “Though the ‘Apology made by him to satisfye, if it may be, W. Tyndale,’ &c., dated the 28th of February, (1535) in itself a contemptible production, became peculiarly offensive, from its being put forth after our Translator had been actually and at last apprehended, and in prison!” (\textsc{Anderson, The Annals of The English Bible}, vol. I, p. 396. Cf. p. 398). In reality, Tyndale was only apprehended in April (or perhaps May) 1535.

\textsuperscript{134} \textsc{Demaus, William Tyndale}, pp. 361–362; \textsc{Mozley, William Tyndale}, 1\textsuperscript{st} New York: MacMillan, 1937, repr Westport: Greenwood, 1971, pp. 269–70. Mozley suspects that it was also Joye who supplied intimate information about Tyndale’s plans and secured a copy of Tyndale’s \textit{Answer to More} for Stephen Vaughan, the English envoy in Antwerp, early in 1531 (\textsc{Mozley, William Tyndale}, p. 192). Cf. Vaughan’s letter to Cromwell dated from Antwerp, 25 March 1531, PRO, Cotton MSS, Galba B.x., fos. 7–8). This, however, presupposes that Joye was an assistant to Tyndale, of which there is no evidence. On Vaughan, see: Walter Cecil Richardson, \textit{Stephen Vaughan, Financial Agent of Henry VIII. A Study of Financial Relations with the Low Countries}, (Louisiana State University Studies, Social Science Series 3). Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1953.

the credit brought him, but Tyndale naturally did not like it to be assumed
that he himself had authorized this and similar changes.”136 (3) Joye is also
guilty of such “piracy” and “plagiarism” “as any modern laws of copyright
would interdict or punish.”137 (4) Joye’s greediness financially undermined
Tyndale “by filling the market with a cheaper and inferior translation, and
so curtailing the circulation of the new and improved version.”138 (5) Joye
did not keep his word and broke the agreement when he published his
second edition of the NT with his correction and his Apologye. (6) Joye
“tampered with” Tyndale’s text, and his changes were “wilful” and “out-
right corruption” of the Bible, “juggling” with the text of the Scripture.139

It is hardly ever mentioned that Joye translated and published almost
one-fourth of the OT that had never been put into print in English before.
When these translations are deemed worthy of a footnote or even a line
or two, they are often dismissed with scorn. Eadie, for example, remarks
that Joye “had already been attempting a translation from the Latin text,
and had published a Psalter at Strasbourg in 1530, the Prophet Isaiah in
1531, and Jeremiah in 1534.”140 He is keen to observe in a satirical foot-
note that “Joye describes his version of Isaiah as ‘Isaye speakinge playne
Englissche.’”141

Joye’s intellectual, linguistic, and scholarly capacities are generally
derided. His style as a writer and his erudition are oftentimes the target of
criticism. He is presented as foolish and ignorant, and he is characterized
as quarrelsome, dishonest, mean, and malicious. By way of illustration,
a few excerpts from the mainstream scholarly literature on the English
Reformation should suffice.

According to Duffield, “Joye shows himself small-minded, mean and
rather hypocritical.”142 Anderson sees Joye as “rash and incompetent,”
“a man of very inferior calibre, whether in regard to learning or sound
judgment.”143 Townley, though uniquely recognizing Joye’s erudition, calls

---

136 Bruce, History of the Bible in English, p. 44. Contrary to the general trend, Demaus
recognizes that “joye, indeed, took care not to connect Tyndale’s name with his edition”
(Demaus, William Tyndale, p. 358). Mozley remarks that “Joye’s name does not appear in
the book, nor does Tyndale’s” (Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 270).
137 Demaus, William Tyndale, p. 359. See also Betteridge, From Prophetic to Apocalyp-
tic, p. 218. Bruce, History of the Bible in English, pp. 43–44.
139 Gerald Snare, Reading Tyndale’s Bible, in Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Stud-
Joye’s integrity into question. Eadie calls him “a careless and unscholarly editor.” Joye’s alterations “betray great weakness of judgement, and frequently depart widely from the meaning of the original text.” Joye’s biographers call his style peculiar, idiosyncratic, and parochial: “plainly, this is not translation of a high literary excellence, it is crude pioneering rather.”

It seems that Joye could not do anything right. Before the discovery of the only complete copy of Tyndale’s 1526 Worms NT edition, the title of Joye’s NT edition (being an exact copy of Tyndale’s) is characterized as “a pompous and affected title.” Once the title page was discovered, he was criticized for copying even the title page from Tyndale’s original. While the tract on The Souper of the Lorde was attributed to Tyndale, it was described as having a tone “reverent in the extreme, and it might have taught More, had he been more willing to listen, that his antagonist was something better than a mere spoiler of the past.” The work was judged “as too able,” too well-written for Joye’s pen. After Joye’s authorship had been demonstrated, it was characterized as “a flimsy little tract in comparison with the sacramental works of Frith and Tyndale.” Apparently The Souper of the Lorde “is either too good or it is just bad enough to have been written by Joye.” He is even held responsible for the lack of uniformity in the spelling of his name by others: to a footnote alleging Joye’s ignorance Eadie disdainfully appends: “He had a wealth of names—Joye, Jaye, Gee, and More adds, ‘otherwise called Clarke.’”

---

144 “Though a learned man, he does not appear to have possessed that conscientious integrity which would have given Christian dignity to his character; and it is to be regretted that while he defended the ‘truth,’ the ‘truth’ does not seem ‘to have made him free’ from guile and deception” (James Townley, Illustrations of Biblical Literature Exhibiting the History and Fate of the Sacred Writings from the Earliest Period to the Present Century, Including Biographical Notices of Translators and Other Eminent Biblical Scholars, vol. 2, New York: G. Lane and P.P. Sandford, 1842, p. 96).
146 W.F. Moulton, The History of the English Bible, London: Charles H. Kelly, s.d. [c.1930], p. 64.
148 DEMAUS, William Tyndale, p. 359. For other scholars’ derogatory opinions on Joye’s title, see infra p. 322.
149 MOZLEY, William Tyndale, p. 254.
152 EADIE, The English Bible, vol. 1, p. 221, n. 1. By way of analogy, Tyndale could be reproached because his name had even more variants: “Tindalus” in his own autography, Tindal, Tindall, Tyndale, and Tyndal, not to mention Hychins, Huchyns, and Hochyns.
In fact, Tyndale's style is deemed so much more eloquent, more precise, more pleasing than Joye's that in many accounts, Tyndale's translation attains the status of the sacrosanct. For David Daniell, for example, the translation of Tyndale is equal to revelation; it is a sacred text, “God's word itself,” not less inspired than the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, which are but the sources for the Bible, which, for Daniell, is the English Bible. In a similar vein, Anderson actually calls the translation of Tyndale “the Sacred Text.” The very attempt to change anything in the translation is ethically immoral, theologically absurd, and linguistically incorrect. Any modification to Tyndale’s text is ab ovo, a priori a corruption that can originate only from a morally corrupt person.

Sometimes, to preserve the air of impartiality, Tyndale’s temper is recognized. This, however, does not diminish his saintliness; it only makes him more human in the eyes of the Tyndale scholars. They are always ready to understand, justify, and absolve Tyndale’s irritability, often by contrasting him with Joye’s imputed moral and scholarly deficiencies.

---

154 Daniell, William Tyndale, pp. 100 and 192. Daniell does emphasize that Tyndale used the ‘original’ Hebrew and Greek texts, which could suggest some awareness of the Bible being more than the English Bible. Nonetheless, the importance of the use of the ‘original’ texts seems to be only an element in the canonization of Tyndale’s work. Characteristically, having detailed the pre-Reformation translations into German, French, Italian, Catalan, Spanish, Portuguese, and Dutch, Daniell goes on to claim that “the Church would never permit a complete printed New Testament in English from the Greek, because in that New Testament can be found neither the Seven Sacraments nor the doctrine of Purgatory, two chief sources of the Church’s power” (Daniell, William Tyndale, pp. 92–93 and 100). But as we have written earlier, “setting aside the false suggestion that the Vulgate contains explicit references to the sacraments and to Purgatory which are absent from the Greek text, it would be interesting to know why the power of the Church would be undermined by a translation into English but not by translations into the languages of Continental Western Europe. The only plausible explanation is that for Daniell, subconsciously at least, ‘the Bible’ means the English Bible, of which the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures are but the sources” (Juhász & Arblaster, Can Translating the Bible Be Bad for Your Health?, p. 338). Daniell’s is not an unusual attitude in the English-speaking world, where some sixty years ago an English newspaper editor could write of the Authorized Version as “the sacred English original” (quoted by Dorothy L. Sayers, The Man Born to Be King, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1990 (London: Victor Gollancz, 1943), pp. 12–13).


156 This, of course, does not apply to Tyndale himself. When modern authors see a connection between correctness in syntax and use of vocabulary, this is in fact a continuation of Erasmus’ and the Humanists’ attitude: correct grammar mirrors and engenders moral rectitude. Cf. Latré, The 1535 Coverdale Bible and its Antwerp Origins, pp. 89–91.
Thus, even Tyndale's bad behaviour offers an opportunity to minimize Joye. Mozley, for example, believes that

It may be that Tyndale, who was by nature blunt and outspoken, showed Joye more plainly than he needed have done, that he thought him a conceited and ignorant fellow: for such he was. At all events Joye himself would feel his own inferiority in learning, ability, and force of character; and, as is often the case with weak and foolish persons, the knowledge rankled with him.\footnote{Mozley, \textit{William Tyndale}, pp. 273–74.}

Duffield exonerates Tyndale from the implication of being confrontational by claiming that “Tyndale was not by choice a controversialist, and only entered this field to defend himself when attacked.”\footnote{Duffield, \textit{The Work of William Tyndale}, p. xxix.} On the other hand, Joye’s furious reaction caused by Tyndale’s justified words is a clear sign of quarrelsomeness, grumpiness, ill temper, and petulance.

Here we could conclude the presentation of the debate according to the conservative consensus emerging from the conventional, mainstream scholarly and popularizing works. In order to do them justice, however, some of the above-mentioned authors deserve some special comment here for having a specific point diverging from the common position.

John Lewis’ \textit{A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible, and New Testament, into English, Both in MS. and in Print} (1739) is the first significant study of the English versions of the Bible.\footnote{John Lewis, \textit{A Complete History of the Several Translations of the Holy Bible, and New Testament, into English, Both in MS. and in Print: And the Most Remarkable Editions of Them since the Invention of Printing}, London: H. Woodfall for Joseph Pote, (11731) \textit{2enlarged}1739.} This pioneering work devoted quite a substantial amount of space to Joye and his translations; it contains a short account of Joye’s life starting with his early Cambridge years and sketching his flight from England to Strasbourg up until his first Antwerp exile.\footnote{Lewis, \textit{A Complete History of the Several Translations}, p. 79. Lewis refers to “Col. Tho. Baker,” the Collection of Thomas Baker (1656–1740), nonjuring Church of England clergyman and antiquary who had a large collection of valuable documents from the early period of book printing (among others, his copy of the \textit{Polychronicon}, printed by Caxton at Westminster in 1482, which bears Baker’s quaint inscription: “Tho. Baker, Col. Jo., Socius ejectus. So scarce and dear that it cost me what I am ashamed to own”). (Dotted Crotchet, \textit{St. John’s College, Cambridge}, in \textit{The Musical Times}, 1 Dec. 1904, p. 776.) His library was bequeathed partly to the British Library and partly to the Public Library of Cambridge, which is now included in the Cambridge University Library. Baker wrote to}
provided by Foxe and More (mentioning Joye’s Primer without the Litany and the Dirge and the Psalter). He attests that the late Mr Humphrey Wanley (1672–1726), antiquary, “dean and chapter of St. Paul’s at London,” claimed to have seen a fragment “which seemed to him to be Part of an entire Bible, and to be older than Coverdale’s Bible, printed in 1535.” Lewis proposes the identification of this fragment with the first page of Genesis that Joye printed at Barrow (Bergen-op-Zoom) and sent to Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn, according to a letter from Tyndale to Frith published in Foxe’s Actes and Monuments. But Lewis’ information seems not to be exclusively secondhand: he exhibits an intimate familiarity with a number of Joye’s Antwerp publications. Some of these are described with meticulous bibliographical information, and he quotes large portions of them (usually from the prologue). (1) He notes that Joye published a translation of the Book of Isaiah under the pseudonym “Balthaser Backneth” [sic] with the (false) printing address of Strasbourg. (2) He describes The Psalter of Dauid, “imprinted at Argentine, January 16 [1530], by Francis Foye [sic] in 12mo,” reprints its prologue by Johan Aleph (vere Joye), and explains that Feline is the “faigned Name” Aretius Felinus, which Martin Bucer used for his Latin version of the Psalter of 1526. (3) After giving the bibliographical details of David’s Psalter (1534), Lewis indicates “that the Latine out of which Joye translated, was that of Frier Felix of the Order of Heremites of St. Austin, which was printed AD 1515 and again 1522.

Bishop Gilbert Burnet suggesting corrections to his ‘History of our Reformation’ (see supra n. 119 on p. 33). Bishop Burnet’s answer to Thomas Baker about the suggestions dated at Windsor Castle, 23 July 1700, was donated by C.M.P. Johnson, senior bursar in 1980 to St John’s College Library, Cambridge (St John’s Library, Misc. Box 4, BU3), the very library of which the first history was written by the same Thomas Baker (Thomas Baker, History of the College of St. John the Evangelist, Cambridge, 2 vols., ed. John E.B. Mayor, Cambridge, 1869). The letter was reproduced with an article by N. Long Brown, the original owner of the letter, in the magazine of St John’s College, The Eagle, issue XLVI (December 1930), pp. 74ff. Apparently Baker suggested, among other things, additional information on Joye.

Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, pp. 79–80.

His reference for Wanley’s claim: “Biblic. Litera. No. 4. p. 40.” On Wanley, see: Peter Heyworth, art. Humfrey Wanley in IS ODNB.

According to Lewis, the book was at that time in the Library of Lord Oxford (Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 78).

Lewis does not seem to recognize that the pseudonym Francis Foye hides Joye.

Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 87.

Present at that time in the ‘Public Library, Cambridge’ under the shelf number A-7-42.

Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 87.
Haganoe in aedibus Thomae Anselmi Badensis mense Decembris.”

(4) Lewis describes *Ieremy the Prophete* (1534) in detail and quotes from its prologue. The *Complete History* also presents a short account of the Tyndale–Joye debate. Lewis explains how the English NT “grew faulty by careless printing,” and how the publishers agreed with Joye to correct the NT. (5) A detailed, apparently first-hand bibliographical description of the “fourth Dutch Edition, the fifth in all, of Tyndal’s New Testament in 12mo” is given, which Lewis assumed to be the edition “corrected by an English Refugee, George Joye” (1534). This bibliographical description, however, does not fit either of Joye’s editions of the NT that can be found in the British Library. Nor does the colophon match either of them exactly. Surprisingly, its place in the book is given correctly. “It seems,” Lewis explains, “that Joye took the Liberty to correct the Translation, as well as the Errors of the Press, and to give many Words their pure and native Signification in their Places which he thought they had not before. Among these was the Word *Resurrectio*, which Joye translated *the Life after this*.” Joye’s edition coming forth just before Tyndale finished his own at the press “occasioned Tyndal to add another Epistle to the Reader, which begins thus W.Tyndal yet once more to the Christen reader.”

---

170 According to Lewis it was in the library of Lord Pembroke. Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations*, p. 79.
171 Lewis claims that “the Title-page is lost; then follows the Epistle to the Christian Reader; next four Prologues to the iv Gospels; then the Table for Acts of Apostles; then a Title thus, *The New Testament*, Anno M.D.XXXIII. At the End are Pistles of the Old Testament” (Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations*, p. 79). Based on that description, this could fit Tyndale’s third edition of the NT, published in 1535 (which does indeed have a title with the date 1534 on it and at the place indicated by Lewis).
172 The colophon Lewis gives is: “Here endith the New Testament dylygentlye oversene and correct and printed now ageyne at Antwerp by me Widow of Christophall of Endhoven in the Year of our Lord a M.D.XXXIIII. in August” (Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations*, p. 80). Although it is not an exact match with the colophon Tyndale presented in his second NT (November 1534) edition, it can be assumed with some certainty that Lewis copied the colophon from Tyndale’s second foreword.
173 “This Edition hath in the End before the Table of the Epistles and Gospelles this Title” (Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations*, p. 80). I suspect that Lewis had indeed seen a copy of Joye’s NT in Lord Pembroke’s library, but when he wrote his *Complete History*, he had no direct access to the book. The copy he saw might also have been a collation of various editions, hence the Epistle to the Christian Reader, the prologues to the four gospels, and tables before the biblical text. His ‘faulty memory’ could also be the explanation for the mistaken size of the book.
174 Lewis, *A Complete History of the Several Translations*, p. 82.
In this, Lewis deems Tyndale “expresses a great deal too much passion and resentment against Joye, particularly for the manner of his translating the Word Resurrectio.” The newly added note “The dead are ignorant of God” at 1 Pt. 4:6 as a reaction to Joye is also quoted by Lewis. Tyndale’s second foreword, in its turn, “occasioned Joye to write and publish a Vindication of himself.” Lewis exhibits thorough knowledge of the contents of the Apologye, of which he gives the lengthy title in full. The bibliographical description of Tyndale’s Worms NT edition (1526), for example, is clearly based on Joye’s description in the Apologye, a fact acknowledged by Lewis himself in the reference note. But the Complete History includes several extensive excerpts taken verbatim from the Apologye. Lewis quotes Joye’s description of the widow’s persistence, how she tried to persuade him to take the job, and Joye’s account of the financial side of their agreement. He also quotes Joye’s assertion of the ignorance of the printer about Tyndale’s own revision of the NT and how Joye’s words were corroborated by Tyndale’s testimony. Finally, Lewis illustrates Joye’s effect on Tyndale’s third NT edition (given by Lewis as 1536 instead of 1535): how Tyndale mended the translation of Mt. 1:18 and the gloss upon 1 Jn. 3 according to the critique and suggestions of Joye.

Among the modern authors, Henry Cotton (1821) is the first to stand out in his treatment of Joye. He enumerates all of the biblical translations by Joye that were known to him in his Editions of the Bible and Parts Thereof in English, with numerous excerpts and selections from the works. His short account of the Tyndale–Joye controversy is also limited to mentioning that Tyndale complained “heavily of George Joye for altering his translation in many important instances, particularly in rejecting the word resurrection, and (concealing his own name) still uttering it as

175 Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 82.
176 Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 85.
177 Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 83.
178 Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 75. Unfortunately, Lewis does not disclose where he consulted the Apologye.
179 Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, pp. 83–85.
180 Lewis, A Complete History of the Several Translations, p. 85.
181 These include: J1534 (but not J1535), Joye’s various translations of the Books of Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and Daniel. On More’s authority, Cotton mentions the translation of the Seven Penitential Psalms, supposedly from 1531–32, but More’s comment is probably referring to Joye’s lost Primer from 1529, which included the seven penitential psalms (Henry Cotton, Editions of the Bible and Parts Thereof in English, from the Year MDV. to MDCCCL.: With an Appendix Containing Specimens of Translation, and Bibliographical Descriptions, Oxford: UP, 1821 2rev1852, pp. 4, 6, 7, 19, 24, 134b, 135, 239, 240, 252, 307–309, 320, 353, and 390).
Tyndale's genuine translation.”182 Cotton adds a short note about Joye answering these charges in the *Apologye*, a “small tract […] of very great rarity.”183 Nonetheless, Tyndale’s attack was deserved, according to Cotton, and Joye’s *Apologye* was only an attempt to defend himself (implying that Joye’s argumentation is unconvincing).184

Anderson, whose *Annals of the English Bible* (1845) I have cited several times already, is probably (together with David Daniell) the most partial author on the subject. His emotionally strong adjectives, his hammering on Joye’s moral deficiencies, and his ignorance of Joye’s achievements and arguments give a very one-sided presentation of the controversy. Even Robert Demaus remarks that “I am no admirer of Joye, but cannot help protesting against the treatment he has received from Anderson.”185

Westcott’s *A General View of the History of the English Bible* (1868) recognized that ‘Joye does not avoid the word ‘resurrection’; and if this were the only change, the particular substitution would be of little moment in the connexion where it occurs; but comparatively few paragraphs are left wholly untouched as far as I have examined the book.”186 After quoting the passages where Joye substituted Tyndale’s ‘resurrection’ with ‘the lyfe after this’ or some similar expression, Westcott remarks: “From these examples it is obvious that Joye’s object was simply exegetical in the particular passages which he altered, and that he had no desire to expunge the idea or the word ‘resurrection’ from his version. Later writers have not dealt justly with him.”187

Demaus’ biography of Tyndale (1871), too, deserves to be mentioned for his attempt to pass a more objective judgement on Joye. He clearly shows some awareness of a number of underlying theological issues, but he stigmatizes them as obscure, irrelevant, dogmatic problems.188 And although
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184 Cotton, *Editions of the Bible and Parts Thereof in English*, p. 7 and 7n.
188 “In his intercourse with Tyndale there had been frequent discussions on an abstruse doctrinal question much controverted in the Christian Church, – the condition of the souls of the dead between death and judgement. In his controversy with Sir Thomas More, Tyndale had asserted, or, at least, had admitted, that ‘the souls of the dead lie and sleep till Domesday,’ whereas Joye maintained, in common perhaps with most members of the Church, Reformed or un-Reformed, that at death the souls passed not into sleep, but into a higher and better life. […] Joye believed that Tyndale had obscured the meaning of Scripture in several passages by the use of the term resurrection, where it was not the resurrection of the body that was really intended: and he therefore in his revision struck out
he thinks that Joye’s “defence of his conduct in appropriating Tyndale’s translation without acknowledgment is extremely lame and unsatisfactory,” he also recognizes that “on the speculative question debated between them Joye defended himself with very considerable ability.”

Demaus affirms, was indeed inconsistent in his teaching on the issue, and “Joye argues with great force and pertinacity in favour of his own views.” Demaus also acknowledges that Tyndale somewhat misrepresented or misunderstood Joye; Joye did not deny the resurrection of the body; he merely maintained that, according to Scripture, the state of the soul between death and the resurrection of the body was a state which was appropriately described as a life, and that Tyndale had erroneously used the word resurrection in his version in passages where the resurrection of the body was not at all alluded to, but rather the continued life of the soul after its separation from the body.

Demaus is also ready to admit that “on the whole Joye seems to have the best of the argument, he certainly espouses that view of the question which has found most favour among Protestant theologians.” Nonetheless, the question in the opinion of Demaus is “speculative rather than practical” and “in learning and in ability of every kind […] Joye’s inferiority to Tyndale is conspicuous.” Demaus’ assessment of Joye’s character is even less appealing. According to him “it is obvious that he was one of that class of shallow, troublesome, narrow-minded men of one idea who in colloquial parlance are denominated bores.” There is, however, one opinion, expressed by Joye, that according to Demaus might have had its influence on Tyndale, namely, Joye’s plea for a biblical text without any notes or glosses: “it had been the first and plainest protest that had yet been uttered in favour of the circulation of the pure and simple text of Holy Scripture, leaving the Word of God to convey its own message without the aid of glosses and comments.” Demaus then explains how Tyndale had preferred a text with glosses, how his second edition contained many such glosses and marginal notes, and how, perhaps under influence

the term, and substituted for it the phrase ‘life after this,’ which was more in accordance with his own opinions” (DEMAUS, William Tyndale, p. 360).

189 DEMAUS, William Tyndale, p. 376.
190 DEMAUS, William Tyndale, pp. 376–77.
192 DEMAUS, William Tyndale, p. 377.
194 DEMAUS, William Tyndale, pp. 377–78.
of Joye’s suggestion, Tyndale’s third and final edition of the NT was published without notes.195

In 1876 John Eadie’s *The English Bible. The External and Critical History of the Various Translations of the Scriptures* appeared in London. He, too, makes an attempt to present Joye and the controversy with Tyndale with more accuracy. To this end, he tells the story of how Joye’s modifications came about and how Tyndale reacted to them, mainly by quoting Tyndale’s and Joye’s own words. Eadie quotes extensively both from Joye’s *Apologye* in modernized spelling and Tyndale’s second foreword. Unfortunately, Joye’s words are mainly used to give the chain of events with regard to the circumstances of the “surreptitious, badly printed” van Ruremund editions, and are heavily commented upon by Eadie.196 His presentation of the story leaves the reader in no doubt about whose side Eadie is on:

To have wantonly touched and retouched a common treatise without authority was wrong; but it was an act of no common daring so to handle the translation which Tyndale regarded as the labour and crown of his life, on which also rested his critical repute and his means of blessing the English people.197

Joye’s changes, according to Eadie, were insignificant: “Joye did not affix Tyndale’s name to the reprint, though the book was really his with some changes, none of any value, or suggested by the original, but only inserted to eke out the sense by unneeded and clumsy supplements.”198 A couple of sentences later, however, Eadie does think that Joye’s version was different from Tyndale’s: “the result of his effort is a poor, marred, and diluted version.”199 The fact that Joye did not spot Tyndale’s error in Mk. 14:5, where Tyndale had two hundred pence (for the Greek δηναρίων τριακοσίων, Vg: *trecentis denariis*), proves in the eyes of Eadie that Joye was working carelessly.200 Eadie does accredit Joye with the wish for a pure text

198 Eadie, *The English Bible*, vol. I, p. 219. These “unneeded and clumsy supplements” were the OT readings, the Calendar, the Concordance of parallel places, etc. Tyndale probably did not think that they were “unneeded” or “clumsy,” for he included them in his new revision.
200 This is the sole proof Eadie offers for Joye’s carelessness (*Eadie, The English Bible*, vol. I, p. 218). Tyndale tended to ‘convert’ biblical money to English money, and the figures were sometimes changed as the ‘exchange rate’ required. Joye kept these ‘conversions.’
without glosses or notes, and in one long paragraph running more than two pages he focuses on the theological background of the debate. He claims that Joye changed the translation of resurrection to ‘life after this’ or some similar expression “though he retained it in cases where the rising of the body is distinctly intended, as in 1 Corinthians xv, and Philippians iii.” Eadie’s incautious formulation, however, might suggest to the casual reader that these are the exceptions, while on the whole the word resurrection was as good as blotted out. According to Eadie, the reason behind Joye’s modification of the word was his dispute with Tyndale about “the nature of the soul-life, between death and resurrection.” Eadie clarifies that “Joye’s view was the common one, that the souls pass into a higher life at death.” This, however, was not disputed by Tyndale, whose “own opinion waivered.”True, Eadie avows, Tyndale had maintained earlier in his controversy with More that the souls lay dead and were asleep until doomsday, but Tyndale changed his opinion and his “more recent view is in harmony with Scripture, which teaches not simply the immortality of the soul, but the immortality of the man.” This unwarranted assertion of an evolution in Tyndale’s view of the afterlife creates the basis for an attempt to harmonize the traditional Protestant theology on the eschaton with some new exegetical approaches of Eadie’s own time read into Tyndale’s words. For the biblical view, according to Eadie, “lays far more stress on the resurrection than our popular theology supposes; looks on the separate existence of the soul after death as an insignificant parenthesis in our existence, and takes almost no notice of it when it is out of the physical organism created it.” Eadie maintains that an unembodied spirit, though in the service of the Divine, is always imperfect, regardless of its brightness or happiness. Perfection and glorification will come only on Judgement Day, when “nature in all its spheres will be perfected in Christ, and prepared for, and admitted into everlasting blessedness.” This amalgam of irreconcilable ideas is, in my opinion, a misinterpretation of Tyndale’s own view.

Francis Fry’s excellent and still indispensable *A Bibliographical Description of the Editions of the New Testament Tyndale’s Version in English with..."
Numerous Readings, Comparisons of Texts, and Historical Notes appeared in 1878. Fry gives very detailed bibliographical data on the various editions of Tyndale’s translation of the NT (from the 1525 unfinished Cologne edition through the Antwerp editions and up to the London editions of the 1550s and 1560s), with plenty of examples drawn from them. He meticulously compares the translation, the notes, and the marginalia of the various printed editions. Number two of the discussed NTs is the 1534 Joye edition. Fry’s presentation of the debate is limited to three or four sentences (in the fashion that was discussed under the ‘conservative consensus’), with a quotation from each involved party. What makes Fry’s approach unique is the fact that the passage he quotes (in modernized spelling) from Joye is Joye’s summary in the Apologye of the reasons why he chose to alter Tyndale’s translation in those places. Fry also quotes all of the places where the word resurrection is retained. Furthermore, he composes a table of more than 100 passages in which he contrasts Joye’s translation with Tyndale’s 1534 revision. This is, however, somewhat misleading, as many of the differences are due to the fact that Joye was following Tyndale’s 1526 edition, and not the 1534 edition.

In 1883 Edward Arber published the full text of Joye’s Apologye. The introduction amounts to barely four small pages. Arber’s explicit goal with the reprint was “not the quarrel, interesting as that is; but the bibliographical information” on Tyndale’s NT editions. Accordingly, the quarrel is not treated at all; only the intimate relationship between Joye and Tyndale is mentioned (though Tyndale distrusted Joye), and that the Apologye is “as bitterly angry a retort as any Christian man could write.” Having characterized Tyndale as “our Luther,” Frith as “our Melanchthon,”
and Joye as “our Carlstadt.” Arber safely passes over to the bibliographical
details. After a reprint of Tyndale’s second foreword from his second NT edition (November 1534), the text of the Apologye is presented in original spelling and with the original punctuation (e.g. using slashes / instead of commas). The marginal notes and the running titles are kept and presented at the appropriate places. Wherever Joye abbreviates Tyndale’s name (T. or Tyn.), the abbreviation is expanded in square brackets: T[indale]. Arber silently structures Joye’s text into two sections, starting with nicely decorated initial letters A (After that w. Tindale . . .) and B (But let us now . . .). Unfortunately, a few mistakes slipped into his transcription. Arber introduces half a dozen notes and clarifications, mainly with regard to the dates and explanation of words. He also uses cross-reference page numbers for Joye’s quotations from Tyndale’s second foreword as they are found in Arber’s reprint. Although the book appeared in a limited edition (in 1895 it was reissued), it has made it possible for scholars all over the world to form a more founded opinion on the question by reading Joye’s Apologye.

In 1905, Alfred W. Pollard published the news about the discovery of the second edition of the NT with George Joye’s alterations. In his article Pollard gives a short account of the facts according to the conservative consensus. He, however, reprints Joye’s epilogue in full, making it available for research for the first time since the 16th century. In 1911 another important work appeared in the field of Reformation studies, Pollard’s Records of the English Bible. The book, as its title and subtitle indicate, is a compendium of important documents relating to the history of the Bible in English. The book contains a seventy-page-long introduction that includes two pages on Joye. Nothing is mentioned about his individual translations. The facts of controversy are enumerated, but their interpretation is debatable. More importantly, Pollard publishes many original documents, and thus makes possible a study of the early English
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213 Arber, Apology, p. vi.
214 E.g. On sig. B3r Arber mistakenly resolves Joye’s pctm intopectum instead of pec-catum, on C6r he has “I her say” instead of “I herd saye,” on C8r he has “Pystel” instead of “Pistle,” on D3r he has “yt” instead of “it,” on D4r he has “ful” instead of “full,” etc.
216 Pollard, Records of the English Bible, 1911.
218 E.g. his claim that “Joye’s new edition being probably itself a fresh cause of offence” (Pollard, Records of the English Bible, p. 8).
Bible translations that no longer exclusively relies on Foxe’s hagiographical martyrology. Among these documents we find Tyndale’s complaint in his second foreword, Joye’s epilogue of his second NT edition, and two extracts from the *Apologye*.\(^{219}\)

In the same year (1911) the Catholic apologist Henry G. Graham’s *Where We Got the Bible* was published. The book, which has been reprinted more than twenty times, is an amusing exception to the rule, not because Graham gives due treatment to the controversy, but because he brings it up for quite a different purpose.\(^{220}\) His mention of Joye’s *Apologye* serves exclusively for an attack on the qualities of Tyndale and his translations.\(^{221}\) Graham’s objective is no less apologetic and is just as biased as the usual presentation of the matter by the scholars of the ‘conservative consensus.’\(^{222}\)

Mozley’s treatment of Joye in his Tyndale biography (1937) should not be left unmentioned here.\(^{223}\) His fairly balanced Tyndale biography (probably still the best work on Tyndale’s life for scholarly purposes) contains many useful historical details of the debate, mainly based on Joye’s *Apologye*.\(^{224}\) Mozley reflects briefly on some theological issues involved


\(^{221}\) The passage in the chapter “A Deluge of Erroneous Versions” is short and entertaining enough to quote it in its entirety: “So long as Henry made no objection, any printer or publisher or literary hack, who thought he saw a chance of making a little money out of the venture, would take in hand the publishing of a new version of the Bible. George Joye, for example, took this course in regard to Tyndale’s Bible, and in consequence (1535) brought down upon himself a volley of bitter and un-Christian reproaches from that worthy who (as I have said before) was a man of uncontrollable temper and scurrilous language when thwarted or resisted. In reply to this tirade, George Joye published an ‘Apology’, in which he showed that the printer had paid him only 4 ½ d. for the correction of every 16 leaves, while Tyndale had netted 10 pounds for his work; and besides, he exposed in fine style the departure from the truth of which Tyndale had been guilty in boasting of his translation and exposition as if it were his own, whereas Joye shows it was really Luther’s all the time; that Tyndale did not know enough Greek to do it, and had only added ‘fantasies’ and glosses and notes of his own imagination to the work of others. However, we have no time to dwell on the quarrels of these amiable Bible translators, else we should never reach the end of our historical review.” (IS Graham, *Where We Got the Bible.*)

\(^{222}\) Graham is quite useful for the earlier periods, but the presentation of the Reformation period is less adequate.


in the debate. He draws attention to the fact that the Reformers’ denial of
the validity of the prayers to the saints and, as a consequence, their denial
of the saints being already in Heaven, posed a serious question, viz. the
question of where the departed souls are “between death and the resur-
rection of the body preceding the day of judgement?” Tyndale, Moz-
ley maintains, claimed ignorance on the issue. More and Joye, however,
undoubtedly but mistakenly believed that “Tyndale’s cautious ignorance
came dangerously near to the doctrine that the souls sleep.” However,
for his part Tyndale was no less certain that “the belief that the souls are
already in glory in Heaven diminishes the need and the value of the bodily
resurrection.” Mozley uniquely also presents (and partially reprints in
modern spelling) Joye’s letters, the early sources of the controversy. He is,
however, incorrect in stating that one of the letters was written by John
Coke, the secretary of merchant adventurers, who, as Mozley believed,
sided with Tyndale on the question. Mozley is also mistaken in believing
that the addressee of that letter was Tyndale. He correctly recognizes
that Joye is the author of the letter to Latimer, which is preserved on the
same sheet of paper among the State Papers from the reign of Henry VIII
in the Public Record Office. Mozley’s interpretation of the
peace agreement of the parties is also doubtful. This misinterpretation
of the treaty gives Mozley the opportunity to claim that Joye not only
did not respect the agreement when he published his second edition of
J1535 crowned with “a spiteful postscript,” but that Joye also “withholds all
knowledge of this fact from his readers.” And despite all of the virtues
of his biography, his description of Joye’s character, as quoted above, is
far from impartial. He judges that “the ignorance and levity of [Joye’s]
attack upon Tyndale’s translation leave a very bad impression upon the
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225 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 271.
226 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 271. Mozley admits that “in fairness to More and Joye it
should be added that the compiler of the index in the first edition of the Answer (whoso-
ever he was) refers to the above passage (III., 180) under the heading: Soul sleep” (Mozley,
William Tyndale, p. 271n).
227 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 271.
228 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 272. For the discussion on the authorship and the
addressee of the letters, see infra p. 306.
230 Mozley, William Tyndale, pp. 277–78. He himself claims that “Nor does Joye’s
account of the treaty of peace hold together” (p. 283). For the discussion, see p. 322.
231 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 283.
232 See supra on p. 39.
reader.”233 He calls the Apologye a “long and rambling document.”234 He speaks in a cynical tone about Joye’s “brilliant argument.”235 According to Mozley, Joye “exhibits a ludicrous medley of conflicting emotions.”236 His final judgement is that Joye’s “want of candour puts him out of court, and clinches the verdict against him. No doubt Tyndale knew his man; he had not associated with him in Antwerp for six or seven years for nothing. He had found him, as we find him, well-meaning and zealous, but vain, shallow and untrustworthy, and probably he had no great confidence that Joye was in earnest, when the reconciliation was engineered by mutual friends.”237

Although he was close to the mainstream authors in his approach, Gervase E. Duffield, who has already been cited, is one of the few authors who mentions Joye’s translations (1965). He, too, has a few good words on Joye: “He was an energetic man who translated a fair bit of the Old Testament, wrote commentaries and treatises, and even translated a prayer book into English.”238 Duffield also recognizes that “the background of [Joye’s] changes [in Tyndale’s translation] was the dispute as to what happened to souls between death and the judgement day.”239 He identifies some of the theological issues and is aware that the Tyndale–Joye debate is only one part of a broader context.240 Duffield reprints Tyndale’s second foreword of T1534 in his work, as well as the full text of Joye’s epilogue of his second NT edition (J1535) and some five pages of Joye’s Apologye, all of

233 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 283.
234 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 280.
235 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 280.
236 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 283.
237 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 283. In his study on the authorship of The Souper of Lorde, his argument for Tyndale being the source of the book is Joye’s character and style: “Besides, the ‘Supper’ is too able a work for Joye’s pen. Joye was zealous and well-meaning, but of second class—vain, foolish, touchy, and apt to intrude into matters beyond his capacity. He lacks the strong simplicity, learning and directness of Tyndale, whose very railings are deeper and more penetrating than Joye’s” (Mozley, Tyndale’s ‘Supper of the Lord’, in N&Q 183,11 (1942), p. 306).
240 “This dispute arose in its turn out of the conflict about the cult of the departed saints. The Reformers were often accused of maintaining that souls slept after death. More accused Tyndale of this, but the latter replied that he was agnostic about the question. Joye may have taken such agnosticism as dangerously near accepting the idea of soul-sleep, hence his emendations” (Duffield, The Work of William Tyndale, p. xxviii).
them in modernized spelling and with (some unfortunate) annotations. Nonetheless, he stigmatizes the van Ruremund NTs as “pirated,” Joye’s variations to Tyndale’s translation as “theological eisegesis” with its “own theological idiosyncrasies,” and Joye’s repeated request to Tyndale to clear his name from the imputation of heresy as “pestering Tyndale.” Duffield clearly misunderstands Joye’s version of the agreement for reconciliation, as presented in the Apologye. Without any substantiation, Duffield calls the Apologye a repetitious, “intemperate book” with “incoherent arguments.” Joye, according to Duffield, “keeps returning to his great theme that Scripture is plain and Tyndale is wrong, though little proof is offered!” In 1971 Duffield studied Joye’s rendering of Bucer’s Latin version of the Psalms. In the same year he also issued a reprint edition of Joye’s first Psalter of 1530 with a short introductory note. Curiously, Joye’s name is not mentioned on the title page of the reprint: “The Psalter of David / Aretius Felinus / 1530 / Introduced by G.E. Duffield.” Joye’s name is only mentioned on p. 12, and Joye does not merit more than two tiny paragraphs sketching his entire life in a mere three sentences and enumerating five arguments for Joye’s authorship. Joye’s “abusive language” (probably meant in relationship to his Apologye) is contrasted with Tyndale’s “moderate tone.” Nonetheless, Duffield recognizes that “Joye’s phraseology passed permanently into the literary heritage of the English Bible.”

David Daniell is currently the most celebrated but probably one of the most biased of Tyndale’s biographers. His biography of Tyndale was published for the quincentenary of Tyndale’s birth (1994). Both there and in his recent The Bible in English (2003) he addresses the debate between Joye and Tyndale, but his Tyndale biography shows an approach different
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244 DUFFIELD, The Work of William Tyndale, p. xxix.
246 The Psalter of David, ed. Aretius Felinus (Martin Bucer) 1530, introd. by Gervase E. DUFFIELD (Courtenay Facsimile 1) Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1971 [hereafter: DUFFIELD, Psalter of David]. Unfortunately, the publication was limited to only 250 copies.
247 DUFFIELD, Psalter of David, p. 15.
248 DUFFIELD, Psalter of David, p. 17.
from that of his latest book. He has also written several articles and studies where the controversy is mentioned. (1) Daniell’s view in his Tyndale biography and his studies corresponds to the ‘conservative consensus’ as described above. These works are marked with tendentiousness and a lack of historical insight. He presents Joye as a quarrelsome, imprudent, dim-witted person who irritated everyone and was the cause of schisms within the early English Protestant community. According to Daniell, Joye was a second-rate editor with “foolish philosophy and generally bad work,” who with his tinkering threatened the harmony and unity of the Scripture, the very foundation of reformist thought. (2) In his recent book on the history of the English Bible, however, Daniell’s treatment of Joye is somewhat different. Daniell, probably influenced by the new scholarly approaches to Joye, presents a less partial picture of him. Joye is no longer ignorant but is introduced to the reader as “an English scholar living in Antwerp.” The debate itself is summarized in four or five concise sentences, and the wording is much less derogatory than in his earlier studies. In the next chapter (somewhat misleadingly called

249 Daniell, The Bible in English.
253 On the whole, the book is marked with the same bias that characterized his earlier works. Blacketer describes it as suffering from “a disturbing lack of evenhandedness that detracts from the overall credibility of the work” (Review by Raymond A. Blacketer, in The Journal of Religion 87 (2007), p. 152). Daniell’s use of double standards is accompanied by his sole criterion of excellence of any biblical translation—its proximity to William Tyndale’s version. “In fact, this book is in one sense a book about William Tyndale and how his translation has never really been eclipsed. Daniell writes about the history of great men, or in this case, the one great man Tyndale, whose spirit dominates the entire narrative” (p. 151). Daniell’s work also exhibits a serious lack of historical understanding: “Daniell’s portrayal of the history of Christian thought is skewed and outdated. He presents a caricature of medieval theology and exegesis in which a good fifteen hundred years of Christian thought can be written off as superstition and ignorance. Daniell betrays his lack of insight into this era when he dismisses the fourfold method of interpretation but then praises its greatest practitioner, Nicholas of Lyra (because he was one of Tyndale’s favorite exegetes). His treatment of John Calvin and later Protestant orthodoxy is similarly disappointing. Moreover, the confessional tone of his writing threatens to transgress the borders of civility. His treatment of Roman Catholic thought and attitudes toward the Bible is simplistic to say the least and comes disturbingly close to bigotry” (p. 152).
254 Daniell, The Bible in English, p. 151.
255 Daniell still remarks that “Not to put his name to the changes was bad enough, but in 1533 the Resurrection was the subject of debate among the English reformers” (Daniell,
After Tyndale), Daniell devotes a section to “Joye and Roy,” where Joye receives a much fairer handling. According to Daniell, “early on he [i.e. Joye] showed a certain gift with trenchant English.” Joye is credited for his OT translation, for the publication of his Primer, and for coining the expressions ‘saving health’ and ‘backslide.’ Daniell points out that Joye “was an innovator in that all the books he translated into English had not been touched by Tyndale.” Daniell even acknowledges, to a certain degree, Coverdale’s indebtedness to Joye. Nonetheless, Joye’s translational strategy is summarized by Daniell as “he was not trying for any literal accuracy, and he liked to fill out the text with words and ideas of his own.” And strangely, after having underlined that Joye’s translations and his Primer were the first ever put into print in English, Daniell states that “Joye did not break new ground.” He also believes that “had Joye been able to translate into English an entire Bible, it would have been inadequate.” Even so, Daniell admits that “Joye’s translations certainly filled a gap, and there are moments in them which have merit,” and as a sign of goodwill he concludes his treatment of Joye by allowing that “whatever his personal faults, Joye did endure two long and difficult exiles for his religion.”

A Shift in the Study of Joye

In the second half of the 20th century, a clear shift can be observed in the scholarly attitude towards Joye’s person and oeuvre. The trend is characterized by such works as William Clebsch’s England’s Earliest Protestants 1520–1535 and Charles C. Butterworth’s publications on the English Primers. This renewed interest gave rise to a series of studies with a new
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262 Daniell, The Bible in English, p. 167.
263 Daniell, The Bible in English, p. 168.
264 Daniell, The Bible in English, p. 168.
perspective on Joye and his works during the last decades of the previous century. Scholars became interested in the person and the writings of Joye, regardless or independently of his quarrel with Tyndale. Joye (re)gained more and more recognition as an important figure of the first decades of the English Reformation. These new studies coexisted with the established, conservative consensus, on which they have exercised very little effect.

Charles Butterworth and Joye’s Only Biography
In 1953 Charles Butterworth issued a comprehensive study titled *The English Primers, 1529–1545*. The book examines the short-lived but very influential genre of printed primers as devotional books. These primers contained the best-known and best-loved portions of the Bible and therefore “had their part in shaping the English text [of the Bible].” Butterworth presents a meticulously detailed description of all of the available evidence on Joye’s Psalters and *Primers*, including his first, lost Primer. Butterworth identifies Joye’s sources for his *Primers* and quotes extensively from them. Where there are parallel texts available from Tyndale, the two are compared. Although Joye’s influence on the later primers is underlined, the qualities of his works are characterized as “slipshod rather than scholarly, uneven rather than temperate, yet generally fresh and racy.”

The first and until now only book-length biography of Joye was published in 1962. The work was started by Charles Butterworth, but after his untimely death in 1957 it was completed by Allan Chester, who contributed chapters 8–11. The book appeared under both names and I will always refer to the authors in the plural because Chester also revised the chapters that originally were written by Butterworth. There is, however, a noticeable difference in style between the two: Chester is markedly “less fond of Joye than was his predecessor.” In their present form, the chapters about the controversy (8–9) are written by Chester based on the notes of Butterworth and are, accordingly, less objective. The facts of the controversy are presented in an interpretative way that has much in common with the ‘conservative consensus.’ And although the analyses of the other

---
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textual changes made by Joye are very useful, Joye’s reasons for altering Tyndale’s ‘resurreccion’ are less than satisfactory. Joye’s ‘conviction’ about the fate of the souls of the saved is seen as “amounting almost to an obsession.”

Joye was “advancing one of his own theological views” when he “wilfully mistranslated an important word.” And to make matters even worse, “by not acknowledging the translation as his own [Joye] had fathered the mistranslation upon Tyndale.”

The biography claims that “Neither etymologically nor historically was there authority for Joye’s figurative rendering the life after death. Joye’s chief offence—the only one which Tyndale could not condone—was an offence against theological and biblical scholarship.”

The Apologye is described as “intemperate,” “marred by repetitiousness and incoherence.” And according to the biography, “Joye does not succeed in vindicating himself against Tyndale’s charges—how could he?” The other chapters of the book, in spite of a number of historical and interpretative flaws, are more useful and credit Joye’s works with some of their merits.

The book contains ample analysis of Joye’s scriptural translations and excerpts from them.

William Clebsch

William Clebsch’s study on England’s Earliest Protestants represents a landmark in Reformation studies. Although his treatment of Tyndale has frequently been the subject of criticism for being too one-sided due to Clebsch’s stress on Tyndale’s dependence on Luther, the book is still indispensable. Chapter 12 in the book is entitled “The Practical Piety of George Joye,” and it is probably the most sympathetic lengthy treatment of Joye the Protestant author has ever received.

Clebsch presents a
detailed biography of Joye listing and describing his literary activities. The first section examines Joye’s biblical translations and his Primers. Clebsch emphasizes the neglected but profound influence Joye exercised on the religious practice of the early Protestant community with his translations of the prophets, the Psalter, and his Primers: “Joye compiled the first printed English primer with such skill that it set the standard for these books for at least a decade and a half, and its influence continued throughout the first Reformation generation [...] Joye earned credit as a shaper of English Protestant religiosity.” Clebsch also underlines the importance of Joye’s choice of the biblical books to be translated: the Psalms and the prophetic books, upon which “in every age Christians have centered personal and family, as well as monastic, devotion.” Joye’s first translation of the Psalms “lodged itself in various English primers of the 1530s and stamped its verbiage on the minds and souls of Protestants who prayed by these books.” Joye’s second Psalter was no less influential, “for no fewer than thirty-eight individual psalms from this version were quoted directly in Robert Redman’s Prayer of the Bible, printed early in 1535.” Clebsch points out that Joye, unlike Tyndale, never specified certain parts and themes of the Bible as “keys to unlock the whole.” “He always held that the common reader should feed his soul on scriptural and devotional materials with minimal assistance from translator or editor.”

The second section in Clebsch’s chapter on Joye is a comprehensive and accurate presentation of Joye’s theology in his various tracts. Clebsch aptly shows how Joye adopted and defended the Zwinglian view on various theological topics ranging from the Zwinglian notion of double justification to his views on the Lord’s Supper.

The final section in the chapter on Joye is Clebsch’s innovative presentation of the Tyndale–Joye debate. Clebsch relates the events objectively. He identifies the theological roots of the debate correctly: “the state of the souls departed: did resurrection of the dead with their bodies await the last trumpet’s call, or were the souls of the faithful departed already living a resurrected life?” This question, as he pointed out, “had slumbered
in Christendom since the days of Pope John XXII.” Clebsch briefly mentions Joye’s letters to Latimer and to William Hill and points out that “the letters show that Joye turned every stone to avoid controversy among the Brethren.” Clebsch believes that Tyndale contested Joye’s changes because he considered Joye a heretic “for believing that the souls of the dead received celestial embodiment without waiting for their mortal flesh to be revivified at the general resurrection.” Joye, however “ably defended himself with An Apologye . . .” This was based on Tyndale’s own works and on the Scriptures and, according to Clebsch’s judgement, “made a good case for his viewpoint on the resurrection.” Clebsch highlights that Joye corroborates his arguments with quotations from Bucer, Pelican, Melanchthon, and Zwingli, and that Joye’s position that “in Scripture words like ‘resurrect’ and ‘resurrection’ are used not only of the general resurrection of the dead but of the life of the soul after this present age” is actually taken directly from Zwingli. Clebsch further observes that “Joye’s keen eye” for the many inconsistencies within Tyndale’s theology “also perceived aspects of the great translator’s personality which, although brushed aside by biographers, find support from primary evidence.” He points to Tyndale’s ambiguous attitude with regard to his own translation:

Tyndale had both welcomed others’ corrections and promised his own revision in the 1525–26 New Testament; by 1534 he regarded not only scripture but his own translation of it as sacrosanct, for, what he earlier conceived as human testimony to divine mercy, he later took to be a contract binding God as well as man.
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Joye “cut close to the bone with the prayer ‘God forbyd that T. shulde so thinke of hymself/ that he hathe so exquisitly/ (ye and that at firste) translated the testament that yt cannot be mended.’”297 Clebsch highlights how Joye pleaded against Tyndale that “a variety of scriptural interpretations was necessary and desirable,”298 and that he genuinely hoped “that Tyndale would overcome the notion that the Holy Ghost spoke in his own translation.”299 As there was no sign of Tyndale’s promised revision, Joye justly accused Tyndale of having ‘slept’ from 1526 to 1534 with respect to the ‘New Testament project’; he was sincere when he declared that he only sought to eliminate the misprints and to clarify some points of misunderstanding, and was acting correctly when he did not append his name to what was essentially Tyndale’s work, “lest he be guilty of the very vainglory of which Tyndale accused him.”300 Tyndale’s second foreword, Clebsch points out, was perceived as feigning humility and charity “while actually castigating a former friend.”301 Clebsch contrasts Tyndale’s praise of his own works with Joye’s crediting their literal accuracy to Frith and Luther.302 He contrasts Tyndale’s worry that someone would steal away his glory and the name of his translation with Joye’s yearning “for the day when other men would edit all the early translations into versions of the full English Bible.”303 Finally, the reception of Joye’s embittered style is set in sharp contrast to the reception of similar sentiments exhibited by Tyndale during their debate:

Joye wrote in the bitterness of personal controversy with a former friend, and confessed it; modern commentators have roundly blamed him for it. Joye pointed out that Tyndale had written in the same bitterness, and had struck the first blow; Tyndale’s biographers have absolved him. In fact, Joye was not without fault. Neither was Tyndale.304

In a similar vein he observes the incorrect treatment Joye has received in the scholarly literature: “modern writers have bent upon magnifying Tyndale, often by minifying his associates. Joye’s accusations against Tyndale have been written off as the fulminations of a near crank against an
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always patient and godly man.” Clebsch's final conclusion with regard to Joye is that

Like him or not, the man translated into acceptable and influential English much of the Old Testament: Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations; all these he was the first to put into modern English, maybe also Job. He neither knew nor claimed to know Hebrew well, working usually from some Reformation Latin version. Both Rogers and Coverdale incorporated parts of his work into their complete Bibles, although Joye was not a major source of either editor. He worked on those parts of scripture to which Tyndale’s efforts did not extend. But his chief interest was to provide English Protestants with usable books of devotion. On that ground he recommended the prophetic and wisdom literature which he translated, and to that purpose he compiled the first Protestant devotional manuals in English. Theologically clever but not profound, polemically strident but effective, Joye left a legacy that enriched the piety and shaped the worship of English Christians. He eluded martyrdom under Henry VIII, unlike Tyndale, Frith, and Barnes. So did Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley, but they became martyrs under Mary Tudor. Joye died an apparently natural death, in an age when to do so was, for leaders of English religion, unheroic.  

Clebsch unmistakably sets a new tone on appreciation of Joye. Through his equitable analysis of Joye’s Primers and his Psalms translations as well as their effects on the newborn Protestant piety, he draws attention to the pre-eminence of Joye in making possible and fundamentally shaping the English evangelical devotion. He examines the cardinal points of Joye’s evangelical theology and demonstrates their predominantly Zwinglian origins. His original, unbiased account of Joye’s dealings with Tyndale sheds new light on their debate. He shows how Joye’s personal arguments against Tyndale are corroborated by Tyndale’s own writings and how Joye’s Apologye was an able defence. It is only a pity that Clebsch pays so little attention to Joye’s arguments concerning the heart of the matter.

Recent Studies
The new assessment of Joye proposed by Butterworth, Chester, and, most importantly, Clebsch has apparently induced other writers to produce a series of other studies dedicated to Joye. A commonly studied topic is the authorship of The Souper of the Lorde, with contributions made in almost
every decade since the 1940s. The increasing scholarly interest in Joye’s own works, translations, and devotional and polemical writings goes hand in hand with a growing appreciation of his oeuvre and recognition of his importance among the early Reformers.

In the 1970s and 1980s Rainer Pineas published a number of articles on Joye. His main interest was Joye’s controversy with More (Pineas had previously studied the More–Tyndale controversy) and with Catholics in general. Pineas shows how, with his oratorical skills and wide cultural background, Joye could use almost anything as an argument in a controversy. And although Pineas condemns Joye’s practice to put the “truth” in the text—i.e. using hyponyms and hyperonyms, and inserting explicatory remarks in the text for his readers—for Pineas this is corrupting the text—he points out how successful Joye was in advancing the cause of the Reformation with his polemical writings.

that a faithful translation is not necessarily a word-for-word translation.\textsuperscript{311} Instead, the translator has to render the sense of the original and not its letter, for it is absurd to produce a literal but incomprehensible translation.\textsuperscript{312} Hobbs points out that in Bucer's view it was "better to risk bringing something of the devout translator's own thought into the version than to leave it so unclear that almost anything can be deduced from it by readers lacking in understanding of the Hebrew context."\textsuperscript{313} Hobbs also shows how Rogers made use of Joye's 1530 \textit{Psalter of Dauid} when he attached arguments before each psalm and inserted marginal notes at various places based on Bucer. Hobbs states that Roger, while revising Joye's translation of Bucer's arguments, "tended to sacrifice grace for the sake of literal accuracy."\textsuperscript{314} According to Hobbs, Roger tried to give a more literal rendering of Bucer's text, but he was less skilful than Joye, and on several occasions he missed its sense.\textsuperscript{315}

Joye's oeuvre has recently been researched by Orlaith O'Sullivan in two studies. In her article \textit{The Authorship of The Supper of the Lord} (1997), she argues convincingly for Joye being the writer of this influential and controversial pamphlet.\textsuperscript{316} Her study demonstrates how Joye's personal row with Foxe and Tyndale brought Joye into discredit and how it could happen that \textit{The Souper of the Lorde}, which had been ascribed to Joye until 1573, was afterwards, due to Foxe’s personal agenda, attributed to Tyndale.\textsuperscript{317} Based on a thorough investigation of the internal evidence (style, themes, topics, and theology) in comparison with Joye's other writings, O'Sullivan proves beyond reasonable doubt the Joyean authorship.\textsuperscript{318} In another publication she studies Joye's biblical translations.\textsuperscript{319}

\begin{flushright}
318 The fact that she misinterprets Thomas More's Catholic vision (among other things on Sacred Tradition) does not take away from the validity of her arguments. Cf. O'Sullivan, \textit{The Authorship of The Supper of the Lord}, p. 216.
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In 1998 Gordon Jackson published excerpts from Joye’s two translations of the Book of Psalms under the title *Surprised by Joye*. In the introduction Jackson argues that the “variance with Tyndale has cost Joye his true literary standing.” Nonetheless, Jackson maintains, there is “a new spirit abroad.” This new spirit involves the re-examination of the key figures of the Reformation, “and it is right and due time that Joye should be included.”

In the same year, Claire Cross briefly reviewed Joye’s works, all produced in exile, in a surprisingly objective manner. Cross calling him an “important scholar” points to Joye’s first psalm translations and his *The Supper of the Lord*, which, influenced by Zwingli, “emphasised the memorial nature of the communion service and rejected the catholic concept of Christ’s death as a perpetual sacrifice.” Cross sees Joye’s importance in the publication of “a further ten books expounding major points of Zwinglian theology” during Joye’s second exile in Antwerp.

Helen Parish (2000) examines how Joye’s writings on priestly marriage (a theme very dear to the married Joye) reflected on the official English policy of the Henrician era concerning the matrimony of clerics. She aptly shows that Joye’s position, influenced by Continental Protestant writers such as Melanchthon and Zwingli, was in line with other evangelical writers of his age arguing for the same.

Vivienne Westbrook’s *Long Travail and Great Paynes*, a reworking of her doctoral thesis published in 2001, examines the work of seven Bible translator-revisers. Among these, she discusses Joye’s biblical translations and the indebtedness of later translations to Joye’s pioneering work. Based on her close textual analysis of Joye’s texts, she argues compellingly for a new evaluation of his Bible translations.

---


Peter Marshall’s contribution on *Evangelical Conversion in the Reign of Henry VIII* (2002) explores how Luther’s dichotomy of Law/Gospel was spelled out by Joye for English readers and how his writings helped shape the Protestant notion of conversion for English Protestant theology.329

Alec Ryrie has studied Joye’s political and ecclesiological viewpoints (*inter alia* on the question of royal supremacy and clerical celibacy) in *The Gospel and Henry VIII: Evangelicals in the Early English Reformation* (2003).330 Ryrie points out how carefully Joye formulated his position on these matters and gives Joye a very prominent place in his study.

**Conclusion of the Status Quaestionis**

This study of the *status quaestionis* shows that the controversy between Joye and Tyndale has usually been treated tangentially. The general view that emerges from the works that do give a place to Joye is an almost unvarying defamation of Joye. Some authors present the reader with specific insights into the debate and its background, but none can be said to have treated the issue both impartially and exhaustively. This is probably due to the secondary rank of style, knowledge, scholarship, and importance usually attributed to Joye. Clearly, Joye’s contemporaries had a very different assessment of his person and influence. He was seen as one of the most prominent members of the Lutheran group at Cambridge in 1526 when his room was searched and he was questioned. Also in 1527, when Ashwell gave him up, Wolsey summoned him as one of the three foremost figures of the heresy in Cambridge. More’s and Tunstall’s testimony also show that they regarded Joye, just like Tyndale, as one of the leaders of the ‘brethren.’ Henry Phillips was paid to betray and arrest the three most dangerous heretics in Antwerp at the time: Tyndale, Joye, and Barnes (Coverdale was not on the list). Hugh Latimer, Stephen Gardiner, Stephen Vaughan, and Edward Foxe all interceded for or recommended him, an act that could have meant a considerable risk or discredit for them. When Joye got entangled in various theological battles, his works were deemed to be important and dangerous enough to be answered by such prominent people as Thomas More and the bishop of Winchester.

---


John Bale counted him among the most illustrious writers of Britain. Joye’s 1530 Psalter (based on Bucer) was reprinted in 1534 in London by Thomas Godfrey, who also (re)printed Joye’s translation of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes in the same year. The Psalter was reprinted again as late as 1541. His *Primers* were taken as a model for later devotional books and shaped the language and the praxis of Protestant piety more than any other book (partly through the Book of Common Prayer). Rogers and Coverdale deemed Joye’s translation useful for their own edition of the Bible, and Coverdale retained a considerable portion of Joye’s renderings. Even Tyndale’s third NT edition contains wordings from Joye’s NT. Joye’s personal adversary John Foxe recognized the importance and effect of his writings.

The evaluation of Joye has undergone a major change in the second half of the 20th century. In the last few decades, there has been a renewed interest in studying Joye’s achievements independently of his quarrel with Tyndale. His works and person have become the subject of scholarly research. Some of his polemical writings have received the attention of scholars like Pineas and Parish, but his debate with Tyndale and the *Apologye* remains neglected. Even his biographers and Clebsch are cursory on the topic, concentrating on circumstantial evidence rather than on Joye’s real arguments.331 This study fills the gap in the new interest in Joye by presenting an original view of the Tyndale–Joye debate based on first-hand evidence available from Joye’s *Apologye* and placing it into its proper historical and theological context.

**Methodological Considerations and the Structure of the Book**

A reflection on the *status quaeestionis* teaches us that the scholarly world has fallen short of presenting an adequate account of the Tyndale–Joye controversy, mainly for the following reasons:

1. A clear bias in favour of Tyndale and against Joye. This can go as far as completely ignoring (or being ignorant of) the Joye sources.

---

331 Cf. Parish’s remark: “The works of Protestant and Catholic polemicists in the mid-Tudor period often receive superficial treatment in biographies of the authors, where polemical writings are glossed over as embarrassing lapses into populism” (Parish, *Clerical Marriage and the English Reformation*, pp. 5–6).
2. The lack of understanding of or attention to the theological issues at hand.
3. Judging the question without placing it in its appropriate context: an ongoing theological debate about issues of the afterlife.
4. Disregarding the historical context of the debate, which explains the use of such anachronistic terms as ‘piracy,’ ‘pirated edition,’ ‘plagiarism,’ etc.
5. The manifestation of a need or strong urge to pass a moral judgement on Joye’s character and thus influence the reader.

Clearly, the first and the last points are the result of a subjective attitude and are closely related to each other. Apparently Tyndale has achieved some kind of an infallible, saintly status in his treatment by some scholars. By trying to ignore or condone what they would see as Tyndale’s shortcomings (especially Tyndale’s attitude in the debate with Joye), these authors implicitly ‘canonize’ the “Apostle of Britain” and the “Father of the English Bible.” These authors give the impression that they feel that acknowledging facts that could be interpreted as human weaknesses would somehow diminish Tyndale’s achievements. Accordingly, the veneration of Tyndale by these writers is explicitly hagiographic, rather similar to that of the Blessed Virgin in the Catholic Church, or even that of Christ: a person without blemish, incapable of doing anything wrong.332 This, in the practice of some writers, has to be emphasized by passing a negative judgement on Joye’s personality.

The other points, however, are of an objective kind and are shortcomings that result in an anachronistic, chronocentric, and uneven view of the controversy. Consequently, in order not to fall into the same trap, the relevant theological issues and the general historical and theological context of the controversy, especially the quest of Christians to grasp the issues of an existence after this earthly life, will form the background of my presentation of the Joye-Tyndale debate.

Accordingly, in the second chapter I present a short historical overview about how the post-mortem fate of the human person has been conceived

332 It is no accident that he is sometimes compared to Jesus. Cf. “The Lord Jesus was betrayed by a man who was supposed to be his friend, and the same thing happened to Tyndale. Tyndale’s ‘Judas’ was a man named Phillips, a man Tyndale trusted, believing that he was faithful and true” (IS THE BOOK OF BOOKS. A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE, Chapter 13. HOW WE GOT OUR BIBLE). “They had, of course, reckoned without Phillips, who had, Judas-like, shared the sop with Tyndale at supper-time” (DANIELL, WILLIAM TYNDALE, p. 366).
throughout the centuries. The scope of this work limits our possibilities with regard to the scale and details of this survey. Therefore, I have to restrict my survey to the extent that these concepts have been relevant and effective to my principal theme, namely, the Tyndale–Joye controversy. Only major influential ideas are treated, and only to the degree that they bear relevance to the controversy. It is therefore not my intention to present an up-to-date evaluation on the subjects treated, but rather to show how they were conceived in the 16th century. The immensity of the available data on the issue makes it virtually impossible to accomplish thoroughness. Nor is it possible within the present work to examine the development of these ideas, how they influenced each other, and what the present-day scholarly evaluation of these is. The sole purpose of the initial historical overview is to present the main concepts that have played a role in the debate, in the form they were understood at the time of the debate.

Chapter three concentrates on the quest for an understanding of after-life issues in the 16th century, the immediate historico-theological context of the debate between Tyndale and Joye. I present the interpretative solutions to the problems of translation of the NT texts and how they caused dogmatic disagreements at the dawn of the early Reformation period. I present the ideas of, among others, Wessel Gansfort, Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Martin Luther, Andreas Bodenstein of Karlstadt, Gerhard Westerburg, Philipp Melanchthon, Huldrych Zwingli, Martin Bucer, Bartholomäus Westheimer, Heinrich Bullinger, and Thomas More. Here, too, the principles of reference and relevance to the Tyndale–Joye controversy are primordial in selecting and presenting the material. My main focus is the contextualization of the Tyndale–Joye controversy in its immediate religious and exegetical context of the early 16th century as it was understood by the parties, and not the presentation of a modern scholarly evaluation on the various authors. I show that not only was the question of soul sleep vs. immortality of the soul a much debated issue at the time, but also that many beliefs concerning a post-mortem existence were called into question, and that it is against this background that the Tyndale–Joye debate has to be understood. These questions have never been studied with regard to the Tyndale–Joye controversy. Nonetheless, as I demonstrate, most of these theological works had a direct influence on the debate, and Joye explicitly refers to many of them in his Apologye. Although it may seem circumstantial, occasionally I pay some attention to a number of personal arguments, subjective comments, ad hominem charges, and polemical remarks in various debates on
this subject at the time of Tyndale and Joye. These are given as samples of
the language and style of the contemporary way of debating such issues,
to familiarize the reader with the tone of such debates at that time in
order to enable him or her to make a better assessment of arguments of
the kind that were used in the Tyndale–Joye debate and help the reader to
place Tyndale's and Joye's very similar notes of harsh accusation in their
wider context.

The fourth chapter treats the actual controversy between Tyndale and
Joye. I present Tyndale's translational strategy in his NT editions. I discuss
the earliest traces of the controversy preserved only in manuscript form
(Joye’s letter to Hugh Latimer under the name of John Coke, intercepted
by a spy of Cromwell). In this letter Joye already points to his exegeti-
cal arguments on the subject. I present the circumstances that led to the
publication of Tyndale’s NT with Joye's corrections and the actual varia-
tions he brought about in the work. I examine Tyndale’s ‘unfriendly’ letter
printed in his second NT edition. Based on the available evidence I recon-
struct an original and plausible scenario for the documented attempt to
reach a concord between Tyndale and Joye and how it was doomed to fail.
I describe briefly Joye’s second NT revision with its concluding remarks on
the debated issue. I present a detailed study of Joye's Apologye, in which
the following aspects are treated: (1) Joye's non-theological arguments;
(2) Joye's theological arguments: the belief of the Sadducees, Joye's under-
standing of the term ‘resurrection’ in passages where he altered Tyndale’s
translation, Joye's understanding of the term ‘resurrection’ in passages that
are left unaltered, and Joye’s other exegetical arguments; (3) Joye’s schol-
arship and use of sources; and (4) Joye's style and translational strategy.

As most of my research in the third and the fourth chapters is based
on primary sources, I will not often refer to the secondary literature that
happens to mention the same topic for a different purpose. Naturally, all
ideas, concepts, and insights originating from others are duly credited. My
somewhat extended study of the status quaestionis spares me also from
reflecting in too repetitive a fashion on the difference between my find-
ings and those resulting from approaches previously taken. Nevertheless,
when this is relevant for a better understanding of my argument, I will
make references to the opinions of other scholars.

Finally, a word on transcribing the source material. I have kept the
original spelling everywhere, but I resolved all abbreviations except ε (for
æ), the & sign (for et or and), and superscript e-s in German (e.g. gehōrt).
Supplied letters are italicized or put within square brackets (e.g. a[n]d
for ād).
CHAPTER TWO

VIEWS ON POST-MORTEM EXISTENCE PRIOR TO THE REFORMATION

Is death the definitive end of human life? If not, what happens to the human being after death? These questions have always fascinated human-kind. As there is no uncontested first-hand information available, the answer to them has to be based on traditions, beliefs, and human reasoning. Developing and revising previous ideas, every age and every generation have tried to formulate and reformulate an answer in the language and paradigm of its own time. The 16th-century interest in these subjects is thus neither exceptional nor without precedent. In order to illustrate and position the debate between Tyndale and Joye on the fate of the dead, and its broader ideological context within the 16th century, I include here a brief bird’s-eye view of the eschatological ideas that have influenced the debate.

The problem of post-mortem existence had occupied some of the attention of the Greco-Roman world as well. In pagan Antiquity, no universally prescribed dogmatic position was held with regard to the post-mortem existence of the human being, and therefore several, sometimes contradictory theories were postulated propagating the transmigration of the souls (*metempsychosis*) and/or personal immortality.¹ These ranged from

(1) the early Elysian fields of the blessed and (2) the ‘democratic’ Homeric view of a common ᾅδης for everyone, through (3) the Orphic and Platonic clear-cut dualism (claiming that the soul, imprisoned in the body in life, is set free by death only to be reincarnated in another body until it is completely purified) and (4) the Aristotelian hylomorphism (proposing somewhat dubiously the immortality of active intellect, the intellectus agens of the later commentaries), to (5) Stoic ambiguity on the subject (generally allowing for a temporal survival of the soul until the cataclysmal Conflagration (ἐκπύρωσις) and (6) Epicurean monist materialism denying all possibility of the survival of the person. Early Christian theology was probably most influenced by (7) Neo-Platonism, with its interest in divine emanations and a strong ethical dualism coupled with the metaphysical. In pagan Antiquity, the idea of a once-and-for-all resurrection of the body for eternal life is absent.

**Views on Post-Mortem Existence in the Bible**

**Belief in the Afterlife in the Old Testament**

There seems to be a consensus in modern scholarship about the fact that afterlife beliefs occur at a rather late stage in the history of the Hebrew Bible. Allegedly, early Israelites had no (clearly developed) idea about

---

a possible future life of the individual beyond death, neither as a soul separated from the body nor in the form of the resurrection of the body. Concerns about death, especially untimely death (generally recognized as a punishment from God), were more interested in the preservation of the family, clan, tribe, or nation than in the fate of the individual (cf. Gen. 38; Dt. 25:5–6; 1 Sam. 2:31; Prov. 10:27–30). The main interest of the early Israelites was the fate of the nation and not that of the individual. It is customary today to explain the apparent lack of interest in a post-mortem existence with the alleged monistic anthropology of the Jewish culture. According to this, the human person is an indissoluble unit, and terms such as בָּשָׂר (traditionally translated by LXX: σάρξ Vg: caro; English: flesh) and נֶפֶ (traditionally translated by LXX: ψυχή Vg: anima; English: soul) refer to the human person in its entire being from a particular aspect (e.g. the human person in relation to the material world, or the human person as a living being) rather than to a component. Although this awareness was not generally present in the 16th century, we will see that some 16th-century scholars with a thorough knowledge of Hebrew argued similarly.3 These were, however, the exceptions. By and large passages, that could be seen even faintly to refer to a post-mortem existence or resurrection (usually reinforced by the Greek and Latin translations of the Hebrew text) were consistently understood and explained by Christians in such a sense. The OT was seen as the prefiguration of the NT, wherein the central tenet is unquestionably Jesus’ victory over death, His bodily resurrection from the dead. Christ’s resurrection is the good news of Christianity, and it is the promise for the salvation of the faithful. Anything that could be seen as a prophecy of Jesus’ death and resurrection was therefore interpreted accordingly, and anything that could be understood as referring to the promise of a post-mortem existence was taken in that sense. In this regard there was no difference between the Eastern and the Western Church, nor between Catholics and Protestants.

This alleged monistic anthropology does not imply that the belief in the resurrection of the body or in some kind of survival of the person beyond death was totally absent from the Hebrew Bible. Such references, usually from the later books, are found abundantly, although they resist any systematic harmonization. Nor does it mean that the Christian reading of

---

3 See infra on pp. 218ff and p. 268.
those passages would have differed significantly from the interpretation of some of those passages by contemporary Jewish interpreters.

The destination of all humankind in the OT is said to be שְׁאוֹל (she'ôl). The primary meaning of the word is grave or pit, but it is regularly translated as ᾅδης in the Septuagint and as infernum in the Vulgate, which were both used to designate the underworld, the realm of the dead or Hell. It is in these senses that the term was mostly understood in the 16th century. The various passages where שְׁאוֹל is used are difficult to synthesize. שְׁאוֹל is the destination for both the righteous and the wicked, the rich and the poor, the slave and the master (Job 3:11–19). The dead in שְׁאוֹל are sometimes described as abandoned by God and cut off from the living; they are sleeping or lying apparently in an inactive state (Ps. 115:17; 30(29):9–12; 88(87):3–12). They are incapable of praising God or even of remembering (Ps. 6:5–6; Eccl. 9:5). In other passages, however, God is present even in שְׁאוֹל (Ps. 139:8), and Ps. 16(15):10 claims that God delivers the soul from שְׁאוֹל. This text was taken as a prophecy of the resurrection of Jesus by the author of Acts (2:25–31; 13:35–37) and was unproblematically used in that sense until modern times. A similar confirmation of the possibility of deliverance from שְׁאוֹל is present in Ps. 49(48):16 and Job 19:25–29.

In 1 Sam. 28, the desperate King Saul consults the spirit of the dead prophet Samuel through the ‘witch’ of Endor. Samuel appears in bodily form (an “old man with a robe”: v. 14) and complains about being disturbed and having to come up, but he finally predicts for Saul what would happen to Saul, much as he would have done in his prophetic ministry while still alive: Samuel’s ghost obviously knows the future. It is certainly not the aim of the message to propagate necromancy (both Saul and the witch know that it is forbidden; cf. Dt. 18:9–12; Lev. 19:31; 20:27), but the possibility of consulting the dead already departed to שְׁאוֹל is evident, and was sometimes used as proof for the survival of the soul after death.

---

4 Enoch and Elijah are possible exceptions. Of Enoch, the genealogy in Gen. 5:24 does not say that he died but “he was not, for God took him.” Elijah is recorded to have been taken to Heaven in a chariot of fire (2 Kgs. 2). Both of them were assumed to have been taken into Heaven in their bodily form.

5 For more on the meaning and usage of שְׁאוֹל, see: art. sh’e’ol; in TWAT; Philip Johnston, Shades of Sheol. Death and Afterlife in the Old Testament, Leicester: Apollos, 2002; Mitchell, ‘God Will Redeem My Soul from Sheol,’ pp. 365–84.

6 Isaiah 19:3 testifies to the Egyptian practice of necromancy. Isaiah rebukes the Jews for practicing necromancy in Is. 8:19; 19:3; 29:4. Manasseh is reported to have practiced
Besides these scattered and seemingly conflicting references to שְׁאוֹל, the prophetic books also contain passages that were seen as promises by God. Ezekiel’s vision about the revivification of the dry bones (Ez. 37:1–14), Isaiah’s apocalypse (esp. 25:87 and 26:19), or Hosea’s comforting words (6:1–2) were all understood as prophecies of a future resurrection at the end of the world in general, or of Christ’s resurrection in particular.

The latest books of the OT, Wisdom literature and the books of Daniel and Maccabees, contain the clearest references to a belief in the afterlife. In the deuterocanonical Book of Wisdom this faith is formulated mostly in dualistic terms, with a confirmation of the immortality of the soul. The book explicitly states the immortal character of the human person as image of God (ἀφθαρσία is used e.g. in 2:23; 6:18–19, and ἀθανασία in 3:4; 8:13.17; 15:3). Eccl. 3:14, too, corroborates the immortal character of the soul (cf. 3:7–8).7 Daniel’s reference in 12:1–3 on the other hand, formulates the hope of those ‘asleep’ in terms of resurrection to eternal life or to everlasting punishment. This judgement will take place in the apocalyptic times, when the Son of Man comes to restore Israel to an everlasting kingdom (Dan. 2:44; 7:13–18 and 26–27). In 2 Maccabees God vindicates the death of His martyrs by their resurrection. He does not allow His people to be utterly crushed, but rewards their faith by raising them from death. (2 Macc. 7). It is also in this deuterocanonical book where the connection between the living and those who had already passed away is expressed: in 2 Macc. 12:38–46 Judas Maccabeus collects money for a sacrifice to atone for those Jewish soldiers who died in sin. The passage formed the basis of the Catholic theology of indulgences, by which the temporal punishment of the souls in Purgatory could be shortened by pious acts of the living.8 In another passage, Judas Maccabeus sees the murdered high priest Onias and the prophet Jeremiah pray for the Jews and the holy city of Jerusalem (2 Macc. 15:11–16). This passage was used for the confirmation of the intercession of the saints on behalf of the living.9

---

7 In contrast, Eccl. 2:1–4 seems to confirm the forsakenness of the souls, much like in some of the texts referring to the dead in שְׁאוֹל.

8 On the theology of indulgences, see infra on p. 114.

9 Also, Sir. 3:3 confirms the possibility of atonement for the sins of the fathers by their sons. It is no accident that the canonicity of the deuterocanonical books was contested by Luther and the Reformers.
The apocryphal 4 Ezra (= 2 Esdras) 7 speaks about death as a separation of body and spirit or soul (vv. 78 and 100), and confirms that departed souls are fully conscious, can feel shame or fear (v. 87), and receive either temporal punishment (vv. 78–87) or comfort (88–99) upon death, prior to the final judgement.\(^{10}\) Punishment and comfort differ both in degree and ‘place’, according to their deeds on earth. Judgement is said to be definitive, without the possibility of modification (vv. 104–105). Thus, 4 Ezra combines the idea of the immortal soul that departs the body at death with the belief of a final and future corporal resurrection of the dead.\(^ {11}\)

One final remark should be noted about the belief in the post-mortem existence expressed in the Hebrew Bible and in the writings of the Intertestamental period. The emerging idea of a post-mortem existence in the

\(^{10}\) Although the book was not recognized as part of the Roman Catholic canon, it is contained in the LXX and Jerome translated it, and thus it made its way into the Vulgate. The Church Fathers frequently cited it (especially Ambrose). The introitus Requiem aeternam in the Catholic funeral is based on 2:34–35: “Ideoque vobis dico, gentes quae auditis et intelligitis: expectate pastorem vestrum, requiem æternitatis dabit vobis, quoniam in proximo est ille, qui in finem saeculi adveniet, parati estote ad præmia regni, quia lux perpetua lucebit vobis per æternitatem temporis” (emphasis mine). The book is now recognized as part of the Bible in the Ethiopian Orthodox Church as well as in the Russian Orthodox Church.
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OT, whether in the form of bodily resurrection or in the form of immortality of the soul, is thoroughly connected with the figure of the Messiah and with the messianic age. The Messiah is believed to lead the Jewish people into a new age (עֲלָיָן הָהָיָה) in which he will establish a new kingdom.12 This new age will only come at the price of sufferings and woes, the “birth-pangs of the Messiah” (in the Rabbinic literature: הבלי המשׁיה) (cf. Hos. 13:13; Zech. 10; Dan. 12:1).13 But the new kingdom of the Messiah will be one of justice and peace (cf. Is. 11; Dan. 2:44), where the righteous are vindicated and saints will reign and the nations will be judged (cf. Dan. 7:10–27). Salvation may be universal, but Israel will keep its privileged place among the nations (cf. Zech. 8:20–23; Tob. 13:11; 14:6–7). The whole world will be renewed (Is. 65:17; 66:22) and the dead will be resurrected.14

Belief in the Afterlife in the New Testament

In contrast with the OT, faith in an afterlife is central to the message of the NT.15 Jesus’ victory over death is the pivotal point of the Christian kerygma. His death and resurrection are the foundation for the salvation of the faithful. But Jesus’ teachings, His prophetic message during His

---

13 SCHÜRER, The History of the Jewish People, p. 514.
14 SCHÜRER, The History of the Jewish People, p. 539.
earthly life about the Kingdom of God (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ; Vg: regnum Dei), also exhibits an eschatological character pointing to a realm beyond this earthly life.16

The Gospels portray Jesus predicting His own death and resurrection both in figurative speech and in specific prophecies. His parable about the workers in the vineyard attacking the owner’s servants and son (Mt. 21:35–39 et par.), His use of the sign of Jonah spending three days in the belly of the whale (Mt. 12:39–41 et par.), and His words on the destruction and reconstruction of the Temple in three days (Jn. 2:18–20) were read in the light of His own death and resurrection. His explicit prophecies were taken as even clearer proof that Jesus in His earthly life already firmly believed in the resurrection of the body, and more specifically in His own resurrection (Mk. 8:31; 9:31;10:34). His belief was vindicated by God when God raised Him up from death, an event that became the very heart of the Christian message. The resurrection of Jesus figures prominently in the proclamation of the good news by the Early Church (e.g. Acts 1:22; 2:31; 4:2.33; 17:3.18.32; 23:6; 24:15.21; 26:23). The evangelists and Paul mention several appearances of Jesus in bodily form (Mt. 28; Mk. 16; Lk. 24; Jn. 20–21; 1 Cor. 15:4–8). Until His ascension into Heaven, the resurrected Jesus converses, exercises physical functions (such as eating and

---

breathing), and can even be touched. At the same time, the resurrected body is not restricted by the laws of nature: it can appear and vanish at will, can pass through closed doors, and can easily bridge great distances (Lk. 24:13–43; Jn. 20:11–29; 21:1–14).

Yet, Jesus’ resurrection is not limited to His person alone, but has its implications for all humankind (1 Cor. 6:14; Rom. 8:11; 1 Pt. 1:3). He promised that He would come back at the end of the world to gather His elected people and to judge the universe. At this final judgement everyone shall be resurrected and shall receive eternal punishment or bliss according to their deeds (Mt. 19:28; 25:31–46; Acts 17:31; 1 Cor. 6:2–3; 2 Cor. 5:10; Rev. 19–22). Thus, the resurrection of the individual is clearly affirmed. Yet, the individual always remains part of the Christian community and is not self-sufficient for salvation. To express this, Jesus uses the image of the vine and the branches (Jn. 15:1–5), and Paul symbolizes it through the metaphor of the body, in which each part is equally important and united by Christ (1 Cor. 10:17; 12:12–27). The parables of the royal banquet (Mt. 22:1–10; Lk. 14:16–24) and of the wedding dress (Mt. 22:11–14), exemplifying the Kingdom of God, depict the future life as a communal meal. It is therefore in the apocalyptic Kingdom of God that the eschatological hope of the community is vested, where the saved will all be partakers of the communal heavenly meal.

17 Paul is the only exception, who on his way to Damascus meets the risen Lord in a vision after the ascension (Acts 9:1–8).


19 On how the Messianic feast and the meal imagery with its communal eschatological aspects have been used as symbols for the life of the Kingdom, and by extension the life of the community, see: Fergus John King, More Than a Passover. Inculturation in the Supper Narratives of the New Testament, doct. diss. at the University of South Africa, 2005, esp. pp. 199–238.
Besides the belief in the bodily resurrection, there are passages in the NT that have traditionally been interpreted as a proof of the survival of the soul separated from the body after death. Jesus’ parable about the rich man and the poor Lazarus (Lk. 16:19–31) is probably the most commonly cited proof of the immortality of the soul.\(^{20}\) Equally common are the references to Jesus’ promise on the cross to the repentant criminal that the thief would be with Jesus in Paradise on that same day (σήμερον) (Lk. 23:43) and to Paul’s desire ‘to depart and be with Christ’ (τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι) as opposed to ‘live’ and ‘remain in the flesh’ (τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί, ἐπιμένειν [ἐν] τῇ σαρκί) (Phil. 1:18b–26).\(^{21}\) Similarly, in 2 Cor. 5:1–10 Paul speaks about his desire to be away from the body and be at home with the Lord (ἐκδημῆσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον) after having put down the earthly tent and moved into a mansion not built by human hands. This, too, has been seen as a reference to the soul leaving the body at death and entering into a Paradise. Finally, while it is not referring to a post-mortem state, Paul’s description in 2 Cor. 12:2–4 about being caught up into the third Heaven (ἁρπαγέντα ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ) has also been used as an argument for the possibility of an extra-corporeal existence of the soul.\(^{22}\)

---


\(^{22}\) Paul writes that he does not know whether it happened “in the body or out of the body” (εἴτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα), but the fact that he allowed for the possibility of this happening “out of the body” was seen as proof of such an existence.
Although its canonicity was the subject of dispute for some time, the Church Fathers and later theologians drew extensively on the visions described in the Book of Revelation with regard to the eschatological events. The author, who calls himself John, describes the epiphany of Christ to him in several cycles of visions. Among others, these include the portrayal of the heavenly court with the Lamb (5:6–14) and the 144,000 sealed (7:1–8 and 14:1–5). In chapters 19–22, John describes his visions of the last things: the second coming of Christ (19:1–16), the call to the heavenly banquet (19:17–18), the final battle, and the binding of Satan (19:19 to 20:3), followed by the thousand-year reign (20:4–10), the Last Judgement (20:11–15), the renewal of Heaven and earth, and the vision of the New Jerusalem (21:1 to 22:5). These descriptions in vivid imagery were sometimes taken literally to identify theological truths.

That the belief in an afterlife was not unproblematic for the contemporaries of Jesus is also documented in the NT. According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is confronted by the Sadducees, who try to entrap him with the story of the seven brothers, who one after the other married the same woman upon the untimely and childless death of the previous brother (Mt. 22:23–33 et par.). They refer to the law of Levirate marriage

---

23 See NJBC 66:66.
(Dt. 25:5–6), according to which brothers living together should marry the wife of their brother who dies without leaving a son, in order to generate a male heir who would keep alive the name of the deceased. It is noteworthy that for the expression ‘keeping alive the name,’ the Hebrew text in Deuteronomy has יָקוּם עַל־שֵׁם using the verb קוּם, which is the usual term for rising, resurrecting. The Septuagint renders the expression κατασταθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος, also using a verb etymologically related to ἀνίστημι but with another verbal prefix. In the Gospels the pun on the term ‘resurrection’ (ἀνάστασις) is even more explicit, as Mark and Luke have ἀναστήσησθαι σπέρμα, and Matthew uses ἀναστήσει σπέρμα (raise offsprings), based on Gen. 38:8 (וְהָקֵם זֶרַע: LXX: ἀνάστησον σπέρμα). But, they ask, whose wife shall she be in the ‘resurrection’ (ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει)?

By reductio ad absurdum, their question ridicules the idea of ‘resurrection’ and seems to exclude any possibility of existence beyond death, implying that physical death is the definitive end to human life. Jesus first rebukes them for their ignorance of the Scriptures and the power of God (τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ). In the ‘resurrection,’ Jesus explains, people neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels. Then, to prove the veracity of the ‘resurrection,’ he replies with a quote from Exodus (3:6): ‘I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob,’ and combines it with a theological theorem: God is not the God of the dead but of the living (see 4 Macc. 7:19; 16:25). Strictly speaking, Jesus’ answer does not prove the bodily resurrection. It rather shows that the patriarchs are not dead but are in some sense alive; thus, there must be some kind of continued existence after death in which the dead are like angels and do not marry. The Sadducees are mentioned in a similar context in Acts, where Paul plays upon the Sadducees’ denial of afterlife beliefs in order to divide the Sanhedrin when he claims that he is being put on trial because of his belief in the ‘resurrection’ of the dead: περὶ ἑλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως

---

27 ‘Keeping alive the name of the person’ was not meant to ensure the individual’s fame, but rather to ensure the future of the nation.

νεκρῶν (Acts 23:6–9). In that passage the author of Acts specifies that Sadducees claimed μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, μὴ δὲ ἐγγελον, μὴ τε πνεῦμα, but the Pharisees acknowledged τὰ ἄμφότερα (v. 8).

In the presentation of Acts, during his missionary activities Paul also encounters problems in connection with the beliefs concerning the resurrection. In Acts 17:16–33 he preaches the good news to the Athenians. The author of Acts names adherents to two Hellenistic schools of philosophy, namely, the Epicureans and the Stoics, as being present among his audience. From their contemptuous and sarcastic reaction (vv. 18 and 32), it is clear that they have a problem with the idea of bodily resurrection, a concept totally strange to his Hellenistic listeners. Paul disappointedly leaves them, but some people did join him, according to Acts (v. 34).

In his letters, too, Paul has to address issues concerning beliefs in the afterlife. In 1 Thes. 4:13–5:11, Paul wants to clarify a misunderstanding about the fate of those who have died. Apparently, the Thessalonians were concerned that their dead would be in some way discriminated against at the second coming of Christ. Paul assures the Thessalonian

---


33 Ascough has recently proposed that the underlying issue of the passage was a concern over identity and belonging in the community: whether the dead members can still be considered as part of the community (Richard S. Ascough, A Question of Death: Paul’s Community-Building Language in 1 Thessalonians 4:13–18, in JBL 123 (2004), pp. 509–30). For a discussion of the various suggestions that have been put forth by scholars about
community that those who died before the Parousia are in no way disad- 
advantaged compared with those who will still be alive at the return of 
Christ. The dead will be resurrected, just like Jesus, who died but rose 
on the third day (4:14). When he returns, the dead in Christ will rise first 
(οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον) (v. 16), and the living will be 
taken up (ἡρμηνευόμεθα) together with them to be with the Lord forever 
(πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα) (4:17).

1 Cor. 15 is the classic passage for the affirmation of the resurrection 
of the body. Though far from being a systematic theological treatise on 
the issue, this is the place where Paul treats the subject most extensively. 
In v. 12 Paul rebukes those in the Corinthian community (ἐν ὑμῖν τινες) 
who denied the resurrection of the dead (ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν). For 
Paul, this makes no sense, because Jesus’ resurrection is the sine qua non 
of the Christian faith. If there was no resurrection, Paul argues, then 
Christ was not resurrected and is dead, and the proclamation of the Gos-
pel (κήρυγμα), as well as their faith, is in vain (κενός) (vv. 13–18). If there 
is no resurrection of the dead, Paul claims, then Christians are the most 
pitiable among all people (ἐλεεινότεροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων) (v. 19). In v. 20 
Paul stops rebuking his antagonists and sets out his own notions: Christ is 
risen from the dead, and His resurrection has consequences for the faith-
ful. In him all will be made alive (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζῳοποιηθήσονται), 
just as all die in Adam (v. 22). This rising will take place at the end of the 
world, when Christ will return (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ). As to the question 
of how the dead will rise, Paul does not give a straight answer. He speaks 
about a ‘mystery’ (μυστήριον) (v. 51) and uses the analogy of the grain 
that is sown (cf. Jn. 12:24). God gives to each kind of seed its own body 
(v. 38), which differs from what is sown. Similarly, the natural body (σῶμα 
ψυχικόν) is sown in corruption, in weakness, and in dishonour. But the
skeletal body (σῶμα πνευματικόν), Paul affirms, will be raised in incorruption (ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ), in power (ἐν δύναμι), and in glory (ἐν δόξῃ) (vv. 42–44; cf. Phil. 3:21). It will bear the image of the heavenly (τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου) (v. 49). This future transformation from corruptible into incorruptible will also take place for those who will be alive at the Parousia: not everyone will die, but everyone will be changed (v. 51), and the mortal body (τὸ θνητὸν) will have to put on immortality (ἀθανασίαν) (v. 53).36

It is evident that for Paul, faith in the resurrection is fundamental and indispensable for discipleship, and is the central element of his Christology. Denial of the resurrection means the denial of the Gospel, it means the renunciation of Christ, and it makes the **kerygma** pointless. On the other hand, Christ’s resurrection is the guarantee for the believer of a future incorruptible life in the resurrected spiritual body after the Parousia, regardless of whether one is alive at the second coming of Christ or is already ‘asleep in the Lord.’ Neither in 1 Thessalonians nor in 1 Corinthians does Paul offer an answer to the question of what happens to the dead in the meantime. This was not an issue in either letter, and Paul’s use of the word ‘to sleep’ (κοιμάομαι) (1 Cor. 15:18, 51; 1 Thes. 4:13–15) does not necessarily imply that the dead are in an unconscious state.37

To conclude the survey of the biblical evidence on beliefs concerning some form of a post-mortem life, we come to a twofold observation. First, there is a common theme in both testaments, namely, the association of sin with death. Death has entered the world through the sin of Adam. But while in most of the OT the emphasis is put on the temporal reward or punishment, according to the NT, reward and punishment will be dispensed by Christ in a future, post-mortem life. Secondly, although there are passages in the OT that were unproblematically identified up to modern times as referring to either the bodily resurrection or the immortality of the soul, these texts are often contradictory and secondary. It is not personal immortality, the survival of the individual, which is important, but the survival of the chosen people, the community of Israel (cf. the Levirate marriage). The eschatological hope is focused on the nation, not the individual. In the NT, however, the resurrection of Jesus is the central point, in which the salvation of the individual is rooted. The resurrection of Christ implies the resurrection of each and every individual at the end times. Yet, the individual is part of the community and never stands

---

36 On the variant readings of 1 Cor. 15:51, see *infra* on p. 135.
alone. Apart from texts referring to the resurrection, there are texts that traditionally have been understood as references to an intermediate state of the disembodied soul after death but prior to the end of the world.

**POST-MORTEM EXISTENCE IN THE CHURCH FATHERS**

Throughout Christianity, questions concerning the afterlife have received much attention and have been frequently disputed. It is impossible to construct a coherent and comprehensive system of the pre-Nicean Fathers’ theology on the post-mortem existence. Nonetheless, several common points can be observed. From the earliest days, the Fathers of the Church clearly affirmed the bodily resurrection.\(^{38}\) They insisted on the veracity of Jesus’ resurrection and on the corporal aspects of the future life after the resurrection at the second coming of Christ.\(^{39}\) Also, the notion of a judgement is present in their writings: God rewards and punishes one’s earthly deeds with heavenly bliss or the torments of Hell.\(^{40}\) On the other hand, at least an implicit affirmation of the survival of the soul seems to be demonstrated from the very beginning.\(^{41}\) To reconcile bodily resurrection

---


\(^{39}\) Cf. Clement I, *Ad Corinthios*, XXIV–XXVII; L,3; Ignatius, *Ad Smyrnaeos III*; Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* V,7; Justin Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, LXXX; Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* VI,1. Unless otherwise indicated, all patristic quotations are from the PG and PL series of Migne, checked against early modern and modern editions (critical or otherwise), when relevant. These editions are contained in the Bibligoraphy among the Primary Sources.

\(^{40}\) Cf. Polycarp, *Ad Philippienses*, II; IV; Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* XIII,1 and XV,1.

and the survival of the soul, several solutions are proposed, generally allowing the souls of martyrs to enter Heaven immediately, with their bodies rejoining them upon the general resurrection at the end of the world. The wicked were believed to enter into the torments of Hell upon their death. It seems that in their treatment of the post-mortem-but-prior-to-resurrection situation of the soul, the Latin Church Fathers focused primarily on punishment and satisfaction in a judicial sense (paying off the debt to God). The Greek Fathers, rather, emphasized the cleansing of the soul by divinization through God’s indwelling. Accordingly, the idea of some kind of purgation of the unclean but worthy souls after death seems to become the accepted orthodox stance both in the East and the West. On the level of orthopraxis, the practice of praying for the dead is demonstrated from very early on. Examples of addressing the saints for their intercession and remembering the heavenly ‘birthday’ of martyrs and collecting their relics can be also found in the Church Fathers and early archaeological evidence.

The Fathers’ position is often formulated in opposition to religious dissent and heterodox views. As a result, they are typically unsystematic and often contradictory. At the same time, their writings testify to the many problems with regard to beliefs concerning the post-mortem existence of the human person. A cursory reading of the pre-Nicean Fathers shows that they combated primarily on three fronts: Hellenistic pagan philosophy, Docetism, and Gnosticism. Polycarp (c.69–155) reports that some heretics denied the post-mortem judgement and the resurrection. Justin refutes the idea of the transmigration of souls and the idea that the soul is not immortal in its own right. Tatian (c.110/120–c.180) apparently believed that the soul by itself is not immortal (οὐκ ἔστιν ἀθάνατος [. . .] ἡ ψυχὴ καθ’ ἑαυτήν), but can die and be dissolved together with the body if it does not know the truth (θνήσκει μὲν γὰρ καὶ λύεται μετὰ τοῦ σῶματος μὴ

---

43 Cf. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata, IV,16; Cyprian, Epistolae LI, LVII, LXV, LXVI; Tertullian, De corona militis, III,3; Tertullian, De monogamia, X,5; Tertullian, De exhortatione castitatis, XI,1–2; Tertullian, De anima, LVIII Also, on the epitaphs and mortuary inscriptions from the earliest periods onwards, see: Robert Milburn, Early Christian Art and Architecture, Berkeley: UP California Press, 1988, pp. 36–38.
44 Cf. Martyrium Polycarpi XVIII,1–3; Milburn, Early Christian Art and Architecture, p. 38.
46 Justin Martyr, Dialogus cum Tryphone, IV–V.
γινώσκουσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν). For Tatian, immortality of the soul can only be obtained by the union of the soul with the Divine Spirit (συζυγίαν δὲ κεκτημένη τὴν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος). According to the report of Irenaeus (c.130–c.202) the Valentinians, followers of Valentinus (c.100–60), the best known and most influential Gnostic, believed that the souls of the righteous are purged of their animal nature after death before finding rest in the intermediate state (requiescere in medietatis loco, ἐν τῷ τῆς μεσότητος τότῳ), that after purgation they are to be consorts of the spiritual angels (sponsas futuros spiritualium Angelorum, νύμφας ἀποδοθήσεσθαι τοῖς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀγγέλοις), and that only the Mother of the Gnostics can enter Heaven (Pleroma, πλήρωμα), where she will be married by her Saviour. They held that attaining gnosis (the perfect knowledge of God) is the true salvation (i.e. the resurrection from the death of ignorance), which does not take place in the afterlife but must be experienced in the here and now. They disallowed a resurrection that would affect the entire person (universam reprobant resurrectionem), and so they despised

47 Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos, XIII.1.
48 Tatian, Oratio ad Graecos, XIII.1–2.

‘God's handiwork’ (despicientes plasminationem Dei) and contradicted the orthodox faith and the Scriptures, Irenaeus remarked. He condemned the Gnostic Cerinthus (Kerinthos), who distinguished between Jesus (as a human being) and Christ (as a spiritual being); Cerinthus taught that Christ had departed from Jesus before Jesus suffered on the cross, and that Jesus’ resurrection has not yet taken place but is still to be expected. Athenagoras (c.133–c.190) wrote a treatise on the resurrection renouncing contemporary pagan tenets, such as dissolution or transmigration of the soul after death. Tertullian (c.150/160, fl. 190–216), too, took a stand against the pagan philosophers. He pointed out the absurdity of believing in metempsychosis but being horrified by the idea of bodily resurrection. The same Creator who created the person in the first place can resurrect his body again, he explained. Tertullian defended the article of faith about Christ’s descent into Hell (infero), which is a vast, deep place in the interior of the earth (fossa terrae, et in alio vastitas), to make the patriarchs and prophets partakers of Himself (ut illic Patriarchas et Prophetas compotes sui faceret). This shows that the blessed no longer have to go there, and therefore there is a difference between ‘heathens’ and Christians, because the pagans put all souls into hades, while the Christians believe that the souls of the blessed ascend up to Heaven immediately after death, where Christ is seated at the Father’s right hand.

---

53 Athenagoras, *De Resurrectione* X,5 and XII,3.
56 Tertullian, *De anima*, LV.
57 Tertullian, *De anima*, LV.
Tertullian also refuted that the soul could sleep, because it is always in motion, always active, and never succumbs to rest—a condition that is alien to immortality.\(^5^8\) Tertullian maintained that the bodily resurrection, although it can be traced remotely and confusedly in heathen teachings, is a Christian teaching (\textit{fiducia Christianorum}).\(^5^9\) He confuted the various heretical positions concerning the resurrection in his \textit{De resurrectione carnis}. There, he explains that Christ refuted the Sadducees, who denied salvation for either the soul or for the body (\textit{neque animae, neque carnis admittunt salutem}).\(^6^0\) But Christ’s answer to them affirmed the resurrection of the two natures of the human person (\textit{resurrectionem utriusque substantiae humanae}).\(^6^1\) Tertullian claims that he, too, has to address the Sadducees of his own time (\textit{ad alios sadducaeos praeparamur}), just like those in the time of Christ who denied the resurrection.\(^6^2\) Some of these, Tertullian reports, allow only for the resurrection of the souls because they despise the body (\textit{agnoscunt resurrectionem, solius scilicet animae; aspernati carnem}).\(^6^3\) These heretics are like the heathens because they vilify the flesh.\(^6^4\) But true Christians respect the body, which was created prior to the soul, and which, together with the soul, forms the human being, the chief work in creation.\(^6^5\) So at the judgement the body, too, will partake in the rewards or the punishments.\(^6^6\)

The Alexandrian Fathers were likewise concerned with the question of the resurrection. Clement of Alexandria (c.150–c.215) refuted the preexistence of souls and claimed that sexual differentiation will disappear in the resurrection.\(^6^7\) Origen (c.185–c.254) believed that at the end of the world all creatures (even the enemies of God) will return to the original harmony: a general and universal restoration (\textit{ἀποκατάστασις}) will take place.\(^6^8\) At the resurrection, the soul will create its own, suitable spiritual

\(^{58}\) Tertullian, \textit{De anima}, LVIII. Tertullian uses Aristotle’s argument that the soul is actuality (Cf. Aristotle, \textit{De anima}, II,1).

\(^{59}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, I and III.

\(^{60}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, XXXVI.

\(^{61}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, XXXVI.

\(^{62}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, II. Cf. Tertullian, \textit{Adversus Marcionem}, IV,37.

\(^{63}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, II. He mentions the Valentinus, Apelles, Marcion, and Basilides.

\(^{64}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, IV.

\(^{65}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, V.

\(^{66}\) Tertullian, \textit{De resurrectione carnis}, LVI.

\(^{67}\) Clement of Alexandria, \textit{Stromata}, III,14; VI,12–13.

\(^{68}\) Origen, \textit{De principiis}, I,6,1–3. Origen has been accredited with believing in universal salvation, viz. that in the general restoration even Satan would be saved. On his views on afterlife, see: L.R. HENNESSEY, \textit{The Place of Saints and Sinners after Death}, in Charles
form for the body (cf. 1 Cor. 15). Origen is unclear whether this ‘spiritual body’ is the ultimate or the penultimate stage of the soul in the ongoing process of self-transcending evolution (ἐπέκτασις). Origen, as reported by Eusebius (431–594), encountered Arabian heretics who held that the human soul dies and perishes with the body at death and that body and soul will be renewed and resurrected together. These heretics, who based their doctrine on the OT, believed that the soul is contained by the blood. Therefore, as the blood is shed or decomposed by death, the human soul, too, must die. Origen argued that the souls of the elect immediately enter Paradise unless they are not yet purified, in which case they pass into a state of punishment, a penal fire, which is to be conceived as a place of purification. He also maintained that Christ, when he “became a soul, without the body” (i.e. after His death on the cross), dwelt among the incorporeal souls and converted some of them. This has been taken later as reference to Christ’s descent into Hell. Origen was also the first to denounce Chiliasts as “visionaries, deluded fools, and what was worse,
literalists.\textsuperscript{75} He intimated that these people, based on their Jewish interpretation of the Scriptures, adopted a superficial view of the letter of the law, and that they yielded to the indulgence of their own desires and lusts, and imagined the fulfilment of the future promises to be looked for in bodily pleasure and luxury.\textsuperscript{76} Consequently, they say that after the resurrection people will marry and beget children, imagining that they will rebuild the earthly city of Jerusalem with the help of other nations that are given to them.\textsuperscript{77}

Later centuries likewise struggled with the comprehension of the post-mortem existence. Epiphanius (c.310–403) discussed with Aerus the effectiveness and legitimacy of the prayers for the dead.\textsuperscript{78} Further, he reported that Manichaeists denied the bodily resurrection, believed in the transmigration of souls, and taught that those who ate flesh were bound to return in the form of the animal they ate (e.g. a pig or a cow).\textsuperscript{79} He also charged

\begin{footnotes}


\textsuperscript{76} Origen, De principiis, II.1.2. Cf. Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III.39. The refusal of ‘hedonistic’ Chiliasm as a Jewish heresy became commonplace in Christian theology after Origen (cf. Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica. Ad emendationes editiones impressa et accuratissime recognita, Suppl. qu. 81. art. 4 ad 4) and was repeated by the Reformers (e.g. in the Augsburg Confession, XVII,4; Calvin, Institutiones religionis Christianae, III,25,5).

\textsuperscript{77} Origen, De principiis, II.11.2.

\textsuperscript{78} Epiphanius, Adversus haereses, LXXV,2–7.

\textsuperscript{79} ἃν ἐσθίοντα σάρκας φυσιν φασιν ἐσθίειν τὸν τοιοῦτον, καὶ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἔνοχον τοῦ καὶ αὐτὸν τοιοῦτό τι γενέσθαι, ὡς ἐπὶ ἑρακεὶ χήρον, χήρον αὖθις γενέσθαι ἢ ταύρον ὥ ὄρνεον ἢ τὶ τῶν ἐξόντων κτισμάτων. διὸ ἐμψύχων οὔ μετέξουσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι” (Epiphanius, Adversus haereses, III.29). Mani taught that only the ‘hearers’ (not completely purified souls) are bound to metempsychosis, while the ‘wicked’ (sinners) are punished, and the ‘elect’ are shipped into the ‘Land of Light.’ The sect is condemned by many other Church Fathers, too (e.g. John of Damascus, Cyril of Jerusalem). Augustine, himself an ex-Manichaean, provides several interesting details on their teachings. See e.g. Augustine, Contra Faustum Manichaeum libri triginta tres, VI.3; XX–XLI; Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram libri duodecim, VII,11,17; X,13,22. The literature on Manichaeism is abundant. See e.g.: A.V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, The Doctrine of Metempsychosis in Manichaeism, in JAOS 45 (1925), pp. 246–68; A.V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, A Sketch of the Manichean Doctrine concerning the Future Life, in JAOS 50 (1930), pp. 177–98;
\end{footnotes}
Origen with spiritualizing the resurrection and denying that the resurrected body is truly flesh. The issue would be taken up again by Jerome, who defended the position that the resurrected body (corpus) is true flesh (caro) against John of Jerusalem. For Jerome, the resurrection of the flesh and the immortality of the soul presuppose each other. In his *Commentary on Matthew*, he raised the question of what Jesus’ intention was in using such an ambiguous citation in His discussion with the Sadducees in order to prove resurrection (Mt. 22:32). Jerome remarked that although there are better texts in the Scriptures that prove the veracity of the resurrection (he quoted Is. 26:19 and Dan. 12:2), it would have been unwise (stultum) if Jesus had quoted them, since they are not found in the five books of Moses, which the Sadducees held exclusively to be authoritative. Therefore, Jesus proves the immortality of the soul on the basis of a citation from Exodus, Jerome explained, and from the immortality of the soul the bodily resurrection should follow. In another controversy, Jerome defended the veneration of relics and the belief that the saints can be both in the tomb and with God at the same time. Jerome also maintained that justification has to be achieved in this world because after death the souls of the departed can neither do good nor commit sin. Nestorians

---


81 Jerome, *Epistola*, CXXIV,10; Jerome, *Contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum*, XXV–XVI.
83 “Porro ad aeternitatem animarum probandam de Moyse ponit exemplum: Ego sum Deus Abraham et Deus Isaac et Deus Iacob, statimque infert: Non est Deus mortuorum sed uiuentium” (Jerome, *Commentaria in Evangelium Mattheai*, III,32).
85 “Donec vivunt homines, posse eos justos fieri, post mortem vero nullam boni operis dari occasionem. Peccator enim vivens potest melior esse justo mortuo, si voluerit ad ejus transire virtutes” (Jerome, *Commentaria in Ecclesiasten, ad Paulam et Eustochium*, ad. IX,6).
and Jacobites believed that these souls sleep, i.e. lie unconscious without being punished or rewarded until the Day of Judgement, because punishment and reward have to be received in the same body in which the sins were committed and merits earned. Macarius Magnes (fl. c.403) meets the opposition of the pagan philosophers in his *Apocriticus.* On the occasion of the death of his brother Satyrus, Ambrose (c.340–97) warned against foolish speculations about the resurrection and the resurrected body but clearly asserted that prayer for the dead is helpful. Ambrose distinguished between three kinds of death (spiritual, mystical, and physical), and he argued that physical death should not be feared and that all those who want to enter Paradise have to be cleansed by fire. He also maintained that Scripture affirmed the immortality of the soul. Basil the

---


88 Ambrose, *De excessu fratris Satyri libri duo,* II,121. Yet in his work on the goodness of death, Ambrose wrote that David prayed for his sins to be remitted while he was alive because after death sins cannot be remitted. For nobody can enter everlasting life unless his or her sins are remitted: “Denique festinabat etiam sanctus David de hoc loco peregrinationis exire, dicens: Advena ego sum apud te in terra et peregrinus, in quo patres mei [Ps 38,13]. Et ideo tanquam peregrinus ad illam sanctorum communem omnium patriam festinabat, petens pro hujus commorationis inquinamento remitti sibi peccata, prius quam discедерet e vita. Qui enim hic non acceperit remissionem peccatorum, illic non erit. Non erit autem qui ad vitam aeternam non poterit pervenire, quia vita aeterna remissio peccatorum est” (*Ambrose, De bono mortis liber unus,* II,5).

89 *Omnis oportet per ignem probari, quicumque ad paradisum redire desiderat; non enim otiose scriptum est, quod ejusdictus Adam et Eva de paradisi sede, posuit Deus in exitu paradisi gladium ignesium versatilium [Gen 3,24]. Omnes oportet transire per flammam, sive ille Joannes Evangelista sit, quem ita dilexit Dominus, ut de eo diceret ad Petrum: Sic eum volo manere … quid ad te? Tu me sequere [Jn 21,22]. De morte ejus aliqui dubitavantur, de transitu per ignem dubitare non possumus; quia in paradiso est, nec separatur a Christo. Sive ille sit Petrus, qui claves acceperit regni coelorum, qui supra mare ambulavit, oportet ut dicat: Transivimus per ignem et aquam, et induxit in refrigierum [Ps 65,12]. Sed Joanni cito versabatur ignis gladius; quia non inuentur in eo ini quitas quem dilexit aequitas. Si quid in eo vitii humani fuit, charitas divina decoxit; Alae enim ejus sicut alae ignis [Cant 8,6]” (*Ambrose, In psalmum primum enarratio,* Sermo XX,12). Cf. Ambrose, *In psalmum primum enarratio,* 38–40.

90 Ambrose, *De bono mortis,* X,43. He used e.g. Jn. 10:38; Lk. 12:20; and Mt. 10:28.
Great (d. 379) is faced with the problem of perpetual bodily mutation. Basil’s death would give the incentive to Gregory of Nyssa (c.335–c.395), Basil’s elder brother, to write his *De anima et resurrectione*, reflecting on the immortal nature of the soul and on bodily resurrection in a dialogue with their sister Macrina. Gregory refuted atheism, the Epicurean dissolution of the soul into atoms, as well as the ideas of transmigration of the soul and the pre-existence of the soul: these concepts are self-contradictory and they result in immoral conclusions. The soul is not subject to the laws of nature, is undimensional (ἀδιάστατος) by nature, and is immortal. Upon death those souls that were detached from earthly desires and were purified by the love of Wisdom ascend to God. But the purgation (χάσματος) of the souls that adhered to carnal desires in life is a necessary requirement for their divinization (ὁμοίωσις πρὸς τὸ θεῖον). Yet, Christian hope is vested not only in the immortality of the soul but also in the resurrection of the human person as a whole: soul and body together. For Gregory, the resurrection is the restoration of the human person to his or her original condition. The soul has an affinity to the body that ensures that the resurrected body will be recomposed of the same particles as the earthly body. His namesake, Gregory of Nazianzen (c.325–89), will be frequently cited later for his reflection on the fate of the infants who die without baptism. He argued that such “unsealed” infants will be neither admitted to the glory of Heaven nor condemned to suffer punishment, since they are not wicked. Consequently, there must be a third option, because if one does

---

91 Basil, *Homiliae in psalmos*, XLIV,1 and CXIV,5.
93 Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de anima et resurrectione*, 76A–77A.
94 Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de anima et resurrectione*, 69B.
95 Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de anima et resurrectione*, 76B; 76C–D; 108B–128C.
96 Gregory of Nyssa, *Dialogus de anima et resurrectione*, 76A–77A.
not merit punishment, it does not follow that one would be worthy of being honoured, or vice versa: one who is not worthy of honour does not necessarily deserve to be punished. Nonetheless, he argues for infant baptism only if there is any pressing danger, for it is better that these children should be unconsciously sanctified (ἀναισθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι) than depart "unsealed" and "uninitiated" (ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα).

Chrysostom (c.349–c.407) maintained that Christians should look forward to their death with joy and that the custom of prayers at mass to help the souls of the dead was instituted by the apostles themselves.

The first official texts that professed Christ's descent into Hell as an article of faith were the Apostolic Creed (κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα) The so-called Apostolic Creed appeared first in its present form in the 6th century in the writings of Caesarius of Arles (d. 542): (cf. Sermones, Homilia I De Paschate; Homilia XVII). It is believed to be based on a creed going back to Apostolic times. Rufinus Aquileiensis' (c.345–410) Commentary on the apostolorum (c.407) contains a creed that is similar to the Apostolic Creed as it is known today, already having the article on Christ's descent to Hell (Rufinus Aquileiensis, Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum, 14–28).

Rufinus confirms that this article was not present in the Creed of the Eastern Church or that of Rome in his time: Sciemendum sane est, quod in Ecclesiae Romanae Symbolo non habetur additum, descendit ad inferna: sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo: vis tamen verbi eadem videtur esse in eo, quod sepultus dicitur. (Rufinus Aquileiensis' Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum, 18.) An earlier form of the Apostolic Creed can be found in a letter by Marcellus of Ancyra (d. c.374) to Pope Julius I (pope 337–352) dating from 340 or 341 (the letter was preserved by Epiphanius in his Adversus haereses, LXXII), but this does not contain the article on Christ's descent to Hell. It is also absent in an earlier Roman baptismal liturgy (believed to be based on the same Creed as the Apostolic Creed) from around the turn of the 3rd century. See: Joseph Rawson Lumby, The History of the Creeds. Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Constantinopolitan, the Apostolic Creed, the Quicunque Commonly Called the Creed of St. Athanasius, Cambridge: Deighton and Bell, 1887; Alfred G. Mortimer, An Historical and Doctrinal Exposition of the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds, London: Longmans Green, 1902; D. Bruce Lockerbie, The Apostle's Creed. Do You Really Believe It?, Wheaton: Victor Books, 1977; Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, Credo. Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition, New Haven: Yale UP, 2003.
and the Athanasian Creed (*descendit ad inferos*), traditionally attributed to St Athanasius (c.293–373). This tenet, attested to in the writings of some of the Fathers, was going to receive much attention in the Reformation period. According to Augustine, when the human person dies, he or she is immediately judged. The separated souls of the saints rest in peace until the end of the world, while


those of the wicked enter into pain.\textsuperscript{105} Although the deceased souls of the righteous already enjoy God's presence after death, this is not yet the beatific vision of God.\textsuperscript{106} Augustine differentiated between lethal or grave sins (\textit{peccata lethales, grandes, gravia, or capitalia}), which, unless duly repented of and remitted, are punished by damnation, and minute or minor sins (\textit{peccata minuta}), which, although they do not merit damnation, if neglected can also lead to death.\textsuperscript{107} He also differentiated between guilt or fault (\textit{culpa}) and debt of punishment (\textit{poena}): while guilt can be remitted, punishment is still to be suffered.\textsuperscript{108} In this manner Augustine can assert that during the interim between death and resurrection, the souls are punished and purged for the sins they committed while on earth, but they may be helped by the prayers and alms of their friends and families, and that the Church prays and commands prayer for all who died in the Christian and Catholic family, even without naming them all, in

\textsuperscript{105} Augustine, \textit{De civitate Dei}, XIII,8.


\textsuperscript{108} "In duobus tuis malis, una est culpa, altera est poena: culpa est quod injustus es, poena est quia mortalis es" (Augustine, \textit{Sermo CLXXI De verbis Apostoli, Gaudete in Domino semper, etc. Philipp.}, cap. IV,4–6, III,3). In Roman Law, \textit{poena} was used for penalty, which was technically the ransom that the injured person may demand from the wrongdoer. \textit{Culpa} originally meant imputability, guilt, or liability but was also used later for negligence. See: Max Radin, \textit{Fundamental Concepts of the Roman Law}, in \textit{California Law Review} 12 (1924), pp. 481–95; Charles Fried, \textit{The Lex Aquilia as a Source of Law for Bartolus and Baldus}, in \textit{The American Journal of Legal History} 4 (1960), pp. 142–72.
a general commemoration. Augustine asks his friends to join him in praying for the soul of his parents “at God’s altar,” because the pains of Purgatory are worse than any pain that can be felt or even imagined in this world. This stage, however, is not definite. At the end of the world the dead bodies will be resurrected, and thus the joy of the righteous will be even greater in the “eternal Sabbath,” while the torments of the wicked will become even worse because torture and reward will also affect the body. In the resurrection the souls of the blessed will receive the bodies in which they laboured here on earth, and for which they will have been longing. The saints will contemplate and praise God eternally, and together with the angels they will form the city of God. The wicked, on the other hand, will be punished. Against Origen, Augustine stresses that the punishment of the wicked will also be eternal, but its severity will differ according to the heinousness of the crimes.

Augustine was also to play an important role with his methodology of interpreting the Scripture. He believed that the knowledge of languages, especially Greek and Hebrew, was necessary for true knowledge of the Bible. This entails knowledge of tropes and other figures of speech, because the understanding of the figurative expressions only in the literal

---

109 “Verum et si aliqua necessitas vel humari corpora, vel in talibus locis humari nulla data facultate permittat, non sunt praetermissae supplicationes pro spiritibus mortuorum: quas faciendas pro omnibus in christianis et catholica societate defunctis etiam tacitis nominibus eorum sub generali commemoratione suscepit Ecclesia; ut quibus ad ista desunt parentes, aut filii, aut quicumque cognati vel amici, ab una eis exhibeatur pia matre communi. Si autem deessent istae supplicationes, quae fiunt recta fide ac pietate pro mortuis, puto quod nihil profossed spiritibus eorum quamlibet in locis sanctis exanima corpora ponerentur” (Augustine, De cura pro mortuis gerenda ad Paulinum liber unus, IV) Cf. Augustine, Sermo CIV De verbis Apostoli, I Cor. cap. III, n–15, Fundamentum aliud nemo potest ponere, etc., 4; Augustine, Enchiridion ad Laurentium sive de fide, spe et charitate, LXVII–LXIX, CX; Augustine, De civitate Dei, XXI,26). Although in Augustine’s works the purging of the soul is not confined to a specific space, he earned the misleading title ‘the Father of Purgatory.’ Cf. Jacques Le Goff, La naissance du purgatoire, (Bibliothèque des histoires), Paris: Gallimard, 1981, p. 61.


111 Augustine, De civitate Dei, XIII,8; Augustine, In Ioannis Evangelium tractatus CXXIV, XLIX,10.

112 Augustine, Confessiones, IX,37; XXII,26.

113 Augustine, De civitate Dei, XXII,26.

114 Initially Augustine seems to have favoured the idea that Hell was not a specific place (Augustine, De Genesi ad litteram, XII,26). At the end of his life he retracted this opinion (Augustine, Retractiones, II,24,2).

115 Augustine, De civitate Dei, XXII,26.

116 Augustine, De doctrina christiana libri quatuor, II,11.
sense is miserable slavery (*Scripturae figuratas locutiones ad litteram accipere servitus miserabilis*). The same word can take on different meanings in different contexts, and Scripture itself contains not only examples of figures of speech but the very names as well (e.g. allegory: Gal. 4:24; enigma: Num. 12:8; and parable: Mt. 13:3). He emphasized that obscure passages should be clarified by places where the sense in which they are used is more manifest, for it is safer to explain a doubtful passage by using other passages of Scripture than by using reason. He also held that even when the intended meaning by the author remained undiscovered, more interpretations of the same words of Scripture were permissible as long as it could be shown from other passages of Scripture that any of the interpretations were in harmony with the truth. In fact, Augustine argued, when the versions of the two different translators are compared, a more precise sense of the original text can be discovered. The seven rules of interpretation for the Scripture established by the Donatist Tichonius (fl. c.370–90) are also preserved by the bishop of Hippo.

---

117 Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, III,5.
118 Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, III,25.29.
119 “Ubi autem apertius ponuntur, ibi discendum est quomodo in locis intelligantur obscurs” (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, III,26). “Per Scripturas enim divinas multo tutius ambulatur; quas verbis translatis opacatas cum scrutari volumus, aut hoc inde exeat quod non habeat controversiam; aut, si habet, ex eadem Scriptura ubicumque inventis atque adhibitis testibus terminetur” (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, III,28).
120 “Quando autem ex eisdem Scripturae verbis, non unum aliiquid, sed duo vel plura sentiuntur, etiam si latet quid senserit ille qui scripsit, nihil periculi est, si quodlibet eorum congruere veritati ex aliis locis sanctarum Scripturarum doceri potest” (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, III,27. Cf. II,12).
121 “Nunc autem collato interpretum sensu, probabilior occurrit sententia proprie” (Augustine, *De doctrina christiana*, II,12).
During the Middle Ages four intertwined tendencies can be observed in the Western Church in connection with notions about death and the possibility of an afterlife: (1) a prevalent fascination with post-mortem existence in general—and the fate of the souls in Purgatory in particular—manifested in legends and mystical writings, as well as in the increasing popularity of the veneration of saints and their relics and of the suffrages for the souls of the dead (attested to by many bequests); (2) speculative Scholastic theology ruminating on issues of the afterlife, fertilized by the rediscovery of Aristotle’s philosophy (a rediscovery stimulated by medieval Arabic philosophers) in the 13th century, which prompted commentaries on Aristotle’s works, engendering the birth of the Averroistic school as well as the highly elaborate systematic theology of Thomas Aquinas; and (3) the appearance of heterodox movements and religious radicals denying some aspects of the teaching of the Church. Consequently, (4) a series of official proclamations were promulgated that stipulated the belief in growing detail in the language of contemporary philosophy.

Faced with a profusion of cases of premature death due to wars, famines, plagues, or crimes, the medieval person developed a natural curiosity into the post-mortem existence of humankind. This was typical not only of theologians but also of the lay population. This medieval fascination with the post-mortem state of the souls led to myriad legends and popular stories of souls suffering in Purgatory. These descriptions “were, in a sense, the prelude to the greatest medieval work of graphic imagination relating to the subject, Dante’s Purgatory, the second book of the Divine Comedy.”

---


Although in the beginning the exact location of Purgatory was not determined, later it was thought to be in the vicinity of Hell.\textsuperscript{125}

The popular interest in the fate of the souls can be found in the visions of medieval mystics, too. William of St Thierry (c.1085–c.1148), Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), Joachim of Fiore (c.1135–1202), Gertrud of Helfta (1256–1301), Julian of Norwich (c.1342–1416), and Catherine of Genoa (1447–1510) gave mystical descriptions and visions of post-mortem existence, souls in Purgatory, and eschatological events.\textsuperscript{126}

The mystical philosophical and theological writings of Nicholas of Cusa (1401–64) were going to play an important role in the Reformers' theology.\textsuperscript{127}

In his sermons *Quem Deus suscitavit, solutis doloribus inferni* (on Acts 2:24) and *Qui per spiritum sanctum semetipsum obtulit* (on Heb. 9:14), Cusanus expounded upon his notions about Christ's descent into Hell.\textsuperscript{128} The German Cardinal interpreted Psalm 30:11–12 as referring to Christ's descent into Hell in terms of agony, namely, Christ's own experience of being dead.\textsuperscript{129} Christ's humanity was not dissolved in His death because


\textsuperscript{128} Nicholas of Cusa, *Excitationes X*, in *Opera Nicolai Cusae Cardinalis* ed. Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Paris: Henri Estienne, 1514, fo. 176v–x. See also his theological and philosophical writings *De docta ignorantia*, III,7, and *De visione Dei*, XXIII.

His humanity was hypostatically united with the divinity in one person (humanitas fuit unita divinitati in una persona) as an immortal unity (per unionem ad divinitatem fuit immortalis, as proved by His resurrection) and remained so even after His death; yet according to His human nature (per unionem formalem ad hominem), His body and soul could spatially and temporarily separate from each other (cessavit esse unio corporis at animae). Therefore, Christ experienced death, descended into Hell (ad inferna), and suffered together with the souls in Hell. In His descent, Christ’s soul acquired the full knowledge of death (scientia mortis), in which the souls in Hell are completely abandoned by God. These souls through direct experience (via cognoscentiae) behold death (visio mortis) eternally. According to the Cardinal, this is what the expression ‘the second death’ in Rev. 20:14 means: from which there is no escape. Because for Cusanus Hell was not a place but an inner condition, and because His suffering enclosed (complicat) all pain in death, Christ’s afflictions in Hell were the greatest conceivable suffering, the consummate penalty (poena consummata). In this freely chosen act of solidarity, Christ kept glorifying the Father as he had done in His earthly life. When Christ

---


131 Cusanus introduces an idea of the co-suffering of Christ with the sinners in this realm. This notion later became the basis for the exchange of attributes (communicatio idiomatum) between Christ and the sinners in Hell in Luther’s theology of the descent, but in the theology of the medieval Cardinal Christ never adopts the active role of a sinner.

was risen, he was liberated from the torments of Hell (solutis doloribus inferni).

The literary genre of *ars moriendi*, pious practical guides on ‘how to die well’ that became extremely popular in the 15th century, also testify to the widespread interest in death and post-mortem existence. These books in the original Latin and their vernacular translations into almost all Western European languages feature prominently among the incunabula and the early printed books of the 16th century, and would be popular in Early Modern times as well.

The fascination with the fate of the deceased was not merely an intellectual curiosity, but a matter of practical concern arising from a strong communal conviction. According to the teaching of the Church, there is a spiritual solidarity within the *communio sanctorum* between the *Ecclesia Militans* (Christ’s Church on earth), the *Ecclesia Triumphans* (the saints already in Heaven), and the *Ecclesia Penitens* (the souls of the deceased in Purgatory): Christians may be physically separated from each other by death, yet they remain united in one Church and can support each other in prayer. This solidarity rests on the basis of prayers to the saints (Church Triumphant) for their intercession on behalf of the living. Many popular saints were thus revered and invoked for their help in everyday life. Their relics were venerated, their feasts were celebrated, and pilgrimages were undertaken to places of importance in their lives in order to appeal for their assistance. In their turn, the living (Church Militant) offered their prayers to alleviate and shorten the sufferings of the souls in Purgatory (Church Suffering). The celebration par excellence of this spiritual solidarity of the *communio sanctorum* between the Church Triumphant and the Church Militant was the consecration of the Pantheon in Rome to the

---

Blessed Virgin and all the martyrs on 13 May 610 by Pope Boniface IV, establishing the Feast of All Holy Martyrs.\textsuperscript{135} With the foundation by Pope Gregory III (pope 731–41) of an oratory in St Peter's for “the relics of the holy apostles and of all saints, martyrs and confessors, of all the just made perfect who are at rest throughout the world,” the date of the feast was moved to 1 November.\textsuperscript{136} In 835, Pope Gregory IV (pope 827–44) decreed the celebration of the Feast of All Saints on 1 November for the entire Church. Pope Sixtus IV (pope 1471–84) added the octave to the feast. The Feast of All Souls (2 November)—the expression of the spiritual solidarity of the \textit{communio sanctorum} when the Church Militant prays for the release from sufferings of the Church Suffering (the souls in purgation)—was first established by abbot Odilo (962–1049) in the Benedictine monasteries under Cluny's authority in the late 10th century.\textsuperscript{137} From Cluny the custom spread and became popular in the 13th century. When Rome introduced the feast into the calendar for the entire Church, the date was retained so that the Communion of all of the saints might be celebrated together.

\textsuperscript{135} In the writings of the Church Fathers, earlier celebrations of the martyrs and saints can also be seen (art. \textit{All Saints' Day} in IS CE).


The popular interest in death and post-mortem existence undoubtedly influenced the medieval Scholastic theologians in their exploration of the issues of afterlife. Scholastic theologians studied the questions of how individuality is retained in the interim state of the soul, whether the soul is a substance, whether there remains a connection between body and soul after the dissolution of the body, whether the soul has any corporal aspects, whether it can feel physical pain (inflicted by physical fire), and whether it has spatial dimensions or can be localized somewhere. They elaborated further on the nature of post-mortem existence; the corporality of resurrection; the age, sex, size, and colour of the resurrected body; what mutilated bodies will be like when resurrected; the details of the reassembly or reconstruction of the particles; what will happen to lost hair and cut fingernails; whether it is possible to possess an authentic relic of Christ's teeth; etc. They were fascinated with problems such as how the bodies of the damned can be burned but not destroyed, whether aborted foetuses will be resurrected, whether the incorporeal devils suffer from the physical fire of Hell, how victims of cannibalism or people digested by wild animals will be resurrected, etc.138

While in the 12th century the schoolmen focused mainly on resurrection and the qualities of the resurrected body, in the 13th century the ‘Aristotelian revival’ shifted the emphasis to survival of the soul.139 This shift of interest can be seen in the increasing attention paid to the cleansing of impure souls. Although the idea of purging the souls after death as temporal punishment or legal satisfaction, as described in Augustine, was repeatedly acknowledged in the West by, among others, Gregory the Great (540–604), Petrus Lombardus, Bonaventure, and the entire Scholastic theology, it is only in the 13th century that the doctrine on the state and purpose of the post-mortem purgation (which by then was localized in ‘spatial’ terms) was fully developed.140 This purgation was understood

---


139 BYNUM, Resurrection of the Body, p. 135.

as the cleansing of the venial sins and the payment of the debt of temporal punishment for those mortal sins that had been remitted in life. Suffrages of the Church for the dead (masses, vigils, prayer, and indulgences) could shorten the period of purgation of the souls or lessen their pain.

In this shift towards an interest in the fate of the soul, two medieval Arab philosophers exercised major influence in the 13th century. Both Avicenna and Averroes stood in the Aristotelian tradition but arrived at...
His position on the purgatorial fire and Hell was to help shape the Reformers’ position. According to him, Hell is a place where nothing detracts from the torment of the damned (nihil in inferno vacet a tormento eorum, qui creatori placere et servire recusaverunt), and where all of the sins ever committed against God are perfectly avenged. He believed that the fear of infernal punishment was a great social utility because it deterred sinners from sinning. The pains of Purgatory, on the other hand, will complete the expiation of those sins not fully atoned for in life. “Thus the pains of purgatory have their beginnings in the anguish of pence, which, if it is not completed in life, is perfected in purgatory.” Since this process of purification begins with penance and ends in the pains of Purgatory, William held that Purgatory, too, has a deterrent effect, as the fear of purgatorial pains induces sinners to repent sooner and to complete their penance in this life. William maintained that the pains of Purgatory and the torments of Hell that affect the separated souls are to be understood as

---

144 Wilham of Auvergne, De universo corporali et spirituali, I, 100 (p. 665(673)b C); cf. William of Auvergne, De moribus, p. 211a C. His collected works were published in: William of Auvergne, Guillemi Alverni, episcopi Parisiensis, ..., Opera omnia, quae hactenus impressa potuerunt, tomis duobus contenta, reconditissimam rerum humanarum, ac divinarum doctrinarum ab omnibus composita, ac proinde honarum artium, ac scientiarum studiosis, maximè verò theologis, ac divini verbi concionatoribus, approbò necessaria/ nunc demum in hac posteriori editione ab innumeris errorum chiliadibus expurgata, instaurata, elucida, atque fide integra ad authoris sensum recognita, ut ex praefatione ad lectorem apertius intelligatur per Ioannem Dominicum Traianum Neapolitanum., Venetiis: Ex Officina Damiani Zenari, 1591. Modern reprint is based on the 1674 Paris edition: William of Auvergne, Opera omnia, Frankfurt, 1963. Page numbers refer to the latter edition.


146 Bernstein, Esoteric Theology, p. 511. Cf. William of Auvergne, De universo corporali et spirituali, p. 678a H.

corporeal fire. Yet, this fire is not comparable to the physical fire of this world, for this post-mortem fire torments the soul but does not consume the body. “It is the metaphorical fire of passion, desire, anguish. William did not use the term metaphor, but he stated that there is no actual fire or heat in the soul.” Just as God could send fire and brimstone to punish Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19:24) and could punish the pharaoh and his people with fire (Ex. 9:23), it is possible for God to create a fire that avenges all of the injuries ever committed against him, William argued. And just as God could address Moses in a fire that did not consume the burning bush (Ex. 3:2), William maintained, God could also create a fire that can torment the souls of the wicked and avenge their sins.

The most elaborate and systematic treatment of questions concerning the afterlife in this Aristotelian revival is found in the *Summa Theologica* of Saint Thomas Aquinas (c.1225–74), which became the standard doctrine for centuries. He thoroughly incorporated Aristotle's philosophy

---

148 “Non igitur abhorreant, aut mirentur, si ignis corporalis aliquis est, qui animas humanas et in corporibus, et a corporibus separatas torquere valeat” (William of Auvergne, *De universo corporali et spirituali*, p. 680b F).


151 “Si juxta legem Hebraeorum igni qui prophetae ipsorum in rubo apparuit, vel datum, vel ablatum est contra naturam suam propriam, et ipsius rubi, vel forsitans novus ignis talis ab omnipotente creatore creatus est tunc, materiam combustilibem, in qua esset, non combureret, quomodo non verisimile est, ut propter exercendam tam ant Dei justitiam talis ignis creatus sit, qui torquere possit animas impiorum, et vindicare in eis injurias Deo altissimo irrogatas?” (William of Auvergne, *De universo corporali et spirituali*, p. 680b G).

into his own theology. According to Thomas, the human person is the unity of soul and body: the body is the matter and the soul is the form of the human person, according to the Aristotelian system of *hylomorphism*. The soul, however, is incorruptible; it does not die at death but survives the body and retains its rational functionality. This separate state of the soul from the body is not a natural state, because the soul is an incomplete reality without the body. Therefore, the soul has a natural tendency to unite with the body, and in the interim the soul awaits the resurrection, when it will be completed. Upon death, the soul is judged immediately in a particular judgement, which determines its fate during the interim between death and the final resurrection at the end of the world: Heaven or Hell, unless it needs to be cleansed. Those who are already purified in life enter immediately into the *visio beatifica*. They can obtain favours for the living; hence, Aquinas recommended praying to them for their intercession. Those who are in need of purification from the effects of venial sins or the temporal punishments of their remitted sins are purged before they are allowed into the beatific vision. During their purgation, souls can be assisted by prayer or the Eucharist celebrated on their behalf. The damned enter into the fires of Hell upon the particular judgement. Their lot is irreversible; the damned cannot be helped. There is another category of dead for Aquinas: those who died before the coming of Christ and the infants who die without baptism. Since baptism is necessary for salvation, they cannot enter into the beatific vision, but they are not damned either. Aquinas believed that these individuals are in a special place situated at the verge of Hell; hence, he called it “Limbo” (*limbus*). The saints of the OT had been kept in *Limbus Patrum* since their death, whence they were liberated by Christ’s coming, while the unbaptised children will stay in

---

Limbus Infantium eternally. At the end of the world, Christ judges the whole of humankind at the general judgement. The whole world will be renewed, and the resurrected body will be immortal and incorruptible. After the resurrection no further purgation is possible. The bliss of the blessed will be even greater, for their souls will be united with their bodies. The damned will be eternally committed to Hell, which lies beneath the earth.

Thomas Aquinas’ position on the threefold destiny of the soul after death and the solidarity between the Churches Militant, Suffering, and Triumphant is closely connected to his soteriology, ethics, hamartiology, and sacramentology. Thomas, rooted in medieval Scholastic theology, differentiated between the twofold effect of sin: guilt (culpa) and punishment (poena). A further distinction was made between mortal (peccatum mortale) and venial (peccatum veniale) sins. In the sacrament of penance, three acts are involved: contrition (contritio cordis), confession (confessio oris), and satisfaction (satisfactio operis). By God’s grace, 

159 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Suppl. qu. 69. art. 4–6. Although the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1992) still left the question open (cf. nos. 1257–61), the *International Theological Commission*, originally commissioned by Pope John Paul II, states that “the many factors that we have considered […] give serious theological and liturgical grounds for hope that unbaptized infants who die will be saved and enjoy the beatific vision.” Nonetheless, it emphasizes “that these are reasons for prayerful hope, rather than grounds for sure knowledge” (*The Hope of Salvation for Infants Who Die without Being Baptized*, ITC, April 22, 2007).


163 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Suppl. qu. 97. art. 7; qu. 99. art. 3.

164 Augustine had already differentiated between the two: see supra on p. 99.

165 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II-I. qu. 88. art. 1. He refers to Augustine’s distinction between lethal and minute sins. See supra on p. 98. On the Scholastic authors, see supra on p. 107.

166 “Sic igitur requiritur ex parte poenitentis, primo quidem, voluntas recompensandi, quod fit per contritionem; secundo, quod se subiiiciat arbitrio sacerdotis loco Dei, quod
through contrition of the heart and auricular confession, absolution from guilt (culpa) can be obtained. But justice demands that the damage caused should be repaired; thus, satisfaction should be made for the temporal punishment (poena). Satisfaction has a double purpose, namely, to pay the debt caused by the committed sin (punitive purpose) and to serve as a remedy in order to avoid future sin (restorative purpose). It can be achieved by means of penitential works done either during this life or in Purgatory. The purification of the soul in Purgatory constitutes the expiation of punishment required for entering glory. In other words, works of satisfaction purify the person to reconcile himself or herself with God and prepare him or her for the beatific vision. Indeed, penitential works such as prayer, fasting, and almsgiving gradually heal the malady of the soul from the effects of sin. The Doctor Angelicus also maintained that the saints performed works of satisfaction exceeding the requirements of their debts, and that these ‘superfluous’ merits together with Christ’s vicarious satisfaction for humankind, stored in the Church’s Treasury (thesaurus ecclesiae, cf. Ws. 7:14), are common property of the Church and can be dispensed in the form of indulgences to the various

fit in confessione; tertio, quod recompenset secundum arbitrium ministri Dei, quod fit in satisfactione. Et ideo contritio, confessio et satisfacitio ponuntur partes poenitentiae" (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III. qu. 90. art. 2).

167 In baptism, however, both guilt and punishment are washed away: “in Baptismo, ubi fit plena remissio peccatorum et quantum ad culpam et quantum ad poenam” (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, III. qu. 84. art. 1).


169 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Suppl. qu. 15. art. 1. In connection with Aquinas’ speculations about the question of whether a crusader receives full indulgence even if he dies before having reached the Holy Land, Cessario rightly remarks that “the power of Christ’s love works differently in one who is still a member of the church on earth than it does in one who has died. The need for spiritual discipline and reformation of life implies that the first one must continue on as part of the church on earth, for death marks the end of a person’s deliberate involvement in the process of salvation. And since the good works of one individual do not appreciate another’s spiritual discipline, Aquinas counsels penance even for the individual who does survive the crusade. Even though the successful completion of the indulgenced work replaces the punitive satisfaction, the crusader still needs to do penance for spiritual growth and maturity” (CESSARIO, *St. Thomas Aquinas on Satisfaction, Indulgences, and Crusades*, p. 94).

170 “Purgatio animae per poenas purgatorii non est alius quam expiatio reatus impeditentis a perceptione gloriae: et quia per poenam quam unus sustinet pro alio, potest reatus alterius expiari, ut dictum est, non est inconveniens, si per unius satisfactionem alius purgetur” (Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum super libros sententiarium magistri Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis*, Lib. IV, Dist. 45, qu 2. art. 2 quinquies ad 3).

171 Thomas Aquinas, *Questiones de quolibet*, II, qu. 8 art. 2.
individuals who remain united in the bond of charity with the Church. But the foundation of indulgences is essentially Christological, for it is ultimately the satisfaction of Christ that remains the principal source of the thesaurus ecclesiae, because Christ’s suffering suffices. The dispensation of this treasure belongs to the Pope because he is the person who is in charge of the whole Church, since the Lord gave the keys of the kingdom of Heaven to Peter (Mt. 16:19). The ultimate ground for the possibility of sharing in the good works associated with Christ and the saints is the union in charity. Accordingly, from a juridical point of view, “indulgences constitute commutations of satisfactory works attached to particular deeds, such as prayers, pilgrimages, or other burdensome actions, including the risky and painful undertaking of military combat” (i.e. crusades). Therefore, an indulgence can replace satisfaction insofar as it is punitive, because the punishment suffered by someone else is imputed to the person who receives the indulgence, and consequently the debt of punishment is removed. Yet, an indulgence does not replace satisfaction insofar as it is remedial, since the disposition to sin due to prior sins still remains, the cure for which necessarily requires the works of satisfaction. Aquinas underlines that indulgences are completely

---


173 “Nec ad hoc requiritur aliquis labor; quia sufficit labor passionis Christi” (Thomas Aquinas, Questiones de quolibet, II, qu. 8 art. 2 ad 3). See also: Thomas Aquinas, Summa Contra Gentiles IV, 55. Cf. Cessario, St. Thomas Aquinas on Satisfaction, Indulgences, and Crusades, pp. 91 and 95–96.

174 Thomas Aquinas, Questiones de quolibet, II, qu. 8 art. 2; Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica, Suppl. qu. 25. art. 1.

175 “Omnes qui sunt in caritate, sunt quasi unum corpus; et ita bonum unius redundat in omnes, sicut manus deservit toti corpori, et similiter quodlibet corporis membrum” (Thomas Aquinas, Questiones de quolibet, II, qu. 7 art. 2). Cf. “Ratio autem quare valere possunt, est unitas corporis mystici, in qua multi operibus poenitentiae supererogaverunt ad mensuram debitorum suorum et multas etiam tribulationes injuste sustinuerunt, per quas multitudo poenarum poterat expiari” (Thomas Aquinas, Scriptum super libros sententiarum, Lib. IV, Dist. 20, qu. 1, art. 3 quæst 1).

176 Cessario, St. Thomas Aquinas on Satisfaction, Indulgences, and Crusades, pp. 82–83.

177 “Indulgentia ergo supplet locum satisfactionis, in quantum est punitiva: quia scilicet poena quam alius sustinuit, imputatur isti ac si ipse sustinuisset, et ideo reatus poenae tollitur” (Thomas Aquinas, Questiones de quolibet, II, qu. 8 art. 2 ad 3).

178 “[Indulgentia] non succedit in locum satisfactionis in quantum est medicativa, quia adhuc remanent proritatas ad peccandum derelictae ex priori peccato, ad quas sanandas
useless for those who have committed a mortal sin and have not repented, for true contrition and confession are demanded as conditions *sine qua non* for gaining all indulgences; they only benefit those who have exercised contrition and confessed their sins.\(^{179}\) He also stresses the point that only God can forgive the offence of sin (*culpa*). Therefore, when the Pope gives a plenary indulgence, this indulgence should not be applied to the offence (*culpa*), but only to the totality of punishments (*poena*): for example, the man who accepted the crusader’s cross will not suffer punishment (*poena*) for his sins, provided that he had achieved the full remission of the offence of sin (*culpa*) through contrition and confession.\(^{180}\) In short, three conditions have to be met for an indulgence to be beneficial and valid: “(1) the work must involve a cause pertaining to the honour of God or the needs of the Church; (2) the indulgence must be established by a duly constituted authority; (3) the one who receives the indulgence must already enjoy that union of charity in which the whole reality of the church consists.”\(^{181}\)

Although Aquinas’ theology of indulgences represented the orthodox position and was repeatedly confirmed by ecclesiastical authorities, his Christological foundation and soteriological perspective were lost on many Christians of his age and of subsequent centuries, and indulgences were reduced in practice to a mercantile view of redemption “as a spiritual deposit-and-withdrawal system for building up heavenly merits, as if they were so much interest in a bank account.”\(^{182}\) At first, indulgences were dispensed to those who did penitential works, of which the most commendable was almsgiving, expressing the solidarity of the believers.\(^{183}\) In order to distribute alms most effectively, official managers of indulgences, so-called *questors* (*pardoners* in popular parlance) were appointed

---

\(^{179}\) Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Suppl. qu. 27. art. 1.

\(^{180}\) Thomas Aquinas, *Questiones de quolibet*, II, qu. 8 art. 2 ob.1.


\(^{182}\) Cessario, *St. Thomas Aquinas on Satisfaction, Indulgences, and Crusades*, p. 77.

whose job was to collect alms and redistribute it among the most needy. Questors were not allowed to absolve sins (remit *culpa*), only to dispense indulgences for the temporal punishment (*poena*) of confessed sins. Nor were they allowed to sell indulgences, but only to collect alms in order to redistribute them to the widest circle of beneficiaries. Abuses, however, developed throughout the centuries, and pardoners were reported to have claimed impertinently to absolve ‘*a culpa et a poena*.’\(^{184}\) Although several pieces of legislation were passed to eradicate abuses, ecclesiastical authorities had trouble carrying these out, especially when charity work, the financial interest of the Church, or the realization of valuable ventures (e.g. the building of hospitals, bridges, or churches) was concerned.\(^{185}\)

But it was not just the practice of indulgences that was problematic. During the Middle Ages several individuals and groups with heterodox beliefs arose who questioned the teachings of the Church on the post-mortem existence. The Waldensians or ‘Poor Men of Lyons’ (followers of Peter Waldo or Pierre de Vaux, d. 1218) denied the existence of Purgatory and the validity of suffrages for the dead, and they apparently doubted the resurrection of the flesh and that the risen Christ truly ate and drank in the same flesh in which he ascended into Heaven.\(^{186}\) The Gnostically inspired movements of Paulicians (7th–8th c.), Bogomils (10th c.), and Cathars (Albigensians; 11th–13th c.), with a strong Manichaean dualistic view, regarded the material world as the creation of a lesser God, and thus

\(^{184}\) E.g. Clement V’s catalogue of the abuses practiced by questors testifies to such an abuse: “et aliqui ex ipsis […] a poena et a culpa […] abolveri volentes” (*Corpus Iuris Canonici*, ed. Aemilius Friedberg, Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1922, II, 1190). Cf.: “That pardoners frequently if not usually absolved ‘*a poena et a culpa*’ cannot be doubted, but such absolution was an abuse and occupies an important place in Clement V’s catalogue of the abuses practiced by pardoners” (Kellogg & Haselmayer, *Chaucer’s Satire of the Pardoner*, p. 252).

\(^{185}\) “Enforcement, however, was a very different matter. Churches and bridges were built, the poor fed, the sick healed, all on the proceeds of indulgences. If those proceeds failed, construction of the church stopped, the care of the sick ceased. There was always a temptation on the part of the regular clergy who operated the great hospitals to avoid the regulations that their collectors be brothers ‘idonei et bone conversationis’ and to employ less worthy but more productive brothers. There was likewise pressure to farm out collection rights to groups of professional questors who were willing to pay a good round sum for making unrestricted use of the indulgences granted the hospital” (Kellogg & Haselmayer, *Chaucer’s Satire of the Pardoner*, p. 258). For an overview of the efforts to eliminate abuses, see: Hagedorn, *General Legislation on Indulgences*; Kellogg & Haselmayer, *Chaucer’s Satire of the Pardoner*, pp. 251–59.

despised the body, from which the soul had to be freed. They believed that Christ had no real body and did not die or rise. Other Cathars held that Christ’s body was left behind at the ascension and rotted away.187 They also rejected Hell and Purgatory, held that the veneration of the saints and relics was idolatry because the body will never rise, and adopted the idea of the transmigration of souls.188 The Amauricians (or Almaricians, followers of Amaury of Bène d. c.1206) denied the reality of the body (in fact, they denied the reality of anything except the spirit), and accordingly allowed all sorts of license to the body and claimed that the Holy Spirit was the resurrection.189 Similar ideas were held later by the heretics of Free Spirit. In 1270 the University of Paris condemned thirteen propositions, including the corruption of the soul (as a form of the human person) at death and the denial of the possibilities that the separated soul could suffer from corporeal fire and that God can give incorruptibility and immortality to corruptible and mortal beings.190 In England the Lollards—the followers of John Wycliffe (c.1324–84)—and in Central Europe the Hussites—the followers of John Huss (c.1370–1415)—called into question the veneration of the saints.191 Although Wycliffe accepted the need for a post-mortem purgation of the souls, he contested that it could be localized.

The first part of the 14th century even witnessed a ‘papal heresy,’ when the opinion of Pope John XXII (1249–1334) on the beatific vision and the post-mortem fate of the soul caused theological controversy.192 Starting on

188 Wakefield & Evans, Heresies of the High Middle Ages, pp. 269–70 and 301–46.
192 “Nenhum dos autores consultados defende que o papa João XXII quis definir algo quando falou em suas homilias sobre a visão beatífica. Ao contrário, baseados nas palavras do próprio papa, afirmam que este emitiu a sua opinião sobre esta matéria, como teólogo privado” (Antonio Augusto Brum Hofmeister, Benedictus Deus. Aproximação ao conteúdo escatológico dogmaticamente definido pelo Papa Bento XII na Constituição de 1236, Promotor: Eduardo da Silva Santos, Master’s thesis, Universidade Católica Do Rio Grande
All Saints' Day in 1331, the Pope expressed his position in six sermons given over the course of several years (1331–33) that the souls of the righteous go into Abraham’s bosom, or sub altari Dei, and do not enjoy the beatific vision (visio facie ad faciem) of the Lord until after the Last Judgement and the resurrection of their bodies.\(^{193}\) His suggestion, never expressed as an ex cathedra teaching, could be understood as an implicit questioning of the possibility of the intercessions of saints and scandalized the sensum fidei of most of his contemporaries exciting reactions all over Europe.\(^{194}\) Counter to the Pope, twenty-nine theologians of the Faculty of Theology of Sorbonne declared that the souls of the blessed were indeed elevated to the beatific vision immediately after death (2 January 1334).\(^{195}\) Other

---

\(^{193}\) “Animae ergo sanctae ante diem judicii sunt sub altare, id est, sub consolatione et protectione humanitatis Christi; sed post diem judicii ipse elevabit eas, ut videant ipsam divinitatem et secundum hoc dicerunt ascendere supra altare” (John XXII, Sermo in Festivitate Omnium Sanctorum, II, 7 in Dykmans, Les sermons de Jean XXII sur la vision béatifique, p. 96)).

\(^{194}\) Trottmann, Deux interprétations contradictoires, p. 327. The Pope did not call into question the private judgement or the consciousness of the souls after death but proposed that the reward or punishment of the deceased will only be attributed when the souls are joined with their bodies. Cf.: “Joan XXII va sostenir, els Últims anys de la seva vida, una lluita aferrisada per a defensar una opinió —la ‘seva’ opinió com a teòleg— sobre l’ajornament de la visió beatífica dels benaurats fins el Dia del Judici Universal. Per a situar correctament l’anomenada opinió de Joan XXII, cal començar dient que el papa mai no havia dubtat del judici immediat a la mort i d’un començament de recompensa o de càstig (cel o infern) per als qui moren en gràcia de Déu o en pecat mortal” (Gil, La benaurança del cel i l’ordre establert, p. 47).

\(^{195}\) The theologians were of the opinion that the Pope should have propounded his doctrine only “rectando,” and not “determinando, asserendo, seu etiam opinando.” John XXII assembled his consistory to reply to the Paris theologians. They regarded the Pope’s
opponents of the pope’s theological position included among others Guillaume Durand de Saint-Pourçain, bishop of Meaux, the Neapolitan king Robert of Anjou, (writing under his title “king of Jerusalem and of Sicily), Juan III de Aragón y Anjou, archbishop of Toldeo and Latin Partiarch of Alexandria, Cardinal Annibale Gaetani di Ceccano, bishop of Frascati and former archbishop Naples, as well as Jacques Fournier, John XXII’s successor, the later pope Benedict XII. The controversy eventually subsided when John XXII retracted his former position one day before his death and declared that the purified departed souls are admitted into Heaven and enjoy the beatific vision immediately upon their death.

The subject of the immortality of the soul received much attention from the philosophers over the course of the 14th and 15th centuries. The incentive was given by the Greek Platonist Georgius Pletho (c.1355–1452). He argued in his De differentiis (1439), the book that inaugurated the celebrated Plato-Aristotle controversy of the Renaissance, that Averroes was a false interpreter of Aristotle when he claimed that the latter believed in the mortality of the soul. The question remained much debated throughout the entire 15th century. The most systematic treatment of the question was presented by the Humanist Marsilio Ficino (1433–99), the most prominent and most influential philosopher of the Italian

answer as a sign of papal absolutism, spoke of “the new heretic, Jacques de Cahors,” and reiterated emphatically their demands for the convocation of a general council to try the Pope, which was prevented by the death of the Pope (DYKMANS, Les sermons de Jean XXII sur la vision béatifique, p. 186).

197 *Animae purgatae separatae a corporibus sunt in caelo, caelorum regno et paradiso et cum Christo in consortio angelorum congregatae et vident Deum de communi lege ac divinam essentiam facie ad faciem clare, in quantum status et condicio compatitur animae separatae* (Ne super hüs (sic) (DH 990–91)).
The main work of the Italian Humanist was his *Theologia Platonica. De animarum Immortalitate*, published in 1482 in Florence, in which he argues for the immortality of the soul based on his Christianized Neo-Platonic view. Following Pletho, Ficino opposed the Averroists’ denial of personal immortality. Death is the liberation of the immortal soul from the body (*mors est animae a corpore liberatio*), he argued. The life after this life is a continuation of the earthly life: after death, the soul preserves its inclination as reward or punishment. Despite his dualistic Neo-Platonist anthropology, Ficino also embraced the idea of the resurrection of the body. This, in his understanding, is by no means the revival of the earthly body but the re-creation of a most pure body (*purissimum corpus*) at the end of the world.

In 1516, Pietro Pomponazzi’s *Tractatus de immortalitate animae* (Bologna, 1516) also addressed the question of immortality. Pomponazzi denied the possibility that the immortality of the soul could be proved on

---


Pomponazzi was declared a heretic in Venice and his book was burned publicly in 1516. Pomponazzi responded with a more detailed statement of his position in his *Apologia Petri Pomponatii* (1517) the following year and in his *Defensorium adversus Augustinum Niphum* (1519) two years later. Under the influence of the writings of Alexander of Aphrodisias, Pomponazzi maintained that only the *intellectus agens*, which he identified with God, is one and the same in every person. The intellective soul is the same as the sensitive soul, and is therefore mortal. In death, it becomes deprived of the body upon which it depends for its object (*dependet a corpore ut objecto*). Accordingly, it can no longer act and must perish with the body. Pomponazzi also denied the possibility of miracles, and the efficacy of prayer and relics. He claimed that these were merely inventions to enforce morality. Based on the doctrine of ‘double truth,’ Pomponazzi nonetheless held that his views were true in philosophy but false in theology.

These proposed ideas of the theologians and philosophers as well as the heretical movements provoked a series of official declarations of the Church defining the questions concerning post-mortem life in ever more detail. Peter Waldo was required to confess in 1180 or 1181 that the resurrection will be of “this flesh and no other,” that Christ’s sufferings in the body were real, that he truly ate and drank in the same flesh that ascended into Heaven, and that alms and prayers benefited the dead. The Fourth Lateran Council promulgated in 1215 the creed *Firmiter credimus*, declaring that the human person is composed of flesh and a rational soul (*ex anima rationali et humana carne compositus*), and that at the Last Judgement the souls will be rewarded with eternal glory with Christ (*cum Christo gloriam sempiternam*) or perpetual torment with the devil (*cum diabolo poenam perpetuam*) according to their deeds (*secundum opera sua*).

The Council asserted that all will rise with their own individual bodies, which they now wear (*omnes cum suis propriis resurgent corporibus quae nunc gestant*). Simony was condemned, as was the abuse of indulgences and relics. The Council did not make a pronouncement on the interim state

---


210 Wakefield & Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages*, pp. 204–06.

211 DH 801 (DS 429).

212 DH 801 (DS 429).

213 DH 818–20 (DS 440).
of the soul. In his bull in 1254 Pope Innocent IV (pope 1243–54) gave the first official designation *Purgatorium* to the place of purgation and differentiated it from Hell as a destination, depending on whether one died in mortal sin with or without the satisfaction of penance (*animas illorum, qui, suscepfa paenitentia, ea non peracta, vel qui sine mortali peccato, cum venialibus tamen et minutis decedunt*).\(^{214}\) Innocent refers to Mt. 12:32 and 1 Cor. 3:13–15 as the biblical proofs for the existence of purgatorial fire, which, as he points out, is also held by the Orthodox Church (*ipsi Graeci vere ac indubitanter credere ac affirmare dicantur*). The souls in Purgatory can be helped by suffrages (*posse suffragiis Ecclesiae adiuvari*). Yet, capital crimes cannot be cleansed, and the souls who died without penitence will be eternally tormented (*aeternae gehennae ardoribus perpetuo cruciatur*). But the souls of baptized children and those having died in the state of grace pass immediately into the eternal home (*ad patriam protinus transvolant sempiternam*).\(^{215}\) In 1274, the Council of Lyons repeated the assignment of the souls to Heaven, Purgatory, or Hell immediately after death. The Council confirmed the efficacy of suffrages, masses, prayers, and alms in helping the souls in Purgatory.\(^{216}\) On the Day of Judgement everyone will have to appear before the tribunal of Christ with their resurrected bodies to render an account of what they have done.\(^{217}\) In 1312, the Council of Vienne stated that the intellectual soul is the form of the body.\(^{218}\) The successor of Pope John XXII, Benedict XII (pope 1334–42), reiterated the position taken in his predecessor’s final statement of retraction in the bull *Benedictus Deus* (29 January 1336), and decreed definitely (*in perpetuum valitura Constitutione auctoritate Apostolica diffinimus*) that purified souls enjoy the beatific vision immediately, even before the general judgement (*etiam ante resumptionem suorum corporum et iudicium generale*).\(^{219}\) They are in Heaven with Christ and the angels (*sunt et erunt in caelo, caelorum regno et paradiso caelesti cum Christo, sanctorum Angelorum consortio congregatae*), where the divine essence immediately manifests itself plainly.

\(^{214}\) “Nos, quia locum purgationis huiusmodi dicunt non fuisse sibi ab eorum doctoribus certo et proprio nomine indicatum, illum quidem iuxta traditiones et auctoritates sanctorum Patrum ‘Purgatorium’ nominantes volumus, quod de cetero apud ipsos isto nomine appelletur” (DH 838 (DS 456)).

\(^{215}\) DH 839 (DS 457).

\(^{216}\) “Ad poenas huiusmodi relevandas prodesse eis fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes et eleemosynas et alia pietatis officia, quae a fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus fieri consueverunt secundum Ecclesiae instituta” (DH 855 (DS 464)).

\(^{217}\) DH 856 (DS 464).

\(^{218}\) DH 902 (DS 481). See *supra* on p. 110 n. 152.

\(^{219}\) DH 1000 (DS 530).
clearly, and openly to them *(divina essentia immediate se nude, clare et aperte eis ostendente)*, and in this vision they enjoy the divine essence *(sic videntes eadem divina essentia perfruuntur)*. At the general judgment human persons with their bodies will have to render an account of their deeds before the tribunal of Christ. A century later, the Council of Ferrara-Florence (1438–39) recapitulated the official teaching on the fate of the souls: the penitent souls that die without fulfilling their penance have to be purified after death, and the living faithful can assist them in this process. The immaculate or completely purified souls are immediately received into Heaven, where they contemplate the triune God in His essence *(intueri clare ipsum Deum trinum et unum, sicuti est)* but in various degrees according to their merits *(pro meritorum tamen diversitate alium alio perfectius)*. Lastly, the souls in a state of mortal sin or subject to original sin descend into Hell, where they are punished with torments. The immortality of the soul was promulgated at the Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17). During Session VIII (1513), the council fathers condemned all that held the soul to be mortal: *Damnamus et reprobamus omnes asserentes animam intellectivam mortalem esse*.

---
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226 During Session X (4 May 1515), the council fathers also treated the matter of the printing press. They declared that the invention and improvement of the printing press had happened with the assistance of God, and that it had brought “many benefits to men and women” because “it is possible to possess a great number of books at small expense.” These permit people to devote themselves to scholarly studies. But since there had been scandals caused by books “containing errors opposed to the faith as well as pernicious
To conclude our survey of the views of post-mortem beliefs in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance, we can observe that theologians were not the only ones to show interest in the subject; philosophers and lay people also manifested concerns. Various positions were formulated: while philosophers concentrated on the metaphysical aspects of the post-mortem existence, the lay people and popular heterodox movements were concerned with the practical aspects of such beliefs. Thomas Aquinas was undoubtedly the foremost theologian of the era and his whose influence was felt for centuries. His theology constituted a balanced mix of orthodoxy and orthopraxis formulated in the language of the philosophy of his time based on Aristotle's writings. The official pronouncements of the Church show an incorporation of his theological language and the Aristotelian philosophy.

views contrary to the Christian religion and to the reputation of prominent persons of rank," the council decreed that all printed books should be examined before publication. Other subjects treated at the council were: the condemnation and rejection of the decrees of the conciliabulum of Pisa (1511), the abrogation of the French Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, peace among Christian rulers, church reform, and the defence of the faith against heresies. The council republished the bull of Julius (1505–06), which stated that simony invalidated a papal election.
CHAPTER THREE

VIEWS ON POST-MORTEM EXISTENCE IN THE EARLY REFORMATION PERIOD

INTRODUCTION

To understand the debate between William Tyndale and George Joye, it is essential to put it into its proper historico-theological context, namely, an ongoing theological dialogue resulting from the attempt of the early Reformers to reformulate the Christian faith by returning to what they understood as the original message of the Bible. This attempt by the early 16th-century theologians, which touched on all subjects of theology—dogmatics, ethics, liturgy, pastoral theology, cannon law, and even church history, ultimately all rooted in exegesis—was particularly productive on issues concerning some aspects of the post-mortem existence, even if the subject is treated systematically only subsequent to the Tyndale–Joye debate. It is clear from the previous chapter that this interest in post-mortem existence in the early Reformation period was neither unique nor without precedent. What was new, however, in the early Reformation period was the unanimous rejection of previous Scholastic theology by Protestant authors. In trying to establish a new, exclusively biblical foundation of the theology of post-mortem existence, the Reformers articulated opinions that bore similarities to many earlier propositions. These similarities, in most cases, were not the result of direct dependence, but their Catholic partners in the dialogue were keen to point them out, and in that regard it is useful to connect the position of the Reformers with the previously formulated standpoints.

The presentation of this ongoing theological quest will start with Wessel Gansfort’s views on post-mortem existence. Although he lived before the Reformation and was not a Reformer, his works were published during the early Reformation period and influenced Luther and other Protestant writers profoundly. After Gansfort’s ideas come the views of Catholic Reformer Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples. In his theology, an evolution can be detected from the defence of Catholic teaching to the profession of a more Protestant point of view. The positions taken by Martin Luther, Andreas Karlstadt, Gerhard Westerburg, Philipp Melanchthon, Huldrych Zwingli, Martin Bucer, Bartholomäus Westheimer, Heinrich Bullinger, Simon
Fish, William Tracy, John Frith, and William Roye are then discussed. Of the reactions by Catholic apologists to the Protestant propositions, only the views of Thomas More and John Fisher are reviewed in some detail (together with a summary of a number of Catholic books defending Purgatory), as only these were relevant to the Tyndale–Joye debate. Finally, a short summary of the theology of the Anabaptists (a movement rather than a single author) is presented, as they, too, played a role in the controversy. The section discussing this group of radical Reformers is placed at the end of the chapter due to the fact that they were treated by their contemporaries as outsiders from mainstream Christianity. Both their theological views and their threatened position in society were to play an important role in the Tyndale–Joye debate.

A few methodological remarks should help the reader in following the train of thought in this chapter. (1) The ideas will be discussed by author rather than chronologically or thematically. Although this makes it more difficult to see an evolution and establish the interrelatedness of the ideas proposed (the presentation of which is not possible within the scope of this work), it will be easier to identify individual influences on the Tyndale–Joye debate itself and will make the identification of sources and judgements on their use easier. (2) None of the authors discussed treat post-mortem existence in a systematic or comprehensive way during the period examined. Protestant authors usually treated the subject of post-mortem existence in commentaries, sermons, or other, more general works. Consequently, their positions are not always clear, and not every aspect of such beliefs is covered. Their Catholic opponents usually reacted to the disputed positions, and their treatment of the question is focused only on those aspects that are called into question. It will therefore be impossible to present an all-embracing and complete picture of the authors. Also, points that bore little or no relevance to the debate were left out of consideration. (3) Although it may seem at times circumstantial, some attention will be paid to a number of *ad hominem* arguments made in various debates in the era. The reason for doing so is to familiarize the reader with the tone of such debates at that time so he or she is able to make better assessments of *ad hominem* arguments in the Tyndale–Joye debate.

**Wessel Gansfort**

In his known works, all dating from the last ten years he spent in his home town of Groningen, the Frisian theologian Jan Wessel Gansfort (or Goesport c.1410–89), a former student of Thomas à Kempis (1380–1471),
held some controversial views with regard to the infallibility of the Pope and of the ecumenical councils, and he questioned the spiritual effect of indulgences. His ideas became influential among the early 16th-century Reformers and played an important role in shaping Protestant views on issues that included Purgatory and the afterlife. Gansfort is therefore often seen as a precursor of Luther.

One of his most influential writings was a collection of theses, random lists of propositions, parts of letters, and various sections of commentary

---


3 Some of his unconventional but not necessarily heretical insights were misunderstood and radicalized by the Reformation. On major theological issues he maintained the Catholic teaching (e.g. freedom of will, veneration of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, merits of good works, the necessity of both Scripture and Sacred Tradition, etc.). His books were placed on the index long after his death, and Gansfort himself was never silenced or questioned.
grouped together under the title Dr. Wesselus de Purgatorio. quis & quals is sit ignis purgatorius. De statu & profectu animarum post hanc vitam.4 The collection starts with three sets of axiomatic dogmatic propositions. The first set of 20 propositions concerns papal authority and jurisdiction in general, the second set of 13 propositions relates to papal authority with regard to indulgences, and the third set of 32 propositions affects the economy of grace and afterlife, including propositions on the Thesaurus Ecclesiae and on Purgatory.5 One of these propositions (no. 25) is that neither the authority of prelates nor the validity of the sacraments can constitute immunity to sin.6 In his next proposition (no. 26), Gansfort claimed that if someone cannot obtain immunity to sin for himself, neither can he decree impunity.7 It is not difficult to see how these words can be taken as a denial of the interrelatedness of the Militant and the Suffering Churches.8 Gansfort then argued that in order to be properly called a state of purgation, Purgatory has to purge one of impurities (sordes, hoc est, peccata).9 Thus, Purgatory is a fire, but not so much a tormenting fire as a purging one, cleansing the inner person or the soul. Through death the soul is liberated from its captive prison, but it still has to be purged of the impurities that cling to it even after it has been released from the flesh.10 Gansfort believed that this is the fire of which Paul wrote in 1 Cor. 3:11–15—the fire that will cleanse every person’s works. It is clear, Gansfort argues, that Paul speaks here metaphorically, and not of a physical building with earthly materials of hay, wood, or straw which can be burned by natural fire. It is therefore just as clear that the fire of which Paul speaks cannot be physical fire.11

4 The collection of Gansfort’s teachings entitled Farrago was published with Luther’s foreword in Wittenberg at the beginning of 1522. Modern reprint: Wessel Gansfort, Opera, Facsimile of the Edition Groningen 1614, Nieukoop: de Graaf, 1966 [hereafter: Gansfort, Opera omnia]. The collection concerning Purgatory (Dr. Wesselus de Purgatorio. quis & quals is sit ignis purgatorius. De statu & profectu animarum post hanc vitam) is found on pp. 826–52.

5 On indulgences and the thesaurus ecclesiae, see supra on p. 112.

6 “25. Neq[ue] Prelatorum auctoritas, neq[ue] sacramentorum veritas in hac vita immunem constituunt à peccato” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 829).

7 “26. Qui non potest immunem à peccato reperire, non potest impunem decernere” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 829).


9 “29. Purgatorium, ut si verè purgatorium sit, oportet ut sordes purget” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 829).

10 “Purgatorius ignis est, qui interioires hominis sordes etiam carne soluti comitantes purgat potius, quàm torquet” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 829).

11 Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 835.
Furthermore, Gansfort declares, physical pain or suffering by itself does not purify. Christ suffered a thousand times, yet he was not purified.¹² Nor will Lucifer ever be purged, despite his eternal torments.¹³ No physical fire can therefore purify; only spiritual fire purges the soul. The fire that purges the soul is therefore not physical, but rather the passion of fiery love (zelus ardentis amoris) towards God. The purging is then not so much penal, but rather a spiritual process (spirituale potiùs, quàm suppliciale) by which one grows gradually in the love of God (nisi augeatur, non purgatur).¹⁴ The state of the deceased is therefore not at all unpleasant, but rather fortunate, for there is no torment perpetrated by the devil and his angels at all.¹⁵ This is what Paul hints at when he comforts the Thessalonians about the fate of the deceased in 1 Thes. 4:13. This, Gansfort claimed, is also the state of transition from imperfection into perfection of which Augustine, Gregory the Great, and William of Auvergne wrote.¹⁶ If one understood this blissful state of the souls in Purgatory (which is a state rather than a place), one would rejoice for them.¹⁷ For in this miserable world, Gansfort describes, we do everything as if by lamplight (ad lumen lucernæ). But Purgatory is “the dawn of the approaching day which the happy wayfarers (the deceased, who are absolved from all their infirmities) traverse until the sun shall clearly rise before them.”¹⁸ Passing through Purgatory is a gradual enlightenment for the souls until they reach the full light and behold God’s presence.

He also taught that this illuminative purging is necessary for everyone, even the saints. Thus, Gansfort denied that the saints would enter into Paradise immediately after this life without first being purged. Once purged, the saints will reach a far better and more perfect state than Adam and Eve had in the Garden of Eden.¹⁹ Furthermore, this purging will take place

¹² “Omnium optimus, omnium pijssimus Dominus Iesus, mille cruciatus pertulit, nul-latenùs tamen purgatus” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 838).
¹³ “Lucifer æternos cruciatus perferet, nullatenùs purgabitur” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 838).
¹⁴ Gansfort, Opera omnia, pp. 833 and 838.
¹⁵ “In statu igitur non misero, non sub virga lictoris, aut in igne praeparato diabolo & angelis ejus sed sub disciplina Patris instituentis, & eorum quotidiano profectu gaudentis” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 834).
¹⁶ Gansfort, Opera omnia, pp. 829, 834, and 837. For Augustine, see supra on p. 99. For Gregory the Great, see supra on p. 106. For William of Auvergne, see supra on p. 108.
¹⁷ “Sunt igitur in tali statu quam si sciremus gauderemus” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 834).
¹⁸ “Solvente ab omnibus infirmitatibus […] transeunt in illucescente[m] & aspirantem diem felices viatores, donec eis conspicuos oriatur sol” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 856).
¹⁹ Gansfort, Opera omnia, pp. 833 and 860.
neither in Hell nor in Heaven, but in Paradise.\textsuperscript{20} Paradise and Purgatory are the same, for Paradise (as opposed to Heaven) is the medium between the sinners and the enlightened.\textsuperscript{21} When Christ told the repenting Good Thief on the cross that he would be with Jesus on that day in Paradise, he meant in “Purgatory,” Gansfort explained.\textsuperscript{22}

It is often claimed that because of this celestial and blissful view of Purgatory, Gansfort believed that the souls in Purgatory were cut off from the living Church and that the suffrages for the deceased had no meaning and were not desirable.\textsuperscript{23} That would mean that Gansfort separated the Church Militant on earth from the Church Suffering in Purgatory. Gansfort, however, claimed just the contrary. He asserted that having been released from this miserable life, he would want what God would want of him. And God would want him to proceed from the dawn of the approaching day into the light of the rising sun. He would have to pray for this, and this is also what the angels are praying for on behalf of the dead.\textsuperscript{24} We also pray for the angels so that their blessed desire for us would be effective. And that is also what the entire Church is praying for, or at least what it should be praying for, Gansfort asserted.\textsuperscript{25} And the deceased, on their part, pray for us that we shall be introduced into their happy society and that our prayers either for them or for ourselves will be more productive.\textsuperscript{26} In other words, Gansfort not only did not deny the interrelatedness of the Churches Militant and Suffering, but emphatically asserted their union, extending it even to the angels.

\textsuperscript{20} “In hac luce purgari post mortem in conspectu Domini preciosam, hujus purgationis purgatorium locum credo paradisum”; “in pugatorio, hoc est, in paradiso”; and “congruentissimusigiturlocuspurgationihui paradisus” (Gansfort, \textit{Opera omnia}, pp. 833, 857, and 863, respectively).

\textsuperscript{21} “Paradisus enim medius est debitores & comprehensores” (Gansfort, \textit{Opera omnia}, p. 860).

\textsuperscript{22} “Latro de cruce paradisum accepit purgatorium, quia interim adhuc viator” (Gansfort, \textit{Opera omnia}, p. 833).

\textsuperscript{23} E.g. “This point leads to Gansfort’s central argument: intercession for the souls in Purgatory is both undesirable and impossible. No one should want to free souls from this Purgatory of enlightenment, and intercession of the Church is, in any case, useless” (Koslofsky, \textit{Separating the Living from the Dead}, p. 133).

\textsuperscript{24} “Volet autem, ut ex illucescente die in lumen solis orientis procedam. Hoc orare debebo. Idipsum orant angeli pro defunctis” (Gansfort, \textit{Opera omnia}, p. 856).

\textsuperscript{25} “Oramus etiam & nos pro angelis, quando oramus ut eorum beata desideria de nobis fiant efficacia. Idipsum orat Ecclesia tota, vel orare debet” (Gansfort, \textit{Opera omnia}, p. 856).

\textsuperscript{26} “Orant pro nobis defuncti, ut in illorum felicem societatem traducemur […] Defuncotrum pro nobis, quàm nostra felici oratio, vel pro nobis, vel pro illis” (Gansfort, \textit{Opera omnia}, p. 856).
Gansfort, however, did criticize a certain contemporaneous Catholic practice of prayers for the souls in Purgatory. In these prayers the believer prayed for the dead as if they were still wayfarers because they sought and found not, and they called and were not answered (cf. Can. 5:6). In other words, the dead are identified with the bride in the Song of Songs. Of her, however, it is said that she is beautiful (tota pulchra) and spotless (immaculata; Can. 4:7), which cannot be said of the dead souls who are being purged. Therefore, Gansfort claimed, this prayer, albeit one emanating from piety, contains errors and is undesirable. Even piety does not justify the confusion of prayer with errors. But prayers for the sanctification and illumination of the souls, and that they may soon reach the full light and may behold all treasures of the house of God in Christ, are desirable to be offered to God by the miserable ones (miserabiles, i.e. the living). Such prayers are already being offered by the blessed angels and by the happy ones (felices, i.e. the dead) themselves, Gansfort accentuated. He claimed that such prayers offered wisely and righteously ascend and appear before God like incense (cf. Rev. 8:3f), and these prayers for the dead are called the baptism in the Holy Spirit, which the primitive Church practiced on behalf of the dead (1 Cor. 15:29).

It is clear from what has been said that Gansfort believed in the possibility of growth and progress for the human soul after death. In the process of purification, the soul is drawn to God by a diminishment of selfish love of the soul towards itself and a growth of love towards God. But he went a step further. For the Frisian theologian, the possibility of the soul growing and evolving after death also entails that the souls of those who never heard the Gospel during their earthly life will get a chance to know the Gospel after the physical death of the body. This is what the first letter of Peter refers to when it says that the Gospel was proclaimed even to the dead, in order that they might be judged as the persons in the flesh but live according to the spirit (propter hoc enim et mortuis evangelizatum est ut iudicentur quidem secundum homines in carne vivant autem secundum Deum spiritu. 1 Pt. 4:6). Gansfort was convinced that only those to whom the Gospel has been preached can be justifiably condemned.
The purpose of Christ’s descent into Hell (1 Pt. 3:18–22) was precisely to preach the Gospel to all who died before Christ and who are to be judged by Christ, in order that they may be justly judged through the preaching of Christ himself. Nonetheless, not every soul will be saved, because there are souls that reject the Gospel even when given this second chance.

To conclude the survey of Gansfort’s position on the post-mortem existence, a final remark should be made. While speaking about the state of the soul after death, Gansfort used the verb ‘to sleep’ (dormire) twice. He applied it to describe the rest of Lazarus’ soul at Abraham’s bosom (Vere dilecti, vere dato somno dormientes in pace in idipsum, & requiescentes) and in his exhortation to pray for the deceased (quemadmodum pro illis, ita pro dormientibus exorare). Despite occasional claims to the contrary, there is nothing to suggest that he would have believed that souls were unconscious after death, or that he would have believed in what later became known as ‘soul sleep’ (psychosomnolence). From Gansfort’s description of the gradual purification process and growth in the love of God, it is obvious that he conceived the souls of the departed to be active. It is therefore safe to conclude that Gansfort’s use of the expression ‘to sleep’ is simply an allusion to the biblical usage of the word.

Erasmus

Erasmus’ influence on the theology of the early Reformation period is immeasurable. His call to put the Bible into the hands of the common people, exemplified by the “ploughboy” (an idea popularized by Tyndale), had been followed by Luther, Tyndale, Joye, and many other translators. With his bilingual Greek-Latin NT editions, Erasmus supplied a readily available Greek text for these fresh vernacular translations. His choice of words, departing from the accepted parlance and attracting much criticism from traditionalist circles, was echoed not only in the new Protestant

---

32 “Omnes ergo per Christum judicandi ante per ipsum Christum, ut justè judicentur, praedicantem evangelisabuntur” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 845).
33 “14. Quòd illi evangelisati, post quàm Christus venit & evangelisavit, sinon credant, excusationem non habent de peccato” (Gansfort, Opera omnia, p. 846).
34 Gansfort, Opera omnia, pp. 849 and 851, respectively.
36 Some of the advocates of the idea of soul sleep were already interpreting Gansfort in such a way during the Reformation period.
translations but also in some Catholic Erasmian vernacular Bibles.37 His works were read and praised by the Reformers. His views on post-mortem existence therefore bear great significance for our study of the topic. In this regard, the clarifications of his motives in establishing, translating, and expounding upon the text of 1 Cor. 15:51 will receive particular attention, as Erasmus’ translation of the passage featured in three controversies, which accused him of “taking away resurrection” and questioned his orthodoxy. His Explanatio symboli apostolorum, an explanation of the Apostolic Creed and published in 1533, gives him the opportunity to explain the Catholic standpoint on the topic in detail. This book will be referred to by Joye in his Apologye, and is therefore of special interest to us.

In early 1519 Erasmus published his Paraphrases in the Two Letters of Paul to Corinthians in Leuven at the press of Dirk Martens.38 The preliminary matters included a dedicatory preface in the form of a letter dated 5 February to Érard de la Marck (1472–1538), prince-bishop of Liège (1506–38). In this prefatory letter Erasmus gave an account of the letters to the Corinthians. He described how in Paul’s time worldly (Greek) philosophy opposed the idea of resurrection of the dead, which, according to Erasmus, Paul believed to be the “foundation and the crown of our belief” (caput ac basis est nostræ professionis).39 In spite of Paul’s effort, Erasmus continued, this heresy still existed in Erasmus’ own time, “for in Italy every year in sermons before the people they try to defend the resurrection, thinking that they will be home and dry on this question, once they can show that Aristotle did not entirely abolish the immortality of the soul.”40 Apparently the sermons were ineffective, because “there are men, and particularly men in high worldly station, who live as if they have no belief whatever in a future life.”41 Erasmus continued by lamenting the fact that Paul has not written about such questions as

---

37 See e.g. Arblaster, Cats. 59, 60, 61, 66, 67, 80, 81, and 84 in TT, pp. 118–19, 123–24, and 133–37; Latré, Cat. 92 in TT, pp. 148–49; Juhász, Cats. 89, 90, 102, and 103 in TT, pp. 142–43; 159–61.

38 Erasmus, Paraphrasis in duas epistolæ Pauli ad Chorintos, Leuven: Dirk Martens, 30 January 1519. The book was reprinted in March 1519 in Basel by Froben.


41 “Certe, quod est in propatulo, sic vivunt quidam, presertim potentes in hoc mundo, quasi de futuro seculo nihil omnino credant” (ibidem).
whether souls exist separate from the body and where they exist; whether they enjoy the glory of immortality; whether souls of the wicked are in torment now, whether our prayers or other good actions are of any service to them, whether an indulgence from the pope frees them all of a sudden from punishment.42

Had God revealed the truth about these questions to us through Paul, there would not be so many people who “are in doubt on these points, or at any rate dispute about them.”43 Hinting probably at Pomponazzi, Erasmus’ remark testifies to the fact that the question was not at all settled, in spite of the doctrinal pronouncements.44

Erasmus’ attention to the issues of resurrection and afterlife is certainly not coincidental. His orthodoxy concerning the resurrection in his text and translation of 1 Cor. 15:51 was questioned by at least three persons. Writing from Leuven in the summer of 1520, Erasmus himself relates the story of one of these attacks to both Hermann von dem Busch (1468–1534) and to Martin Luther.45 In what follows, I will follow Erasmus’ account in these letters. On a spring day in 1519, Dr. Henry Standish, who had been opposing Erasmus’ NT translation for some time, was preaching in St Paul's Church-yard in London.46 Erasmus reports that during his sermon, Standish “suddenly forgot all decency and charity” (the topic on which he had started to preach) and began to “rave” against Erasmus’ NT translation.47 In his sermon he repeated his critique of Erasmus’ rendering Jn. 1:1 with In prin-

42 “An extent animæ semotæ a corpore, et vbinam extent, an fruantur immortalitatis gloria, an impiorum animæ iam nunc crucientur, an eis subueniant nostræ preces aut alia benefacta, an indulgentia summi Pontificis subito liberentur a poenis” (ibidem).
43 “Super hisce rebus ambigere, aut certe disputare” (ibidem).
44 For Pomponazzi, see supra on p. 120. For the pronouncements of the Church, see supra on pp. 121–123.
47 “Cunque sermonem exorsus esse a charitate, subito pudoris omnis simul et charitatis oblitus, cœpit debacchari in nomen ac famam meam” (Allen, IV, p. 310).
cipio erat sermo instead of the traditional phrase In principio erat verbum.48 Later the same day, Standish was dining at court.49 Sir Thomas More and the royal chaplain, John Stokesley, sat at the table with him and provoked him to discuss this passage and Erasmus’ choice of words. When More pointed out to him that the Vulgate uses sermo in Wis. 18:15, Standish still expressed his aversion to Erasmus’ books, which made him fear destructive heresies and disastrous schisms. When pressed to speak more specifically, Standish named three items “counting the points out on his fingers.”50 His three points were (1) Erasmus’ taking away the resurrection, (2) making the sacrament of matrimony worthless, and (3) holding false views on the Eucharist.51 When he was asked to prove his points, Standish referred to Erasmus’ rendering of 1 Cor. 15:51.52 The second half of this verse in the Vulgate reads as follows: omnes quidem resurgemus sed non omnes inmutabimur (all of us will rise, but not all of us will be changed). This reading reflects a Greek text (πάντες μὲν ἀναστησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα) for which there is no extant attestation, but a very similar reading is found in the Greek of the prima manus of the 6th-century Codex Claromontanus (D* 06): πάντες ἀναστησόμεθα, οὐ πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.53 Since this codex was not consulted by Erasmus, and since his five Greek manuscripts were unanimous, he accepted their reading in the continuous text: πάντες μὲν οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλαγησόμεθα.54 He rendered this reading

---

48 Standish had been criticizing Erasmus’ choice of wording since the publication of the Greek-Latin NT. (See Erasmus to Peter Barbirius on 17 July 1517, published in Allen, III, n. 608, on p. 21.)
49 Since his support of the King in Convocation on the issue of ‘criminous clerks’ (the punishment of clerics by lay tribunals) in December 1515, Standish had enjoyed the favour of Henry VIII, who first appointed him bishop (1518), and later ambassador to Hamburg (1524) and examiner of heretics (1525).
50 Allen, IV, p. 312.
51 “Primum inquit ‘Erasmus tollit resurrectionem. Deinde nihil facit sacramentum matrimonii. Postremo male sentit de Eucharistia’” (ibidem). Standish only expounds upon the first accusation, but not the others.
52 In his 1522 edition of the NT, Erasmus mentions in the annotations to 1 Cor. 15:51, that his Latin translation of this verse procured accusations against him. Without mentioning Standish, Lee (see infra p. 141), or Nicholas Baecchem of Egmont (see infra p. 142) by name, he intimates that he was accused of taking away the resurrection: “Alter in corona frequenti nobilium & eruditorum hominum apud summos principes, impiegat, quod tollerem resurrectionem, propterea quod concederem non asseuerarem, aliquos in adventu domini non morituros” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 518).
53 The reading is also attested to in Latin by various mss of the Itala, and by many, mainly Western Church Fathers (inter alios Marcion, Tertullian, Jacob of Nisibis, Ambroisaster, Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, and John of Damascus).
54 Erasmus made use of the 11th-century Cod. 2817, the 12th-century Codd. 1 and 2815, and the 15th-century Cod. 2816. This reading is also attested to by the second corrector.
into Latin with *Non omnes quidem dormiemus, omnes tamen immutabimur* (not all of us will fall asleep but all of us will be changed).

Erasmus was certainly not the first in the West to argue for this reading. The Florentine diplomat and Humanist scholar Gianozzo Manetti (1396–1459) had translated the passage earlier by combining two of the attested readings in the following paradoxical way: *Omnès quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur. Omnes quidem non dormiemus. Omnes autem immutabimur.*55 His work, however, remained in manuscript form and was in all probability unknown to Erasmus. Later, independently from Manetti, the Italian Humanist Lorenzo Valla (c.1406–57) cited the passage in his *Annotations*, adhering even more closely to the Greek word order, in the following way: *omnes quidem non dormiemus, sed omnes immutabimur.*56 Erasmus, who edited Valla’s work and thus knew it thoroughly, rather follows Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples (c.1450–1536) translation more closely but without acknowledgement.57 Lefèvre had rendered the text in his translation of the Pauline Corpus with the following words:

---

55 Cited by Andrew J. Brown in *ASD* VI/3, p. 327. But Paul Arblaster has rightly pointed out that “medieval manuscripts sometimes give textual variants in a ‘run-on’ fashion, often separating them only with an interlinear $\&$ for vel—something not all editors are aware of” (private communication).


57 On Lefèvre, see *infra* on p. 152. De Jonge suggested that the verbal similarities between Erasmus and Lefèvre are not sufficient to determine that Erasmus borrowed from Lefèvre (Henk Jan de Jonge, *The Relation of Erasmus’ Translation of the New Testament to that of the Pauline Epistles by Lefèvre d’Étaples*, in *Erasmus in English*, no. 15 (1987–88), pp. 2–7). But Andrew J. Brown argues that “there is a heightened suspicion that Erasmus’ translation owed an unacknowledged debt to Lefèvre’s work” (*ASD* VI/3, p. 15). According to Brown, this “borrowing” does not amount to outright “plagiarism,” since “it was a matter of borrowing a word here, and a phrase there” (*ibidem*). On concepts of copyright, ‘plagiarism,’ etc., see *infra* on p. 328.
non omnes quidem dormiemus, omnes autem immutabimur. But neither Valla's nor Lefèvre's work aroused the sort of opposition that Erasmus had to face on account of his work.

In his letter to von dem Busch, Erasmus points to the annotations in his NT. In the annotations he reviewed the variant readings of the verse together with the available Patristic evidence for those readings from Jerome, Theophylactus, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, and Augustine. One of his motives to put the uncommon reading in the continuous text is a consequence of a principle of textual criticism: lectio difficilior potior. In the second edition of his NT (1519), Erasmus adds a comment to the annotations on this verse where he explicitly formulates the principle: whenever there are various readings attested to by the ancient authorities, he writes in 1519, there is always one that seems to be more respectable, viz. the one that at first sight seems more absurd. For this more absurd reading is likely to offend an insufficiently knowledgeable or inattentive reader by its apparent absurdity, and so the offended抄ist altered the text, Erasmus explained. In the following edition (1522) he corroborates his preference for the more difficult reading with arguments of intrinsic probability. This is most likely what has happened, Erasmus writes: the reader, who was not aware of the fact that Paul was talking here about the resurrection of the just, was probably

59 Jerome, Ad Minervium et Alexandrum monachos; Chrysostom, In Epistulam ad Romanos, XI; Tertullian, De resurrectione carnis XLI; Origen, Contra Celsum, V; Augustine, De civitate Dei, XX,20 and De octo quaestionibus Dulcitii, qu. III,3.
61 “Et quoties ueteres fatentur lectionem esse diuersam, semper mihi suspicient esse solet ea quae prima specie uidetur absurdior, ut consentaneum sit, lectorem uel parum eruditum, uel parum attentum, offensum absurditatis imagine, mutasse scripturam” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 517; ASD VI,8, p. 310). On the difficulty of translating “suspectior” in this sentence, see Krans, Beyond What Is Written, pp. 43–45. Krans suggests that a 'non' is missing from the sentence, but his conjecture is not necessary, since the meanings ‘to look up,’ ‘to esteem,’ ‘to respect,’ and ‘to admire’ of the verb suspicio are widely attested to (cf. Charlton T. Lewis & Charles Short, A Latin Dictionary, Oxford: Clarendon, 1879, ad vocem).
puzzled when reading that everyone shall be changed (*immutabimur*), since the ‘change’ (*immutatio*) of which Paul speaks refers to “the transition to blissful immortality.” The inattentive reader was then at more of a loss when he continued to read Paul's words in the following sentence, where he writes: “and the dead will rise incorruptible, and we will be changed” (*et mortui resurgent incorrupti et nos immutabimur*). But this sentence is only an apposition to the previous sentence, spelling out the difference between those who died before the coming of Christ (these individuals will rise incorruptible) on the one hand, and those still alive at the coming of Christ on the other. The latter, although they will not die, will be changed into the same state of immortality as those who had died and will be resurrected at the second coming. Erasmus appeals to the reader for judgement: “Vides optime lector quàm hic nihil sit quod in me debat reprehendi.”

Nonetheless, Erasmus emphasizes that he did not reject any of the readings, but he opts to translate the reading that is found in the Greek manuscripts that were available to him. He stresses that Jerome knew about this ‘bizarre’ reading, and that this is the way Theophylactus and Chrysostom cite the passage. Also, Origen's words point to such an understanding of the passage. Erasmus indicates that intrinsic evidence, too, can corroborate this reading, for Paul was clearly expressing his expectation of being alive at the return of Christ (cf. 1 Thes. 4:15). The reading of the Vulgate, which is followed by Augustine, does not contradict the reading found in the Greek manuscripts, Erasmus explains. The reading, which maintains that we will all rise (*omnes quidem resurgemus*), refers to the deceased, and it means that although everyone will rise on the last day, the change that some of us will not undergo (*sed non omnes immutabimur*) concerns entering into bliss (*immutari sit proprium transeuntis ad vitam beatam*); this follows Augustine's explanation of the verse. This reading therefore suggests that only the just will be changed, for only they will enter into heavenly bliss.

---

62 “Siquidem immutationem hic appellat transitum ad felicem immortalitatem” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 518).
63 “Nec animaduertit Paulum hic separasse pios mortuos à piis uiuis: quum ait, Et mortui resurgent incorrupti, sentit de piis qui iam ante Christi aduentum obdormieran in Christo, quum addit, Et nos immutabimur, explicat id quod paulo ante coeperat dicere, Non omnes quidem dormiemus, sed omnes immutabimur” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 518).
64 Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 518.
65 Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 516.
But for Erasmus, accepting the more difficult reading does not mean that the traditional reading or any other reading would necessarily be false. The variant reading, of which Augustine himself exhibits knowledge—that all of us will fall asleep, but not all of us will be changed (omnes quidem dormiemus, sed non omnes immutabimur)—can also be accepted, Erasmus suggests, for all of us will die, but not all of us will enter into glory. Finally, the third variant reading—that not all of us will fall asleep, but all of us will be changed (omnes quidem non dormiemus, sed omnes immutabimur)—can also be accepted, as the first part of the sentence refers to those who will be alive at the second coming of Christ, while the second part of the sentence refers only to the just, as Origen understood the passage, Erasmus maintains.66 Two seemingly contradictory sentences can be true at the same time. Erasmus elucidates this seeming contradiction with the following example: one’s statement, speaking about the theologians in Leuven, that “all theologians are sincere,” does not contradict someone else’s statement that “not all theologians are sincere” if the latter assertion is spoken about theologians in general.67 Also, Jerome affirms that the living will be transformed into the glory of immortality (uiui transformentur ad gloriam immortalitatis) in his letter to Mercella (third question).68 This does not mean that Paul believed that some people will not die. The living will die all of a sudden in the rapture and will be immediately revived.69 Paul’s point is therefore about the deceased, who will be resurrected just like the seed that is sown in the earth. Erasmus then quotes a pseudo-Augustinian writing to confirm that there can be a difference in opinion on what happens to the persons still alive at the second coming of Christ, but that these differing views should

66 “Siquidem totus hic sermo non ad omnes homines communiter, sed ad iustos pro-prie pertinet” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 517). In his Apologia, Erasmus adds the possibility that the first part of the sentence might refer to Elijah or Enoch, who have been said to be transferred alive to Heaven: “Cum igitur Paulus explicaturus modum resurrectionis dixisset, non omnes quidem morituros, (sive hoc dictum sit propter Eliam & Enoch, sive propter eos quos adventus Christi deprehendet vivos) sed tamen omnes immutandos ad immortalitatem, & eos qui revixerint, & eos quos subitus adventus Christi deprehenderit in vita, quod in genere proposuerat, pergit explanare distinctius” (LB IX. col. 436).

67 “Nec hoc magis mirum, quàm si duo simul uerum dicant, quum alter pronunciet omnes theologos esse synceros, de Louaniensibus sentientes: alter, non omnes theologos esse synceros, de cunctis in genere sentiens” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 517).

68 Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 517.

69 “Credamus uiuos in subito in ipso raptu morituros ac reuicturos” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 517).
not necessarily be considered heretical opinions unless they are proposed with heretical purposes.\textsuperscript{70}

But let us return to Erasmus’ account of Standish’s charges against him. When More enumerates these Patristic arguments to the bishop, Standish is forced to admit that the variant reading presented by Erasmus was indeed known to Jerome and to the ‘early’ and ‘orthodox’ Church Fathers; but Jerome, Standish maintained, “restored the original Hebrew” in his translation.\textsuperscript{71} For, Erasmus explains, Standish believed that Jerome, just as he did with the OT, translated this passage in the Pauline corpus from Hebrew sources.\textsuperscript{72} To expose Standish’s stupidity, the royal chaplain John Stokesley asks Standish to repeat “this idiocy” (\textit{ille stolidam}), and (to ensure full attention) he asks for royal permission to formulate an answer on such a grave matter. When he is granted leave to answer, Stokesley professes that he can hardly formulate an apt answer to such an argument because he cannot possibly suppose that Standish “would be so deranged” that he could believe that the Pauline epistles were first written in Hebrew, when even a schoolboy knows that they were written in Greek.\textsuperscript{73} Why would Jerome change the communal reading from Hebrew books, Stokesley asks, when it is customary to base the changes on the sources, and nobody has ever claimed to have seen those letters written in Hebrew?\textsuperscript{74} At this point the stupidity (\textit{stultam}) and absurdity (\textit{absurdam}) of Standish’s position were clear to all present, Erasmus writes, but Stokesley kept repeating and

\textsuperscript{70} “Verum quia sunt & alij æque catholici & eruditi uiri, qui credunt anima in corpore manente, immutandos ad incorruptionem & immortalitatem eos qui in adventu domini uiui sunt, & hoc eis imputari pro resurrectione ex mortuis, quod mortalitatem immutatim deponat, non morte, quo libet quis acquiescat modo, non est hæreticus, nisi ex contentione hæreticus fiat. Sufficit enim in ecclesiæ lege carnis resurrectionem credere futuram de morte” (Erasmus, NT, 1535, p. 517). The \textit{Liber de dogmatibus ecclesiastibus} is now universally attributed to Gennadius of Marseilles (fl. end of 5th century). Erasmus quotes chapter 6 (\textit{PL} 42, col. 1215 = \textit{PL} 58, col. 983). For Augustine’s view, see \textit{supra} on p. 100.

\textsuperscript{71} “Fassus est esse verum, et hanc lectionem recenseri a veteribus orthodoxis, et nominatim ab Hieronymo: ‘sed hoc’ inquit ‘Hieronymus reposuit ex Hebreo’” (Allen, IV, p. 313).

\textsuperscript{72} “Audierat vir egregius Hieronymum quædam ex Hebreorum fontibus restituisse in Vetero Testamento, et putabat idem habere locum in Paulinus Epistolis” (Allen, IV, p. 313).

\textsuperscript{73} “Profecto inquit, ‘non satis video quibus rationibus isti argumento possit occurri, aut quid responderi debeat pro ipsius dignitate. Neque enim opinioni R.P. vsqueadeo delirare vt existititem eas epistolæ primum Hebraice scriptas fuisse, cum pueri quoque sciant a Paulo Graece scriptas esse” (Allen, IV, p. 313).

\textsuperscript{74} “Quod autem fuiisset illud Hieronymi consilium ex Hebrais voluminibus mutantis publicam lectionem, cum ex fontibus id fieri soleat, cumque nemo testetur has epistolæ vllí visas Hebraice descriptas?” (Allen, IV, p. 313).
emphasizing his argument to the point that Henry felt pity for so much idiocy (tante stoliditatis) exhibited in the midst of such exalted people and changed the subject.75

Erasmus' personal remarks on Standish are not very amiable, to say the least. What could be more insane, Erasmus asked, than to accuse him of taking away the resurrection by changing in one place the word resurrec-tio, when Paul confirms it in so many passages?76 In his letter to Luther, Erasmus calls Standish a “well-known madman” (ille furiosus), “insane” (vesanus), and “dense” (stolidus).77 Standish’s idea is called an “absurdity” (deliramentum) that would seem to be “insane” (insana) to any table company, let alone to the highest rulers and the most educated people. Who can suppose that Standish would have even a morsel of sanity (habere micam sanae mentis)? Erasmus asks.78 Also in his letter to von dem Busch, Erasmus jeered at Standish, the senex theologus, for confusing Corinthians with Colossians, and in his usual satirical tone Erasmus asks rhetorically, “who could believe that this person has any brains?”79

The question of Erasmus’ textual changes to the wording of the Vulgate in 1 Cor. 15:51 crops up again in Erasmus’ debate with Edward Lee.80 The conflict between Lee and Erasmus started when Lee went to Leuven to improve his Greek. When Erasmus faulted him in a public letter in May 1518, Lee composed a list of some 300 erroneous passages in Erasmus’ NT.

75 Allen, IV, p. 313.
76 “Iam cum resurrectio tot locis apud Paulum comprobetur, quid insanius dici poterat quam sublatam esse resurrectionem, si vno loco mutata fuerit vox resurrectionis?” (Allen, IV, pp. 312–13).
77 Allen, VIII, pp. xlv–xlvi.
78 Allen, VIII, p. xlvii.
79 “Quis crederet huic homini esse cerebrum?” (Allen, IV, p. 312).
After having circulated this list in manuscript form among his friends, Lee published his critique in 1520.\footnote{Edward Lee, *Annotationum libri duo, alter in annotationis prioris editionis noui testamenti Desiderii Erasmi, alter in annotationes posterioris editionis eiusdem*, Paris: Giles de Gourmont, 1520.} He attacked Erasmus for changing the Sacred Scripture on his own, human authority, arguing that by adopting variant readings, Erasmus created a multitude of Gospels.\footnote{Erasmus cites Lee (fo. cciii v), referred by *CWE* 72, p. 33 n. 162. *ASD* IX-4, p. 46.} Erasmus reacted immediately with his *Apologia qua respondet duabus invectivis Edvardi Lei*. In his *Apologia*, Erasmus pointed out that there are innumerable variant readings found even in the Latin manuscripts, that the Church often uses different translations (of the Psalms) in the liturgy and in the readings, and even printed Latin versions of the Vulgate translation differ among themselves.\footnote{*ASD* IX-4, p. 46 (CWE 72, pp. 33–34).} He argues, therefore, for the educated reader’s right to discern based on the manuscript evidence and the quotations from the Fathers, but for that reader to ultimately rely on the authority of the Church.\footnote{*ASD* IX-4, p. 50 (CWE 72, p. 39).}

Erasmus complains that when he translates the Greek text in a way that differs from the Vulgate, Lee charges him with doing violence to the reading of the Church in a bold and impious manner. In fact, Lee repeatedly indicted Erasmus for heresy. Lee also charged Erasmus with stealing his ideas and taking credit for them. Erasmus sharply replied that he is not the sort of person who would pride himself on borrowed feathers (*non admodum me venditem plumis alienis*).\footnote{*ASD* IX-4, p. 56 (CWE 72, p. 46).} Erasmus’ style is somewhat embittered and often sarcastic. He ridiculed his opponent, belittled him for his limited erudition, stressed how unknown and nameless Lee was, and rebuked him for his arrogance.\footnote{Cf. e.g. *ASD* IX-4, pp. 61.66–67.69 (CWE 72, p. 53.61–62.65).} Erasmus held against Lee his repetitiveness and his prolixity, but Erasmus’ own *Apologia* is similarly iterative and long-winded. Lee blamed Erasmus for his pride and arrogance. Though Erasmus denied the charge, his self-righteous complacency discredited his seemingly modest words.\footnote{Cf. e.g. *ASD* IX-4, pp. 57–58 (CWE 72, pp. 48–49). In the Colloquies Erasmus described Lee as someone dedicated to “sophistical riddles, vain babbling, sycophancy, arrogance, virulence, sardonic humour, thraisonal boasting, and self-love.” See also: Preserved Smith, *A Key to the Colloquies of Erasmus*, Cambridge, 1927, pp. 5–6.} Both Lee and Erasmus repeatedly called upon the “indifferent reader” to arbitrate in the polemic.\footnote{In his *Responsio ad annotationes Lei* (April 1520) Erasmus reiterates his arguments (*ASD* IX-4, pp. 217–18). The third book by Erasmus dedicated to the controversy with Lee treats the rest of the debated issues: *Liber tertius E.R. qua respon[sn]det reliquis
A third attack was launched by Nicholas Baecchem of Egmont (c.1462–1526). Erasmus responded to the Flemish Carmelite’s attack with his Apologia de loco taxato in publica professione, per Nicolavm Ecmon-danvm, theologum et Carmelitam Lovaniensem. Locus est in epistola Pavli ad Corinthios priore, Cap. XV. Omnes quidem resvrgemus, sed non omnes immutabimvrm. Here, Erasmus reiterates his argument that all of the Greek codices he saw (and he did see quite a few, he stresses) agree in having the reading he favoured. He also repeats at length his argumentation based on the Patristic witnesses, emphasizing that he did not reject any of the readings, nor are the variant readings mutually exclusive. In any case, he proclaims his adherence to the teaching of the Church on the matter.

More than a decade later, the question of bodily resurrection and the heretical ideas about it were still occupying Erasmus’ mind, for he treated the subject exhaustively in his catechism of 1533. The book, usually referred to as Explanatio symboli apostolorum, was written at the behest of Sir Thomas Boleyn and appeared in March 1533. The book became
immensely popular and immediately sold out.\textsuperscript{93} The work was republished the same year in Basel, Antwerp, Cologne, and Paris.\textsuperscript{94} The English translation appeared a year later in London and had to be reprinted immediately.\textsuperscript{95} Erasmus’ catechism takes the form of a dialogue between a catechist and a young person asking for instruction in the Christian faith. Erasmus, probably affected by the—in his eyes—devastating effects of the Reformation, maintains an unmistakably Catholic position on doctrinal issues and presents his answers in a virtually apologetic fashion.\textsuperscript{96} The opening words of the catechumen already underline this: he seeks instruction in order to be admitted into the “society of the Catholic Church, the house of God, outside of which there is no hope of eternal salvation.”\textsuperscript{97}


\textsuperscript{93} Erasmus wrote that year to the German Humanist Canon Johannes von Vlatten (1498–1562): “In symbolum non indiligenter scripsi; item et in praecepta Decalogi. Liber exit mercatu verno: mittam per hunc, si quaem nancisci apud me nullus reliquus est. Hieronimus ait se Francfordiae omnes vendidisse intra tres horas” (Allen, n. 2845 on p. 269, li. 14–17).


\textsuperscript{96} E.g. Erasmus accepts the unwritten Sacred Tradition along with the Bible as source of revelation (ASD V-1, p. 290), enumerates the Deuterocanonical books in the canon of the Bible (p. 278), and acknowledges seven sacraments (p. 284). He calls blasphemers those who question the perpetual virginity of Mary (p. 245). He even defends the need to occasionally restrict access to the Bible (p. 279). Luther railed against Erasmus’ catechism in a letter to Nikolaus von Amsdorf (1483–1565) dated from Wittenberg, 11 March 1534: the German Reformer called Erasmus a viper (\textit{vipera}), a liar (\textit{mendax}), and the very mouth and organ of Satan (\textit{ipsam os et organum Satanæ}), who castigated the catechism, put together with diabolical artifice (\textit{artificio plane satanico compositum}), and sowed doubts in the catechumen about the dogmas and faith by providing details concerning heresies against the articles of the Creed (WA Briefwechsel 7 no. 2093, pp. 27–40). Erasmus, who received Luther’s letter through the recatholicized Georg Witzel (1501–73), answered it in his \textit{Purgatio adversus epistolam non sobriam Lutheri}, republished in ASD IX-1, pp. 427–83.

\textsuperscript{97} “Iamdudum mihi gestit animus asscribi in consortium Ecclesiae Catholicae, quae est domus Dei, extra quam nulli speranda salus aeterna” (ASD V-1, p. 205).
Erasmus’ views presented in the catechism on human nature, afterlife, and the last things also reflect the Catholic position. Accordingly, the Dutch scholar takes it as self-evident that the human person is composed of two separable substances: a body as matter, and a soul as form. Of these, the soul is the more important part of the human being (potiorem hominis partem), for the presence of the human soul as form of the body constitutes the human being, and “its departure causes what was once human to lose that name.” The body is rightly called the dwelling place of the soul, the catechist teaches. In death, these two components are separated; in fact, the separation of body and soul is what one calls the natural death. We all know, the catechist says, what a person’s corpse is like when death occurs. But the soul, because it is immortal, remains alive with Christ after the collapse of the body if it has departed in faith and with the hope of the resurrection of its own body.

Erasmus also treats the articles of Christ’s death, descent into Hell (ad inferna), and resurrection comprehensively. He spells out the various heresies with regard to these articles and articulates the Catholic position on them. The article of Christ’s descent into Hell is especially problematic (Erasmus even doubts whether Thomas Aquinas held this article), since Scripture does not unambiguously attest to it, the catechist says, and it is clearly a later addition to the Creed. The biblical passages that are used traditionally to corroborate this article do compel belief that Christ’s soul descended to Tartarus or limbo, the catechist proposes. Scripture often calls death (mortem) and burial (sepulturam) the “underworld” (inferos). Therefore, the Latin term descendere seems to the catechist to refer to burial also, because when a person is buried, he or she is said “to go down,” which can only mean “to be buried in the tomb.” At any rate,

---

99 ASD V-1, p. 250.
100 ASD V-1, pp. 249–50.
101 “Animæ domicilium recte dicitur corpus” (ASD V-1, p. 250).
102 “Mors hominis naturalis est animæ a corpore separatio. Quod vbi factum est, quale sit cadauer hominis nouimus omnes; anima vero quoniam immortalis est collapso corpore subsistit viuens apud Christum, sit cum fide decessit et expectans proprii corporis resurrectionem” (ASD V-1, p. 252).
103 ASD V-1, pp. 252–64.
the catechist suggests to the catechumen, it suffices to profess his belief in Christ’s descent to the underworld as the Scriptures and the Church perceive it.106

Erasmus stresses that Christ’s resurrection is the central element of the Christian faith, particularly of the belief in the afterlife. If Christ had not risen, Erasmus states, we would be deprived of all hope of immortality.107 For Erasmus, the resurrection of Christ is clearly the sine qua non of immortality, and apparently immortality and the resurrection of the body are interdependent. Christ has suffered for us in order to redeem us from eternal death, and he rose for us that through him we might obtain eternal life.108 Later, too, when Erasmus talks about the Holy Spirit, he draws a parallel between the Son, who raised dead bodies to life as the author and first fruits of the resurrection (excitauit corporaliter mortuos autor ac primitie resurrectionis), and the Holy Spirit, who brings people back to spiritual life (spiritualiter viuificat) by forgiving sin.109 Retaining, regaining, re-entering into life is just a synonym for resurrecting, reviving, rising.

Erasmus also stresses that there can be no doubt about the bodily resurrection of Christ. His resurrection is clearly foretold in the Scripture and is confirmed by the testimonies of many apostles. In fact, nothing has been handed down by the evangelists more fully than the evidence for the resurrection. And St Paul not only corroborates the resurrection but also describes it to the Corinthians and the Thessalonians.110 Nevertheless, there are people, the catechist says, who “in the midst of sunlight are left in darkness,” for there have been many heresies proposed in connection with this article of faith.111 Erasmus mentions Cerinthus (Kerinthus), who taught that Christ had not risen yet, but will rise in the future.112 Others, refuted by Paul in 1 Cor. 15, allowed for Christ’s resurrec-

106 “Tibi satis est profiteri Christum sic descendisse ad inferos, queamadmodum sentit scriptura et ecclesia” (ASD V-1, p. 260).
107 “Nisi Christus resurrexerit, nobis omnis spes immortalitatis fuisset ademptra” (ASD V-1, p. 260).
108 “Quemadmodum enim ille pro nobis passus est, vt ab æterna morte per illum liberemur, ita et pro nobis resurrexit, vt per illum vitam æternam consequeremur” (ASD V-1, p. 260).
110 ASD V-1, p. 261.
112 ASD V-1, p. 260. On the 1st-century Gnostic Kerinthos, see supra on p. 89.
tion but denied that our bodies would ever rise. Valentinus accepted the resurrection of spirits and souls (spiritus et animae resurrectionem) but rejected the resurrection of bodies (corporum). The following group of heretics named by Erasmus are the Chiliasts, who dream of a thousand years of bodily pleasures after the resurrection of their bodies.

But all of these heretics are wrong, Erasmus states, and their teachings are no dogma, but prodigious absurdities (prodigiosum deliramentum). These fantasies are fabricated because the human mind is struggling to grasp how a body, after having been changed, can be restored to its original identity. But God is omnipotent and cannot be subject to the laws of nature, of which he is the creator. He who created Heaven and earth out of nothing can surely restore the body from what already exists.

Erasmus further explains Christ’s ascension into Heaven and what it means that Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father. Then he turns to the article of Christ’s judging the living and the dead at the end of the world. The catechist makes it clear that there are two judgements, an individual judgement at the death of each and every person, and a general judgement at the end of the world. In the former, the souls are judged as soon as they have left the body. Their destination can be three-fold according to their state at the moment of death. The pure souls, according to Erasmus, enter into heavenly life. Those who are liable to judgement will be dragged into Hell. Finally, those who are defiled by minor blemishes will be taken to the fire of Purgatory, whatever it may be. The second, universal judgement will take place on the last day, on the Day of Judgement (iudicii dies). On that day, “when the Son of Man comes in His glory, and all the angels with him, he will sit on the throne of His glory and all the nations will be gathered before him,” says the catechist, quoting Mt. 25:31f. In that judgement there are only two outcomes possible because the good and the wicked will be separated overtly and

113 ASD V-1, p. 260. See supra on p. 84.
115 ASD V-1, p. 261. On Chiliasts, see supra on p. 92.
116 ASD V-1, p. 261.
117 “Quid autem mirum si corpus restituit ex eo quod est, qui primum coelum ac terram et angelos ex nihilo condidit” (ASD V-1, pp. 261–62). Cf. Tertullian supra on p. 89.
118 ASD V-1, pp. 262–64.
119 “Animae mox vt emigrarent e corpore iam iudicatae sint, vt aut si purae hinc abierint transeant ad vitam coelestem, sin obnoxiae crimini pertrahantur in gehennam, aut si leuioribus inquinatae maculis deferantur in ignem purgatorium quisquis aut qualis id est” (ASD V-1, p 264).
eternally. They will be judged by Christ, who endured unjustly judgement and condemnation for us. He will judge the whole universe to render to each according to his or her deeds.\textsuperscript{120}

But what is the need for a final judgement at the end of the world if the souls are judged immediately upon death? the catechumen asks. In his answer the catechist mentions the opinion of Pope John XXII that neither spirits nor souls receive their punishment (eternal pain) or their reward (heavenly life) before the final judgement.\textsuperscript{121} Erasmus hurries to point out that this opinion was rejected by the authority of the Church.\textsuperscript{122} The catechist, therefore, can only give a ‘probable’ (probabiliter) answer: after the general judgement, the pains of the wicked will increase, for they will suffer in both body and soul. Similarly, the joys of the righteous will be complete, as they will receive their glorified body.\textsuperscript{123} This body, which had served the righteous in their good works and was a companion to them in their suffering, will also take part in their rewards and joy.\textsuperscript{124}

The catechumen is still puzzled, and asks how such an infinite multitude of people can be present in one place, and how much time will suffice for the examination of so many human deeds. In his answer Erasmus’ catechist reiterates what he has already stressed several times, namely, that the language of the Creed, just like the language of the Bible, is anthropomorphic, as it is adapted to human nature (sermonem suum attemperat ad humanos affectus). The judgement will take place in an instant, and the glorified body will be different from the earthly bodies because it will be transformed by immortality. Consequently, the transformed and glorified body will no longer occupy the threefold spatial dimension of length, width, and depth. It will be possible for countless bodies to be present at the same time in a minimum of space. Otherwise, it would be impossible to understand, the catechist teaches, how Tartarus, which is believed to be at the very bottom of the earth, would be able to contain so many bodies.\textsuperscript{125}

The final formula “of whose kingdom there will be no end” was added to the Creed because there were people who dreamed about prodigious blasphemies pertaining to the Platonic cycles. They lay at the origin of

\textsuperscript{120} ASD V-1, p. 264.
\textsuperscript{121} See supra on p. 117.
\textsuperscript{122} See supra on p. 122.
\textsuperscript{123} See supra on p. 99.
\textsuperscript{124} ASD V-1, p. 264.
\textsuperscript{125} ASD V-1, p. 265.
Origen’s errors (if he really believed and not simply related them, the catechist inserts) about the demons becoming angels and vice versa after many thousands of years, and about the damned in Hell who would eventually be set free from their sufferings and would be purified to enter bliss. In Origen’s account Christ would be crucified again, so the kingdom that he had prepared by His death would eventually come to an end. This blasphemy is too stupid to repel, but the Eastern Churches added the above formula.

After the expositions on the Holy Spirit, Scripture and Canon, the nature of the Church, and the sacraments, the last part of the Creed is treated. This part (carnis resurrectionem) teaches about the end of the world, the catechist clarifies in Erasmus’ Explanatio. The catechist reiterates that the good shall be separated from the wicked at the end of the world. The wicked will suffer endlessly, but the good will have no pain or fear of harm because that part of human nature which groans will be freed from every trouble. All things will be renewed, changed in quality but not in substance. The Creed, Erasmus points out, calls the human body ‘flesh’ and the restoration of life ‘resurrection.’ This article of the Creed is the basis of our faith (hæc est basis totius fidei nostræ), Erasmus emphasizes. Therefore, it has to be maintained even more firmly than the other articles because this article gives hope to the afflicted pious while it signifying fear for those who would fall into all sorts of crime without restraint. Therefore, if one questions this article, then believing the rest is pointless.

At this point Erasmus lists the various heretical doctrines that have appeared over the centuries around this article of faith. The pattern is always the same: the catechist bids ‘farewell’ (valeant) to the group of heretics who maintained a certain erroneous view with regard to the resurrection of the body. The first group of heretics named by Erasmus are the ‘miserable’ (infelices) Sadducees. They did not believe in the resurrection of the body (corporum resurrectionem), nor did they believe in...
the existence of the angels (angelos) or spirits (spiritus), as if there were nothing in nature that is not accessible to the physical senses. But the bodily senses can deceive and human reason can deceive, Erasmus’ catechist had indicated at the very beginning of his instruction. Therefore, the Sadducees err, according to Erasmus, because the greatest realities are inaccessible to the senses, and nothing is more inaccessible than the godhead (deitas) itself.

Based on the argument that the soul, being immortal, cannot rise, nor can it die, Erasmus’s catechist ‘bids farewell’ to those who believe that only the souls will rise but not the bodies. They call it ‘the resurrection of the souls’ (resurrectionem animarum) when, according to their imagination, the souls will be called forth to happiness from ‘their lurking hole,’ in which they have been concealed for a certain period of time. Both J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink and Larel Carrington refer to Tertullian’s De resurrectione carnis with regard to this heresy, but Erasmus, as will be seen later, probably chose this particular group of heretics with a polemical intention against his own contemporaries. At least, this is the reading some of the readers of his time gave to this passage.

The catechist bids farewell to those who believe that the body we have now will not be revived, and we will instead receive a far superior one. This, however, could not guarantee the retention of personal identity. For if we do not receive the same body, we will not be the same person, Erasmus argues. Besides, what need is there to create new bodies, the catechist asks, when God by His omnipotent will is able to restore this present body to the most perfect splendour and blissful immortality? This restoration will not change the substance of the body (corporis substantia), but will instead improve its qualities (in melius commutatis qualitatibus). The catechist bids farewell to the Chiliasts, too. They err because they have

---

135 ASD V-1, pp. 206–07.
136 “Valeant qui profitentur animas resurrecturas, corpora nequaquam, quam anima quoniam est immortalis tam non possit reuïiscere quam non potest mori” (ASD V-1, p. 288).
137 “Sed illi resurrectionem animarum apellant, quam e latebris in quibus ad certum tempus reconditae fuerant, iuxta illorum somnia euocabuntur ad beatitudinem” (ASD V-1, p. 288).
138 ASD V-1, p. 289. n. 438; CWE 70, p. 346, n. 45. On Tertullian’s remark, see supra on p. 89.
139 See infra on p. 403.
140 ASD V-1, p. 288.
141 ASD V-1, p. 288.
misunderstood the Apocalypse of John and dream about a thousand years of bodily pleasures after having been revived.\footnote{ASD V-1, p. 288. On Chiliasts, see supra on p. 92.}

After having enumerated all of these heresies, Erasmus professes his own faith in the resurrection. He quotes Job 19:26–27 and 2 Cor. 4:14 as scriptural compasses for resurrection matters and expresses his firm belief that “at the end of the world, every human being will come to life again with the same bodies which they have now on earth.” Our resurrection will not differ from Christ’s resurrection, Erasmus stresses, and Christ will transform our body to His own glorified body (cf. Phil. 3:21). Here again, Erasmus’ emphasis on Christ’s resurrection being the model and foundation for our resurrection can be perceived.

Erasmus uses the term ‘immortality’ in connection with not only the soul, but also the post-resurrection condition of the body. He maintains that in the resurrection, ‘immortality of the body’ (\textit{corporum immortalitas}) will be bestowed on the unjust and the just alike.\footnote{ASD V-1, p. 289.} For the unjust this will bring eternal suffering, while for the just it will bring eternal happiness. Therefore, in the case of the unjust, ‘eternal death’ (\textit{æterna mors}) is a more appropriate description than ‘immortality,’ the catechist suggests. Similarly, the expression of ‘life everlasting’ (\textit{vitam æternam}) is appropriated for the just, while the term ‘resurrection’ (\textit{resurrectionis vox}) can refer to both the wicked and the just. Nonetheless, there is a tendency to use ‘resurrection’ only in connection with the just, the catechist remarks, and he refers to Jn. 11:25 and to Paul’s common usage of the word. That ‘resurrection’ can refer to the unjust is clear from Jn. 5:29: \textit{et præcedent qui bona fecerunt in resurrectionem vitæm qui vero mala egerunt in resurrectionem iudicii}. Here, of course, the word ‘judgement’ (\textit{iudicium}) is used for ‘condemnation’ (\textit{condemnationem}), Erasmus clarifies.

Erasmus then quotes from the Athanasian Creed: ‘At whose coming all people shall rise again with their bodies (\textit{resurgere habent cum corporibus suis}); and shall give account of their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting (\textit{in vitam æternam}) and they that have done evil into everlasting fire (\textit{in ignem æternum}).’\footnote{On the Athanasian Creed, see supra on p. 95.} This echoes what Paul writes in Rom. 6:23: “For the wages of sin is death (\textit{mors}), but the free gift of God is eternal life (\textit{vita æterna}) in Christ Jesus our Lord,” Erasmus concludes. There, Paul adds the adjective ‘eternal’ to life, the catechist
explains, to emphasize that just as there will be no hope of comfort for the unjust, there will be no fear for the just that their happiness will ever come to an end or diminish.

Erasmus also reflects on this eternal happiness of the blessed in the Expalantio. There is no need, he writes, to imagine this happiness to consist of bodily pleasures, such as food, drink, or sexual activity. These things will not be needed then because the bodies will be spiritual (erunt corpora spiritualia), and in them we will live like the angels of God. Their happiness is to see the face of the Father who is in Heaven. And this is also what Jesus says in Jn. 17:3: “and this is eternal life, that they may know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent.” This knowledge, which begins here with faith, will be perfected there when we shall see His face revealed, Erasmus concludes the passage.

**Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples**

The French Catholic Humanist Jacques Lefèvre d’Étaples, or Jacobus Faber Stapulensis (c.1450–1536), the probable translator of the first complete French Bible in print (Antwerp: Merten de Keyser, 1530), would also exercise great influence on the Reformers.\(^{145}\) Although he never obtained

a degree in theology, he wrote several theological, exegetical, and pastoral works, and is justifiably ranked among the best theologians of his time.\footnote{Bedouelle, Jacques Lefèvre d’Étapes, p. 19. His lack of academic training in theology would rouse suspicion at the Faculty of Theology of Paris, which was to pursue him for the rest of his life (Arblaster & Gilmont, Cat. 77 in TT, pp. 130–31). Lefèvre was a protégé of Francis I, and the King protected the French priest from an open condemnation for some time. When the King was captured in Pavia and kept in prison in Spain (see supra on p. 5), the Paris Theologians, influenced by the general panic caused by the spread of peasant revolt into Alsace (see supra on p. 4), felt it was time to denounce Lefèvre publicly. See: Nicholls, Heresy and Protestantism, p. 186.} The annotations of Luther and Zwingli to some of Lefèvre’s works have been preserved.\footnote{For Luther, see Annotationes Quincuplici Fabri Stapulensis Psalterio manu adscriptae (1513), WA IV, pp. 466–526; for Zwingli, see CR IC, HZSW XII, pp. 280–91. Zwingli’s “allusion to Lefèvre, whose Psalterium Quincuplex Ulrich possessed and used. His copy, beautifully printed in 1513, with its wide margins in which is inserted here and there the fine hand of the reformer, is to be found at Zurich” (Jean Rilliet, Zwingle. Le troisième homme de la Réforme, (Les temps et les destins), Paris: Fayard, 1959, p. 99).} The ideas of the French Catholic Humanist on biblical interpretation, with what seemed like a rejection of the traditional fourfold interpretation, were regarded as exemplary by many of his contemporaries.\footnote{But see his remark added to the preface of the second edition of his fivefold Psalter: “non que alios sensus: allegoricum/ tropologicum & anagogicum presertim vbi res exposit negare velim” (Lefèvre d’Étapes, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. Az’). Unless otherwise stated, the sigla refer to the second edition (see n. 166). Cf. “One can understand that the Reformers would have seen this as implementing sola Scriptura, the reading of Scripture by Scripture; but Lefèvre’s approach is much more Neoplatonist, by an affinity to Pseudo-Dionysius, Nicholas of Cusa, and Pico della Mirandola” (Bedouelle, Jacques Lefèvre d’Étapes, p. 24). See also: Maurice Villain, Le Message Biblique de Lefèvre d’Étapes, in Recherches de Science Religieuse 40 (1952), pp. 243–59.}

In 1509 he published a fivefold parallel edition (3+2) of the Psalter under the title Quincuplex Psalterium.\footnote{Jacques Lefèvre d’Étapes, Quincvplex Psalterium. Gallicum. Rhomanum. Hebraicum. Vetus. Conciliatum, Paris: Henricus Stephanus (Henri Estienne), Pridie Kalendas Augusti (31 July) 1509.} This contained five different Latin versions of the texts of the psalms with a commentary: (1) Psalterium Vetus: the Old Latin Version; (2) Psalterium Rhomanum: Jerome’s first revision; (3) Psalterium Gallicum: Jerome’s second revision; (4) Psalterium Hebraicum: Jerome’s third revision, based on the Hebrew text; and (5) Psalterium Conciliatum: Lefèvre’s own harmony of the Vulgate with the literal translation of the Hebrew text.\footnote{Against the possible objection that such textual variations can undermine the credibility of Scripture, Lefèvre defends his Psalter by referring to Origen and his Hexapla.} The book was dedicated to Cardinal Guillaume Briçonnet (d. 1514), the father of the bishop of Meaux of the same name.

François Gilmont, Cat. 77 in TT, pp. 130–31, Jean-François Gilmont, Cats. 44 and 78–81 in TT, pp. 101–02 and 132–35.
(1472–1534), the latter being Lefèvre’s patron. In this prefatory letter to the Cardinal, Lefèvre developed the twofold literal sense (*duplex sensus literalis*). According to him, the most obvious meaning of the words (e.g. interpreting David’s psalms as applying to David himself) is the improper sense (*improprium*), which is held only by those who “are blind and interpret divine things according to the flesh and in human categories” (*caecutientium & non videntium qui diuini solum carnaliter passibiliterque intelligunt*). These blind interpreters clung to the most obvious sense of the text are the Jews (*Iudaei*) and the rabbinic interpreters (*Hebraei*), but Lefèvre also probably has in mind Nicolas of Lyra (c.1270–1349), who opposed many far-fetched allegorical interpretations, followed Rashi and David Kimhi, and applied the text to David rather than to Christ. According to Lefèvre, these are the kind of literal interpretations of which Paul spoke when he said that the letter kills (2 Cor. 3:6); these, the French author believed, are threatening (*mortificantia*) to the spirit and should be avoided (*esse fugienda*). Such an interpretation is in fact a fiction and a lie (*figmentum esse & mendacium*), and not the literal sense at all. For the true literal sense of the psalms refers to Christ, which was “the intention of the prophet and of the Holy Spirit speaking in him.” This truly ‘literal’ sense coincides with the Spirit (*cum spiritu coincidit*) and with the spiritual sense (*sensus igitur litteralis & spiritualis coincidunt*), and is conveyed to the prophets (*prophetis*) and to those who are able to see (*videntibus*). Christ is the key (*clavis*) to understanding David, and it was Christ about whom David spoke in the Psalter, commissioned by the Holy Spirit (*per spiritum sanctum constitutum erat*). Christ joins the NT with the OT, and the true Christian meditating on Christ should

---


152 E.g. *Postilla venerablis fratris Nicolai de Lyra super psalterium*, in *Biblia Latina*, Venice: F. Renner de Hailbrunn, 1482–1483, II. sig. A3r. The medieval Jewish commentators Rashi (Rabbi Solomon ben Isaac, *רבי שלמה בן יצחק* c.1040–1105, abbreviated as *ר”ש*) and David Kimhi (*דר”ק* דוד קמחי, usually abbreviated as *ד”ק* c.1160–c.1235) were copiously used by Lyra for his *Postilla*. They were highly respected by many Reformers (e.g. Luther and Bucer).

153 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincvplex Psalterium*, sig. A2r.

154 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincvplex Psalterium*, sig. A2r.

155 Videor michi alium videre sensum, qui scilicet est intentionis prophetae & spiritus sancti in eo loquentis” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincvplex Psalterium*, sig. A2v).

156 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincvplex Psalterium*, sig. A2r.

157 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincvplex Psalterium*, sig. A2r.
be formed into Christ (Christiformitas).\textsuperscript{158} When questions arise, the harmony of the Scriptures (concordia scripturarum) can be the guide to identify this sense, as has been Lefèvre’s own guide in his commentary.\textsuperscript{159}

Lefèvre’s \textit{Quincuplex Psalterium} of 1509 attracted much criticism. One of the critics was Pierre, prior of the Carthusian monastery of Gosnay (Pas-de-Calais).\textsuperscript{160} Pierre disapproved of Lefèvre’s commentary of Ps. 30:11–12.\textsuperscript{161} In his \textit{Quincuplex Psalterium} of 1509, Lefèvre had written that some people believed that Christ suffered not only earthly torments, but also the torments of Hell.\textsuperscript{162} Lefèvre identified one of these people, namely, Nicholas of Cusa, who had used these verses of Psalm 30 in his sermons as a reference to the descent of Christ into Hell.\textsuperscript{163} While never explicitly saying so, Lefèvre seemed to follow Cusanus’ mystical Christocentric interpretation of Ps. 30:11–12 in his commentary, although he remarked that the Greek text of Acts 2:24 (the subject of one of Cusanus’

\textsuperscript{158} In his Christological reading of the OT, Lefèvre is thoroughly influenced by Nicholas of Cusa. See: Guy Bedouelle, \textit{Le Quincuplex Psalterium de Lefèvre d’Étaples. Une guide de lecture}, Geneva: Droz, 1979, pp. 151–66. On Cusanus, see \textit{supra} on p. 103.

\textsuperscript{159} “Concordia scripturarum maxima ex parte nos pervexit” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Quincuplex Psalterium}, sig. A3 v–r). Cf. fo. 170 v.

\textsuperscript{160} The \textit{Cartusia Vallis Sancti Spiritus} (also \textit{Cartusia Beatae Mariae prope Gosnay}) in Gosnay (canton of Béthune, Pas-de-Calais, France) was founded in 1320 by Thierry d’Hérisson, bishop of Arras, and by the countess Mathilde (Mahaut) of Artois (c.1268–1329, daughter of count Robert II of Artois, who died in the Battle of the Golden Spurs in 1302), and it became one of the more important Charterhouses of France. In the 15th and 16th centuries it suffered much from wars, and several times the monks had to seek refuge in Béthune. The repair works, starting in 1526, were partly financed by a donation from Charles V. The smaller Charterhouse was restored by 1526, but the renovation of the greater Charterhouse was only completed in the 17th century (Carol Steyn, \textit{The Manuscripts of Gosnay}, in \textit{Journal Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae} 45 (2004), pp. 225–36; Claude Malbranke, \textit{Guide de Flandre et Artois mystérieux}, (Les guides noirs), Paris: Tchou, 1969; Jules Marie Richard, Mahaut, comtesse d’Artois et de Bourgoigne (1302–1329). \textit{Étude sur la vie privée, les arts et l’industrie, en Artois et à Paris au commencement du XIVe siècle}, Paris: Champion, 1887; Albert Grus, Cartusiana. Un instrument heuristique, vol. 2 \textit{Maisons}, Paris: CNRS, 1977, p. 286; Grus also lists the available manuscript sources on the history of the cloister). It is plausible that to secure imperial support, prior Pierre of Gosnay (\textit{Petrus Cartusiensis/ venerabilis Gosnaianae domus prior}) sought the opportunity to prove his orthodoxy to the Emperor by attacking Lefèvre.


\textsuperscript{162} “Sunt qui volunt dominum non solum portasse pro nobis dolores mortis terrenæ/ sed etiam Dolores inferni in anima sustinuisse” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Quincuplex Psalterium}, fo. 46 v).

\textsuperscript{163} See \textit{supra} on p. 102.
sermons) has θάνατος (τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου), which ought to be translated as “doloribus mortis” rather than “doloribus inferni,” as it stands in the Vulgate. Yet Hell should be understood in the text of the Psalm as well as in the words of Peter in Acts.\textsuperscript{164} Even if some things are not clearly expressed in the Gospels, Lefèvre argued, they should be accepted on the authority of the prophets (\textit{caetera etiam què in euangelio expressa non sunt/ex prophetis sunt accipienda}).\textsuperscript{165}

The criticisms of Prior Pierre of Gosnay (which are no longer extant) occasioned Lefèvre’s reaction in the second edition of the \textit{Quincuplex Psalterium} (1513) in the form of (1) a half-page epilogue (\textit{epilogus}) and (2) a twelve-page exposition on the contested interpretation of Ps. 30:11–12, both placed between the dedicatory letter to Cardinal Briçonnet and Jerome’s Prologues.\textsuperscript{166} In these, Lefèvre cautiously gave another turn to his interpretation. Quoting extensively from Nicholas of Cusa and commenting on his text, Lefèvre apparently defended the German Cardinal, whose available sermons Lefèvre was to publish the following year.\textsuperscript{167} But Lefèvre departs from Cusa’s interpretation, even as he presents his own position as being in line with that of Cusanus. The French theologian starts off by denying that Christ’s suffering in Hell was necessary for the salvation for humankind, because a single oblation (Christ’s death on the cross)

\textsuperscript{164} He enumerates a number of other places as well where the \textit{veritas hebraica} contain the word \textit{mors} rather than \textit{infernum}, although these texts, too, according to Lefèvre, speak about Hell (e.g. Ps. 17:6–7; 14:3; and 87:4; the Hebrew text has \textit{שְׁאוֹל} in these places). Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Quincvplex Psalterium}, fo. 46v. Lefèvre also stresses Christ’s physical sufferings against Docetists. (46v–47v).

\textsuperscript{165} Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Quincvplex Psalterium}, fo. 47v.


was enough to achieve salvation.\textsuperscript{168} Salvation was earned once and for all by Christ's earthly passion and the shedding of His blood.\textsuperscript{169} By His earthly suffering Christ redeemed all humankind.\textsuperscript{170} Why did He suffer then in Hell? Following Cusanus, Lefèvre argued that Christ's suffering in Hell, the greatest conceivable suffering, had the purpose of glorifying the Father (\textit{magnificare & glorificare deum patrem}) by proving that Christ was obedient to the Father even through the most excruciating torments.\textsuperscript{171} Accordingly, when Christ died, His soul did not enter into a state of pain, but into state of glorification. To this effect, a number of biblical passages are quoted to prove that after His death on the cross, Christ's soul passed immediately to the Father.\textsuperscript{172} Christ therefore did not descend into Hell to suffer there, but to put an end to the suffering of those who were there (\textit{non pœnas sustinens: sed pœnas soluens}).\textsuperscript{173} He did not go there to endure any torment himself, but to relieve the torments of those dwelling in Hell thorough His prayers, as He was prefigured by Jonah praying in the belly of the fish (Jn. 2:1–6).\textsuperscript{174} The story of Moses liberating the Jews from Pharaoh in Ex. 14 is also a prefiguration of Christ's liberating the souls from Hell.\textsuperscript{175} The tenet that being in Hell or inspecting those in Hell does not necessarily mean torment is proven by Jesus' parable on Lazarus and the rich man: although Lazarus sees the torment of the rich man, he himself is not tormented, and the request of the rich man to send Lazarus over to alleviate

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textsuperscript{168} “Per gloriosam CHRISTI mortem & preciosissimi sanguinis effusionem: humana redemptio sufficienter facta est” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A4\textsuperscript{r}).
  \item \textsuperscript{169} “Redemptio facta est & aeterna quidem redemptio/ in sanquine/ & temporali CHRISTI passione” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A4\textsuperscript{v}). Lefèvre deduced this from the following passages: Mt. 26:27–28; Eph. 1:7; Heb. 9:32; 1 Pt. 1:28–19; Rev. 5:9; Jn. 19:30; and Heb 10:34.
  \item \textsuperscript{170} Is. 53:4–5.
  \item \textsuperscript{171} Lefèvre quotes Cusanus: “Illam poenam sensus conformem damnatis inferno pati voluit in gloriam Dei Patris sui, ut ostenderet quod ei obediendum sit usque ad extremum supplicium” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A4\textsuperscript{r}). For Cusanus’ view, see \textit{supra} on p. 103.
  \item \textsuperscript{172} Other passages quoted: Lk. 23:43–46 and 24:25–26; Phil. 2:8.9–10; Heb. 29 and 57; and Ps. 3:5 and 91(90):11–15. (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A4\textsuperscript{r}).
  \item \textsuperscript{173} Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A4\textsuperscript{r}.
  \item \textsuperscript{174} Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A5\textsuperscript{r}.
  \item \textsuperscript{175} “Moyses ipse in figura: CHRISTVS. Virga Moysi: crux CHRISTI. Pharao: tyrannus inferni. Mare ruptum: infernus. Populus eductus/ animae e captiuitate inferni liberatæ” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A6\textsuperscript{r}). To prove that Christ liberated souls from Hell he also cites Rufinus Aquileiensis, \textit{Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum}, 16 (see \textit{supra} n. 100). Lefèvre refers to Rufinus’ work as \textit{Expositio symboli ad Laurentium} (which is not to be confused with Augustine’s Exposition of the Creed to Laurentius). Other biblical reference quotations for the same purpose are Col. 1:20; Jn. 14:30; and Hos. 13:14 (Lefèvre d’Étaples, \textit{Qvincvplex Psalterium}, sig. A6\textsuperscript{r}).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
the suffering assumes that Lazarus himself would not be tormented where the rich man is, should it be possible for him to get there.\textsuperscript{176} Furthermore, when Christ predicted His sufferings He never mentioned anything about suffering in Hell, Lefèvre argued (Mt. 16:21–23).\textsuperscript{177} In view of that, Peter’s words in Acts 2:24 do not refer to Christ’s torment in Hell but to the suffering of those who were detained in Hell.\textsuperscript{178} This is what Cusanus meant when he spoke about the \textit{visio mortis}, because the direct experience of the vision of death is the suffering of the damned.\textsuperscript{179} Christ, the author of life, destroyed death by His own death and restored life.\textsuperscript{180} Therefore, Christ’s soul could not possibly suffer after His death, and the suffering Cusanus mentions in connection with the descent into Hell should be understood as Christ’s suffering on the cross, for it was not in His person (\textit{in persona}) that Christ suffered, but in His bodyparts (\textit{in membris}). As Christ suffered for sins once and for all (\textit{semel}), both for the righteous and for the unrighteous (1 Pt. 3:18), it is not unreasonable to think, Lefèvre argued, that on the cross Christ suffered both earthly and hellish torments at the same time (\textit{semel}).\textsuperscript{181} For Lefèvre, this is what the psalms teach: as they speak about the suffering of the parts of the body, they can only refer to Christ’s suffering on the cross because Christ’s soul was separated from His body by death, and consequently could not suffer in His limbs after

\textsuperscript{176} “Ecce quomodo iusti videntes cruciatus non cruciantur: neque etiam si in illis locis tormentorum sint/patiantur. Mitte (inquit) Lazarum vt refriget linguam meam: intelligen etiam/ Lazarum missum/ tormenta illa pati non posse” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. A6'). Lefèvre also quotes Sir. 24:25.

\textsuperscript{177} Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. A6'.

\textsuperscript{178} “Et id solutis doloribus sive soluens dolores: non referetur in CHRISTVM/ tanquam intelligendum sit soluens dolores CHRISTI/ sed ad eos quis a morte et doloribus inferni detinebantur” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. A4'). Also: “Ergo haec intelligantur de doloribus: quos in preciosissimo corpore suo in hoc mundo CHRISTVS pertulit” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. A5'). Lefèvre also quotes Augustine’s commentary on Genesis: see supra on p. 97 n. 101.

\textsuperscript{179} “Ergo de illis poenis intelligi debet quod ait Cusa: cum dicit. Visio mortis via cognoscenti: est poena consummata” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. a2').

\textsuperscript{180} “Qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxit: & vitam resurgendo reparavit. qui salutem humani generis in ligno constituit: vt vnde mors oriebatur/ inde vita resurget” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. A5'). Lefèvre cites for his purpose Mt. 8:29; Sir. 38:5–6; Heb. 2:24; Col. 2:14; and Zech. 9:11. He also refers to Jerome’s \textit{Commentarium in Zachariam prophetam ad exsuperum}, ad. IX,11, and the Hymn in the Evensong of Easter: \textit{Ad caenam Agni providi} (Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sgs. A4’–A5’).

\textsuperscript{181} Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. a3'. Lefèvre believed that this was what Cusanus also meant: “virum apostolicum Cusam locutum fuisse de temporali CHRISTI passione” (Lefèvre d’Étaples, Quincvplex Psalterium, sig. a2').
His death. The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God, and no torment can affect them, Lefèvre quotes Wis. 3:1. To state the contrary, that is, to ascribe torment to Christ’s soul, is “nefarium & irreligiosum.” In fact, it was in His life that Christ suffered ineffably. In his conclusion, Lefèvre stresses that he submits his own interpretation to that of the Church and emphatically acknowledges the authority of the Church:

quam de questione illa sentio/ quam veneror/ quam prédico/ quam tota animi sincēritate amplerctor. volens sanctē CHRISTI ecclesiē omnium verē fidēlium matris incontinentiē/ vestigiī semper inniti/ semper submitti/ semper obedire/ & sanctis eius semper acquiescere iudiciēs.

A further change provoked by the criticism of Pierre of Gosnay, beyond the two already discussed, can be found in the commentary section of the 1513 edition of the *Quincuplex Psalterium*. While Lefèvre reprinted his arguments of 1509 without any change, he added a list of Church Fathers whose writings corroborate, according to Lefèvre, the position that Christ suffered not in His person but in His limbs. In this fashion Lefèvre could give a completely different meaning to his commentary without making an open retraction. In this manner, his second edition of the fivefold Psalter was more in line with the orthodox interpretation.

With regard to Purgatory, Lefèvre’s position moved in the other direction: from convention to dissent. It is evident from his writings that for some time he not only accepted but also defended its existence. Lefèvre, undoubtedly promoted by his patron, the bishop of Meaux, combated Luther’s position that the existence of Purgatory could not be proven by Scripture. On the contrary, the places where it is mentioned are numerous, and their interpretations all conclude that there must be a post-mortem place where souls owing satisfaction are purged and can be expiated. To prove the existence of this place of expiation, Lefèvre accommodated himself to the sole authority recognized by Protestants and relied exclusively on Scripture, not mentioning the Sacred Tradition or the arguments of

---

183 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincuplex Psalterium*, sig. A5’.
184 Lefèvre quoted Lam. 1:12; Mk. 14:33; and Lk. 22:44.
185 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincuplex Psalterium*, sig. a2’.
186 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Quincuplex Psalterium*, fo. 47’. He mentions Origen, Tichonius, Ammonius, Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazzianzus, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and Cassiodorus without specifying in which books they concur with the position in question.
medieval Scholastic theology. In his commentary on the Gospels (1522), Lefèvre refers to Purgatory several times. Commenting on Mt. 5:21–22, he distinguished between *iudicium* (κρίσις), *concilium* (συνέδριον), and *gehennae ignis* (γέενναν τοῦ πυρὸς). The first term (*iudicium*) is the most serious, namely, the eternal punishment (*supplicium aeternum*); the two others are applied to minor sins that can be expiated (*expiabilis*) and are temporal punishments (*supplicium temporale*), and therefore they refer to Purgatory (*ignis purgatorius*), even if the term *gehennae ignis* can be used for eternal punishment in other places (e.g. Mk. 9:42.44.46). Lefèvre then cites a number of places to prove the possibility of expiation for souls after this life (*de expiandarum animarum loco post istum mundum*). These include the classic proof texts (e.g. Mt. 12:32; 1 Cor. 3:11–15; and 2 Macc. 12:43–45). But Faber Stapulensis also found proof of the existence of Purgatory in texts that had not been used for this purpose. His innovative interpretations of Mt. 5:12; Mt. 18:34; and Lk. 16:19–31 are a few such examples. These two instances especially deserve our attention. In the parable about the Unforgiving Servant, the ruthless servant, demanding the reimbursement of a debt from his fellow-servant, is said to be punished by torment until he paid the entirety of his own debt (*dominus eius tradidit eum tortoribus quoadusque redderet universum debitum*). Punishment in Hell for one’s sins is inexpiable; from there it is impossible to escape (*locus tormentorum, infernus unde nunquam quisquam...*).

---


189 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatori in Qvatar Evangelia*, fo. 27v.

190 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatori in Qvator Evangelia*, fos. 27v–28v.

191 “Occurit locus qui nobis coniecturam de expiandarum animarum loco post huius mortalis vitae functionem.” Besides the text mentioned here in the main text, Lefèvre analyses and accepts the following texts as proofs for the existence of Purgatory: Zech. 9:11; Ps. 6:6, 62:10, 85:13, and 113:25; Is. 38:18; Acts 2:24 (here he takes the expression *doloribus inferni* of the Vulgate for the suffering of the souls in Purgatory); Eph. 4:9–10; and Rev. 5:13. Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatori in Qvator Evangelia*, fo. 28v–v.

192 Some ten years earlier, when Luther had not yet appeared on the scene, Lefèvre did not mention Purgatory while expounding upon 1 Cor. 3:11–15 in his commentary on the *Corpus Paulinum* (see supra on p. 156, n. 166).

Consequently, the parable can only refer to Purgatory, where satisfaction can be given for crimes committed. The existence of Purgatory can also be proven, according to Lefèvre, by the parable about Lazarus and the rich man (Lk. 16:19–31): the rich man must be in Purgatory because he was praying for his five brothers, a pious act that can only be performed by souls in Purgatory and not by the damned. To prove that there is still temporal punishment to be suffered for remitted sins, Lefèvre employs the story of David's adultery with the wife of Uriah: David's sin was forgiven (2 Sam. 12:13: *transstulit peccatum tuum*), yet he was punished by the death of the child of Bathsheba (2 Sam. 12:14–23). Therefore, it is possible that God forgives someone's sins, yet he punishes him either in this life or, if there was no satisfaction executed, after the first death (*mors prima*), in Purgatory (cf. Rev. 20). He concludes that *ex quo satis aperte insinuare uidetur quaedam pœnationem esse locum quem non pauci purgatorium appellant in quo ipse dives esset*, quippe *cum bonum optare videatur*. Accordingly, the fate of the deceased is threefold: (1) those whose sins and punishment (*peccatum et poenam*) are remitted during their lives by God enter into eternal life (*vitam aeternam*) after death; (2) those whose sins (*peccatum, id est culpam*) are remitted but who still owe punishment (*reservata poena*) enter a place of expiation (*expiationum locum*) or Purgatory; and finally (3) those whose sins are not remitted during their life die immediately the second death (*mors secunda*) and enter into Hell. At the same time, Lefèvre emphasized the absolute gratuity of God’s grace and the unique character of Christ's sacrifice, without which nobody could achieve his or her own salvation (*nullus unquam suis ad aeternam salutem potuisse Deo satisfacere*).

But Lefèvre's position on the subject seems to have changed over the years. Three years later, when he published his sermons on the readings of the fifty-two Sundays of the year, he gives a different interpretation.

---

194 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatorii in Qvatvor Evangelia*, fo. 93v.
196 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatorii in Qvatvor Evangelia*, fos. 28r and 251v.
197 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatorii in Qvatvor Evangelia*, fo. 251v.
198 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatorii in Qvatvor Evangelia*, fos. 28r and 251v.
199 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatorii in Qvatvor Evangelia*, fo. 251v.
200 Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Commentarii Initiatorii in Qvatvor Evangelia*, fos. 251v and 28v.
of these passages. In the parable of Lazarus (Lk. 16), the rich man enters Hell, where he cannot be helped any longer, it being too late for any help for him. In the above-mentioned verses in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5:21–22), Lefèvre differentiated only between outward and inward acts (killing and being angry), and called the punishment for the latter the "fire of Gehenna" without specifying what exactly it means. The Unforgiving Servant of Mt. 18 is said to be condemned to eternal torment, unable to ever pay off his debt. Of course, the Epistres et evangiles pour les Cinquante et deux Sepmaines de l’an, written in French and meant as a guidebook for preachers, and thus ultimately aimed at the lay population, targeted a different public from that of his biblical commentaries in Latin. Nonetheless, the absence of Purgatory in Lefèvre’s works from 1524 on; his connection with Gérard Roussel, Jacques Pauvan (d. 1526), and Matthieu Saunier, who publicly attacked, among other things, the existence of Purgatory as not having any scriptural foundation; and Lefèvre’s silence on the accusations of ‘guilt by association’ with these persons, suggest that by 1524–25 Faber Stapulensis abandoned his views on the existence of a locus purgationis.

More hints are available with regard to his position about the intercession of the saints. Although Lefèvre never publicly attacked the veneration of the saints, some of his remarks indicate that he regarded the invocation

---


of the saints as a futile or inappropriate act that might be a hindrance to true piety. In his *Epistres & Evangiles*, commenting on the parable of Lazarus (the reading of the first Sunday after Pentecost), Lefèvre asserted that there was a great chasm between Lazarus and the rich man, and this chasm demonstrates that the rich man could not pray for himself, the dead, or the living.\(^{203}\) This is so because God wants us to be saved by the faith he gives us, and not by those who passed away.\(^{204}\) Also, the letters of Lefèvre’s contemporaries testify to what seemed to them to be Lefèvre’s rejection of the cult of the saints.\(^{205}\)

To conclude the survey on Lefèvre, it is worth mentioning how an anonymous Parisian writer testifies to the fact that by the second half of the 1520s Meaux had earned a reputation as a centre of heresy. The writer assumed that most of the people of Meaux were Lutherans, for which Lefèvre was to blame. With only the vaguest idea of what it was, the writer characteristically understood ‘Lutheranism’ as not believing in images, holy water, prayers for the dead, or Purgatory.\(^{206}\) Obviously, the writer

\(^{203}\) “Qui est bien monstrer qu’on ne peut obtenir priere ne pour luy ne pour autruy ne por les morts ne pour les vifz.” Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Epistres & Evangiles*, fo. 176r.

\(^{204}\) “Car c’est là où il nous faut aller, c’est celle par laquelle en donnent foy, Dieu nous veult sauver, non point par ceux qui sont passéz de ce monde.” Lefèvre d’Étaples, *Epistres & Evangiles*, fo. 176r. In the 1542 Lyon edition six new sermons are contained that are more Protestant in character. One of these claims that “Car la sanctité de la Vierge Marie et de tous les anges, saints et saintes du paradis, riens ne nous profitera, sinon par la parolle de Dieu deuement de nous honorée, ouye, retenue et observée” (fo. 102). The authorship of these amendments is questioned (as is the exact role of Lefèvre in the publication of *Epistres & Evangiles*). For the discussion, see: Bedouelle, *Lefèvre d’Étapes et l’Intelligence des Écritures*, pp. 205–06.

\(^{205}\) Guillaume Farel (1489–1565) wrote to Zwingli on 13 January 1519 that “Ce bon Fabry avait travaillé après les légéndes des Sainctz et Sainctes, et desja deux moys des Martyrs estoyent impriméz, car il avoit delibré de mettre tout ce qu’il pourrait trouver, et le jour et l’année de tous. Mais ayant entendu la grosse idolatrie qui estoit ès prières des Sainctz, et que ces légendes y servent comme le souphre à allumer le feu, il laissa tout et se mit du tout après le Saincte-Escriture” (Guillaume Farel, *Épître a tous*, 1530, republished in Herminjard, *Correspondance*, vol. I, pp. 40–41). Farel wrote of the hermit Michel d’Arande to Corneille Schefer on 2 April 1524 that “de Sanctorum cultu abrogando, rursus in multis a Fabro commonefactus” (Herminjard, *Correspondance*, vol. I, no. 97, pp. 205–06).

\(^{206}\) “Et faut noter que la plus grande partie de Meaulx en estoit infectée de la faulce doctrine de Luther, et disoit on qu’un nommé Fabry, prestre, estudiant avec autres, esoit cause desdicts embrouillemens, et entre choses qu’il ne falloit avoir ès eglises aucunes images, ne prendre eu beniste pour effacer tous les pechez, ne prier pour les trespasses, à cause qu’incontinent après le trespay ilz alloient en paradis ou en enfer, et qu’il n’y avoit nul purgatoire, et qu’il n’estoit vray et ne le croy[oit] pas” (Le journal d’un bourgeois de Paris sous le règne de François Ier (1515–1536), ed. Victor-Louis Bourrilly, (Collection de textes pour servir à l’étude et à l’enseignement de l’histoire 43), Paris: Picard, 1910, pp. 233–234).
was concerned with orthopraxis rather than orthodoxy or ecclesiology, and the fine distinctions about Lutheran theology were lost on him, as they were on many of his contemporaries.

**Martin Luther**

Although Gansfort, Erasmus, and Lefèvre voiced some opinions that afterwards were seen as Protestant tenets, what later became known as the Protestant Reformation was really initiated by Martin Luther (originally Luder, 1483–1546). On 31 October 1517, Luther reputedly nailed his ninety-five theses attacking the teaching of the Church on the efficacy and power of indulgences to the door of the Schloßkirche in Wittenberg.

---

207 “Doubts about the powers of the saints were the most common of all and opened up the road to heresy for many” (David J. Nicholls, *The Nature of Popular Heresy in France, 1520–1542*, in *The Historical Journal* 26 (1983), p. 272). He refers to cases of the theology student Thérouanne—who was burnt in Paris in 1526 and who believed that the Virgin Mary had no power, and neither did any other saint—and of the ‘Lutheran’ wool-worker from Meaux who did *amende honorable* in April 1536 for attacking images, holy water, and prayers for the dead (pp. 272–73).


209 Some parts of this section have been published in *TT*, Cats. 14 and 15 on pp. 69–70.


211 The tradition that Luther nailed his theses on the door of the Schloßkirche in Wittenberg on 31 October 1517 has been called into question by historians. For example, Hans Volz suggested that the nailing took place a day later, on 1 November (Hans Volz, *An welchem Tag schlug Martin Luther seine 95 Thesen an die Wittenberger Schlosskirche an?*, in *Deutsches Pfarrerblatt* 57 (1957), pp. 457–58). Erwin Iserloh, professor of church history at the University of Trier, proposed the theory in 1961 that Luther never nailed them to the church door but instead sent them to two of his ecclesiastical superiors—Bishop Schulz of Brandenburg and Archbishop Albrecht of Magdeburg and Mainz. He has argued that the first source for this tradition is Melanchthon’s description in 1546, written only after the death of Luther, and that Melanchthon was nowhere near Wittenberg in 1517. Iserloh has
The ninety-five theses were soon printed and circulated widely not only throughout Germany, but all over northwest Europe and even beyond. Rome was compelled to react. In 1518, Pope Leo X (1475–1521, pope 1513–21) sent an envoy to obtain Luther’s formal withdrawal of some of his unorthodox teachings. This envoy was Cardinal Cajetan (Tomasso di Vio Gaetano, 1469–1534), an Italian theologian, excellent biblical scholar, and general of the Dominicans. In October Luther was heard in Augsburg, but instead of recanting, he began to question the jurisdiction of the Pope. Luther started his dissent on the question of indulgences, and he did not desire to establish any new teachings, let alone a new church community. His ninety-five theses (1517) were centred around the objectionable practice of selling indulgences and touched upon Purgatory only tangentially. Even then, his chief concern was about the financial and lucrative character of the clerical abuse of the teaching on Purgatory. At that time he did not deny the existence of Purgatory as such at all. His rejection also pointed out that there was no open discussion at Wittenberg, that no original copy or printing of Luther’s theses is preserved, and that Luther’s own words suggest that he acted in secret. Nonetheless, it is also clear from Iserloh’s book that it was the intention of Luther and the leaders of Protestant Reformation to commemorate the beginning of their movement on the Eve of All Saints’ Day 1517. (Erwin Iserloh, Luther Thesenanschlag: Tat- sache oder Legende?, in Trierer theologische Zeitschrift 70 (1961), pp. 303–12; Erwin Iserloh, Luther zwischen Reform und Reformation. Der Thesenanschlag fand nicht statt, Münster: Aschendorff, 1966; English translation: Erwin Iserloh, The Theses Were Not Posted. Luther Between Reform and Reformation, trans. Jared Wicks, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968; Wilhelm Pauck, The ‘Catholic’ Luther, in John C. Olin, James D. Smart & Robert E. McNally (eds.), Luther, Erasmus and the Reformation. A Catholic-Protestant Reappraisal, New York: Fordham UP, 1969, pp. 48–58, esp. 49–52; Thurman L. Smith, Luther and the Iserloh Thesis from a Numismatic Perspective, in SCJ 20 (1989), pp. 183–201). Aland and Bornkamm argued against Iserloh and Volz in favour of the authenticity of the event on the traditional date: Kurt Aland, Martin Luthers 95 Thesen. Mit den dazugehörigen Dokumenten aus der Geschichte der Reformation, Hamburg: Furch-Verlag H. Rennebach, 1965; Kurt Aland, Die Reformatoren. Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Calvin. Mit einem Nachwort zur Reformationsgeschichte, Gütersloh: Gütersloher, ‘41986; Heinrich Bornkamm, Thesen und Thesenanschlag Luthers: Geschehen und Bedeutung, Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967. On indulgences see supra on p. 112.  


213 Martin Luther, Disputatio pro declaratione virtutis indulgentiarum (1517), published in WA I, pp. 233–38. See esp. articles 16–25 on p. 234.
of the doctrine of Purgatory grew only gradually, as did his acceptance of the idea of soul sleep. In his elucidation of the ninety-five theses, the *Resolutiones disputationum de indulgentiarum virtute* (1518),\(^{214}\) he asserted explicitly the existence of Purgatory: “mihi certissimum est, purgatorium esse.”\(^{215}\) Luther at that time believed that the souls experienced infernal torments and despair in Purgatory.\(^{216}\) According to him, the souls are purified by these ineffable, indescribable, and incredible sufferings (*tantas infernales, quantas nec lingua dicere nec calamus scribere nec inexpertus credere potest*), and by immeasurable fear.\(^{217}\) The souls of the departed were not, however, required to give satisfaction for unfulfilled earthly penance.\(^{218}\) He denied the effect of indulgences on the fate of the soul and rejected the teaching that the Church Militant would have any jurisdiction over the dead.

A year later, a public debate took place at the Pleissenburg Castle in Leipzig from 27 June to 16 July 1519 under the aegis of George the Bearded (Georg Wettin der Bärtige, 1471–1539), Duke of Saxony (1500–39). At the confrontation, which became known as the Leipzig Disputation, Karlstadt and Luther entered into debate with Johann Eck (1486–1543), a professor of theology at the University of Ingolstadt, a distinguished scholar, and a feared disputant. Purgatory was one of the four topics discussed by Luther and Eck at this encounter.\(^{219}\) Luther admitted the existence of Purgatory in spite of his conviction that there was no scriptural foundation for such a tenet, as he did not recognize the canonicity of 2 Maccabees.\(^{220}\) The other

---


\(^{215}\) *WA* I, pp. 555–58 and 586.


\(^{217}\) *WA* I, p. 557.

\(^{219}\) *WA* II, pp. 322–44. The other three topics being the papal supremacy, indulgences, and penance.

\(^{220}\) “Cum enim divina scriptura tota prorsus nihil habeat de purgatorio, sed omnia loquitur vel de inferno vel celo, volo hoc hac una responsione ad omnes auctoritates respondisse, quod non faciant ad propositum: sequenter et expositiones omnium patrum, nisi expresse meminerint purgatorii, nam credebile est, quod quando tractant scripturas sanctas, sensum etiam scripture sancte sequantur” (*WA* II, p. 323). “Ego, qui credo fortiter, immo ausim dicere ‘scio’, purgatorium esse, facile persuadeor […] sed […] nam et liber Machabeorum, cum non sit in canone, pro fidelibus potens est, contra pertinaces nihil facit” (*WA* II, p. 324).
traditional biblical proof texts cited by Eck were dubious in Luther’s view. Luther declared that the only thing he knew about the souls in Purgatory is that they suffer there and are helped by our good works and prayers.\footnote{Ego enim nihil de purgatorio novi nisi animas ibi pati iuvandas operibus et orationibus nostris (\textit{WA} II, p. 325).} He denied, however, that either good works or prayers gave any satisfaction and maintained that indulgences had no effect whatsoever on the fate of the deceased. Apparently Luther (like most of his contemporaries) did not regard indulgences as the extension of penitential works.\footnote{Cf. Romanus Cessario’s remark, which held that “one might even argue that if Aquinas’s theological finesse in treating indulgences had shaped the practice of the church in the sixteenth century, they might not have been one of the issues that provoked Protestant reform” (Cessario, \textit{Christian Satisfaction in Aquinas}, p. 77). For Aquinas’ position, see \textit{supra} on p. 113.}

The Leipzig Disputation was a turning point in Luther’s career, as it exposed the extent of his estrangement from the official position of the Church (especially on the other three issues). The subsequent excommunication and the Edict of Worms (1521) only made explicit what was already implicitly manifested in Leipzig: Luther had become irrevocably seen as a heretic. His teachings began to differ more and more from the orthodox views. In his \textit{Assertio omnium articulorum} (1520)\footnote{Martin Luther, \textit{Assertio omnium articulorum M. Lutheri per bullam Leonis X. novissimam damnatorum}, Wittenberg: Melchior Lotter, 1920. Published in \textit{WA} VII, pp. 94–151.} he still held that Purgatory exists (\textit{ego tamen et credo purgatorium esse et consulo suadeque credendum}) and that Scripture remains silent about Purgatory.\footnote{\textit{WA} VII, pp. 111 and 149.} According to Luther, the souls are not tormented by fire but by their banishment and by fear.\footnote{“Iam cum ipsimet fateantur, Animas non ab igne, sed in igne pati, quam possunt aliam poenam dare quam fugam et horrorem?” (\textit{WA} VII, p. 11).} Nonetheless, Luther claimed, the only reason for arguing for the existence of Purgatory is the concern of the Papist Church for its profit.\footnote{“Et quae necessitas est pro purgatorio sic tumultari, nisi quod Papistica Ecclesia lucro suo timet, quod inaestimabile trahit ex purgatorio?” (\textit{WA} VII, p. 149).} Therefore, one is not necessarily a heretic if one denies the existence of Purgatory, nor is one a Christian \textit{per se} if one affirms its existence.\footnote{“Suo quisque periculo hic credat vel non credat, non est haereticus, si purgatorium non credit, nec ideo Christianus, si credit” (\textit{WA} VII, p. 149).} Luther uses the example of the Greek Church, which denies the existence of Purgatory but is still considered Catholic.

Rome reacted to Luther’s estrangement from the Catholic teachings in the form of a bull issued in 1520. The papal bull \textit{Exsurge Domine} was issued on 15 June 1520. It extracted 41 errors from Luther’s 95 theses, his
subsequent writings, and sayings attributed to him. Items 37–40 were concerned with questions relating to Purgatory. The bull condemned the positions that it was impossible to prove the existence of Purgatory from Scripture (37), that some souls in Purgatory were not sure of their final fate (38), that it is sinful for the souls in Purgatory to seek rest and abhor punishment (39), and that the souls freed from Purgatory by suffrages of the living are less happy than if they had made satisfaction by themselves (40).228 The condemnations, though not all directly evidenced in Luther’s writings, prove that Luther’s position on Purgatory was still hesitant. The Pope demanded that Luther retract his theses within sixty days of publication.

A year later (1521), in the Grund vnd vrsach aller Artikel D. Marti. Luther,229 the German version of the Assertio, Luther argued that imperfect love hinders one’s getting into Heaven after death, and therefore the soul is in need of purgation. But it is impossible to know whether there is a Purgatory.230 As far as Luther was concerned, he believed in it, despite his belief that no Scripture can unambiguously prove it. But everyone is free to decide for himself or herself.231 And about the state of the souls in Purgatory, it is enough to know, Luther claimed, that the souls suffer great and unbearable pain and crave your help. But, Luther suggested, if one wishes to discuss the question, one must leave room for conjecture and differences of opinion, as he does.232 His Ad Librum Magistri Nostri Magistri Ambrosii Catharini, published in the same year, contained a short passage implying that the Catholic claim about the Pope’s ability to liberate souls from Purgatory was only a fiction, invented to extract money from the people.233

---

228 "Purgatorium non potest probari ex sacra Scriptura quae est in canone" (Leo X, Exsurge Domine, as contained in DH 1487 (DS 777)).
230 "Das aber die grosse furcht. mocht wol eyn fegfewr seyn. hab ich. dunkels weyß gehalten weyß das selb widder zcü setzen noch zcu entsetzen. Die erfarrung wirtts wol leren. Ist auch nichts dran gelegen. ob wyrß nit wissenn" (WA VII, p. 348).
232 "Ist gnüg das du wissist wie sie ynn grosser vntreglicher peyn seyn. vnd deyner hulff begeren. aber yhe daun dispuitiern, ßo laß doch eyn wahn bleyben yndn gutte meynug wie ich thue" (WA VII, p. 454).
233 "Quis vero enumeret prodigia illa de solis defunctis? Bone deus, quantum hic mare mendaciorum de apparitionibus, adurationibus responsisque spiritum inundavit, quibus factus est, ut Papa etiam mortuorum rex factus sit et in purgatorio iam regnet magnó sacrificulorum incomodo, si pergat: qui e purgatorio omnem victum, omnes spes, omnem illam
A year later Luther distanced himself a step further from the official teaching of the Church. In a letter dated 13 January 1522 that was written to his Wittenberg scholar friend Canon Nicholaus von Amsdorf (1483–1565), who had accompanied Luther to the Leipzig Disputation and the Diet of Worms, Luther addressed the idea of soul sleep for the first time. Amsdorf’s original letter has not been found, but from Luther’s answer it seems that Amsdorf had asked Luther about his opinion on the matter. In his response Luther states that he is ready to concede that the souls of the righteous sleep at an unknown place until the Day of Judgement. This is what 2 Sam. 7:12 (in the Vulgate’s reading: dormiunt cum patribus suis) seems to suggest, Luther argued. But Luther was not sure if this is the case for all souls, if one takes the raptures of Paul (2 Cor. 12:2), Moses (Dt. 35:5f), and Elijah (2 Kgs. 2:11) into consideration. Luther maintained that the appearance of these last two on Mount Tabor (Mt. 17:3), as well as the story of Lazarus and the Rich Man, seems to contradict such a sleep of the souls after death. Therefore, it is not clear what God does with the souls separated from their bodies. It also remains unresolved whether the damned will receive their punishment immediately after their death or only at the end of the world, but it is conceivable that they, too, are asleep and insensible until the second coming. In any case, the denial of the existence of Purgatory in the traditional sense (which is a necessary conclusion if one assumes the souls to be asleep) cannot render anyone a heretic, Luther asserted again. For Purgatory is not so much a distinct place, Luther wrote, but a state of purgation by torment.

The publication of Gansfort’s *Farrago* in Wittenberg (1522) was probably not without effect on Luther’s views of Purgatory. Luther must have recognized that he arrived at a conclusion similar to Gansfort’s when Gansfort taught that Purgatory is not so much a place as a necessary state of the soul during a post-mortem purgation. Also, Gansfort’s doubts about the effect of intercessions for the dead and about the jurisdiction of the
Church Militant must have found a sympathetic reader in Luther.\textsuperscript{241} But the claim that Luther’s conclusions were the same as those of the Fri-sian theologian does not do justice to either Gansfort or Luther.\textsuperscript{242} Luther viewed purgation more in terms of pain and penalty, whereas Gansfort regarded purgation in terms of a gradual growth in love towards God without any penal aspects.\textsuperscript{243}

Luther’s sermons dating from this period testify to his emerging uncertainty about the existence of Purgatory.\textsuperscript{244} He remained deliberately vague on the topic, claiming that he could neither deny nor affirm the existence of Purgatory, but the purification of souls after death was certainly within God’s power. But the possibility of the soul sleep continued to intrigue him. In his sermons on the story about the Rich Man and Lazarus (1522 and 1523), Luther taught that the bosom of Abraham is not a carnal reality (because Abraham’s body is buried in Canaan and his soul has no bosom), but refers to God’s blessing of Abraham in Gen. 22:18: “by your offspring shall all the nations of the earth gain blessing for themselves.”\textsuperscript{245} Therefore, all those who died before Christ with a firm faith were transferred to Abraham’s bosom—that is to say, they are stored and kept as if in a bosom until the Day of Judgement, except for those who were already resurrected together with Christ (Mt. 27:52).\textsuperscript{246} In his later sermon, Luther claimed that everyone would be transferred to Abraham’s bosom, which

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{241} See Koslofsky, \textit{Separating the Living from the Dead}, p. 130.
\item \textsuperscript{242} For such a claim, see: Koslofsky, \textit{Separating the Living from the Dead}, p. 130.
\item \textsuperscript{243} See supra on p. 86.
\item \textsuperscript{245} WA X/3, p. 191. WA XII, pp. 595–96.
\item \textsuperscript{246} “Also sind alle Vetter fur Christus gepurt ynn den schoß Abrahe gefaren, das ist sie sind am sterben mit festem glawben an dißem spruch Gottis blieben und ynn das sel-bige wortt entschlaffen, gefasset unnd bewaret als ynn eynem schoß, und schlaffen auch
\end{itemize}
is understood as a metaphor for the Gospel. But if the bosom of Abraham refers to God’s promise wherein the blessed rest, are kept, and stay preserved until the last day, then Hell, where the rich man is depicted in the story, must also refer to the absence of God’s word, from which the infidels are deprived until the end of the world.

Now the question arises, Luther wrote, of whether the rich man is going to be tormented until the end of the world. This is a subtle question, Luther claimed, and is not easy to answer for the inexperienced. But in the other world, Luther asserted, there is no temporality; everything happens as if in an eternal blink of an eye (cf. 2 Pt. 3:8). Therefore, the rich man could have experienced all of this in the blink of an eye—his eyes opened in death, and the next thing he will know is the end of the world. Hence, Luther finds it impossible to say whether the rich man is still being and will be continuously kept in torment until the end of the world. In a later sermon, Luther restates the atemporality of the other world, claiming that at the resurrection, Adam and the ancient Fathers will feel as if they had still been alive only half an hour earlier.

As to the effect of prayers for the dead, Luther is also hesitant. We have received no commandment from God to pray for the dead, he claims, and therefore one cannot commit sin if one does not pray for them. Nonetheless, he provided his parishioners with an agnostic prayer for the dead:


247 “Derhalben dise schoß ist das Ewangelium, die verhaissung die dem Abraham geschehen ist, da müssen wir alle hynein, wenn ich unnd ein yegklicher Christ sterben muß, so muß er die augen zuthun und allain an gottes wort hangen und got vertrawen, das er unns auff nemen werdt” (WA XII, p. 596).

248 “Denn gleych wie Abrahams schoß Gottis wort ist, darynne die glawbigen durch den glawben rugen, schlaffen, und bewaret werden biß an den iungsten tag. Also muß yhe widderumb die helle syen, da Gottis wort nicht ist, darynne die unglewigen durch den unglawben verstossen sind biß an iungsten tag: Das kan nicht anders den eynn leer, unglewbig, sundig, böße gewissen seyn” (WA X/3, p. 192).

249 “Denn hie muß man die zeyt auß dem synn thun unnd wissen, das ynn yhener wellt nicht zeytt noch stund sind, ßon dernn alles eyn ewiger augenblick, wie Sanct Petrus am zweyten Pet: am zweyten sagt” (WA X/3, p. 194).


251 WA X/3, p. 194.

252 “Und wenn man auffersteen wirt, so wurde es Adam und den alten vetern werden, gleich als weren sie vor einer halben stundt noch im leben gewest. Dört is kain zeyt” (WA XII, p. 596).

253 “Wyr haben keyn gepot von Got fur die todten zû bitten, Darumb niemant dran sundigen kan, der nicht fur sie bittet” (WA X/3, p. 194).
“Lieber Gott, ist die seele ynn dem stand, das yhr noch zů helffen ist, So bitt ich, wolltist yhr gnedig seyn.”254 “This prayer,” as Koslofsky puts it, “is a far cry from the certain intercession for the dead offered by the Roman church through masses, vigils, and indulgences.”255 In fact, Luther preached that to say masses for the dead and to hold vigils for them is wicked and sinful (böß und sünd); it is a mockery of God (da wirtt Gott verspottet) and is pure blasphemy (lauter lesterung Gottis).256

By 1525, Luther openly endorsed the idea of soul sleep. Expounding upon Jn. 8:51 (“Very truly, I tell you, whoever keeps my word will never see death”) in a Lenten church postil, Luther differentiated between dying (sterben) and seeing or tasting death (den tod sehen oder schmecken).257 The faithful, he claimed, in spite of the fact that they, too, have to die, will not see or taste death, because they keep and cling unto Christ’s words. But the infidels will taste death, that is to say, the power and might or bitterness of death, which is eternal death and Hell, because they do not keep Christ’s word.258 For Luther, the future destinies of the human person—death or Hell on the one hand and Heaven or resurrection on the other—are only the terminus, the final stage of a process that can already be experienced by the person during his or her earthly life. The Christians are already saved from death and Hell in this earthly life, so even when they die, Luther held, they will live (Jn. 11:25), for they will have no recollection of the atemporal soul sleep.259 The Scriptures call death ‘sleep,’ he argued, and just as one who falls asleep and wakes up the next morning does not know what has happened in the meantime, so will the just rise up suddenly on the last day unaware that they were in and had passed through death.260 A year later (1526), he remarked that Eccl. 9:5 (“the living know that they will die, but the dead know nothing; they have no more reward, and even the memory of them is lost”) is the most powerful passage in Scripture to show that the dead are asleep and do not know

254 WA X/3, p. 195; See also WA XII, pp. 592–97.
255 Koslofsky, Separating the Living from the Dead, p. 136.
257 WA XVII/2, p. 234.
258 “Also das man den tod schmecken wol mag heyssen die krafft und macht odder bitterheyt des tods, ia es ist der ewige tod unde die helle” (WA XVII/2, pp. 234–35).
259 WA XVII/2, p. 235.
260 “Drumb heyst auch der tod ynn der schrifft eyn schlaff. Denn gleich wie der nicht weys, wie yhm geschicht, wer eynschlefft und kompt zu morgen unversehens, wenn er auffwacht. Also werden wyr plötzlich auferstehen am Jůngsten tage, das wyr nicht wissen, wie wyr ynn den tod und durch den tod komen sind” (WA XVII/2, p. 235).
anything about earthly affairs. Luther argued that this clearly stands in opposition to the invocation of the saints and the fiction of Purgatory.

In his *Vom Abendmahl Christi, Bekenntnis* (1528), Luther repeated his argument that neither Purgatory nor prayer for the dead has any scriptural basis. Therefore, Luther maintained, it is not necessary to believe in Purgatory. Nonetheless, Luther added, all things are possible for God, and he could very well allow souls to be tormented after their departure from the body. But since God has not caused this to be spoken or written about, he does not wish to have it believed either, Luther argued. He also expressed that he knew of some kind of a Purgatory, but he deemed it improper to teach anything about it in the congregation or to deal with it by means of endowments or vigils.

By 1530 Luther was already completely estranged from the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory and wrote his *Widerruf vom Fegefeuer*. In that work an already embittered Luther resolutely denied the existence of Purgatory and advocated the indifferent sleep of the soul after being separated from the body by death. Luther began his work by reiterating his earlier position about the Catholic proof text *par excellence* for Purgatory (2 Macc. 12:43–45), claiming that the book is not part of the Bible and therefore cannot be held as a decisive argument. Furthermore, he asserts that the passage says nothing about Purgatory but refers to the article of faith on the resurrection of the dead, which was very much despised at the time.

---

261 WA XVII, p. 147.


263 "Wie wol Gott alle ding möglich, auch wol kündte die seelen peinigen lassen nach dem abschied vom leibe. Aber er hats nich lassen sagen noch schreiben, drumb wil ers auch nicht gegleubt haben" (WA XXVI, p. 508).

264 "Ich weis aber sonst wol ein fegefewr, Aber davon ist nichts ynn der gemeyn von zu leren noch da widder mit stiften und Vigilien zu handeln" (WA XXVI, p. 508). This other kind of Purgatory, as Koslofsky suggests, is clarified in Luther’s 1532 lectures on Psalm 51. There, Luther refers to David experiencing true Purgatory, that is, he was oppressed by the sorrows of sin and of God’s wrath: “David versatus in vero purgatorio, hoc est, oppressus doloribus peccati et irae Dei” (WA XL/2, p. 436). As these lectures appeared in print only in 1538, when Tyndale was already dead, they had no effect on the controversy between Tyndale and Joye. The idea of Purgatory as a state of inner sorrow and separation from God during this life takes its origin from Augustine’s view of purgation before and after death. See supra on p. 86.


266 WA XXX/2, p. 369.
the book was written, just as it was in Luther’s own time, he claimed. On the contrary, the text argues against any prayer for the dead in Purgatory, Luther argues, because it claims that there is nothing to stop the pain or the purging of the souls, as it says: “For if he were not expecting that those who had fallen would rise again, it would have been superfluous and foolish to pray for the dead.” Here it is clear, Luther explains, that the dead can be freed from their sins only at the time of the resurrection, and not before. Therefore, the text is not only dubious, but it directly contradicts the efficacy of the prayers for the souls in Purgatory. Furthermore, Luther held, the text speaks about one example which is not necessarily to be followed, as the numerous human sacrifices that the Bible mentions are clearly not to be followed (cf. Gen. 22:2; 2 Kgs. 16:3; 21:6; Jer. 7:31; Ez. 16:20). Anyway, Luther continued, Judas Maccabeus provided for a Jewish sacrifice according to the old covenant (Lev. 4), which is abolished now by Christ. So if Judas lived now, he would not dare to act in a similar way any longer. Accordingly, if the Papists really wanted to follow Judas, they would also have to sacrifice oxen, goats, and sheep, Luther maintained.

Luther also denied that Ps. 66(65):12 (“we went through fire and through water; yet you have brought us out to a spacious place”) referred to Purgatory. It only speaks about the sufferings of the holy ones “in these times” (i.e. Luther’s own time), he asserted. At the time when the psalm was

---

267 “Der text sagt von den sunden der verstorbenen und lobet Judas umb den artikel der aufferstehung, das der gute man, der dis buch gemacht hat, wil hiemit preisen den edlen artikel von dem aufferstehen der todten, der daszumal (wie auch noch) seer verachtet war” (WA XXX/2, p. 369).

268 WA XXX/2, p. 369.

269 WA XXX/2, pp. 370–71.


271 “Er sagt allain vom leiden der heiligen ynn dieser zeit” (WA XXX/2, p. 373). Since Luther equated the papacy (especially after Gregory VII) with the Antichrist, and he conceived the advance of the Ottoman Empire and the persecution of the Reformers as signs of the end times as described in Daniel and Revelation, he (like many of his contemporaries) lived in constant and eager expectation of an imminent end to the world. Nonetheless, Luther rejected chiliasm (see supra on p. 92) and calculations of the arrival of the end of the world (e.g. the calculations of his student, Michael Stiefel (also spelled Stifel or Styfel; d. 1567), that Christ would return on 19 October 1533). In “these last times of affliction,” Luther looked forward—without temporal calculation—to Christ’s second coming and the “lieber jungster Tag” (Letter of Luther to his wife, dated Eisenach, 16 July 1540, WA BW IX, p. 175, no. 3512, li. 17). See: Robin BRUCE, Prophecy and Gnosis. Apocalypticism in the Wake
written, Purgatory did not yet exist, he claimed, so the psalmist could not possibly refer to it.\textsuperscript{272} Luther also denied that ‘water’ in this verse would refer to some kind of water in which, as if in a sanctifying holy sauna, the souls were being tortured by rushing to and fro between the heat of the fiery sunshine and the icy water (cf. Job 24:19 in the Vg: \textit{ad nimium calorem transeat ab aquis nivium et usque ad inferos peccatum illius}).\textsuperscript{273}

Nor can Rev. 14:13 (“Blessed are the dead who from now on die in the Lord… They will rest from their labours, for their deeds follow them”) be taken as a reference for the intercession for the souls in Purgatory, Luther argued, because the text speaks about their own deeds in their life before they died, and not about vigils and intercessions that are offered for them after they died.\textsuperscript{274} In Luther’s view, the text signified the faithful who die in peace and in the faith in the Lord. The deceased who have died in the Lord are holy, Luther explained, and they enter into rest (cf. Wis. 3:3) and are at peace, as Is. 57:2 says that the just, when they die, go in peace as if to bed. For this reason they are called the ‘sleepers,’ and their death is called ‘sleep’ throughout the Scriptures.\textsuperscript{275}

Moreover, when 1 Cor. 3:15 (“If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire”) is taken as a reference to purgatorial fire, it is clearly taken out of context, Luther argued. For a proper explanation of this passage, he refers to Johannes Bugenhagen.\textsuperscript{276} Bugenhagen claimed that the text clearly talked about the
preachers and teachers, who are to build the Christian church with their teachings, and that Paul called some teachings gold, silver, and precious stones; other teachings, however, were wood, hay, and straw (1 Cor. 3:12). Obviously, Paul does not speak of the gold, silver, and precious stones that women wear around their neck, nor does he speak of the wood, hay, or straw that cows and calves eat. But the teachings and sermons of the Christians will not be eaten by cows, nor will they be worn around any woman’s neck, as any cow would probably know unless it was a Sophist (Papist). Likewise, the fire by which the teachings are tested is not the fire with which gold, silver, hay, and straw are tested, but another fire, one that will test what just and unjust are on the day on which this will be revealed. But if the text speaks about the teachings and the sermons, Luther argued, then Purgatory as the ‘Papists’ believe it to be must be only for the teachers and the preachers, because they are the ones who deliver them, and not the ordinary believer. The fire, then, cannot be the fire of Purgatory, but only the fire of opposition that the preaching of the Gospel has to pass through in this world.

After refuting the Catholics’ classic biblical proof texts, Luther attacks the Sacred Tradition as presented by the Church Fathers. Their testimonies, Luther maintained, are contradictory, confusing, and unwarranted. St Gregory, for example, wrote about the purgatorial fire, but he is untrustworthy because he also mentions many examples of the appearance of ghosts, and these ghosts, Luther affirmed, cannot be anyone but the devil. When the Church Fathers cite from the Bible, their quotations are often taken out of context and are against the sense of the original text, Luther claimed. These naive pious men meant no harm and wished to establish no new teachings. They spoke inconsiderately, but not
with bad, heretical intentions, Luther believed.283 Yet their writings were twisted and abused by the Sophists to make new articles of faith.284

To conclude, Luther claims that there is no reason to believe in Purgatory, and the psalms and other biblical texts used in the vigils and suffrages have nothing to do with Purgatory. Consequently, the Catholic liturgies of praying for the dead are a blasphemous abuse and abomination (lesterlicher misbrec h vnd grewel).285

After the publication of the Widerruf vom Fegefeuer, there is no further mention in Luther’s works of the possibility of the existence of Purgatory or any purification after death. When he had his above-mentioned sermons reprinted in the 1530s, he carefully removed every reference to these topics.286 Yet Luther remained enthralled with issues concerning the hereafter.287 In his sermon on Easter Monday, 6 April 1534, preaching about Jesus’ encounter with the disciples on their way to Emmaus, Luther wondered what Jesus could possibly cite from Moses (Lk. 24:27) to prove that the Son of Man had to suffer and rise again.288 One such possible text, recorded in Mt. 22:32, which Christ used to prove resurrection during His earthly life in His discussion with the Sadducees, is one of the most commonly used texts of the OT.289 God is not the God of things that do not exist, Luther explained, and therefore Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all of the other prophets, as well as those in the grave, must be alive in the eyes of God, because God said to Moses that His name will be “the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” forever (Ex. 3:15).290

283 “Die lieben veter haben solchs unbedacht, aber nicht böser, ketzerischer meinung gered” (WA XXX/2, p. 382).
284 WA XXX/2, pp. 380–84.
285 WA XXX/2, p. 389.
286 Koslofsky, Separating the Living from the Dead, p. 138; Köstlin, Luthers Theologie, I, p. 376.
287 Luther was also concerned inter alia about Christ’s descent into Hell. He held that Christ’s soul descended into Hell according to its substance: “Vere enim anima christi secundum substantiam descendit ad inferos” (WA V, p. 463). He rejected the idea of universal salvation (WA XXVI, p. 509; XXXVII, p. 372).
288 *Ego optarem, das man mocht wissen, quales scripturas hab gefurt ex Mose et propheteis, quibus entzundet und gesterckt corda et uberzeuget, quod must leiden, resurgere et in nomine eius praedicari remissio peccatorum, weil man doch so gar wenig in Mose findet, als lesst sichs ansehen, quod tale nihil in Mose schiehet* (WA XXXVII, p. 363).
289 *Acceptit das gemeintse wort, quod ludaei habebant: ‘Ego deus Abraham.’ Ista optime noverunt, fuit communissimus textus” (WA XXXVII, p. 365).
290 *Quid schleuf Christus draus? Sadducaei non de spiritu, angelis. Ibi Christus facit Mosen sehen und reden, qui cecus & c. quid? deus est Abraham, Iacob, &c. das
But this being alive in the eyes of God, the resurrection, has already started in this life, as Luther argued on the basis of 2 Cor. 4:12 in his sermon on the following day. But even if Paul is speaking spiritually about resurrection, flesh and blood will rise on Judgement Day, for this is the ultimate promise and hope of the believer (cf. Rom. 8:11). Luther also warned that dying spiritually (geistlich) with Christ, being buried spiritually with Him, and rising spiritually together with Him should not denote the detestation of the body or the physical reality. Obviously, Luther's
spiritualized explanation of Jesus’ words to the Sadducees is a far cry from
the traditional vindication of the immortality of the soul. The more
Luther wondered about questions concerning the afterlife, the more he
became convinced that souls in the hereafter are asleep and unconscious.
Thus, he even propagated the situation of new cemeteries outside of busy
town centres as an appropriate and quiet place for the sleeping souls.
For him, the specifically and genuinely divine act is the resurrection of the
dead, in which all will participate, not only the believers.

As has been demonstrated, Luther’s rejection of the idea of Purgatory
evolved gradually. His initial problems with the lucrative business of sell-
ing indulgences led him to question the authority of the Church Militant
over the Church Suffering. At first he accepted the existence of Purgatory
in spite of his denial of any clear scriptural evidence. Later he claimed
that the existence of Purgatory is not a necessary article of faith. He came
to believe that there was a post-mortem purgation (a state rather than a
place). Finally, he rejected any consciousness of the elect after death and
claimed that the saints enter into atemporality after death. By the time
of the Tyndale–Joye controversy, Luther had developed his ideas about
soul sleep and his position had been well publicized. It would be false,
however, to claim that Luther used the idea of soul sleep in order to reject
the existence of Purgatory.

loquitur hic. Non de coelo et terra ut creata, Non de homine, ut habet animam, corpus,
5 sensus, *wie er erbeit, Das ist als* a deo creata et omnia bona, quae dicit &c. De his
non loquitur. Sed is est terrenus homo, qui est sine deo, non agnoscit a deo dari, nihil
habet, nisi quod dat ratio, qui est infidelis, caecus, nihil sciens de deo, vita aeterna et non

294 See supra on p. 93.
295 For Luther’s reasons for suggesting extramural burial places, see: Koslofsky, *The
Reformation of the Dead. Death and Ritual in Early Modern Germany*, London: Macmillan,
296 WA XXX/1, p. 250; WA XXVI, p. 509. Cf. Ulrich Asendorf, *Eschatologie bei Luther,*
Göttingen: V&R, 1967, p. 287; Paul Althaus, *Die Theologie Martin Luthers,* Gütersloh:
297 In later years, however, Luther reverted occasionally to his inherited Catholic view
on the fate of the soul after death. As a consequence, the doctrine on psychosomnolence
was in most Protestant denominations replaced by that on the natural immortality of the
298 To the contrary: George R. Knight, *Seventh-day Adventists Answer Questions on Doc-
In 1522 an anonymous compilation of theological theses by Luther, Melanchthon, and Karlstadt (c.1480–1541) was published in Basel. In this publication, a series of forty-eight scripture-based articles concerning the fate of the dead under the heading *Articuli de coniuratione mortuorum migrantium* has been ascribed with certainty to Karlstadt. In these articles Karlstadt treated the afterlife fate of the human soul. He claimed that having left the body, the soul immediately enters either Heaven or Hell. Those who pursued good will enter into eternal life; those who pursued evil, into eternal fire. He also declared that people who already received their reward in this life (as the rich man in Lk. 16:19–31) will be tortured in the other, but those who were treated ill in this life (as Lazarus) will enjoy eternal comfort. Between the place of comfort and the place of torture there is an immense chasm, such that it is impos-

---

299 For Melanchthon, see *infra* on p. 188.


Koslofsky, *Seperating the Living from the Dead*, p. 134.


sible to pass from one place to the other (cf. Lk. 16:26). Karlstadt also held that people believing in the immortality of the soul merely based on the Purgatory of St Patrick are for this very reason infidels. In this compilation of propositions Karlstadt apparently rejects the existence of Purgatory altogether and excludes any post-mortem purification.

At the end of the same year or in early 1523, while still in Wittenberg Karlstadt published, in quarto format, his *Ein Sermon vom stand der Christglaubigen seelen, von Abrahams schosz vnd fegfeur/ der abgeschydnen seelen*. The short pamphlet of barely twelve pages became a bestseller and saw altogether seven consecutive editions in Augsburg, Nürnberg, and Strasbourg in 1523 alone. This work of Karlstadt already shows a direct influence of Wessel Gansfort’s writings, published only a year earlier in Wittenberg. The book is presumably the written form of an actual sermon, delivered in Wittenberg, possibly on All Souls’ Day 1522.

Karlstadt’s *Ein Sermon vom stand der Christglaubigen Seelen* stands in sharp contrast to his earlier publication, for in his new book he did not

---


306 A popular place of pilgrimage in Ireland, described by Jacobus de Voragine in the *Legenda Aurea*, (much circulated in manuscript form, and first printed in Strasbourg in 1482).


309 Besides the quarto Nürnberg edition (see n. 308), the other editions (all in quarto) were: five editions in Augsburg (three by Philipp Ulhart, one by Jörg Nadler, and another by Sigmund Grimm) and one in Strasbourg by the heirs of Matthias Schürer (d. 1539) (Matthias Schürer Erben). See: Ernst Koch, art. *Fegfeuer, in Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 5, Berlin, 1976, p. 74; Kohler, Wilfert & Weismann, *Flugschriften des frühen 16*, Fiche 332, no. 937; Alejandro Zorzin, *Karlstadt als Flugschriftenautor*, (Göttinger theologische Arbeiten, 48), Göttingen: V&R, 1990, pp. 97–100 and 273–308, n. 52; Woodbridge, Gerhard Westerburg, p. 105. Koslofsky counts only six editions. (Koslofsky, *Separating the Living from the Dead*, p. 130).

310 See *supra* on pp. 86 and 127. The influence of Gansfort on Karlstadt was first proposed by Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, 1962, p. 104, and was demonstrated by Kleiner, Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt’s *Eschatology*, pp. 1–6. Koslofsky suggests that Karlstadt “may have been instrumental in bringing Gansfort’s writings to press in Wittenberg in 1522” (Koslofsky, *Separating the Living from the Dead*, p. 130).

311 Karlstadt refers to 1 Thes. 4 as today’s reading and as “Das ist die Epistle, wolche die vermainte Christliche kirche den Seelen zu hilf und trost gestatt ze lesen und zu singen” (Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, *Ein Sermon vom stand der Christglaubigen seelen*, (1523), sigs. A2r and A3v). See: Koslofsky, *Separating the Living from the Dead*, p. 135.
deny the existence of Purgatory any longer. In fact, the title pages of five out of the seven editions are illustrated with woodcuts showing souls being helped out from the fiery abyss, because Karlstadt argued in his pamphlet that there is some kind of purgation after death, but it is a spiritual one.\footnote{Koslofsky counted only six editions. Koslofsky, Separating the Living from the Dead, p. 130.} Karlstadt developed this idea of a ‘spiritual Purgatory’ very much akin to Gansfort’s ideas, and in all probability this change in Karlstadt’s thinking was influenced by the writings of the Frisian theologian, who was brought to Wittenberg by Hinne Rode a year earlier and whose writings were published in the course of the same year as Karlstadt’s work.\footnote{On Gansfort’s book in Wittenberg, see supra nn. 2 and 4 on p. 127. For developing a spiritual understanding of Purgatory, Hans-Peter Hasse revealed Karlstadt’s dependence on the mystical German theologian Johannes Tauler (c.1300–61). Hasse, Karlstadt und Tauler. See also: Woodbridge, Gerhard Westerburg, pp. 127–29.} His starting point is the reading of the day, 1 Thes. 4:13–18. Karlstadt suggests that besides its obvious literal sense (consolation of the Thessalonians that they will be reunited with their dead in the resurrection), the passage has another, hidden meaning, too. The basis for this hidden sense, according to Karlstadt, is the statement that we should rejoice for the dead (cf. 1 Thes. 4:13). The doctrine of “priests, popes and bishops” is therefore false, because they

![Figure 1. Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, Ein Sermon vom stand der Christglaubigen Seelen von Abrahams schoß vn[d ] Fegfeür, der abgeschydnen Seelen, Wittenberg [vere Augsburg: Philipp Ulhart], 1523. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Regensburg, Staatliche Bibliothek—999/4 Theol.syst. 540(3).](image-url)
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preach that Purgatory should be feared and that the souls abiding there are in a miserable position and should be pitied. But in reality, one should not want to bring them out from Purgatory, because the state of the souls there is better than that of the living.\textsuperscript{314} Praying for the dead is thus not only useless, but it is also wrong, for unless one asks from God what God’s own will is, a prayer for the souls’ release from Purgatory is wicked and against God.\textsuperscript{315} Therefore, Karlstadt criticized the Catholic practice of suffrages for the deceased, asserting that no earthly intercession but fire alone is able to purify the souls and bring them closer to God. Karlstadt also believed that in this spiritual Purgatory “die Abgeschiedenen schlummern, sie sind nicht tot, sondern schlafen.”\textsuperscript{316} With this booklet Karlstadt was the first Protestant—preceding even Luther—to openly defend the idea of soul sleep.\textsuperscript{317}

In the same year (1523) Karlstadt’s brother-in-law, the Cologne theologian and reformer Gerhard Westerburg (1486–1558), published an adapted version of Karlstadt’s work under the title \textit{Uom fegfewer vnnd standt verscheyden selen eyn Chrystliche meynung} (Strasbourg, 1523).\textsuperscript{318} Westerburg was clearly taken by the subject, for he also published a Latin booklet on the same topic later in the course of the same year, with the title \textit{De purgatorio et animarum statu} (Strasbourg, 1523).\textsuperscript{319} Although it follows a comparable train of thought with arguments similar to his German writing, the Latin pamphlet is not a translation but an original work. While the German work was intended as popular reading for the common people of Germany, the Latin treatise was more concise and, besides the obvious

\textsuperscript{314} “Das wir sie auß dem standt wollten bringen der besser ist dann unser standt?” (Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, \textit{Ein Sermon vom stand der Christglaubigen seelen}, (1523), sig. A3’).

\textsuperscript{315} “So wer unser geebt wider got und böß” (Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, \textit{Ein Sermon vom stand der Christglaubigen seelen}, (1523), sig. A3’).

\textsuperscript{316} Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt, \textit{Ein Sermon vom stand der Christglaubigen seelen}, (1523), sig. A3’. Cf. also “Wir haben hoffnung das unsere abgestorbne freundt in Christo verstorben seind. […] und hoffen darzu/ das sie in Christo schlaffen/ wie Lazarus in der schoß Abrae schlieff […] Auch wissen wir/ das sie Christus im letsten tage wirt auffwecken/ und bey sich behalten” (sig. A4’).

\textsuperscript{317} Cf. \textit{HZSW} VI,1, p. 188, n. 4; Willem Balke, \textit{Calvijn en de doperse radikalen}, Amsterdam: Bolland, 1977, p. 35.


\textsuperscript{319} For bibliographical data of the Latin pamphlet, see infra n. 321. Due to the similarity between Westerburg’s books and Karlstadt’s work, the authorship of Westerburg’s pamphlets has been called into question by some. For a discussion, see: Woodbridge, Gerhard Westerburg, pp. 110–15.
addressees, viz. the theologians of Cologne, targeted an international and more educated readership. Consequently, Westerburg’s thoughts are elaborated upon in more detail in the Latin version on three subjects: the prayers for the dead, the post-mortem preaching of the Gospel to the souls, and the concept of soul sleep. Both the German and the Latin publications went through three editions and became immensely popular, earning Westerburg the title of ‘Dr. Fegefewr.’

Westerburg began his German pamphlet by advocating the Protestant principle of *sola scriptura*. For him, the Bible is the sole authority on every question, and no dreams, stories, fables, fictitious examples, or human teachings (*keine treüme gesicht/ fabelen/ erdychten exemplen/ menschlichen leren*) can be used to establish the truth.


Westerburg referred to Jer. 51:3; 20:9; and 23:29 (Westerburg, *Uom fegfewer vnnd standt verscheyden selin*, sig. B3v).
This should be taken not as a natural fire (*naturlich fewer*), but as a spiritual one (*das da geystlich ist*), he argued, as is clear from the parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man.\(^{325}\) The fire Paul mentions in 1 Cor. 3:13 should be understood as a simile and not as a reference to physical fire. According to Westerburg, Is. 40:6–8 also speaks about how God’s word burns the heart of the human person, and cleanses the soul and mortifies the flesh upon entering the human person.\(^{326}\) God’s word purifies the human being from the selfish love that hinders the human person from seeing God.\(^{327}\) This process of spiritual purification starts on earth, continues in Purgatory, and ends in the resurrection: on earth the human person recognizes God in the darkness and is overwhelmed by the Lord and his teachings; in Purgatory the souls recognize that God is as the sun in the sunrise; and finally, in the resurrection God will be immediately recognized, just as the sun in the full light of day.\(^{328}\) In view of this, Westerburg, similarly to Gansfort, held that Purgatory is not a fearful place of punishment, but a rather pleasant and desirable state for the souls. Westerburg also followed Gansfort in allowing for a post-mortem possibility of salvation. The purpose of Christ’s descent into Hell was the preaching of the Gospel to the dead, because God does not condemn anyone to whom the Good News has not been made known.\(^{329}\) Nonetheless, there will be souls who will refuse to

\(^{325}\) “Auch die schrift nicht anzeigt ein naturlich fewer in dem schoß Abrahe” (Westerburg, *Uom fegfewer vndern stantd verscheysten selen*, sig. B3r).

\(^{326}\) “Dar zu gehört auch das Esaias spricht. Das alles fleysch ist gleich als hew/ und seyn glorien gleich als die blumen uff dem acker/ das hew ist verdoeret/ und die blume ist abgefallen/ wan der geyst des herren hat darynne gewehet/ das volck ist wahrhafftig hew/ es ist verdoeret/ und sein blume ist abgefallen/ wan das wort des herren hat gewirckt jm volck. Esaiam am. xl. cap. Als solt er sagen/ das wort des herren das da ewiglich bleybt das ist eyn fewer/ welches in das hertz geht” (Westerburg, *Uom fegfewer vndern stantd verscheysten selen*, sig. B3r). Woodbridge rightly remarks that the idea of fire is absent from the passage in Isaiah and that Westerburg not only stretched the meaning of the original passage but misquoted the last verse (Woodbridge, *Gerhard Westerburg*, p. 126).

\(^{327}\) Westerburg, *Uom fegfewer vndern stantd verscheysten selen*, sig. B4r-v.

\(^{328}\) “Zum ersten erkennen wyr hie got in der vinsternis und verwundern uns vom herren und von seyen reden. Jm anderen erkennen wir gott gleich als die sonne in der morgenroet. Jm dritten sehen wyr got gleich wie die sonne ym klaren mittag” (Westerburg, *Uom fegfewer vndern stantd verscheysten selen*, sig. B3r). Woodbridge assumes that Westerburg inherited Karlstadt’s mysticism. (Woodbridge, *Gerhard Westerburg*, pp. 127–28). On Karlstadt’s mysticism, see *supra* in n. 313. As has been quoted, Gansfort applied similar imagery, see *supra* on p. 179.

\(^{329}\) “Ergo neminem iudicat cui non est predicatum euangelium. […] Nunc aut Christus neminem iudicat nisi euangelizatum” (Westerburg, *De purgatorio et animarum statu*, sig. A4r). For Gansfort’s similar position, see *supra* on p. 132.
believe, and these will be damned.330 But Westerburg went further than the Frisian theologian and claimed that the dead souls have fallen asleep in Christ, and any attempt to liberate them disturbs them. Consequently, it is not only worthless to celebrate masses and to offer sacrifices for the dead (which only distress the people), but it is also destructive.331 Westerburg acknowledged that praying for the dead was an ancient custom but indicated that no prayer, not even one according to God’s will, could help the souls in the process of this spiritual purification.332 He also reflected on the financial aspect of the practice of selling indulgences. He regarded the payment for intercessory prayers, masses, and indulgences as contrary to the idea of solidarity with the poor. According to him, the money spent on these prayers would be much better spent if it were shared with the living poor according to Christ’s teaching.333 Arguing in this manner, he advocated precisely the original purpose of indulgences.334

The thirteen editions of Karlstadt’s and Westerburg’s comparable works on Purgatory published in only two years (twelve in 1523 and one in 1524)

---

330 “Predicabat ergo ut doceret & credulos dignos eterna uita, incredulos autem dignos aeterno supplicio iudicaret” (Westerburg, De purgatorio et animarum statu, sig. A4’).

331 “Ex quo etiam constat frivolum opinionem pontificis missas, sacrificia pro defunctis instituentis, ut nos nomine defunctorum tristes faceret, quoniam si dormierunt animae in Christo optabilis est earum pars, desiderabilis dormitio [...] Pestilens est liberatio quae huiusmodi spem perturbat” (Westerburg, De purgatorio et animarum statu, sigs. A1’–A2’).

332 “Darumb sollenn wyr nit betten das die selen eher in eyn besser wesen genommen wurd, als got wil. Auch so werden sye eyn in eyn serren und gereynigt das da geystlich und vorstentlich ist/ und nicht durch furbit” (Westerburg, Uom fegfewer vnnd standt verscheyden selen, sig. B1’).

333 “Von der unkost/ wer besser (meynes beduckens) dz man sölch gelt/ do für die toden unbarmhertzlich und geweltlich von den armen gedrungen und abgeschetzet/ sunst unnutzlich aufgeben wyrt/ den lebenden armen nodturtigen/ das ist/ unseren bruderen nach Christus leer/ mitteilet/ und leyß sye keynen mangel lyden/ da wurdt es anzweyfell wol undt unnutzlich aufgegeben seyn/ und dyß sey dem gemeinen man gesagt” (Westerburg, Uom fegfewer vnnd standt verscheyden selen, sig. C3’). Cf. WOODBRIDGE, Gerhard Westerburg, p. 120.

334 See supra on p. 112. In England, to encourage poor folk to come and pray, handing out alms was part of the funeral service and the Mass for the Dead. See: DUFFY, The Striping of the Altars, pp. 221, 354–57, 365.
testify to the enormous popularity and effect they exercised, especially in Germany and the Low Countries. The exact quantity of the pamphlets in circulation is difficult to approximate, but Westerburg wrote a decade later that 3000 copies of his Latin edition were put out. Stefan Oehming estimates the typical output of each edition to be between 800 and 1500, and the seven editions together produced a circulation of several thousand books. Sigrid Looß points out that Karlstadt’s sermon on Purgatory now survives in the unusually high number of 130 copies in various libraries around the world.

Ten years after the first publication of his pamphlet on Purgatory, Westerburg issued a revised version in the form of an answer to the objections raised by the Cologne theologians and by Joannes Cochlaeus (1479–1552), his former friend and classmate in Bologna, against Westerburg’s books. The new treatise of 93 folios received the deservedly lengthy title Wie die hochgelerten von Cölln Doctores in der Gottheit vnd Ketzermeister/ den Doctor Gerhart Westerburg des Fegfewrs halben/ als einen unglaubigen verurtheilt/ vnd verdampt haben. Wie Doctor Johann Cocleus von Wendelstein wider D. Westerburgs buch/ vom Fegfewr geschrieben. Westerburg developed new arguments against the intercession for the dead. He argued that only Christ could forgive sins, and only He was capable of giving satisfaction for sins. He is the only Saviour and Reconciler of all humankind, who once and for all gave satisfaction by His death on the cross, which


337 OEHMING, Karlstads Auffassung vom Fegefeuer, p. 90.

338 LOOß, Die Wirksamkeit von Flugschriften des Andreas Bodenstein aus Karlstadt, p. 130.

was sufficient for all sins. But intercessions and masses for the dead performed by the priests and the monks imply that Christ’s salvific death was not sufficient for all sins. Hence, masses and prayers for the dead could not possibly remit sins or give satisfaction for them. Westerburg stressed the Protestant principle of *sola fide*: salvation can only be reached through faith. He defined faith as believing that Christ is the Redeemer and Saviour; that His suffering was sufficient for all sins; that He gave satisfaction for them on the cross; and that He redeemed us from eternal death.

**Philipp Melanchthon**

Although he never took a doctorate in theology, Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560) was probably the most erudite of all of the early Reformers.

---


341 “Dann das ist der recht glaub/ der vns selig macht/ das wir glauben das Christus unser erlöser und Heilandt/ durch sein leiden fur alle vnseren sunden gnug gethan/ vnd am stam des heligen creutz bezaelt/ und uns vom ewigen todt erloeset hat” (Westerburg, *Wie die hochgelerten von Cölln Doctores*, sig. O2v). Woodbridge pointed out how this argument stood in contradiction to Westerburg’s concept of Purgatory. See: Woodbridge, Gerhard Westerburg, p. 141. According to Calvin A. Pater, in 1545 (that is, after the debate between Tyndale and Joye), Westerburg was to revoke his earlier statements on Purgatory, but Pater gives no references. See: Pater, Gerhard Westerburg. The Father of Anabaptism, p. 149, n. 37. For his later works touching upon the subject, see: Woodbridge, Gerhard Westerburg, pp. 141–43.

342 Philipp Schwarzerd (or Schwarzert or Schwarzerdt) was first tutored by the Hungarian Johannes Hungarus (or Unger) at the famous Dominican school at Pforzheim, where he learned Latin and Greek and was introduced to the writings of Aristotle and of the authors of Antiquity. Philipp’s maternal grand-uncle was the Catholic Hebraist Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522), under whose influence the young Philipp took on the Humanist name Melanchthon. The humanistic figure of his uncle remained a source of inspiration for Melanchthon and influenced his entire life, even though Melanchthon’s participation in the Reformation later caused a break between them. At the age of fifteen he took his BA in Heidelberg (1511) and enrolled the following year at the University of Tübingen. After gaining his master’s degree in philosophy (1516), he became an instructor of younger scholars. In 1518 he published his Greek grammar (which became a standard schoolbook until the 18th century) and obtained the newly created chair of Greek at the recently founded University of Wittenberg (1502) on Reuchlin’s recommendation. There he obtained his bachelor’s degree in biblical studies and became a professor at the Faculty of Theology. His ideal was to remain a Humanist scholar, and he continued to work on the classics, along with his exegetical studies, until the end of his life. On his life and theology, see: Adolf von Harnack, Philipp Melanchthon, Berlin: Buxenstein, 1897; Peter Fraenkel, Testimonia
His encounter and friendship with Luther, whom he later often called his “spiritual father,” affected his life deeply. Yet the influence was mutual: while Melanchthon attended Luther’s lectures at the university, it was Melanchthon who helped Luther learn Greek and who revised Luther’s translations of the NT and of the LXX, despite Luther’s initial opposition to Melanchthon.³⁴³ Later Melanchthon accompanied Luther to the Leipzig Disputation (1519).³⁴⁴ He drew up a report of the disputation in cooperation with Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531) that elicited Eck’s criticism.³⁴⁵ In his reply Melanchthon set forth Luther’s opposition between the authority of the Scripture versus that of the Fathers.³⁴⁶ In 1521 Melanchthon set down the first systematic summary of Protestant doctrine, the Loci communes rerum theologicarum.³⁴⁷ In subsequent years he kept revising the work, and the book went through more than a hundred editions during his lifetime. He also published several commentaries and treatises on various topics. His writings became very influential in the course of the development of Protestant dogmatic thought. It was

---

³⁴³ Luther had opposed Melanchthon’s candidacy for the chair of Greek at the University of Wittenberg.

³⁴⁴ See supra on p. 166.


³⁴⁶ Philipp Melanchthon, Defensio Philippi Melanchthonis contra Ioannem Ekivm Theologiae Professorum, Wittenberg: Johann Rhau-Grunenberg, 1539. See: Meijering, Melanchthon and Patristic Thought.

³⁴⁷ Philipp Melanchthon, Loci communes rerum theologicarum seu hypotyposes theologicae, Wittenberg: M. Lotther, 1521, reprinted in Basel: Adam (Heinrich) Petri, 1521 (much reprinted in subsequent years, also with emendations by Melanchthon).
he who drafted the Seventeen Articles of Evangelical Faith (the so-called *Augsburg Confession*) for the Diet of Augsburg (1530).

The first traces of Melanchthon’s theological views on the afterlife can be found in his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew.\(^{348}\) Expanding on the text of Mt. 22:23–33, Melanchthon wrote that the Sadducees denied not only the resurrection of the dead (*negarent resurrectionem mortuorum*) but also the immortality of the soul (*negarent animas esse immortales*), and they believed that human life terminates at death (*hominum vitam credebant finiri in morte*). They rejected any form of life beyond this one, and doing so they also disallowed for a judgement after this life (*nullum restare iudicium post hanc vitam*).\(^{349}\) By denying this fundamental and foremost article of faith about the life after this and about the future judgement, the Sadducees were manifestly the enemies of God and of the Church, Melanchthon maintained.\(^{350}\) It is interesting to note here that Melanchthon equated the denial of the resurrection with the denial of the immortality of the soul. According to Melanchthon, denying bodily resurrection implies denying the immortality of the soul, too. Therefore, in Jesus’ discussion with the Sadducees, the real issue is the question of immortality, he argued. In Melanchthon’s eyes, the Sadducees’ question concerns the “life after this life” (*vita post hanc vitam*). This is what the Sadducees have ridiculed, and this is the subject Christ addresses in His answer.\(^{351}\) Melanchthon summarizes the logic of Christ’s answer as follows: “God is the God of the living and not of the dead. God is the God of Abraham. Thus Abraham is alive.”\(^{352}\) In such a reading Christ’s answer only disproves the mortality of the soul, but, strictly speaking, it is not an argument for the bodily resurrection. Strictly speaking, Christ’s answer refuted only the Sadducees’ disbelief in the immortality of the soul, according to Melanchthon. Yet the bodily resurrection cannot be doubted either,


\(^{349}\) Melanchthon, *In Evangelium Matthaei annotationes*, col. 959.

\(^{350}\) “Cumque negarent hoc praeicipum fundamentum articulorum fidei de vita post hanc vitam, et de iudicio futuro, manifeste erant hostes Dei et Ecclesiae” (Melanchthon, *In Evangelium Matthaei annotationes*, cols. 959–60).

\(^{351}\) “Nunc venio ad argumentum Christi de vita post hanc vitam” (Melanchthon, *In Evangelium Matthaei annotationes*, col. 961).

\(^{352}\) Melanchthon, *In Evangelium Matthaei annotationes*, col. 961.
as it was sufficiently proved by the resurrection of Christ and of many others, stated the Reformer. According to him, Christ’s answer to the Sadducees contains consolation not only for the future life, but also for this present life, because Christ’s words also mean that God cares about the living, too.

A post-mortem existence is also discussed in Melanchthon’s commentary on Lk. 23:43. Melanchthon expounds upon this text in a spiritual way. According to him, Christ’s words (hodie mecum eris in Paradiso) mean that the repentant thief will not be eternally dead (non eris in morte æterna), but will enjoy true happiness in God (habebis gaudia vera in Deo). Melanchthon calls the repentant thief an heir of eternal life (hæres vitæ æternæ) already in his earthly life, and therefore he is already rejoicing in God. For this is eternal life, Melanchthon said, alluding to Jn. 17:3, that we may know God and that we recognize Jesus, whom He sent as the Christ. By participating in this joy in his heart, the Good Thief received new life, which means new justice (nova vita, quæ est nova iustitia). For where there is true faith, Melanchthon claimed, there are all of the virtues, and this faith produces good works. In this passage Melanchthon did not address the question of what happens to the soul of the Thief after his death. It is not entirely clear why he avoided the topic, but it is not at all implausible that he wanted to prevent an open conflict with Luther, who by that time was developing his ideas about soul sleep.

In 1535 Melanchthon published a revised version of his Loci communes theologici. In that new edition Melanchthon for the first time treated the biblical basis of the belief in eternal life and in the resurrection of the dead. He discussed both subjects under one heading: “De resurrectione mortuorum.” Melanchthon did not specify whether eternal life means the immortality of the soul (as could be presumed on the basis of his earlier commentary on Matthew), and he called ‘eternal life’ and ‘resurrection of the dead’—in ‘one breath’, so to say—a single article of faith.

---

353 “Caeterum bene refutati sunt Sadducaei, ipsa resuscitacione Christi, et aliorum multorum, qui resuscitati sunt et conspecti a multis” (Melanchthon, In Evangelium Matthei annotationes, col. 961).

354 Melanchthon, In Evangelium Matthei annotationes, col. 1026.

355 Melanchthon, In Evangelium Matthei annotationes, col. 1026.


357 Melanchthon, Loci communes theologici (1535), col. 524.
This article is one of the foremost precepts of the Gospel and is clearly stated and often emphasized in the NT. According to Melanchthon, it is Christ’s own words that most evidently speak about this article of faith in the passages where Jesus promises eternal punishment for the wicked and eternal bliss for the just (Mt. 25:46; and Jn. 5:25 and 6:40). In 1 Cor. 15 Paul, too, keenly affirms this article, Melanchthon added. Subsequently Melanchthon cites Is. 26:19–21 as proof text from the OT for the double expectation of eternal life and resurrection of the body. In Melanchthon’s view, Isaiah unmistakably speaks in this passage about the revivification of the dead, the joy of the saints, the punishment of the wicked, and the ‘present’ afflictions of the Church. But what is eternal life, Melanchthon asks himself? And the answer he finds is that for the faithful it is eternal bliss (perpetua lætitia), perfect knowledge of God, and perfect justice without sin or death.\footnote{In his next, still further amended edition of the Loci theologici (1543), Melanchthon elaborated upon the theme of the afterlife (Melanchthon, Loci theologici recens recogniti. Avtore Philip. Melanthone, Wittenberg, Petrus Seitz, 1543 (Republished several times in Wittenberg, Basel, and Leipzig). Published in Melanchthon, Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae supersunt, omnia, (CR XXIV), ed. Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider, Brunswich: Schwetschke, 1854, cols. 561–1106). In that edition, too, Melanchthon treats eternal life (this time more clearly including the immortality of the soul) and the resurrection of the flesh under the common title “De resurrectione mortuorum.” Melanchthon adds several other OT proofs for the double expectation of eternal life and the resurrection of the body (e.g. Is. 66:22–24, 65:17–20, and 24:21; Ps. 15:9; Job 19:25; etc.). Melanchthon also claims that the accounts of the translations of Enoch and Elijah being alive to God prove the existence of eternal life: Enoch et Elias vivi transstuli sunt ad Deum, ut textus de Enoch clare dicit. Haec facta certe sunt manifesta testimonia vitae aeternae. In this version of the Loci, immortality of the soul and eternal life seem to be mutually interchangeable (cols. 925–29).}

Melanchthon’s views on the afterlife prior to the Tyndale–Joye controversy are only partially made explicit.\footnote{In 1540, Melanchthon published his Commentarius de anima (Vitebergæ, Ioannis Luft, later revised as Liber de anima (1553)), an innovative commentary on Aristotle’s philosophical work about the soul, which can only be fully understood in light of Lutheran theology. In this, Melanchthon claimed that any commentary on Aristotle’s work should be about the Christian rather than about the human soul, and that there was no inherent ‘spirit’ equivalent to the rational soul in the human person with whose help the human person could gain salvation, but rather that the human person as a whole, both body and soul, became subject to either salvation or damnation. See: Sachiko KUSUKAWA, Melanchthon’s Science Textbooks, in Paradigm. Newsletter of the Colloquium on Textbooks, Schools and Society 1,5 (1991); Sachiko KUSUKAWA, The Transformation of Natural Philosophy. The Case of Philip Melanchthon, (Ideas in Context 34), Cambridge: UP, 1995, esp. pp. 74–89; Sascha SALATOWSKY, De Anima. Die Rezeption der aristotelischen Psychologie im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, (Bochumer Studien zur Philosophie 43), Amsterdam: B.R. Grüner, 2006.} Up until 1535, the Loci communes did not cover the issue. Whether this means that for some reason Melanchthon felt no particular need to pronounce a clear standpoint on
the matter, or whether his views corresponded to the traditional Catholic teaching, is not entirely clear. His commentary on Matthew seems to suggest that for him the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul are only two sides of the same coin. They seem to be dependent on one another. For him, the denial of one involves the denial of the other, and proving one proves the other, too. His more spiritual explanation of Lk. 23:43 might hint at his awareness of Luther’s ideas on the topic and at a desire to avoid an open confrontation on it. There is nothing to suggest that he would have shared Luther’s ideas about soul sleep.

Huldrych Zwingli

When the authority of the Swiss Reformer Huldrych Zwingli (1484–1531) was challenged by a radical wing of Protestantism, Zwingli turned violently against its adherents.\(^{360}\) In addition to employing political repression and persecution, Zwingli also engaged himself in a verbal combat against the Anabaptists (whom he called Catabaptists). He wrote repeatedly against their teachings.\(^{361}\) Similarly to most of his contemporaries, Zwingli conceived Anabaptists as people who misinterpreted the Gospel, endangered society by undermining moral requirements, and constituted a menacing source of social unrest.\(^{362}\) His main and final theological work on the subject, the *In catabaptistarum strophas Elenchus*, appeared in


Zürich on 31 July 1527, issued from the press of Christopher Froschauer. This is the only work in Latin by Zwingli on the topic. The first part is a defence vis-à-vis a confutation booklet, written perhaps by Konrad Grebel and directed specifically against Zwingli himself. The second part refutes the *Seven Articles of the Schleitheim Confession*, which spelled out the key convictions of the emerging movement. The third part expounds upon the ideas of Covenant (*De fœdere*) and Election (*Electio*). Finally, four additional Anabaptist teachings are confuted in an appended epilogue (*Auctarium*).

It is in this epilogue that Zwingli attacked the teaching of the Anabaptists about soul sleep. He explained that the Anabaptists believe that the dead sleep, both body and soul, until the Day of Judgement. In his refutation he claimed that his opponents were ignorant of the fact that the Hebrews used the word ‘sleeping’ for ‘dying.’ Along the lines of Aristotle and Tertullian, Zwingli then argued that the soul (which the Greeks called ἐντελέχεια) cannot sleep (dormire) or die (intermori), as it is by nature spiritual, and therefore incessantly active (natura incessans operatio aut motus). It is as incapable of falling asleep as the sun is of

---


364 Zwingli discussed other issues concerning the afterlife in several of his works. In the *Sixty-Seven articles* (1523), for example, he had not yet completely rejected the idea of Purgatory. He stated under the heading ‘Vom fegfür’ that Purgatory lacks a scriptural foundation, that God’s judgement is only known to Him, that one should not speculate on such matters (cf. *supra* on p. 94), and that prayers for the dead are allowed, but it is devilish to determine the duration of punishment and to lie for profit: “57. Die war, heylig geschrifft weyßt kein fegfür nach disen zytten. 58. Das urteyl der abgescheidmem ist allein got bekant. 59. Und ye minder unns gott darvon hatt lassen wissen, ye minder wir uns darvon ze wissen undernemen söllten. 60. Ob der mensch für die gestrobnen sorgfeltig gott umb gnad inen zu bewisen anrüfft, verwürff ich nit; doch davon zyt stellen und umb gewüns willen lügen, ist nit menschlich sonder tüfelisch” (*HZSW I*, p. 464). He did reject the intercession of the saints, claiming that Christ is the one and only intercessor (*Das Christus ein einger mitler ist zwüschend gott und uns*), and no other is needed besides Him (20. [...] *Das wir usserthalb diser zyet keines mitlers dörffend denn sin.*); cf. Heb. 9. (*HZSW I*, p. 460). Zwingli also asserted that God alone could forgive sins through Christ (50.) and that not only are penitential works a human institution developed in order to menace others (53.), but they are blasphemous, for Christ has borne all of our pains and labour (54.) (*HZSW I*, pp. 463–64).

365 “Catabaptiste docent mortuos dormire et corpore et animis usque in diem iudicii; propterea quod dormiendi verbo ignorant Hebrëos pro moriendi verbo uti” (*HZSW VI,1*, pp. 188–89).

366 “Coelestis ergo spiritus, quem nos animam, Græci ἐντελέχειαν vocant, tam vivax, constans, robusta, tenax ac vigilans substantia est” (*HZSW VI,1*, p. 189). See *supra* on p. 85.
being dark. Experience shows us that it is merely the body that sleeps, for upon awakening one remembers one's dreams. It is much less possible for the soul to sleep when it is liberated from the body by death. It is therefore only the body that can fall asleep at death and remain so until the Day of Judgement. Furthermore, Zwingli argued, Anabaptists are ignorant of the fact that the Hebrews used the word 'resurrectio' not always for the resurrection of the flesh, but also for the interim state, the continuation and existence of the soul after it has been freed from the body, in which state it can neither sleep nor die.

To substantiate his point, Zwingli cited examples from the Scriptures. Joshua 7:12–13 twice uses the Hebrew verb קֹם, translated in the Vulgate with a form of the verb surgere. In both instances the word means to stand fast, resist, or endure. Jesus' response to the Sadducees in Mt. 22:31 proves that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive despite their actual physical deaths. Christ's answer confirmed what the Sadducees denied, namely, 'resurrectio,' which means to be alive, and not the resurrection of the flesh. In Heb. 11:35, too, resurrectio is taken to mean the life of the soul severed from the body; the martyrs had such a firm faith that the 'resurrectio'—that is, the life after this one—will be a better life,

367 “Unde tam abest, ut dormire possit, quantum a luce aut sole abest, ut obscursum corpus sit. Quocunque solem abigas, splendet ac incendit, id quod Phaëton expertus est; sic anima, quocunque detrudas, animat, movet ac impellit, adeo ut corpore devincta dum impsum, que eius est inertia, dormit, ipsa tamen non dormiat” (HZSW VI,1, p. 189).
368 “Meminimus enim eorum, que in somno vidimus. Quanto magis corpore liberata dormire nequit, cum sit substantia ad perpetuam operationem, que defatigari non potest, concinnata” (HZSW VI,1, pp. 189–90).
369 “Dormit ergo corpus, anima nunquam; sed cum corpore liberatur, iam corpus noctem ěternam dormit” (HZSW VI,1, p. 190).
370 “Postremo ignorant catabaptistę resurrectionem mortuorum Hebreis non semper accipi pro carnis ista suprema resurrectione, quam olim videbimus, sed interim pro lac, interim vero pro constantia aut perduratione animę, qua corpore soluta in vita constat ac durat non somno aut morte depressa, neque enim potest deprimi” (HZSW VI,1, p. 190).
371 “Iehosue 7. siq loquitur dominus: ‘Non potuerunt filii Israël surgere coram hostibus suis’, et paulo post: ‘Non poteris surgere ante hostes tuos.’ Hic utrobieque ponitur ‘surgere’ pro: consistere ac perdurare; nam et Hieronymus ‘stare’ transtulit” (HZSW VI,1, p. 190). In the autograph, Zwingli inserted the Hebrew consonantal form לָקוּם and the vocalized form לָקָוּם before and after the verb surgere (the critical edition erroneously transcribed them as לקדם and לָקָדָוּם, respectively). He also introduced the Latin consistere at the same place.
372 “Mat. 22. sic loquitur Christus: ‘De resurrectione mortuorum non legistis quod dic tum est a deo dicente vobis: ‘Ego sum deus Abraham et deus Isaac et deus Iacob’? Non est deus mortuorum, sed viventium.’ Qua respondi sio nihil aliud docet quam vivos esse Abraham, Isaac et Iacob, etiamsi essent mortui, quos Saducei aut prorsus negabant resurgere, hoc est vivere, at saltem catabaptistarum more adserebant dormire. Non enim quadrat responsio Christi ad resurrectionem carnis, sed ad hoc, quod Abraham, Isaac et Iacob, etiamsi mortui essent, viverent” (HZSW VI,1, p. 190).
that they refused to be saved for this life and embraced the life that follows after this one.\(^{373}\) Similarly, Jesus’ promise to the believers in Jn. 6:40 should be understood as a promise to keep those who trust in Him alive even beyond their death.\(^{374}\)

In 1 Cor. 15, Zwingli claimed, the whole discourse on the resurrection of the flesh is clearly linked to and depends on the immortality of the soul. For Paul speaks about ‘resurrectio’ in general terms, and from the beginning of the chapter until verse 35 the word is used not (exclusively) for the resurrection of the flesh, but (also) for the continuance or persistence of life after this life.\(^{375}\) It is only from there on that Paul speaks about the bodily resurrection, Zwingli maintained. To prove this, Zwingli used five arguments. (1) First he pointed to vv. 21–22 (as death came through a human being, the ‘resurrectio’ from the dead also comes from a human being, for as in Adam all die, so in Christ all are made alive). It is clear, Zwingli argued, that here ‘resurrectio’ pertains not only to the resurrection of the flesh, but also to that life which immediately follows after this present one: through Adam we all die, but through Christ we are preserved in life.\(^{376}\) That is why Christ promised that even though those who believe in Him die, they will live (Jn. 11:25).\(^{377}\) (2) The second argument came from the (in Zwingli’s view) despicable custom of baptism for the dead (1 Cor. 15:29).

He contended that this practice proves and presupposes the survival and

---

\(^{373}\) “Hebr. 11. sic loquitur Paulus: ‘Alii vero distenti aut crucifixi sunt nullam recipentes redemptionem, ut meliorem invenirent resurrectionem.’ Ecce, ut hic ‘resurrectio’ pro vita animae, quam soluta corpore habitura est, accipitur. Ad hunc sensum: sic vitam istam, quæ hanc sequitur, amplexi sunt, ut praesentem nollent, etiam cum offeretur, recipere, tam constans enim erat fides, ut certi essent eam, quæ sequeretur, meliorem esse” (HZSW VI,1, p. 190).

\(^{374}\) “Unde et Christi verbum, quod Io. 6. habetur: ‘Ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die’ non debet in alium sensum detorqueri quam: ego, dum is moritur, qui me fidit, in vita servabo. Ut vel insinuet: nunquam intermoram, qui se fidant, vel nunquam non iucundissime pervicturos. Novissimus autem dies istic non tam est ultimus ille omnium rerum praesentis mundi quam postremus culiusquam dum ex hoc mundo demigrat. Id quod Io. 5[,]24]. facile deprehenditur: ‘In iudicium non venit, sed transiit a morte in vitam’” (HZSW VI,1, pp. 190–91).

\(^{375}\) “In 1. Cor 15. de resurrectione loquens apostolus hanc, quæ pro perdurance et consistentia in vita capitum, tanquam superiorem facit, de qua in genere loquitur, donec ad hunc locum veniat: ‘Quomodo resurgunt mortui aut quali corpore incidunt?’ Ibi tandem, quæ aliqando ventura est, carnis resurrectionis disputationem ingreditur” (HZSW VI,1, p. 191).

\(^{376}\) “Vides, ut istud: ‘Ex homine mors et ex homine resurrectione mortuorum; nam sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur, sic et in Christo omnes vitae restituantur’ non solum ad carnis resurrectionem pertinent, sed ad istam vitam, quæ hanc protinus sequitur. Per Adam enim moriuntur, sed per Christum in vita servamur” (HZSW VI,1, p. 191).

\(^{377}\) HZSW VI,1, p. 191.
active character of the soul beyond death.\textsuperscript{378} (3) Zwingli’s third argument is Paul’s logic in vv. 30–31, which is, according to the Swiss theologian, that eternal life must follow immediately upon death; Paul would be a fool to expose himself to danger every day if there was no life after this one, or if a sleep followed upon death.\textsuperscript{379} (4) The fourth argument is provided by vv. 32–33. There, Paul disapprovingly quotes the Corinthians: “let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die,” and then he adds: evil communications corrupt good manners. But it is precisely the Anabaptists’ advocacy of soul sleep and their blasphemous tenet that even Satan would eventually be saved, Zwingli maintained, that undermine society and encourage crime, because such beliefs remove the fear of any post-mortem penalty for the evil committed in this life.\textsuperscript{380} (5) The final argument is deduced from v. 34, where Paul calls upon the Corinthians to wake up and come to their senses from their folly: \textit{ἐκνήψατε δικαίως}. Paul used the verb ‘to wake up’ with great pungency, for the Anabaptists, pressed in their sleep of ignorance, presume that the souls sleep, just as the wolf thinks that all animals eat raw food since it does so itself.\textsuperscript{381} And when these would-be

\textsuperscript{378} HZSW VI, pp. 191–92. The custom also serves as an argument for infant baptism for Zwingli.


\textsuperscript{380} “Quarto, quod ait: ‘Edamus’ etc. et ‘corrumpunt mores sanctos commercia prava’ etiam hic pertinet. Nihil enim \textit{ἔρι} mores corruptit atque docere animos intermorni, aut, ut nunc catapabiște blasphemant, dormire usque ad postrema diem ac deinde adserunt et \textit{δημονεμ} et omnes salvari. Quę igitur poena peridos ac sceleratos manet? Quę corruptio non tam large sequeretur, si isti solummodo negaret carnem revicturam” (HZSW VI, p. 192). On the idea of universal salvation, see \textit{infra} on p. 198.

\textsuperscript{381} “Quinto ista quoque consideres: \textit{ἐκνήψατε δικαίως}, hoc est: evigilate recte. Resipiant enim \textit{ὥ} verba \textit{Paulinam} acrimoniam. Cum enim isti somno ignarițic pressi putarent, quod lupus, qui omnia credit animalia crudis vesci, eo quod ipse vescitur, animas dormire ‘evigilate’ ait” (HZSW VI, p. 192).
scholars think themselves to be awake, Paul rightly calls upon them to wake up, for while they think that they are awake and are exactly right, they dream somnolently about sleep.382 Zwingli’s conclusion is that the apostle speaks in the first part of the chapter about the state of the souls after this life, and only in the second part uses ‘resurrectio’ to mean the resurrection of the flesh.383

In the following point Zwingli attacked the Anabaptists’ teaching about universal salvation, which proposed that even the devils and the damned will eventually be redeemed.384 This, however, represents a contradiction in their teaching, because if the souls sleep until Judgement Day, and if on that day everyone will be saved, there is no Hell, no Gehenna, no inextinguishable fire, no flames that consume the tares (cf. Mt. 13:30).385 But the Anabaptists ignore the fact that the Hebrew adverb לְעֹלָם means ‘for- ever’ (in ęternum), an interminable eternity. Both Lk. 1:33 and Mt. 25:41 use the expression ‘in ęternum.’ Now, if the term referred only to a certain amount of time, then the salvation of the blessed should also be temporal. But after the Last Judgement, Zwingli asserted, there will be no other

382 “Cum autem propter acumen sibi doctuli viderentur ac ideo minime dormire, recte ait: ‘evigilate’; putatis enim vos vigilare et rem acu tetigisse, qum somniculose de somne somnietis” (HZSW VI,1, p. 192). Zwingli’s description of his adversaries is not particularly charming. He calls the arguments advanced by the Anabaptists “foolish, impious and absurd” and lacking in any substantial backing from Scripture, and he seeks to refute them with the help of God. “Stulta igitur, impia et absurda, quę docent, adsignatis paucis scripturę locis (sed talibus, ut eis tota catabaptistarum caterva non possit resistere) convelfemus σὺν τῳ̂ θεῳ̂” (HZSW VI,1, p. 188). Cf. “Stultus stulta loquitur” (HZSW VI,1, p. 194). The Anabaptists are oppressed not so much by sleep as by wickedness, and they teach whatever occurs to them. “Et videbis catabaptistas non tam somno quam nequicia depressos tradere, quicquid inciderit” (HZSW VI,1, p. 193).

383 “Post hęc sequentia quoque expende, lector, et ubi videris in genere primum loqui apostolum de anı̆mę post hanc vitam vita, ac deinde ad carnis resurrectionem descendere, huc redi” (HZSW VI,1, pp. 191–92).


judgement, and there will be no age but sheer eternity, because then all
time will cease.\footnote{386}

In catabaptistarum strophas Elenchus was not the first work in which
Zwingli advocated such an interpretation of the word resurrection. Que-
sions on a post-mortem existence had been the subject matter of an ear-
lier letter by Zwingli to the Bern reformer Berchtold Haller (1491–1536).\footnote{387}
This letter was dated at Zürich on 6 November 1526. Haller’s original letter,
to which Zwingli responded, is no longer extant, but it concerned the res-
urrection of the flesh, as is clear from Zwingli’s answer. Apparently Haller
asked for the clarification of two biblical texts. As will be seen, Zwingli’s
letter already contains some of the arguments he was going to use in his
battle against the Anabaptists.

The first text Zwingli elucidated was 1 Cor. 15. He began by quoting
v. 29: “what will those people do who receive baptism on behalf of the
dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why are people baptized on their
behalf?” The word resurrectio, Zwingli explained to Haller, is occasionally
taken to mean the general judgement of all mortals at the throne of Christ
(pro publica mortalium omnium coram throvo Christi comparitione), as
described in Mt. 25:31–46, yet other times ‘resurrectio’ refers to the immor-
tality of the soul (pro immortalitate animae), as the Hebrew verb קום can
mean to stand up or to survive.\footnote{388} It is in the latter sense that the word is
used in Joshua 7:12, where the Hebrew text reads לקום and the LXX uses
ὑποστῆναι (consistere: to remain, or to exist), but the Vulgate translates it
as stare (to stand).\footnote{389} Accordingly, resurrectio means the life of the dead,
or the endurance or persistence of souls.\footnote{390} For further examples of this
Hebraism, Zwingli refers Haller to Leo Jud’s notes taken in the
Prophezei.\footnote{391}
But Zwingli is ready to offer illustrations from the NT, where *resurrectio* should be taken to mean the immortality of the soul. Such is the encounter of Jesus with the Sadducees in Mt. 22. Christ’s answer in v. 32 proves only that the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are alive, i.e. that the souls continue to exist after they leave the body, but it does not prove the resurrection of the flesh.\(^3\)

There are people, Zwingli wrote, who believe that the souls are asleep until Judgement Day, a position that plainly contradicts the immortality of the soul.\(^3\) But their custom of sprinkling holy water on the graves (which Zwingli identified with baptism for the dead) proves the immortality of the soul, because who would be willing to be baptized for the dead, if the soul ceases to exist when the body dies?\(^4\)

Zwingli did not deny that Paul’s words in 1 Cor. 15 can refer to the resurrection at the general judgement, but he asserted that Paul used the word indiscriminately, referring to both meanings of the word (*apostolum de utraque resurrectione promiscue loqui*), much as Christ spoke indiscriminately in Mt. 24:4–51 about both His second coming and the age preceding it.\(^5\)

According to the Swiss theologian, in 1 Cor. 15, Paul speaks about

---

392 “De re vero ipsa exemplum habes Christi, apud Matth. 22.: ‘De resurrectione vero mortuorum, non legis di, quod vobis a deo dictum est?’ Ubi manifestum est, Christum non loqui de carnis resurrectione, sed de immortalitate animae. Nam exemplum, quod adducit de Abraham, Isaac et Iacob, non trahit ad carnis resurrectionem, sed ad animae immortalitatem, cum ait: ‘Non est deus deus mortuorum, sed vivorum.’ Huc ergo penetrat Christus, ut probet Abraham, Isaac, et Iacob vivere. Non enim posset hoc exemplum carnis resurrectionem probare; sed quod animae durent ac vivant, postquam corpore posuerunt” (HZSW VIII, p. 760).

393 “Dicunt somno quodam animas sepeliri ac teneri usque ad ultimum iudicium. Quod quid aliud sit, quam animae immortalitatem negare, non video” (HZSW VIII, p. 760).

394 “Probat igitur ex eorum ritu, animas esse immortales. Nam si minus, hoc permit tant iam contradicere publicae consuetudini, qua quidam pro mortuis se e tingant. Qui si mortuorum animas crederent simul cum corpore extintae, non baptizetur pro eis” (HZSW VIII, p. 760).

395 “Si vero nunc dicas, videri tibi Paulum eo loci de publica resurrectione loqui, respondeo, me non inficiari, propter omnium doctorum huius loci expositionem, apostolum
the spiritual body, or, perhaps more accurately, about the soul as the faculty of the intellect and of the senses. For the correct interpretation of the term, he compared Paul’s language here with that of Col. 2:9, where it is said about Christ that the fullness of divinity dwells bodily in Him. This latter text, Zwingli believed, should not be understood as saying that God is a body, because ‘body’ is taken here for ‘essence’: Christ was, by essence, God, similarly to the sense in which the German idiom “er ist’s lyplich” is used. In the same manner, when Paul says about the spiritual body that it dies and rises (v. 44), he means that when the earthly body dies, the spiritual body—i.e. the very substance of the soul—lives. But since there are so many objections to such an interpretation, Zwingli cautioned against accepting any idea heedlessly, lest he appear to be a Manichaean, who denied the resurrection of the flesh. He claimed that even if he interpreted this place as referring to the immortality of the soul, there are other passages where the resurrection of the flesh can be proven. Since all ancient interpreters took that passage to mean the resurrection of the flesh, it is safest to leave the question open, as Paul used the term indiscriminately, sometimes denoting the resurrection of the flesh and other times meaning the immortality of the soul. Zwingli mentioned, however, that there was one exception among the Church Fathers, viz. Ambrose, who seems to have equated resurrectio with the life after this
life in his commentary on 1 Cor. 15:30, but Zwingli admits that this is only an incidental remark of Ambrose.\textsuperscript{401}

The other biblical place Haller wished to have explained by Zwingli was 1 Pt. 4:4–6. This passage, the Swiss Reformer maintained, is not as difficult as it seems at first sight. The meaning of the words in the epistle of Peter can be summarized, according to Zwingli, in the following way: “The people are surprised, when you do not join them in the excesses of licentiousness, and they despise you because of your innocence and accuse you falsely. But they will have to give account to Him, who is appointed to judge the quick and the dead” (1 Pt. 4:4–5).\textsuperscript{402} What follows these words, Zwingli explained, is the rhetorical device of adding the proofs: for Christ will be the future judge of all mortals, both those who are alive and those who are dead.\textsuperscript{403} For the dead received the proclamation (which is the sense of the Greek term εὐηγγελίσθη, Zwingli clarified) in order that they be judged by ordinary law for all things that pertain to the flesh (by which all human beings will be judged), so in spirit they might live through God (1 Pt. 4:6).\textsuperscript{404} Zwingli specified that Christ’s proclamation to the dead is the preaching of the Gospel to the dead (\textit{Mortuis praedicatum est euangelium}), the announcement of their salvation (\textit{Christum animarum salutem advenisse adnuntiari}).\textsuperscript{405} This is attested to in 1 Pt. 3:19, where it is said that Christ preached to the spirits in prison, and that through His precious death the captives were redeemed, and Christ, the victor, led them upwards, as is professed in the Creed: “he descended into Hell.”\textsuperscript{406} Now,
one can wonder, Zwingli proposed, how they came forth from there, whether cloaked in the body or as a pure spiritual substance; but Peter anticipated the question and said that the flesh of those who were liberated by Christ the victor will be judged when all flesh will be judged, but in the meantime their spirits will live and rejoice through Christ in God.\footnote{407} Peter put it elegantly when he said that the quick and the dead will be judged by Christ, who is said to have brought the remedy of the Gospel to the dead \((ad mortuos quoque pervenisse evangeli medelam)\).\footnote{408} Peter’s words also mean, Zwingli believed, that their flesh is not yet resurrected but will be judged in the general judgement, from which the resurrection of the flesh can be proved and established.\footnote{409}

The annotations by Leo Jud in the \textit{Prophezei} about the Hebrew verb קום not always denoting the bodily resurrection—to which annotations Zwingli referred in his \textit{In catabaptistarum strophas Elenchus}—were later incorporated into Zwingli’s exegetical works and Bible translations.\footnote{410} Commenting on Ex. 21:19, Zwingli remarked in 1527 that the use of the verb קום in this verse is a Hebraism, for it does not mean the bodily resurrection, but that the injured party can stand up and walk again.\footnote{411} Earlier in his commentary he had a seemingly comparable remark about another Hebrew verb, namely, about the verb עמד to stand, to take one’s stand, to remain, to endure, etc.; which in his comment on Ex. 9:16 he paraphrased as, among other things, ‘keeping alive.’\footnote{412}

His commentary on Isaiah two years later (1529) also contains references to this alleged Hebraistic use of the verb קום. The first such
reference is occasioned by Is. 13:6, which actually does not contain the verb in the Hebrew text but claims that the day of the Lord is near: כִּי קָרוֹב יוֹם יְהוָה (quoniam prope est dies domini in Zwingli's translation). Here, Zwingli incorporated a long excursus on the meaning of the term dies domini. He argued that the expression can denote (1) the death of the individual, (2) the daily punishments God sends to His people, or (3) the general judgement at the end of the world. In Jn. 6:40 (Omnis qui cognoscit aut videt filium et credit in eum, habebit vitam ęternam, et ego resuscitabo eum in novissimo die), the expression ‘last day’ can refer to the day of the death of the individual: in this verse Christ promises the faithful that He will preserve them alive, just as a chapter earlier, in Jn. 5:24, He promised that the faithful would enter into life from death without being condemned. Martha's words in Jn. 11:25, by contrast, refer to the universal judgement, Zwingli asserted. Again, Paul's words in 1 Cor. 3:13 (the classical proof text for the existence of Purgatory) speak about the daily afflictions. In a similar way, he argued, the expression ‘resurrection of the dead’ can also be understood in two different ways: (1) it often means the life in which the souls are received after this life, and (2) other times it denotes the resurrection of the flesh. Then, the ‘resurrection of the flesh’ can again refer to (1) the general judgement (Lk. 3:6), for not all people will see Christ's salvation in this life, or (2) the revivification of the human flesh. Accordingly, the noun ‘judgement’ is sometimes taken for the last and universal judgement, but other times

---

413 “Quod si videamus diem domini, interim pro fatali cuuisque hora, interim pro tempore vindictę, quam de nobis quotidie sumit deus, interim autem pro universalis iudicii die capi” (HZSW XIV, p. 226).
414 “Hic ultimus etiam dies pro fato cuuisque accipitur. Promittit enim Christus se in vita servaturum eos, qui se fidant, quacunque hora hinc migrant, quemadmodum superius quinto capite dixit: credentes citra omne iudicium transire a morte in vitam” (HZSW XIV, p. 226).
415 HZSW XIV, p. 226.
416 HZSW XIV, p. 226.
417 “Eodem modo dicendum est de resurrectione mortuorum, quae et ipse semel pro vita ea accipitur, quae protinus mortalem istam sequitur, iterum vero pro carnis resurrectione, quae futura est ultimo die, de quo alias” (HZSW XIV, p. 227).
418 “Item carnis ipsa resurrectio nonnunquam pro universali iudicio omnium hominum ponitur, quo modo dicitur: 'Videbit omnis caro salutare dei,' quem caro, quocunque vertas, non recipiat salutarem Christum in hac vita, sed caro pro hominibus accipitur, nonnunquam autem pro ipsa carnis humanae revivificatione” (HZSW XIV, p. 227).
for the daily judgement, which is meant by Christ in Jn. 12:31, the Swiss
Reformer maintained.\footnote{419 “Sic iudicium aliquando pro ultimo et universali accipitur, aliquando vero pro quotidiiano, quod et iuge est, quomodo Christus dixit: ‘Nunc iudicium est mundi’ etc.” (HZSW XIV, p. 227).}

He took up the theme again while commenting on Is. 26:14, where the
Hebrew text does have the verb מַתִים לַבי־יִחְיוּ רְפָאִים בַּל־יָקֻמ. Here it is
clear, Zwingli argued, that Isaiah uses the term in resurrectione mortuo-
rum for the common dwelling of the blessed saints after this life.\footnote{420 “Neque sunt in resurrectione mortuorum. Hic plane videmus resurrectionem pro felici iucundoque beatorum contubernio, in quo post hanc vitam degunt, sumi. ‘Sanc-
torium autem’ de meo addidi, quo dilucidius fieret, quod per resurrectionem intelligant” (HZSW XIV, p. 276).} For
Zwingli, Christ’s words to the Sadducees (Mt. 22:32) are the proof that
resurrectio can be understood in such a way: His argument says nothing
about the resurrection of the flesh, but it refutes the “Jewish error” that
maintained that the souls do not live after this life.\footnote{421 “Resurrectionem autem hoc modo ab eis capi, quomodo ante attigimus [vide supra n. 417] et Christus ipse testatur, quom saducaeis de resurrectione sic respondet: ‘Non est deus mortuorum, sed vivorum’ etc. Non enim est verisimile saducaeos tam crassum erorem ausos fuisse inter Judaeos adserere, quod animae non viverent post hanc vitam. At simul si quis contendet eos carnis modo resurrectionem negavisse, obstat Christi respon-
sio, quae ad carnis resurrectionem hoc loco nihil facit, quom tamen perhibeantur omnes admirati fuisse eius presensionem, quod nullo pacto factum esset, nisi dissolvisset illorum objectionem” (HZSW XIV, p. 276).} Zwingli mentions
further that Christ’s words also refute the Anabaptists, who dream that
the souls fall asleep at the time of death of the human being, and refers
his readers to his Elenchus.\footnote{422 “Adparet igitur somnum quendam animabus tribuisse insulos sciolos, quomodo catabaptistae etiamnun somnian, Christum autem, vitam eorum et beatitudinem, qualis ante natum Christum erat, adseruisse, quod non dormirent, sed viventes et vigilantes et suo aliquo modo beati essent. De qua re in elencticis aliqui” (HZSW XIV, p. 276).} Is. 40:8 provided the third example in the
Isaiah commentary to treat this subject. Although the term is sometimes
taken to refer to the resurrection of the flesh, Zwingli pointed out, he
rendered the Hebrew וּדְבַר־אֱלֹהֵינוּ יָקוּם לְעוֹלָם with the Latin Verbum tamen
dei nostri permanet in aeternum, because he argued that the Hebrew verb קוּם denotes ‘to remain’ or ‘to endure’ in this verse, similarly to the sense in
which Paul used the Greek ἐγείρονται in 1 Cor. 15:29, which Zwingli para-
phrased as, “who would want to be baptized for the dead if the dead are
dead after this life?”\footnote{423 “Vel hic possimus discere surgendi verbum illis pro persistendi manendique accipi. Hinc resurrectio mortuorum pro vita et duratone animarum etiam Paulo capitur, qum ait: ‘Cur, inquam, baptizantur pro mortuis, si mortui non resurgunt?’, hoc est: non...
those to whom Paul was writing did not profess the crass error that the souls died; they confessed, like the Anabaptists in Zwingli’s own time, that the souls slept until Judgement Day, and Zwingli referred back to his earlier mention of this idea.\(^{424}\) In Is. 46:10, the Hebrew text once again contained a form of the same verb (תָקוּם), and this time Zwingli translated it with the Latin verb \textit{constat}, adding a note in the commentary explaining that the Hebrew read \textit{surgit} (the Vulgate translates it with \textit{stabit}).\(^{425}\)

Finally, the same Hebrew verb is employed in Ps. 1:5: \(וּעַל־כֵּן לֹא־יָקֻמ רְשָׁעִים בַּמִּשְׁפָּט וְחַטָּאִים בַּעֲדַת צַדִּיקִים.\) Zwingli’s translation, as contained in the Psalter published posthumously by Leo Jud (1532), reads: \textit{Hinc fit ut neque impii neque scelerati vivant in coetu et concilio iustorum.}\(^{426}\) Joye will explicitly refer to this translation.

In the summer of 1531, Zwingli addressed Emperor Charles V in the \textit{Christianaec fidei brevis et clara expositio ad regem Christianum} to defend the Reformers’ position.\(^{427}\) Arguing \textit{inter alia} on the basis of Jn. 5:24,
Zwingli here called Purgatory a papist invention and fiction. Christ, by His incarnation, took away all penalty and punishment due to the debt of sins, and therefore no penitential works are required. Pious works do not have merit, but they do testify to the faith of the believers. Accordingly, there are only two possibilities after the death of the human person: the saints (or believers) enter into a blissful life and the wicked (or non-believers) into a miserable and distressing life, both of which are perpetual. Therefore, the Anabaptists are wrong when they conceive the soul to be asleep after death until the Day of Judgement. Hence, they deserve to dream and sleep in Hell, from which sleep Zwingli hoped they would never wake up. Mentioning the Anabaptists’ teachings gave him the opportunity to warn the Emperor against their dangerous sect. The Zürich Reformer pointed out that their teachings are not a novelty, but are old heresies, aptly dealt with by Irenaeus when he wrote against the Valentinians and by Gregory of Nazianzen. They are a danger to society, and Charles should treat them accordingly.

Perlemente or Cownsaill at Ausbrough with the chief lordis & lerned men of Germanye. The yere of owr Lorde M.D.xxx. In the monethe of Julye, Translated & Imprynted at Zijryk [vere Antwerp: Catherine van Ruremund] in Marche. Anno Do. M.D. XLJJJ. Although the critical edition describes the German, French, modern English, and modern Polish translations, it does not mention Joye’s.

428 “Cum Christus ipse docuerit, quod, qui credunt, vitam eternam habeant, et quod, qui fidunt eo, qui Christum nobis misit, in iudicium non venient, sed iam transierint a morte in vitam, fit manifestum, quod hec mora cruciatus, quam animis hinc migrantibus dant papista, commenticia est et ficta” (HZSW VI,5, p. 74).


430 “A piis hominibus opera idcirco non intermitti, quod maior est fides, tanto plura maioraque facimus opera” (HZSW VI,5, p. 123).

431 “Postremo credimus post hanc vitam, quæ captivitas et mort potius est quam vita, foelicem ac iucundam sanctis sive credentibus, miseram autem ac tristem impis sive perfidis usus venturam et utramque perpetuam” (HZSW VI,5, p. 126). Cf. HZSW VI,5, pp. 126–32.

432 “Qua in re et istud adversus catabaptistas, qui animas cum corporibus dormire usque ad universale iudicium contendunt, adserimus animum sive angeli sive hominis non posse quidem dormire aut occidari; tam abest, ut isti quicquam ratione consonum dicant” (HZSW VI,5, pp. 126–27). Cf. HZSW VI,5, pp. 133–34.

433 “Cum interim somniantes catabaptistæ merito somnum dormiant apud inferos, et quo numquam expergefiant” (HZSW VI,5, p. 132).

434 “Quoniam vero in catabaptistarum mentionem incidimus, volumus tibi, o rex, pau­ciss eius sectæ rationem prestringere. Genus est fere hominum perditorum et præ angustia rerum extorrium, quorum quæstus est anus magnifice de rebus divinis sermone demerei, quo aut alimentum aut non minutam stipem depromant” (HZSW VI,5, p. 133).

435 For Irenaeus’ refutation of the Valentinians, see supra on p. 86. For Gregory of Nazianzen, see supra on p. 95.

436 HZSW VI,5, pp. 134–36.
Although Martin Bucer (or Butzer, 1491–1551), one of the leaders of the South German Reformation, is celebrated today for his irenic attitude and his endeavours to bring about reconciliation between the factions of the German Reformation, for our present topic his controversies and his Psalm translations are more relevant.\footnote{Born in Alsace, at the age of fifteen Bucer joined the Dominican order (1506). He was sent to Heidelberg, where he met Luther and adopted his doctrine. With papal dispensation Bucer left the Dominican order in 1521 and became Court Chaplain to Frederick, the Elector Palatine. In 1522, as a secular priest, he married a former nun, being one of the first priests in the Protestant movement to break his vow of celibacy. After being excommunicated in 1523, he went to Strasbourg, where he played a major role in shaping the new Protestant identity of the capital of Alsace. He played a pivotal role in moving the synod to take actions against the residing Anabaptist refugees in 1533 (see supra in n. 66 on p. 19 and infra on p. 278). After having questioned their leaders, he let Melchior Hoffman imprisoned and ousted Caspar Schwenckfeld. Within mainstream Christianity, however, he strove for the unification of various factions. He undertook several attempts to accommodate Luther’s and Zwingli’s teachings on the Eucharist. His harmonizing efforts were initially denounced by both parties but eventually (after the death of both Zwingli and Oecolampadius) resulted in the Concord of Wittenberg among German Protestants (1536). This agreement, however, did not last long, was rejected by several Protestant congregations, and created a breach between Bucer and the Swiss Protestants. After the Schmalkald War (1546–47), the Diet at Augsburg adopted the Twenty-Six Articles (Augsburg Interim) in 1548, which Bucer fiercely opposed, for he feared ‘Romanizing.’ Nonetheless, the City Council of Strasbourg consented to the compromise settlement between Catholic and Protestant teachings, and Bucer felt obliged to leave. He accepted an invitation by Archbishop Thomas Cranmer and left for England. He was commissioned to make a Bible translation from the original languages into Latin, which was to serve as a basis for a vernacular translation. Later he was appointed to teach at Cambridge (1549) and to advise on the Book of Common Prayer (1550). Shortly after receiving the degree of doctor of divinity, Bucer died. He was buried in the principal church at Cambridge, but under Queen Mary I his body was exhumed and publicly burnt (1556). The best biography of Bucer is Martin Greschat, Martin Bucer. Ein Reformator und seine Zeit, 1491–1551, München: C.H. Beck, 1990 (English translation: Martin Bucer: A Reformer and His Times, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004). For a bibliography on Bucer, see: Holger Pils, Stephan Ruderer & Petra Schaffrodt (eds.), Martin Bucer (1491–1551). Bibliographie, Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2005. On his theology, see also: Marijn J.J.P. de Kroon, Wij geloven in God en in Christus. Niet in de kerk. Wessel Gansfort (+1489) en Martin Bucer (+1551), (Theologie en geschiedenis), Kok: Kampen, 2004; Nicholas Thompson, Eucharistic Sacrifice and Patristic Tradition in the Theology of Martin Bucer, 1534–1546, (SHCT 119), Leiden: Brill, 2005.} Around 1525 Luther asked Bucer to translate Johannes Bugenhagen’s Latin Psalter into German.\footnote{Johannes Bugenhagen, Ioannis Pomerani Bugenhagii in librum Psalmorum interpretatio, Wittembergae publice lecta, Basel: Adam Petri. 1524. For a bibliography on Johannes Bugenhagen (1485–1558) and his works, see: Georg Geisenhof (ed.), Bibliotheca Bugenhagiana. Bibliographie der Druckscriften des D. Joh. Bugenhagen, (Bug. 1; QDGR 6), Leipzig: Heinsius Nachf., 1908 (reprint: Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1963). See also: Werner Rautenberg (ed.), Johann Bugenhagen. Beiträge zu seinem 400. Todestag, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958; Helmut Claus, Johann Bugenhagen 1485–1558. Bestandsverzeichnis der Drucke}
the fact that Bugenhagen had little Hebrew, he was said by Luther in the first foreword of the Psalter to be “primus in orbe” to interpret the psalms, because the Psalter had not been adequately translated prior to Bugenhagen.439 Luther also expressed his wish that a Latin translation of his own Kirchenpostille be published.440 In spite of Zwingli’s advice not to accept either, Bucer performed both translations.441 Bucer’s Latin translation of Luther’s Kirchenpostille was published in four volumes by Johann Herwagen in 1525–26 in Strasbourg.442 Bucer’s German translation

439 “Audeo tamen dicere, A nemine (cuius extent libri) esse Psalterium Dauid explicatum Essque hunc Pomeranum primum in orbe, qui psalterij interpretes dici mereatur” (Bugenhagen, Ioannis Pomerani Bugenhagii in librum Psalmorum interpretatio, fo. 2 r). The other foreword was written by Melanchthon (fo. 2’). 

440 It was Johann Herwagen (see infra n. 442) who asked Bucer on Luther’s behalf to translate Luther’s Kirchenpostille from German into Latin and Bugenhagen’s Latin Psalter into German. Bucer had previously prepared Latin translations of Luther’s commentary on the Letters of Peter and of Jude (1524) (PRSch 5). Luther had written to Bucer previously that “Ich habe Johann Pommers, unsers Pfarrers, Auslegebuch [. . .] Ich halte, daß er es in der Auslegung wohl getroffen und viel Gutes habe” (WA Br XII, p. 60). See also infra n. 455 on p. 212.

441 Cf. Interdixeramus enim homini ab utraque interpretatione tam Latina quam Germanica non præter causam” (Zwingli. Amica Exegesis ad Martinum Lutherum, republished in HZSW V, p. 597). Bucer was already halfway through the Psalter when he received Zwingli’s admonition, and he had already promised Herwagen to translate the Kirchenpostillen: “A vertendis illius [sc. Lutheri] operibus per te pridem dehortatus. Sed tum fidem typographo obstrinxeram. Ita de Pomerani psalterio quoque monuistim cum fere opus ad umbilicum perductum esset.” (Bucer’s letter to Zwingli around 25 March 1527 (HZSW IX, no. 499 on p. 71)). His precarious financial situation at the time might also have played a role in his accepting translation jobs for printers. (Cf. R. Gerald Hobbs, Conrad Pellican and the Psalms. The Ambivalent Legacy of a Pioneer Hebraist, in Reformation and Renaissance Review 1 (1999), p. 85.)

442 PRSch 12, 13, 14, 15. Johannes Herwagen (Hervagius) (1497?–1558?), Swiss printer and bookseller active in Strasbourg 1522–28. After marrying the widow of Johannes Froben, he moved to Basel (1528), where he worked in association with his in-laws Hieronymus Froben, Nikolaus Episcopus, and Johann Erasmus Froben. In 1542 he was expelled from Basel for his liaison with the wife of J.E. Froben. In 1545 he was granted clemency. Herwagen published many Protestant and humanistic works and was renowned for his excellent Greek publications. See: Immanuel Stockmeyer & Balthasar Reber, Beiträge zur Basler Buchdruckergeschichte. Zur Feier des Johannistages 1840, Basel: Schweighauser, Historischen Gesellschaft zu Basel, 1840.
of Bugenhagen’s Psalter was published in 1526 in Basel by Adam Petri, who also published Bugenhagen’s original Latin work.\footnote{Johannes Bugenhagen, \textit{Psalter wol uerteutscht auß der heyligen sprach. Verkleerung des Psalters/ fast klar vnd nutzlich/ Durch Johann Bugenhag auß Pomern, Von dem Latein inn Teutsch/ an vil orten durch jn selbs gebessert}, trans. Martin Bucer, Gedruckt zů Basel: Adam Petri, 1526. (Geisenhof no. 13). Critical edition: Martin Bucer, \textit{Schriften der Jahre 1524–1528}, ed. Robert Stupperich, (MBDS 2, MBOO Series 1: Deutsche Schriften 2), Gütersloh: Mohn, 1962, pp. 177–223, where the disputed explanation of Psalm 111 (110) is reprinted in full.} In his translation of the Psalter, however, Bucer, who had a much better understanding of Hebrew than Bugenhagen, did not follow Bugenhagen’s rendering very closely, but instead adapted the translation and took the liberty of inserting some of his own theological understandings, especially on the Lord’s Supper. In the translation Bucer seemingly sided with Zwingli, who denied the real presence in the Eucharist.\footnote{“Sed et sequenti anno Germanicæ in psalterium scripsit imitatum Pomeranum Martinus Bucer, id quod duplici in forma imprimebat Adamus [Petri] me cooperante et indices parante in omnes libros, quos imprimebat, non sine magnis meis laboribus” (Conrad Pellican, \textit{Chronikon}, ed. Bernhard Riggenbach, Basel, 1877, p. 78). The somewhat dubious expression “me cooperante” and an occasional remark by Bucer gave rise to speculation that Pellican was the author. See, e.g. Hobbs, \textit{Exegetical Projects and Problems.}, pp. 89–108.} Bucer’s changes were so substantial that Conrad Pellican, who assisted the printer in producing the indices, wrote that Bucer had not translated, but “scripsit imitatus Pomeranum.”\footnote{“Pręcipue male propitium habeo et dira minantem Pomeranum, cuius psalterium veritate conspurcavi” (Bucer to Zwingli from Strasbourg on 9 July 1526, CR XCV, no. 503 on pp. 651–52).} Later, Bucer himself would admit in a letter to Zwingli that his translation tarnished Bugenhagen’s Psalter.\footnote{Johannes Bugenhagen, \textit{Der CXI. psalm Dauidis/ mit der exposition vnd verkleerung des Hoch gelerété Johannis Bugenhajj Pomerani Pfarrherren zů Wittenberg, 1526. Darin ain rechter Christlicher bericht des Nachtmals Christi vnnerser heren/ ainem yegkichen verstendigklich gegeben wirdt}, Augsburg: Philipp Ulhart, 1526. (PRSCh 19). See also: Johannes Bugenhagen, \textit{Der m. Psalm: darinn ain rechter christlicher bericht des Nachtmals Christi vnners heren, ainem yeglichen verstendigklich gegeben wirdt}, [Nürnberg], 1526.} Matters got worse when the Augsburg printer Philipp Ulhart reprinted Bucer’s contested translation and explanation of Psalm 111 under Bugenhagen’s name without any reference to Bucer as translator.\footnote{“Pręcipue male propitium habeo et dira minantem Pomeranum, cuius psalterium veritate conspurcavi” (Bucer to Zwingli from Strasbourg on 9 July 1526, CR XCV, no. 503 on pp. 651–52).} In his foreword Bucer stated that Bugenhagen, who had sent Bucer a copy with corrections in his own hand, gave him free rein to add or to leave out things as he pleased, and to change anything
in order to improve the work. Wolfgang Fabricius Capito (1478–1541), Bucer's friend and fellow reformer in Strasbourg, wrote in a letter to Zwingli on 26 September 1526 that Bucer was foolish enough to take seriously what Bugenhagen meant only as rhetorical cliché. Capito had feared a negative reaction from Wittenberg as soon as the work came off the press. Also, the last volume of *Kirchenpostille* saw some additions: Bucer attached a new preface (*Præfatio ad fratres Italice*), a few notes that amended Luther's exegetical notes, and a letter to the reader in which he refuted Luther's exegesis of 1 Cor. 9:24–10:5.

Bucer's alterations outraged both Luther and Bugenhagen. Bugenhagen published his *Oratio*, in which he called Bucer's changes impious (*quæ ego sane non possum (ita me amet Christus) non impia iudicare*), for although Bucer knew better, he inserted his own teachings into the text to make it look as though they were Bugenhagen's. By doing so, Bucer blemished


449 “Non quod excusem Bucerum, qui stultus putavit serio scribere, quod Pomeranus oblique scribebat, nempe permissum esse Bucero, ut mutaret atque [?] aliter interprettaret ac enarraret pro arbitrio. Quæ verba civilitatem mutuam requirebant, scilicet ut hic noster illi rescriberet: Indoctior sum, quam quod ausim vel iotam de tuis mutare; quin bene mecum agitur, quæ dixisti prior optime Latinis auribus, in Germanam ceu coloniam traducere non pessime. Iustud esset candoris theologici. Iam vero rusticus noster simpliciter accepit, quæ rhetorica figura in alitud dicuntur, commutat, variat, vertit invertitque omnia, quatenus plebeium lectorem putavit referre” (HZSW VIII, no. 531, p. 724).


Bugenhagen referred to his open letter to Johann Heß (1490–1547), minister of the word at Breslau.\footnote{Johannes Bugenhagen, \textit{Contra novum errorem de sacramento corporis et sang. J. Chr. ad D.J. Hessum}, 1525. “Quasi vero non sim is, qui non solum in aliis libris, sed etiam in publicum contra hanc opinionem adita ad D. Hessum epistola, haud obscuris verbis meam testatus sum sententiam? […] Qui potuit ista interpres meus ignorare?” Bugenhagen, \textit{Oratio Ioannis Bugenhagii Pomerani}, sig. A2'. On Johann Heß, see: Neue Deutsche Biographie, vol. I, p. 456, and vol. IX, pp. 7–8.} In this writing Bugenhagen publicly contradicted the Zwinglian understanding of the Lord’s Supper. The fact that he himself gave Bucer the liberty to bring about changes, Bugenhagen dismissed with the following remark: “Poterat [sc. Bucerus] et alius addidisse meis sententiis has et similes, lapidem esse panem, aquam esse ignem, Turcam esse Christiunum, deum non regnare etc.”\footnote{Bugenhagen, \textit{Oratio Ioannis Bugenhagii Pomerani}, sig. A4'.}

As for Luther, although he was satisfied with the first three volumes of Bucer’s translation of the \textit{Kirchenpostille}, he was infuriated by Bucer’s additions to the fourth volume. Luther also took great umbrage at Bucer’s translation of Bugenhagen’s Psalter. In an open letter to the printer requesting a reprint of the \textit{Kirchenpostille}, Luther called Bucer’s changes perfidious.\footnote{“Ita ut non sint contenti miseri homines suum virus propriis et iam infinitis libris sparsisse, nisi et alienos libros eo veneno illito perdant. Idem fecit et antea Johanni Pomerano in suo Psalterio insigni perfidia, quem non ignorabat per Dis dia pasôn ab illa impia Secta dissentire” (Luther to Johann Herwagen (see \textit{supra} n. 438 on p. 208), dated 13 September 1526; WA XIX, p. 471).} He demanded that the new edition also include his open letter to Herwagen, the antidote to Bucer’s heresy.\footnote{“Hanc epistolam, mi Hervagi, ideo ad te scribo, ut si editurus es denuo Tomum illum quartum, omnibus modis eam praefigas vel subnectas, ut sit Lectori in meo libro antidotum adversus Buceri praefationem” (WA XIX, p. 473).}

That same year, Bucer’s translation of Bugenhagen’s Psalter was also published in a Dutch translation.\footnote{Johannes Bugenhagen, \textit{Die souter rvel verduytscht wt die heylige oft Hebreeusche sprake. Verclaringshe des gheheelen psalters eer clair ende profeticel door Johaenem Bugenhag wt Pomeren/ aen vele plasten door hem seluen gebetert, ei on wuricheyt der ghemeynten in goeden verstædeliken dytscche ouer gheset, Basel: Adam Anonymous [vere Antwerpen: Johannes Hochstraaten], 1526. (PRSch 20).} The book was purported to be published by a certain Adam Anonymous in Basel. This led some to believe that the book was from the press of the Basel printer Adam Petri, who
had published Bugenhagen’s original Latin version and Bucer’s German translation.\textsuperscript{458} Typographical evidence, however, proves that the book is the work of Merten de Keyser in Antwerp.\textsuperscript{459} One copy of this book can now be found in the Württembergische Landesbibliothek in Stuttgart. This copy differs from other known copies because at the end it contains three extra quires (sigs. hh-kk). The extra quires contain three texts in Dutch. The first one bears the title \textit{Den hondert ende thienden Psalm met een andtwoort op die valsche leeringe Butceri vant Sacrament, daer mede hi Pomerani wtlegginge vervalst ende verkeert heeft etc} (Psalm 110 with an answer to the false teachings of Bucer concerning the Eucharist, in which he falsified and altered Bugenhagen’s explanation).\textsuperscript{460} The other two are Dutch translations of a letter by Luther to “\textit{Den wtvercoren ende getrouwwen dienaren Christi in nederlandt}” (To the chosen and faithful servants of Christ in the Netherlands), and of a short letter by Bugenhagen. Both letters claim to be autographs (\textit{eyghen handt}) and are only preserved in this edition.\textsuperscript{461} The authors of the Dutch text are a certain Clemens and Jacob, who translated Bugenhagen’s original Latin text into Dutch and made comments on Bucer’s translation.\textsuperscript{462} Their aim is to disclose the heresy in Bucer’s translation.\textsuperscript{463} For Bucer’s falsification of Bugenhagen’s Psalter

\textsuperscript{458} E.g. Bugenhagen, \textit{Bibliotheca Bugenhagiana}, ed. Georg Geisenhof (Bug. 1; QDGR 6), Leipzig: Heinsius Nachf., 1908 (reprint: Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1963); W.H. Neuser in MBDS, 2, p. 183. The pseudonymity was intended, of course, to give the censoring authorities the same idea.


\textsuperscript{460} Published in Hammer, \textit{Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen}, pp. 440–54.

\textsuperscript{461} Published in Hammer, \textit{Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen}, pp. 440–54. See also Hammer’s discussion on pp. 434–40.

\textsuperscript{462} There is no further information available on the identity of the authors. See: Hammer, \textit{Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen}, p. 425.

\textsuperscript{463} “Daeromme, hoe wel dat Pomeranus selve teghen desen vervalsscheren, ghelijckerwijs hi mi beloefde te doene, sonder twijfel genôch gevescreven heeft ofte scriijven sal, nochtnas op dat ick oock het mijne daer toe doen soude ende aen haren doelen ontschul- dichij sijn soudeân den grooten dach des heeren Jesu Christi, so hebben wi, Clemens ende Jacob, na die genade, die ons god gegeven heeft, desen hondert ende thienden Psalm wt den Latijne in onsen nederlandschen duytscche overgheset, ghelijckerwijs hi van Pomerano gescreven is, op dat die loghenachtighe valscheyt deser ketteren te beter aen den dach ofte int openbaer come soude” (Hammer, \textit{Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen}, p. 446).
was an act of the devil and a blasphemy. Bucer himself, according to the tract, is a ‘hopeless heretic’ (vertwijfelde ketter) and not a servant of Christ, because he only seeks human approval (cf. Gal. 1:20). Clemens and Jacob believed that Bucer and his fellows “souden niet eenen armen maden sack willen verstooren ofte vertoornen, om die eere des woordts Christi te onderhouden” (would not even disturb a corrupt person—literally, a sack of worms—for the sake of the glory of Christ’s Gospel). They are heretics who “lochenen ende seggen, dat broot ende den kelc des heeren niet te sijn dat lichaem ende dat bloet Christi” (deny that the bread and the chalice of the Lord are the body and blood of Christ).

Also, Erasmus accused Bucer of dishonesty in a private letter to the Strasbourg Reformer. Although the Dutch Humanist acknowledged that he had read neither Bucer’s translations nor Luther’s or Bugenhagen’s accusations, nonetheless, Erasmus believed that Bucer would not be accused of such heresy if he had translated the works frankly. Erasmus’ judgement rests exclusively on the unanimous condemnation of Bucer’s falsifications by those who read his translations.

Bucer felt that he had been unjustly attacked and wanted to defend himself immediately after the publication of Bugenhagen’s Oratio. Capito’s above-mentioned letter indicates that Bucer had already made plans for a reply to Bugenhagen’s Oratio in order “to disperse the clouds from the eyes of the readers.” Capito was clearly concerned about the negative effects of the dispute between Bucer and Bugenhagen, and felt ashamed in their stead. The defence was published both in Latin and in German.

464 “So gedachte die Sathan ooc een capelle bi deser kercken godts ['de Souter van Pomerano'] te timmeren ende is gevaren inden Bucerum, ende die heeft die reyne godsalige Christi inden Latijjnische Souter—namelic in desen hondert ende elfsten Psalm—Pomerani laten staen ende aan die stad sijne onnutte clapperij ende duvelsche ketterije van der verkeeringhe des woordts Christi int avontmael ghesettet ende des Christelicken bisschops Pomerani boeck gevalschet” (Hammer, Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen, p. 446). Cf. p. 451.

465 Hammer, Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen, p. 446.

466 Hammer, Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen, p. 446.

467 Hammer, Der Streit um Bucer in Antwerpen, p. 453.

468 “Versionem in psalmos tuam non legi, sed si bona fide vertisti que scripsit Pomeranus, non possunt abesse dogmata que nunc pro damnatis habentur a plerisque […] Ego nec Luhteri ac Pomerani criminationem nec tuam purgationem legi. Tantum quod vno ore dicebatur ab his qui legerant credidi” (Erasmus to Martin Bucer, on 2 March 1532, published in: Allen, IX, no. 2615, pp. 449–50).

469 Ergo apologia apologiam pariet, qua dubii lectoribus obculos fumus spargetur” (HZSW VIII, no. 531, p. 725).

470 “Ridiculam videbis tragediam […] Pudet me vicem istorum, qui se tantopere produnt: diminuendo nominii ac famæ crucis prædicatores timent” (HZSW VIII, no. 531, p. 725).
in 1527.\textsuperscript{471} Capito rejected the imputations of being impious (\textit{gottloß}) or of wanting to blemish the fame of the Wittenberg School.\textsuperscript{472} Bucer’s main argument claimed Bugenhagen’s own authorization to change what he pleased.\textsuperscript{473} He also claimed that he did not change the content of Bugenhagen’s words and that he held with Bugenhagen that as Christ’s body and blood redeemed the disciples, they give eternal life to those who eat and drink the true body and blood of Christ in faith.\textsuperscript{474} Finally, Bucer pleaded ignorance in connection with Bugenhagen’s letter to J. Heß. He read it only when the Psalter was already in print.\textsuperscript{475}

Two years later, in 1529, the city of Strasbourg embraced officially the “New Faith” and the celebration of the Mass was replaced by preaching services. In the same year Bucer published his own commentary on the Psalms. The publication was produced by the Strasbourg printer Georg Ulricher of Andlau (fl. 1529–36) and was exhibited at the Autumn Book Fair of Frankfurt in September 1529.\textsuperscript{476} The voluminous (more than 400 folios)


\textsuperscript{472} Bucer, \textit{Verteütschung des Psalter}, p. 266.

\textsuperscript{473} Bucer, \textit{Verteütschung des Psalter}, pp. 268–69.

\textsuperscript{474} “Sonder frey hab ich an disem und anderen orten geschrieben und predigt, wo glaubige seind, die das nachtmal Christi halten und glauben, das er auch inen wie seinen jüngerem sein leib und blüt zü ewiger erlösung schencke, das solche den waren leib und ware blüt Christi warlich, das ist durch den glauben, essen und trincken zü ewigem leben” (Bucer, \textit{Verteütschung des Psalter}, p. 267).

\textsuperscript{475} “Und warlich, wer deine unbedachte Epistel zü dem Hessen Ee, dann diser Psalm gedrucket war, mir zü kommen, ich wolte weytleüfigger vom nachtmal Christi an diesem ort geschrieben und der welt, was mein und dein meynung hierin were, angezeyget haben” (Bucer, \textit{Verteütschung des Psalter}, pp. 269–70). In the Latin text, Bucer shared more details: “Imo ut tibi fateor, quod multis cordatis simis et fide dignis testibus possum verum comprobare, ubi edita fuit tua illa ad Hessum Epistola, te certe indigna, animus erat, in fine libri, nam quae in psalmum 111. scripsarum, antequam Epistolam tuam accepissim, excusa fuerant, testandi, mihi tecum de Eucharistia non convenire, ne viderer, eo quod solius spiritualis manudentionis Christi tecum memineram, malo aliquo dolo tacuisse carnalem. Sed typographi gratia, cum quae scripsarums, cum tuus non variarent, id omisi” (Martin Bucer, \textit{Ad Pomeranum satisfactio}, 1527, sig. F4').

\textsuperscript{476} Martin Bucer, \textit{S. Psalmorvm Li bri Qvinqve Ad Ebraicam Veritatem Versi, Et Famil iar Explanacione Elvcidati/ Per Aretivm Felinvm, Strasbourg: Georg Ulricher, 1529. I used
commentary claimed to be the work of a certain “Aretius Felinus theologus” from Lyon. As Bucer later explained in a letter to Zwingli, he chose pseudonymity in order to facilitate the circulation of his work in France and the Low Countries, for “it is a capital crime to import into these countries books which bear our names.”477 Not associating the work with his name could also be advantageous for its reception, he thought, for he had been playing such a conspicuous role in the debate over the Lord’s Supper. In his Epistola adversus Pseudeuangelicos (1529), Erasmus had already mentioned both Bucer’s translation of Bugenhagen’s commentary and Bucer’s own work.478 Erasmus clearly and strongly disapproved of Bucer’s pseudonymity, which he regarded as frivolous fraud and deception of the reader.479 Although he initially hesitated to answer, Bucer published his Epistola Apologetica.480 With this publication, the breach between Erasmus


479 “Nuper, ut audio quidam istius factionis Ecclesiastes non incelebris, verso nomine dicavit librum filio Regis Galliarum, & insparsit identidem voces aliquot Gallicae, ne in Auctorem Germanum cadat suspicio, affectus & alius aliquot conjecturis, ut Liber Lugduni à Gallo & scriptus & excusus esse videatur. Agnoscis esse verissimum quod dico, neque enim obscurum est, quis hanc technam commentus sit, & alias in lusu simili reprehensuros. Hunc ludum si sibi permitteret in re vulgare, & profana, tamen indignus esset gravi viro: nunc quid minus conveniebat eum, qui se profitetur sacrosancti Euangelii preconem?” (Erasmus, Epistola contra quosdam qui se falsa inactant evangelicos, col. 1581 D-F).

and the Strasbourg Reformers reached its widest point.\footnote{Martin Bucer, \textit{Martini Buceri Opera Latina}, vol. 1, p. 61.} In his apologetic epistle Bucer pointed out that even Roman Law only punished the alteration of names in books if it was meant to defame or harm someone.\footnote{Cf. “Si quis librum ad infamiam aliauis pertinentem scripsert composuerit ediderit dolove malo fecerit, quo quid eorum fieret, etiamsi alterius nomine ediderit vel sine nomine, uti de ea re agere liceret et, si condemnatus sit qui id fecit, intestabilis ex lege esse iubetur” (\textit{Corpus Iuris Civilis}. Digesta XLVII,10.5.9).} Furthermore, the OT presents Abraham (Gen. 12:14–20), Isaac (Gen. 26:7–11), and David (1 Sam. 21:10–15.27) deceiving people about their identity, Bucer claimed. Therefore, he called his pseudonymity only a pious fraud, which harmed no one but benefited many.\footnote{“Pius dolus est, qui nocet nemini, prodest multis” (Bucer, \textit{Martini Buceri Opera Latina}, vol. 1, p. 128). Erasmus was not impressed by Bucer’s arguments and refuted Bucer’s book with his \textit{Epistola ad Fratres Germaniac Inferioris}, (Erasmus, \textit{Responsio ad Epistolam Apologeticam}, August 1530, republished in: LB 10, cols. 1589–1632). On the debate, see J.V. Pollet, \textit{Bucer et Gerhard Geldenhauer: dispute avec Érasme}, in J.V. Pollet (ed.), \textit{Martin Bucer. Études sur les relations de Bucer avec les Pay-Bas, l’Électorat de Cologne et l’Allemagne du Nord avec de nombreux textes inédits}, vol. I, (SMRT 33), Leiden: Brill, 1985, pp. 26–34.} The deceit was successful. ‘Felinus’ became popular among both Protestants and orthodox Catholics, and even Johann Eck consulted and cited ‘Felinus’ (albeit with reservations) on several occasions.\footnote{Johannes Eck, \textit{Explanatio psalmi vigesimi}, 1538, republished in Johannes Eck, \textit{Explanatio psalmi vigesimi} (1538), ed. Bernhard Walde, (Corpus Catholicorum 13), Münster: Aschendorff, 1928. Walde pointed out in his introduction that “Diese Psalmenerklärung war weithin auch in katholischen Kreisen beliebt, bis der wahre Name des Verfasser bekannt wurde. Ob Eck diesen gekannt hat, geht aus den Zitaten nicht hervor” (p. XXXIII, n. 8). But to the contrary: Hobbs, \textit{How Firm a Foundation}, p. 478.}

In the volume, which would later play a pivotal role in the Antwerp controversy, Bucer gives a translation and a detailed commentary of the 150 psalms. Bucer draws extensively on Hebrew material and comments upon the language, vocabulary, and style of the psalmist. He often refers to Jewish sources, too. One of the most cited Hebrew authors in the book is Rabbi David Kimhi, whose commentary on the Psalms was the first book ever printed to contain a book of the Hebrew Bible.\footnote{Kimhi’s commentary was first printed in 1477, probably in Bologna. The volume is one of the most beautiful early Hebrew printed works. The biblical text is printed in square type and pointed by hand. Kimhi’s commentary is in a cursive type along the corresponding verses. Daniel Bomberg (c.1480–c.1550) included the commentary in the first edition of the \textit{Biblica Rabbínica} (1536–17). Burnett mentions only the first edition of the \textit{Mikra‘ot Gedolot} owned by Bucer, but Hobbs asserted that the Strasbourg Reformer also made use of the second edition, which dropped Kimhi’s commentary in favour of the commentaries of Abraham ben Meir Ibn Ezra (1089–167) and Rashi alongside the text of the Psalms. (Cf. Stephen G. Burnett, \textit{Spokesmen for Judaism}. Medieval Jewish Polemicists and their Christian Readers in the Reformation Era, in Peter Schäfer & Irina Wandrey}
Bucer’s translation of Ps. 1:5 reads as follows: “Quare in iudicium acti improbi haudquaquam consistent, neque stabunt flagitiosi in concilio iustorum.” In his commentary Bucer noted that he translated the words לא יקימו {Lo iakumu} as non consistent, but many translate it as non surgent and elaborate on the resurrection of the dead. But the same verb (נידון), Bucer pointed out, can carry several different significations, such as ‘to stand’ (stare), ‘to consist’ (consistere), oftentimes ‘to erect oneself’ (se statuere) or ‘to rise’ (erigere), and, further, ‘to stand up’ (surgere). In fact, as he remarked, this verb is used in the original Hebrew text as a synzeugma (the same verb governing and joining more than one clause), but the Alsatian theologian translated the verse with two separate verbs (consistent, stabunt). In Bucer’s understanding the verse does not mean that the wicked would not rise up, but that they will not ‘stand in the judgement,’ which is a metaphor to say that they will not be vindicated or win their cause in the judgement. The judgement (מִשְׁפָּט) in v. 5, Bucer clarified, is the Last Judgement, when Christ will come in the power of God the Father to judge. Therefore, the wicked shall rise (i.e. will be resurrected) but not “in resurrectione uitæ,” for they will stand before the tribunal of Christ, and as soon as the sentence is passed on them, they will be taken to the eternal fire prepared for them by the devil and his angels (Mt. 25:41). For support, Bucer referred to Kimhi’s commentary, which understood the word ‘judgement’ as the day of death. Kimhi also took the
council of the righteous to mean the assembly of the souls of the saints, to which the saints are admitted after this life, Bucer added. From this assembly the wicked are excluded, so they will perish in body and soul.491

Bucer’s representation of Rabbi David Kimhi’s commentary is fairly accurate. Kimhi’s commentary runs as follows:

In line with other medieval Jewish commentators (inter alios Rashi) and with the Aramaic Targum, Kimhi understood Ps. 1:5 in the light of the future judgement. Apparently this judgement takes place, in Kimhi’s understanding, immediately after (on the day of) the death of the person. The soul (נפשה) of the righteous (צדיקים) “will be able to stand in the judgement.” And after the person’s death, he or she will join the assembly of the souls of the righteous in glory. But neither the wicked (רשעים) nor the sinners (חטאים) will be able to stand in the judgement,493 for the sinners will perish both soul and body (תאבד נפשים עם גופם), and therefore will not stand in the judgement. Kimhi’s recurring expression לא תקוםלחם to explain the Hebrew verb יקום is an allusion to Lev. 26:37:

A very literal rendering of Kimhi’s expression in English could be: there will not be for them (the possibility of) standing (הקומם). This explanation,

491 “R. Kim. iudicium hic diem mortis cuiusque intelligit, & concilium iustorum, coetum sanctorum animarum, in quem sancti post hanc uitam admittentur, & ex quo reprobri excludentur, ut qui pereant animo & corpore” (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinque, p. 11).

492 “THEY WILL NOT RISE IN THE ASSEMBLY—this wants to say: in the day of the judgement, and this is the day of death, they shall not be able to stand. AND THE SINNERS—also likewise, and this will be the judgement for those who scorn: they shall not be able to stand IN THE ASSEMBLY OF THE RIGHTIOUS; for the Righteous, when they will die, they will be able to stand; but surely the SINNERS—they shall not be able to stand but their souls will be destroyed together with their bodies on the day of death. And: IN THE ASSEMBLY: for when the righteous die, their souls will be delighted with the souls of the righteous in glory in the supreme world” (my translation). Republished in: Mikra‘ot Gedolot ‘Haketer’. Psalms., ed. Menachem Cohen, Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan UP, 2003–04. p. 4.

493 There are differing views in medieval Jewish exegesis whether these represent two different groups and whether or not the sinners will rise at all. Rashi e.g. differentiates between the two groups. Cf. Mikra‘ot Gedolot ‘Haketer’, (2003–04), pp. 3–6.
of course, is somewhat ambiguous, for it uses the noun (תְּקוּמָה) derived from the same verb (קוּם). On the whole, however, there seems to be a consensus that Kimhi understood this as the bodily resurrection.\footnote{Solomon B. Freehof, \textit{The Book of Psalms. A Commentary}, Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1938, p. 13. Cf. "In de joodse overlevering wordt de stam qūm vertaald met het oog op het goddelijke eindgericht (LXX, Targum, Midrash, ook Vulgata: resurgent), maar de betekenis 'opstaan' geldt alleen waar sprake is van gestorvenen" (N.A. Van Uchelen, \textit{Psalmen}, vol. I (1–40), (De prediking van het Oude Testament), Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1971, p. 14). See also: Sawyer, \textit{Hebrew Words for the Resurrection of the Dead}, pp. 218–34, esp. p. 232.} Bucer, however, employed the Latin expression “cœtum sanctorum animarum” to translate the term “assembly of the righteous” (עֲדַת צַדִּיקִים). In doing so he gave a Christian character to the text. This Christian interpretation of Kimhi is reinforced by seamlessly integrating the presentation of Christ as the judge of both the righteous and the sinners in Kimhi’s text.

The same verb (קוּם) is used again in Ps. 3:8, which Bucer rendered with “Exurge Iehoua” and explains that the verb ‘surge’ here means ‘pro-fer, declara contra hostem, in meam salutem, tuem potentiam’ (Stretch out and show your power in my salvation against the enemy).\footnote{Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve}, pp. 40 and 44.}

In Psalm 107 (Vg: 106), verse 29, Bucer commented on the meaning of the same verb (קוּם) once more. Here, the Strasbourg Reformer translated the Hebrew יָקֵם סְעָרָה לִדְמָמָה וַיֶּחֱשׁוּ גַּלֵּיהֶם with the Latin \textit{Facessit uentus procellosus, ut mare fileat, taceant fluctus eius}. Thus, the verb קָוָם that normally means “to rise” (quod surgere significat) is used to express the calming of the storm (\textit{procellam sedatam, ac inde fluctus resedisse}). A few verses earlier, in verse 25 of the same psalm, another verb—namely, עָמַר ‘to stand’ (que stare significat)—is used to express the opposite—namely, to excite a stormy wind: וַיֹּאמֶר וַיַּעֲמֵד רוּחַ סְעָרָה.\footnote{Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve}, pp. 506 and 508.} As in verse 25 עָמַד means ‘to be there’ or ‘to come forth,’ so should קָוָם be understood in verse 29 as ‘to cease’ or ‘to retire,’ Bucer stated.\footnote{"Vt ergo illud, stetit, accipiendum est pro adfuit, prodijt: ita illud surgere, quidam pro facescere, cedere, accipiunt." (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve}, p. 508.) However, the commentary of verse 25, to which Bucer referred, does not contain any explanation of the verb עָמַר; instead, Bucer quoted there verse 29—"Ver. 25. Et dicit, & fiat spiritus procellae. Ver.29. Surrexit procella ad silentium, & omnis iniquitas claudet os suum"—and expounded upon the profundity of God’s miracles and deeds in connection with the sea, which was even recognized by Pliny, whom Bucer cited off-handedly: “nihil ulla in parte naturae esse, quod non etiam in mari sit, & praeterea multa in mari, quae nusquam alibi.” Pliny’s text reads: “vera ut fiat vulgi opinio, quicquid nascatur in parte naturae ulla, et in mari esse praeterea multa quae nusquam alibi” (Caius Plinius Secundus, \textit{Naturalis historia}, IX,1. Bucer mistakenly refers to chapter 2).}
Besides his comments on the verb קום, Bucer touched upon issues of the afterlife while explaining the meaning of the Hebrew nouns שבול, בור, שחת, קבר (all being synonyms for grave). Ps. 6:5–6 (Vg: 6:4–5) gave him his first opportunity to reflect on these nouns. These two verses read in his translation as follows: Recipe ab ira te, ô Iehouah, eripe animam meam, serua me pro tua bonitate. Etenim inter mortuos nemo tui memor est, apud infernos quis te celebret. In this passage, Bucer translated the Hebrew שבול with apud or in infernos, although the noun שבול technically means ‘grave’ (sepulchrum), Bucer noted. The Hebrew language has four words that can be translated as ‘grave’ (שבול, בור, שחת, קבר), but their meanings differ, Bucer stated. בשול is the grave which is always open and swallows everything; בור is a small pit which is dug out; שחת is the grave in which everything that is buried will be destroyed; and קבר is the grave that has to be dug. At the same time, the OT has no specific word to describe the state of the souls after this life, Bucer asserted. Just as the Latin language uses the word infernus to describe the dead, the OT authors make use of the noun שבול for referring to the souls of the dead. By way of illustration, Bucer quoted Gen. 37:35, where Judah cries out in his grief over Joseph: “Descendam luge[çon] שבולה, id est in infernum, ad filium meum.” Another example for such a usage can be found in the story in Num. 16 about the revolt of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, Bucer pointed out. There, upon Moses’ words, it is said about the rebels that they “uiui descen[ton] שבולה, id est in infernum.” The two examples show that the noun שבול is semantically neutral, for it can denote the state of the righteous as well that of the wicked, Bucer explained. For nobody

498 “{Biscol.} בשולה, id est in sepolchro (quidam uertunt in inferno, & si sepolchrum propriè significet” (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve, p. 69).
499 “{Sceol. bor. Scachath. Keba.} קבר zeigt בור, שחת, שבולה. His omnibus sepolchrum significatur, sed diuersa ratione.” (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve, p. 69.)
500 “שאולה, quod sepulchrum uidetur semper patere, absimit enim omnia. בור, quod effodiatur, sitque fouea quedam. שחת, à corrupiendo. nihil enim non corrupit & dissoluitur, quod fuerit sepultum. קבר, item à fodiendo” (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve, pp. 69–70). Bucer’s semantic description of the synonyms is accurate and proves that he is well-versed in Hebrew.
501 “Cum autem de statu spirituum nostrorum post hanc uitam […] in ueteri instrumento, desunt & nomina eius” (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve, p. 70).
502 “Vt igitur Latini, ab eo quòd terra reconduntur mortui, ac ita infrà nos ponunt Inferos dixerunt: ita & scriptura, à sepolchro mutuato nomine, eorundem conditionem שבולה, {Sceolah.} id est quoi infernum reddunt, uocat” (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve, p. 70).
503 Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve, p. 70.
504 Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve, p. 70.
can doubt that Judah had hoped to be carried by angels to the bosom of Abraham, in the assembly of the blessed faithful fathers, while the rebels descended to somewhere else entirely.\textsuperscript{505} Consequently, ישאול can signify the state of the dead, whether they be the righteous or the wicked.\textsuperscript{506}

Nonetheless, the OT does have a proper term to indicate the place of the wicked after their death, Bucer continued. This expression is Gehenna, which is derived from the Hebrew \textit{גיאנון} \textit{הנין} \textit{גיאן הנם} \textit{גיאן הנם}, id est ulla filij Hinon.\textsuperscript{507} Into this valley of the Son of Hinnon cadavers and the filth of Jerusalem were dumped, and it is also where, according to Jer. 7:31–32; 19:2–6; and 32:35, the ungodly sacrificed their children to Molech, Bucer related. From the name of this valley the noun \textit{גיאן הנם}, id est gehennam\textsuperscript{508} is contracted, and by way of transfer of meaning it is used to describe the condition of those who are sentenced to eternal punishment. These people are like the excrement of the world (\textit{mundi excrementa}) for whom there can be no place in Jerusalem, the city of the saints, Bucer concluded his explanation.\textsuperscript{509}

But why were the OT saints so afraid of death? asked Bucer. He found the answer in the idea that the knowledge about the future life was not as clearly revealed to them as it was after Jesus' glorification.\textsuperscript{510} Among the examples illustrating his point, Bucer cited Phil. 1:23: There is no Christian, the Alsatian exegete wrote, who does not hope to live eventually with Christ in the blissful mansion in eternal, inconceivable happiness. But how few people can eagerly say together with Paul that they long to depart and be with Christ? If people really hoped to win the blissful life with God, they would sooner lay down this present life with all of its dreadful sufferings as soon as possible than they would deny the Lord,

\textsuperscript{505} “Quis autem dubitet, Iacob nunquam aliò peruenturum se sperasse, quàm quà transltatus ab angelis fuit Lazarus in sinum Abrahæ, in beatum fidелиum patrum concilium: seditiosos atem illos longe aliò descéndisse?” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 70).

\textsuperscript{506} “Significatur ergo hoc nomine ישאול, quod per infernum ferè redditur, status mortuorum, tam bonorum quàm malorum” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 70).

\textsuperscript{507} Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 70.

\textsuperscript{508} “Hunc ergo locum contracto nomine גיאן הנם, id est gehennam uocarunt, & eodem per translationem, conditionem eorum, qui æternis addicuntur supplicijis” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 70).

\textsuperscript{509} “Hi enim sunt ceu mundi excrementa, quib. in Ierusalem, ciuitate sanctorum, locus esse non potest” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 70).

\textsuperscript{510} “Quare prisci sancti mori tantopere horrurerint? […] Prima, que illis ratio utiæ futuræ non tam reuelata fuit, atque post glorificatum Christum” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 72).
Bucer maintained.\textsuperscript{511} Therefore, to think about death as a gain \textit{(ut mori pro lucro habeamus)}, it is necessary to be fully convinced about the benefits of the future life \textit{(de bonis futuræ uite)}, Bucer exhorted his readers.\textsuperscript{512} Death is therefore not to be feared, he argued, because the future life is a life with Christ in the fullness of happiness. From Bucer's use of Paul's words it is clear that the Strasbourg Reformer understood this being with Christ as taking place immediately after the death of the human person and as a real, temporal alternative to remaining in the body.

Bucer reflected on the word \textit{ל(setting)}\textit{אָל} again in his comments on Ps. 16:9–10. The joy and the confidence of the Psalmist in verse 9 stem from his faith in the resurrection, which is professed in the following verse, Bucer explained, because the faith in the resurrection renders everything light and sweet, and the fruit of true faith is the intense joy of the soul.\textsuperscript{513} While in his translation Bucer opted to use 'sepulchrum,' the literal meaning of the word \textit{ל(setting)}\textit{אָל} in verse 10, in the paraphrase Bucer rendered it with \textit{infernum} because, he argued, the Hebrew word means both the grave \textit{(sepulchrum)} and the state of the dead \textit{(conditionem mortuorum)}.\textsuperscript{514} The verse also contains another Hebrew synonym for 'grave': \textit{שָׁחַת}. This, as Bucer noted, is translated in the Greek of the LXX as \textit{διαφθορά}, which means 'corruption' or 'decay.'\textsuperscript{515} The Greek noun reflects the root of the Hebrew noun because the body in the grave decomposes and perishes. The translators of the LXX therefore expressed more simply \textit{(simpliciter)} what the Psalmist

\textsuperscript{511} “Nemo siquidem est Christianus, qui non credat sibi apud Christum beatam mansio\textit{nm} paratam, in qua olim incredibili felicitate in æternu uiuat, at quotsquisqu\textit{e} tamen ex animo dicat cum Paulo: Cupio dissolui, et esse cum Christo? Inuenias quide\textit{m} & huius fidei aliquot, sed plures qui hunc nondum uenerunt: & si adeò credant apud Deum beat\textit{em} se uitam uicturos, ut hanc diris cruciatibus posituri sint citius, 

\textsuperscript{512} Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 73.

\textsuperscript{513} “Veræ fidei fructus [. . .] solida animi lætitia est. [. . .] Vbi enim spiritus fide certa donatus est, & uerum diuinæ bonitatis, gustum percepit, redundat illico eius gaudium, & in carnem, ut nihil trepidet, secureque manum Domini sustineat, & si crux illi ferenda sit, & renasce nequeat, nisi antea destructa. Nam illi resurrectionis spes, omnia leuia & dulcia reddit. Hanc uersus decimus canit, nam ait, Non deseres animam meam in sepulchro: id est non ita destitues me, ut anima mea morti concedat” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 73).

\textsuperscript{514} Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 73.

\textsuperscript{515} “Verse 10 was translated as “Neque enim deseres animam meam ut sepulchrum subeat: neque permittes, ut uideat bonus, quem tibi delegisti, foueam.” Bucer paraphrased the translation in the commentary: “Quia non deseres animam meam ad infernum, non das bonum ad uidendum foueam” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, pp. 129 and 134).

\textsuperscript{514} “Verse 10 was translated as “Neque enim deseres animam meam ut sepulchrum subeat: neque permittes, ut uideat bonus, quem tibi delegisti, foueam.” Bucer paraphrased the translation in the commentary: “Quia non deseres animam meam ad infernum, non das bonum ad uidendum foueam” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 134).

\textsuperscript{515} “יְהִינָשׁ Græci, per διαφθοράν reuddunt, quod corruptionem significat” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 135). Bucer is correct asserting that the verb יְהִינָשׁ means ‘to corrupt,’ ‘to destroy.’
says figuratively (figuratè).\(^{516}\) Bucer also pointed out that the LXX correctly renders לִשְׁאל as εἰς ᾅδην and not as ἐν ᾅδου, for the Psalmist uses the particle ל (to/towards/into) and not the particle ב (in).\(^{517}\) This means that even the translators of the LXX might have conceived God's protection of His saint as not letting the saint descend into the netherworld.\(^{518}\) Also, in the Acts of the Apostles, Ps. 16:9–10 is quoted in this form, although when the apostles Peter and Paul quote the psalm (Acts 2:27 and 13:35), they apply it to prove the resurrection of Christ. There are uneducated people (rudiores), Bucer maintained, who therefore would object in the following way to such a reading of the psalm: according to our faith, Christ did go to the netherworld, did die, and was really buried, but His spirit could not be detained by the netherworld, nor could His body be kept in the grave.\(^{519}\) But when they cite Ps. 16:10 to prove their case, the Jews, who conceive the Psalm to be referring to David, laugh at us Christians and say: 'David was thus mistaken when he thought that he would be preserved by God, in whom he put his hope that God would preserve him and not let him descend to the grave or to the netherworld.'\(^{520}\) But Peter foresaw this argument and refuted it when he pointed out that David died eventually, and his monument was still present in Peter's time (Acts 2:29).\(^{521}\) Consequently, the Psalm could not refer to David, Bucer argued, because his soul descended into the netherworld and his body decayed in the grave.\(^{522}\) But the prophecy is fully fulfilled in the Saviour, who, although He died and was buried, did not remain dead and buried in the grave, but instead

\(\text{---}\)

\(^{516}\) Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve, pp. 129 and 134.

\(^{517}\) The Greek ἐν ᾅδου would translate the Hebrew לִשְׁאֵל.

\(^{518}\) "unde liquet & ipsos intellexisse sic seruari sanctum, ne ad inferos descendat" (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve, p. 135).

\(^{519}\) "Fides nostra habet Christum inferos adijisse, uerè mortuum & sepultum: at neque animam apud inferos, neque corpus eius in sepulchro detineri, atque ita corrupni potuisse" (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve, p. 135).

\(^{520}\) "Ad huius ueritatis confirmationem, cum adducitur praesens Psalmi huius locus, uti & Petrus atque Paulus eum ad probandam Christi resurrectionem adduxerunt, ridet nos Iudei, atque dicunt hic Dauide cecinisse se seruandum à Domino, quem colendum sibi, & in quo speraret, unicum proposuerit, ne in sepulchrum uel ad inferos descenderet, & ne uideret foueam, id est ne reconderetur in foueam corrumpendus" (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve, p. 135).

\(^{521}\) "His obijcere licebit, quod diuus Petrus citato hoc loco in Actis, patribus illorum obiecit, patriarcham Dauidem mortuum esse et sepultum, et sepulchrum eius ad eum usque diem, quo ista Petrus loquebatur, fuisset apud Iudeos" (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve, p. 135).

\(^{522}\) "Non est igitur in Dauide, quod hic canitur, impetum. Animæ enim eius tandem ad inferos descendit, & uidit caro eius foueam, in qua & consumpta est" (Bucer, Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinquve, p. 135).
rose on the third day, and His body was inaugurated into the happy and immortal life.\textsuperscript{523} So if Christ said of those who believed in him that they would not taste death, this can be applied even more so to Himself, who is called life and resurrection (Jn. 8:52; 11:25; cf. Mt. 16:28 \textit{et par.}).\textsuperscript{524}

Commenting on Ps. 49(48):16, Bucer also alluded very briefly to the intermediate state of the soul between death and resurrection. This verse, which Bucer rendered with \textit{Sed animam meam reductam ab inferno Deus: nam suscepit me. Selah}, speaks about God bestowing immortality (\textit{dare immortalitatem}) on those who leave behind this world: while the body is given to earth and becomes food for worms (\textit{corpus humo demandatum esca uermium est}), the soul enjoys God’s comfort.\textsuperscript{525} And when the Psalmist declares his reason for rejoicing in this verse (because He receives me), he preaches about all believers, for the Saviour promised that the elect, to whom He gave His spirit, will never taste death.\textsuperscript{526} The believers will be resurrected at the end of the world, but in the meantime God gives happiness to their souls in Heaven, a mystery which can barely be understood, and therefore the Psalmist added Selah at the end of the verse.\textsuperscript{527}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{523} “At in Seruatore uerè completum illum scimus. Licet enim mortuus & sepultus fuerit, non tamen in morte & sepulcro haesit, sed in triduo rediviuius, immortalem & beatom uitam in corpore quoque suo auspiciatus est, ut non iniuria dicatur inferos nunquam adiisse, neque uidisse sepulchrum” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 135).
  \item \textsuperscript{524} “Etenim si de credentibus in se propter resurrectionis expectationem Seruator dixit, mortem huiusmodi nunquam gustaturos: id multo rectius de ipso, qui ipsa uita est & resurrectionis dicitur” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 135).
  \item \textsuperscript{525} Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 323.
  \item \textsuperscript{526} “Huius uerò felicitatis dum caussam reddid, prædicat eandem omnibus credentibus communem. Ait enim, Quia sescepit me. Quoscunque enim suscepit Deus, suscipit autem quos eligat ad uitam, quibus suum donat spiritum, iij ommes ut Seruator dixit, mortem nunquam gustabunt” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 323).
  \item \textsuperscript{527} “Nam suscitabit illos in die nouissimo, et interim mentibus sua gaudia donabit in coelis. Et hoc enigma est, quod caro & sanguis intelligere haud possunt, ideo & Selah adiectum est” (Bucer, \textit{Sacrorvm Psalmorvm libri quinqve}, p. 323). Bucer noted that the Aramaic Targum renders the last clause of the verse by ‘because He will teach me His Law for ever’, but Kimhi interpreted the qal imperfect third-person masculine singular \textit{יקַּחֵנִי} from the verb \textit{לקח} as ‘he will take me away,’ as it is said in Gen. 5:24 about Enoch that he was taken away and existed no longer, because Kimhi thought that the soul would be extinguished together with the body. Yet Ibn Ezra interpreted the clause as referring to God receiving the soul of the Psalmist after his death, as the Psalmist says at another place: ‘he will guide me with his council and will receive me with honour’ (Ps. 73(72):24). “Chaldeus habet hic: Quoniam docebit me legem suam in aeternum. Kimhi uero accipit \textit{ניקח} \textit{לכאת} pro tollet me, sicut accipitur Gen.5 de Chancoc: Et non erat, quia \textit{ניקח}, id est sustulit illum Deus. uult enim sensum esse, Redimet Deus animam meam ab inferno, uel sepulchro, quum sustulerit me & mori fecerit, ut scilicet anima cum corpore extinguatur. A.Ezra autem, suscipiet me, idem esse putat atque, assumet ad se in morte spiritum meum. luxta illud: Deducet me consilio suo, & postea gloria suscipiet me.” Again, Bucer’s quotations
\end{itemize}
Bucer’s outstanding biblical scholarship established him as one of the major exegetes of the early Reformation period. His sound methodology, his extensive use of medieval Rabbinical commentators, and his linguistic ability were exceptional for his era. It should also be noted that his works employing Jewish commentaries made these commentaries available to some extent to the majority of his contemporaries who were not well versed (enough) in Hebrew. Joye is an example of such a person who relied on Bucer for the use of Jewish material in his biblical scholarship.

**Heinrich Bullinger**

In the summer, or autumn at the latest, of 1526 the Swiss theologian Heinrich Bullinger (1504–75) wrote a small pamphlet with the title *Quod animae a corporibus separatae non dormiant, sed cum Christo in caelis vivant.*

The booklet was to satisfy the repeated requests of Paul Beck (d. 1547) of Munderkingen, who had joined the Reformation in Zürich at an early stage and to whom Bullinger’s book is addressed. Bullinger began his exposition by referring to the pagan writers of Antiquity (including Seneca, Ovid, and Cicero). Since it involved oblivion, they considered sleep (ὕπνος) to be an image of dying (mortis imago). Bullinger posed the rhetorical question: “Somnus enim quid alius est quam quies et cessatio?” But the soul, Bullinger believed, is perpetual—ἐντελέχεια, as Aristotle says in his De anima—hence, it cannot cease to exist.

Not only ancient pagan philosophy but also the teachings of Christ, who is the Truth, demonstrated the immortality of the soul, Bullinger argued, when He answered the Sadducees in Mt. 22:32. Jesus’ answer is a general law that does not contain anything about the bodily resurrection. Therefore, Bullinger asserted, all deceased believers must be alive because God is the God of every believer. Since their bodies are sleeping, they can only be alive according to their souls (iuxta animam). But Christ’s answer was given to the exact question that was put to him, because the Sadducees, according to Josephus, denied the immortality of the soul, so their question must have been about the immortality of the soul and not about bodily resurrection. Next, Bullinger quoted Jn. 6:40: “This is indeed the will of my Father, that all who see the Son and believe in him may have eternal life; and I will raise them up on the last day.” Here, Bullinger maintained, Christ evidently refers to two distinct notions: (1) the eternal life of the souls that starts at the moment of corporeal death and (2) the

---

529 Paul Beck was registered at the University of Heidelberg in January 1516, where he obtained his B.A. in 1523. Subsequently, he was chaplain in Heidelberg, parish priest of Munderkingen, preacher in Geislingen and Langenau, and dean in Esslingen. (Georg Burkhardt, Paulus Beck, der este evangelische Geistliche Geislingens, in Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte 35 (1931), pp. 249–65; and 36 (1932), pp. 63–108.)


531 “Quae quidem sententia generalis γέωργι est; unde nihil agunt, qui resurrectionem tantum obiciunt” (HBTS, II, p. 129).

533 “Lege Iosephum, Antiqui. lib. 18, cap. 2” (HBTS, II, p. 129).
resurrection of the flesh on the Day of Judgement. The conclusion, therefore, is that the souls live an eternal life after death, even before the general judgement.

According to Jn. 11:24–26, Martha had already believed in the resurrection of the dead, yet Christ deemed it necessary to reveal to her that those who believe in Him, despite dying, will live, and everyone who lives and believes in Him will never die. This means, Bullinger explained, that Lazarus will not just appear on the Day of Judgement in the upper spheres, but will appear there instantly at that time, for all of the dead who firmly believe will promptly overcome death. Consequently, the dead do not sleep but are alive. According to Bullinger, the immortality of the soul is also attested to in Jn. 12:26 and in Jn. 17:24, where Christ says that He wants the believers to be with Him and wants them to serve Him and to behold His glory, because everyone knows that Christ lives in the heavenly home. Therefore, only the blind do not see, Bullinger wrote, that the souls are living together with Christ in Heaven, as Paul wrote in 2 Tim. 2:11f. God gave us His spirit (2 Cor. 5:5) so that we become the children of God. As such, we are heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ (Rom. 8:16f). Our heritage is eternal life, the Swiss theologian asserted, and this could not be the case unless our souls are preserved as joint heirs with Christ until the Day of Judgement.

In the beginning of 2 Cor. 5, Paul describes in clear language the incorruptible life of the soul after the corporeal death, Bullinger continued. And in Phil. 1:21 Paul calls death a gain (lucrum), and therefore he yearns not to fall asleep and snore, but to live together with Christ. Furthermore, one should take into account the descriptions in Scripture of the deaths of the first Christian champions. While suffering on the cross, Christ promised the Repentant Thief that he would be with him on that very day in Paradise (Lk. 23:43). Christ was talking about the Good Thief’s

534 HBTS, II, p. 129.
535 “Vivunt itaque animae post mortem ea vita, quae aeterna est, sic it quemadmodum ea vita post iuditium erit, sic a morte usque ad iuditium sit, nisi quod glorificatio corporis nondum accessit” (HBTS, II, p. 129).
536 “Lazarum non modo in iuditii die superas proditurum in auras, verum etiam nunc e vestigio proditurum, imo omnes a mortis statim articulo victuros, quotquot sibi certo fiderint. Constat itaque, quod fideles non dormiunt, sed vita vivant” (HBTS, II, p. 130).
537 HBTS, II, p. 130.
538 HBTS, II, p. 130.
539 “Et in Phillipen, epistola mortem vocat lucrum, quandoquidem desyderio mortiendii se adserverat teneri, atque inde non addormiendi, non adstertendi (ut ita dicam) anima-liter, sed cohabitantii Christo” (HBTS, II, p. 131).
soul and referring to eternal life, the Swiss exegete maintained. And when he was stoned to death, the protomartyr Stephen saw the glory of God and Christ standing on the right hand of God, and he prayed, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit” (Acts 7:55–59). Stephen asked Jesus to receive his spirit, which means his soul (spiritum, hoc est animam), but not to receive it in the reign of dreams (non in somni regiam). To the possible objection that the souls of the deceased rest in the bosom of Abraham (in Abrahae sinu quiescere), Bullinger explained that the bosom of Abraham is not a dormitory (non somni aulam), but signifies eternal life (vitam sempiternam), because it is said that “many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven” (Mt. 8:11) and that Lazarus was comforted there (Lk. 16:25). Now, because the Word of God cannot be false (Num. 23:19; Heb. 6:18; Ps. 33(32):4), Bullinger argued, the souls are not detained by sleep, because resting can by no means be characterized as bliss.

But the very usage of the verb ‘to sleep’ in the sense of dying (this usage, according to Bullinger, takes its origin from 1 Thes. 4:13ff) should reveal that it can be applied properly only to the body and not to the soul. For in sleep, one falls asleep for a short period of time, and afterwards one rises again. In a similar way, the body is abandoned by the soul for a while, and it rises afterwards and lives together with the soul forever. Therefore, sleeping and rising again can properly refer only to the body, not to the soul, Bullinger maintained, for only things that pass away can rise again, and the soul does not pass away. Finally, the passages in which Paul speaks about our dwelling place (conversatio) in Heaven, from where we expect our salvation (Phil. 3:20), and about the crown of righteousness he is going to receive (2 Tim. 4:8), as well as John’s words in 1 Jn. 3:2 (we are God’s children now; what we will be has not yet been revealed)—all of these places refer to the final Day of Judgement at the end of the world, Bullinger argued, when God will transform the body of our humiliation so that it may be conformed to the body of His glory (Phil. 3:21), and we will be like Him, for we will see Him as He is (1 Jn. 3:2).

---

540 HBTS, II, p. 131.
541 HBTS, II, pp. 131–32.
542 “Ideo corporibus proprie competit dormitio, corporibus resurrectio, animae vero non item” (HBTS, II, p. 132).
543 “Nam quae ceciderunt, resurgunt. Anima non cadit” (HBTS, II, p. 132).
544 HBTS, II, pp. 132–33.
A few months later, at the end of 1526, Bullinger wrote another booklet on the article of the Creed about Christ’s descent into Hell. The occasion for the writing of the book was the teaching of a certain Rudolf Weingartner (d. 1541), who was the addressee of several letters and works by Bullinger between 1524 and 1528. In a short letter to Zwingli, Bullinger asked Zwingli’s assistance in answering Weingartner concerning Christ’s descent into Hell. Zwingli’s answer has not survived, but we know Zwingli’s position on the matter, as it is articulated in his letter to Berchtold Haller. Bullinger’s stance shows several points related to Zwingli’s.

Bullinger started by clarifying 1 Pt. 3:17ff and 4:1–7 to explain the soteriological character of Christ’s descent. He pointed out that Christ died for our sins so that we, purged by His blood from sin, would become apt to behold God (1 Pt. 3:18). To that Peter adds that Christ went to preach to the spirits in prison (1 Pt. 3:19) and the Gospel was even proclaimed to the dead (1 Pt. 4:6). Bullinger maintained that these spirits in prison, as well as the dead who stayed apud inferos, were the faithful of the OT who were detained there from the time of Adam until Christ’s death. They had been waiting for the coming of the Messiah in order to be released. But the question arises as to how they were released by Christ. Based on the quotation Peter uses in Acts 2:27 where he cites Ps. 16:10—“you will not leave my soul in inferno”—and based on Gen. 42:38 and 44:29, Bullinger identified the word infer(n)um with sepultus (grave). Consequently, Bullinger rejected both the bodily and the spiritual interpretation of this

---

545 Heinrich Bullinger, De articulo fidei “Descendit ad inferna” de suffocato item et sanguine ab apostolis in Actis inhibito, Zürich, 1526. The booklet is preserved in manuscript form in Zürich (ZB, Msc A82, fos. 119–122v). Published in HBTS, II, pp. 174–80.


548 See supra on p. 199.

549 HBTS, II, p. 175.

550 “Qui apud inferos ab Adae haecatem tempore detenti sunt” (HBTS, II, p. 177).

551 To prove his point he also cites Felix Pratensis’ (d. 1558) translation of Ps. 16:10 (1515): “Non dabis sanctum tuum videre foveam” (HBTS, II, pp. 177–78).

552 “Infernus Ebreis plurimum usurpatur loco sepulturae” (HBTS, II, p. 177).
article of faith. Rather, he argued that the virtue of Christ’s death and salvation had its beneficial effect on the faithful of the OT, just as baptism, through the virtue of Christ’s resurrection, washes away the sins of the baptized. It is Christ who is announced to the dead and it is by Him that they are redeemed—the very same Christ who is also announced to us.

But how, Bullinger asked, would these souls of the blessed leave *infer(n)um* if they are pure spiritual substances? His answer is that they will do so *per procatalipsin* (προκατάληψις: anticipation). Their flesh will be judged with all other flesh (with all other people), but in the meantime their souls have already been liberated, and they live by Christ and rejoice in God. From this, Bullinger interjected, one can see whether the souls are sleeping. And to avoid all ambiguity Bullinger marked in the margin: “animae vivunt.”

Bullinger also raised the question of what happened to Christ during those three days. Surely He could not have been *apud inferos*, could He? Bullinger’s answer is unambiguously negative (*Non, Hercule!*). Christ is believed to consist of spirit, soul, and body. His spirit is of divine nature, and this part was never separated from God the Father. His soul and body were human, but the body was locked in the grave, and His human soul was in the hands and glory of God the Father because that is where the dying Christ commended it (Lk. 23:46). The hands of God the Father, Bullinger explained, signify the conservation and protection in the heavenly kingdom. Consequently, he claimed, all stories about Christ’s entrance and incursion into Hell, and His fight, glory, and triumph are pure poetical fables and similes. Concerning the destination of the liberated souls Bullinger held that their aspiration is the bosom of Abraham.
(sinum Abrahae), which is the conservatorium animarum fidelium. The Swiss theologian, as in his Quod animae a corporibus separatae non dormiant, here, too, identified this with eternal life (vita sempiterna).

In 1535, Bullinger’s Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata was published.\(^{564}\) The book takes the form of four dialogues between Simon, who takes up the defence of the Anabaptists’ teachings, and Ioiada, who refutes their position. The last chapter in the first dialogue received the title Animas extvas corporibvs non dormire, sed uiuere cum Christo.\(^{565}\) Bullinger repeated his earlier arguments, claiming that the Anabaptists’ position invalidates Christ’s resurrection. Simon tries to argue that Ioiada does not understand their teachings, because the Anabaptists’ teaching about the souls sleeping in the bosom of Abraham (Lk. 16:23), which the Anabaptists equate with Paradise, is based exclusively on the the use of language of the OT as well as on Paul’s choice of word in 1 Thes. 4 and that of Luke in Acts 7:59, but the Anabaptists also acknowledge eternal life and the resurrection of Jesus.\(^{566}\) Nonetheless, saying that the souls sleep until Judgement Day is the same as saying that they die, Ioiada argues, because the soul is incapable of resting.\(^{567}\) This can be deduced from the pagan philosophers, but it is also attested to in Scripture: Lazarus’ soul was rejoicing in the bosom of Abraham; consequently, it could not have been asleep, and the bosom of Abraham cannot be a dormitory.\(^{568}\)

---

564 Heinrich Bullinger, Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata Heinrychi Bullingeri lib. IIII, Tiguri: Apud Christophorum Frosohoverum, 1535. In 1531 Bullinger’s Von dem unverschämten Frevel appeared in Zürich, in which he formulated similar arguments. The book was translated into English by John Vernon with the title: An Holesome Antidootus or Counter-Poysen against the pestylent heresy and secte of the Anabaptistes, London, 1548.

565 Bullinger, Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata, fos. 38v–44v.

566 “SIMON. Tu catabaptistas non capis, Nam neque euangelium, neque resurrectionem Christi negant. Animas post corporis mortem (si fide hinc exscesserint) in sinu Abrahæ, ad ultimum usque diem dormire dicunt, tum demum uiam æternam ingredi. Atque hanc suam doctrinam ex euangelii & Paulo probant Luec 16. 1. Thessalon. 4. Nolo uos ignorare […] In ueteris testamento de patribus scribitur quod dormierint cum patribus suis. Item de Stephano qui dicitur obdormiuuisse in domino” (Bullinger, Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata, fo. 39r). “Paradisus & sinus Abrahae/catabaptistis idem sunt, in quo animas dormire aiunt” (fo. 44r).

567 “Nam dicere animam dormire, idem est, ac si dicas eam non esse. Si dormit, requiescit quoque: si requiescit, non operatur: si non operatur, non est: nam operari & esse in anima idem sunt, quum sit perpetua ἐνδελεχία. Sed anima est, ergo non dormit” (Bullinger, Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata, fo. 43r).

568 “Consequitur ergo Abrahæ sinum non dormitorium esse, sed uitam iam æternam. Quod ex cap. 16. Luec […] Si gaudet anima, impossibile est quod dormiat. […] ut interim taceam somnum naturæ animae: (qua ἐντελέχεια siue ἐνδελέχεια est) omnino aduersari” (Bullinger, Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata, fo. 44r).
the souls do not sleep is also proved by Phil. 1:23 and Jn. 14:2–3.\footnote{Bullinger, \textit{Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata}, fos. 39\textsuperscript{v}–41\textsuperscript{v}.} The immortality of the soul was even proved by Christ’s answer to the Sadducees in Mt. 22:29–32.\footnote{“Sadducæi docebant resurrectionem nullam esse, & per hoc animæ immortalitatem & endelechiam negabant, in summâ & angelos, et spiritus omnes Acto.13. Horum ora dominus his rationibus obstruit: Erratis inquam ignorantes scripturas, neque uirtutem dei aniduertentes. Deus post mortem patrum se deum uocat Abraham Isaac, & Iacob, qui deus sit non mortuorum sed uiuientium: mortuos ergo nos esse Abrahamum reliquosque patres. Iuxta corpus quidem mortui iam olim erant et sepulti etiam: de animæ ergo uiuere loquitur Christus. Anima ergo à corpore separata uera est & operatur uiuens, nunquam dormit. Hunc syllogismum catabaptistis omnibus proponi, ut ad hunc respondeant, & sese Sadducæ hæresi liberent. Sadducæis enim sunt et Manicheis similes” (Bullinger, \textit{Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata}, fos. 43\textsuperscript{v}–44\textsuperscript{v}).} But the Anabaptists are wrong because on the basis of the unity of body and soul they attribute to the soul what really pertains to the body. This, however, gives rise to dogmatic problems, because then Christ’s soul, too, must have died with His body, and the resurrection is done away with, which, Bullinger asserted, was clearly a blasphemous position.\footnote{Si animæ nostræ post mortem corporis dormiunt, dormit et anima Christi, & resurrectio abolita est. Nam sua resurrectione æternam uitam testatur Christus, quæ æterna esse non potest, si anima dormit, & tum demum uiuere incipit dum iudicium sit. Catabaptistarum ergo sonnus Euangelium & resurrectionem euacuat” (Bullinger, \textit{Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata}, fo. 39\textsuperscript{v}). And further: “In hoc ergo falluntur illi, quod animæ attribuitur, propter unionem animæ & corporis in uaedemque persona. Quod exemplum supra de Christo quoque adductum est. Dicitur enim Christus mortuos esse, quum tantum corpus in Christo mortuum sit, non diuinitas, non anima. Sic obdormit homo, sed corpore non anima. Hanc synekdichaum (ut caeteros tropos) non intelligunt (aut non intelligere uolunt) catabaptistæ, & hac de causa in multis errant” (fo. 41\textsuperscript{v}).} The doctrine about soul sleep is not only repugnant to Scripture and faith, and not only eliminates Christ’s resurrection and the Gospel, but is against common sense and displays a vulgar and imprudent ignorance.\footnote{“Doctrina de somno animarum non solum scripturis & fidei repugnat, non solum euangelium et resurrectionem Christi eneruat, set & sensui communi aduersatur, rudis quædam & indocta ignorantia” (Bullinger, \textit{Adversvs Omnia Catabaptistarvm Prava Dogmata}, fo. 42\textsuperscript{v}).}

Bullinger later reiterated his position in his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew (and in his commentary on Mark he referred the reader to his commentary on Matthew).\footnote{Heinrich Bullinger, \textit{In sacrosanctum Iesu Christi domini nostri Evangelium secundum Matthaeum, commentariorum libri XII}, Zürich: Apud Froschoverum, 1542; \textit{Heinrich Bullinger, In Sacrosanctvm Euangelium Domini nostri Iesu Christi secundum Marcum, Commentariorum lib. VI per Heinrichum Bullergerum, 1545.}} The Sadducees, Bullinger claimed, for whom the Torah was the sole authority and who attributed everything to free will, taught that one can be justified by one’s own efforts, and they
denied the existence of spirits and angels. They also denied “resurrection of the dead.” Since “resurrection” is the renewal or resuscitation of what fell, it can refer to the immortality of the soul and the resuscitation or restoration of the body. Bullinger reaffirmed that the verb resurgere is used in Scripture in the sense to ‘endure’ or ‘persist,’ and consequently resurrectio can be used for the endurance or immortality of the soul and spirit. And even if Christ’s answer does not prove the resurrection of the body, there are enough passages in those books of the OT which are not recognized by the Sadducees as authoritative, and their fallacy, Bullinger asserted, and all of the later heresies concerning the resurrection were effectively refuted by Augustine and Epiphanius.

**Bartolomäus Westheimer and Otto Brunfels**

The polemics against the Catholics brought about not only new Bible translations, commentaries, sermons, and treatises, but other, practical

---


575 “Est item Resurrectio eius quod cecidit instauratio sive resuscitatio. Referetur itaque Resurrectio, tam ad immortalitatem animarum quam corporum resurrectionem sive restitutionem.” However, Bullinger noted, dying, falling, and decomposition can only be properly said of the body, for the soul does not decompose, nor does it die or fall unless by the tumbling and death of sin: “Haec enim proprie moriuntur, cadunt & computrescunt: animae non computrescunt, neque cadunt aut moriuntur, nisi lapsu & morte peccati” (Bullinger, *In Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*, fo. 198v).

576 “Resurgere autem in scripturis accipitur pro eo quod est emergere & non interire aut occidere, sed permanere atque subsistere: ita resurrectio usurpari poterit pro animæ ac spirituum permanentia siue subsistentia vel immortalitate” (Bullinger, *In Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*, fo. 198v).

577 “Locus ille Deuteronomii nihil faciebat ad approbandam vel improbandam mortuorum resurrectionem [. . .] Erant praeterea multa alia prophetarum de resurrectione illustria testimonia, quae cum Sadducæi non recipierent, bonam scripturæ partem ignorabant” (Bullinger, *In Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*, fo. 198v). Cf. Henrich Bullinger, *In Evangelium secundum Marcum*, fo. 31r. On Augustine, see *supra* on p. 97. On Epiphanius, see *supra* on p. 92. On the canon of the Sadducees, see *infra* on p. 373.
works and aids, such as thematic collections of biblical texts and biblical dictionaries. They served as guides and resources for preachers of the new learning. One such work, which was used by Joye, was compiled by the German Reformer and Lutheran theologian Bartholomäus Westheimer (1499–c.1567), who later was also active as a printer in Basel between 1536 and 1547. Richard Rex suitably described his publications as “bibliographical nightmare[s],” for every time Westheimer brought out a new edition of a work, he gave it a new title. The book Joye used bears the title *Collectanea Troporum Communivm Bibliorum* and is made up of two parts (*tomus*). The first one (*Schematum et troporum Bartholomaei Westemerii tomus primus*) treats the definition of various rhetorical figures of speech (e.g. prolepsis, zeugma, anaphora, epanalepsis, homoeoteleuton, asyndeton, climax, antipophora, procatalepsis, metanoia, aethiologia, synonymia, paradoxum, eclipsis, litotes, epitisus, analogia, mimesis, ellipsis, etc.) with examples from the Scriptures (and some from ancient classical literature). The second (*Troporum in sacris literis usus*) explains the usage of a number of words and concepts as tropes in the Scripture, based mainly on excerpts of commentaries and clarifications by other biblical scholars.

In his first introduction, under the heading *Scriptvrae sacrae tractandae ratio, in primis consyderandae*, Westheimer summarized how one can

---


580 Bartholomäus Westheimer, *COLLECTANEA TROPORVM COMMVNIVM Bibliorum, non estimandis sudoribus recognita & locupletata, summa tum diligentia, tum iudicio, ex sacrorum Patrum scriptis, excerpta. BARPTOLOMAEO VESThemero collectore, BASILEAE: APUD Thomam Volflum, M.D. XXXIII. Mense Martio. An earlier version was published with the title: Tropi insigniores Veteris atque Novi Testamenti, summa, Basel, 1527. The Placard of Charles V in 1540 as well as the Indices of forbidden books issued by the University of Leuven in 1550 condemned “Phrases seu modi loquendi Divinae Scripturae ex sanctis et orthodoxis scriptoribus per eruditissum Barptolomaeum Westemerum, in studiosorum usum diligenter congestae.” This refers to the Antwerp edition by Johannes Grapheus for Johannes Steels, 1536. In 1551 a reworked edition was published under the title: *Troporum, schematum, idiomatumque communium liber/ ex omnibus orthodoxis ecclesiae patribus singulari industria tam collectus, quam in ordinem […] alphabeticum, dispositus […] Barptolemaeo Westhemero […] collectore* (Basileae: per Ioannem Hervagium, 1551).
establish the sense of those words, the meaning of which is obscure. If doubt arises, one should not use one’s own mind or turn to frivolous glosses, but try to establish the meaning by looking at other places where the meaning is clearer, taking the context and the characteristics of the biblical languages into consideration.\footnote{581} This has to be done in the spirit of piety, by which one seeks not one’s own honour but that of God through Christ and the education of one’s neighbours.\footnote{582} Then, Christ, who has the key of David, will open and reveal the meaning of that which is closed and cannot be opened by anyone else, and He will reveal it to whomever He wishes.\footnote{583} Westheimer’s approach consciously echoes the interpretative rules of Augustine, and he acknowledges this in his second foreword. In this section, Westheimer gave a detailed description of the use of tropes in Scripture, quoting from Augustine’s own interpretatory rules and those of Tichonius.\footnote{584} Westheimer underlined that the understanding of tropes

\footnote{581} “Si quando literae sacræ dißidere uidentur, non adferendu est nostri cerebri, aut capitis glossæmæ fruolum, sed per clariorem locum alium, illustraudus uenit obscurior. Consulenda linguærum (quibus primum scripti sunt) proprietas, attendantur præcedentia una cum sequentiibus sanè collatis, ipse uerborum contextus” (Westheimer, Collectanea Troporum Communivm Bibliorum, fo. 1 r). Cf. supra on p. 100.

\footnote{582} “Deniqúe pio et timido animo non nostra quidem, sed gloria Dei summi patris per Christum, in ædificationem proximi, omni studio inquirenda summa est: dona dei, erudition, peritiae in scripturis exercitatio, quaerenda & magnificienda sunt: nequàm illis uel fidendum uel superbiendum” (Westheimer, Collectanea Troporum Communivm Bibliorum, fo. 1 r).

\footnote{583} “Imo improbus conatus industriae, crebis praecibus adiuuandus, donec aperiat nobis librum septem signaculis obsignatum, quia qui habet clauen Dauid. Qui claudit & nemo aperit, arcana patris, quæ nemo nouit nisi filius, & cui uluuerit filius reuelare. Cui enim ipse mentem intelligendarum scripturarum non donauerit, obsignatus ille liber erit, quicquid acuminis eruditionis uel peritiae habuerit, usque adeo sine ipso nihil possumus, ne cogitare quidem aliquid boni tanquam ex nobis sufficientes. Sed sufficientia nostra ex Deo est per Christum” (Westheimer, Collectanea Troporum Communivm Bibliorum, fo. 1 r–v).

is indispensable because Scripture is full of them. Nonetheless, he cautioned against taking everything to be a trope; a true trope is recognizable by the absurdity of the literal sense of the text, which would contradict an article of faith. He also established that the meaning of the tropes cannot be arbitrary but should be substantiated by plain words of Scripture, and that mystical and allegorical interpretations can be dangerous and should be avoided. Nonetheless, not everything in Scripture is self-explanatory, and there are interpreters who obscure the meaning of the Bible. Therefore, Westheimer, following Augustine and Rabanus, insisted on the necessity of an advanced knowledge of biblical languages.
In the second part of the volume, where the various biblical concepts as tropes are discussed, Westheimer included an article on resurrection entitled *RESVRRECTIO*.

There, following Zwingli, Westheimer argued that the expression ‘resurrection of the dead’ does not refer exclusively to the resurrection of the body at the end of the world, but also to the immortality of the soul (the life after this life) and the resuscitation of corpses.

The first illustration for this usage is to be found in the denial of the ‘resurrectio’ by the Sadducees. This means, Westheimer suggested, that they thought that the soul enters into sleep (or dies) when it leaves the body at death. According to the German theologian, this is evident from Christ’s answer to the Sadducees, which proved that the patriarchs are alive; hence, ‘resurrectio’ should be understood as the state of the souls after death.

The following example is taken from the Gospel of John. In chapter 6, Jesus promises to those who believe in him that he will raise them on the last day (Jn. 6:39–44). Now, ‘last day’ should be understood here, Westheimer maintained, as ‘their last day’ and not as the Day of Judgement, and accordingly, Christ’s promise is that their souls will be preserved when they die.

This is corroborated by Christ’s similar pronouncement in the previous chapter, where He promised that those who listen to His words and believe in Him and in God, who sent Him, will have eternal life and will not enter into judgement but will pass from death into life. This means, Westheimer argued, that even if they undergo bodily death, they will not perish but will enter into immortal life.

---

589 “RESVRRECTIO MOTRVOrum Hebræis non solum ultimam illam corporum resuscitationem, sed etiam uiam ac subsistentiam animæ immortalem, post hanc uiam signiﬁcat, etiam antequam corpus reuisscat” (Westheimer, *Collectanea Troporum Commnvm Bibliorum*, fo. 313 v). Cf. supra p. 204.

590 “Saducæi negabant resurrectionem, hoc est, putabant animas post egressionem à corporibus dormire (nam non uidetur uerisimile tam crassam sectam fuisse inter Iудæos, que aut immortalitatem animae negaret, aut animas cum corporibus dormire uel interire assereret) quo in loco ut ex responsione Christi, qui Saducæis animas Abrahæ, Isaac & Iacob uiuere probat, colligitur, resurrectio, pro eo statu uiate capitur, quo anima post mortem corporis uiuit” (Westheimer, *Collectanea Troporum Commnvm Bibliorum*, fo. 313 v).

591 “Item Ioannis. 6. Resuscitabo eum in nouißimo die, inquit Christus, ubi, per nouißimum diem non illum ultimum intellegit, sed diem mortis cuiusque, ut sit sensus, resuscitabo eum, id est, in uita seruabo eum, dum moritur” (Westheimer, *Collectanea Troporum Commnvm Bibliorum*, fo. 313 v).

592 “ioan.5.Christus dicit: Amen amen dico uobis, quod qui uerbum meum audit, & credit ei qui misit me, habet vitam æternam, & in iudicium non ueniet, sed transit à morte in uiatam. Hoc est, dum corporaliter moritur in nullam mortem aut perditionem uadit, sed
in Jn. 11:24, where Christ calls Himself ‘Resurrectio’ and ‘Vita,’ Resurrectio,
Westheimer asserted, should be taken for ‘life,’ as ‘Vita’ stands in apposition to ‘Resurrectio.’
Also, in Heb. 11, where Paul writes that the OT martyrs rejected deliverance in order to obtain a better ‘resurrectio,’ he really means that the martyrs could easily despise this life because they were to enter into a better life. According to the Lutheran exegete, Paul uses the term here in the same sense as it is applied in Jn. 5:29: they will rise to the resurrection of life, that is, they live forever. Furthermore, in 1 Thes. 4, where Paul denounced the exaggerated grief of the Thessalonians over their dead, he spoke not only about the resurrection of the body at the end of the world, but also about the immortality of the soul, Westheimer believed. For Paul’s logic can be paraphrased as follows: if the soul died together with the body, then the Thessalonian Christians would not grieve without reason, but since we are certain that those who passed away from this world not only left all troubles upon their death but also gained perennial life, it is unwise and clearly unchristian to grieve so much about the dead, as if they had perished. To explain why the Gospel was preached to those who are dead, Westheimer quoted 1 Pt. 4:6: so that even though the dead will be judged in the flesh as humans, they may live in the spirit according to the will of God as souls in the bosom of Abraham. The dead will be judged just like any other human being at the resurrection of the flesh, but in the meantime they live according
to the spirit. Westheimer’s last example is taken from Isaiah. Here, he quoted Zwingli’s commentary on 26:14 word for word. His conclusion is again taken from Zwingli: ‘resurrection’ can refer to (1) the life after this life, (2) the resurrection of the flesh, or (3) the general judgement at the end of the world.

Westheimer also includes a short article entitled SVRGERE. Zwingli gives the lead to Westheimer here, too: in the Hebrew, he argued, the verb ‘to stand’ seems to be used in the sense of ‘persisting’ and ‘enduring’; hence, resurrection of the dead can be taken for the post-mortem life and survival of the soul. Paul himself uses it in that sense in 1 Cor. 15:29 because the Sadducees, and those against whom Paul wrote, thought that the soul died together with the body. But the same verb can also mean to confirm (as in Gen. 23:20) or to declare (as in Ps. 3:7–8).

---

597 "Petrus in sua prima epistola.4.caP. [sic] In hoc mortuis Euangelion prædictatum esse ait, qui sic quidem iudicabuntur secundum homines carne, uiiuent autem iuxta Deum spiritu, hoc est, Evangeli prædicatio & fructus etiam ad mortuos peruenit, id est, ad illas animas que fuerunt in sinu Abrahæ, nempe eorum qui in fide uenturi Christi exesserant, qui quidem iuxta iudicium carnis, sed iuxta communem omnium hominum cursum iudicabuntur, cum caro resurget in ultimo iudicio, quum tamen interim iuxta spiritum uiant" (Westheimer, Collectanea Troporum Commmnium Bibliorum, fo. 314 r–v).


599 "Breuiter, Resurrectio mortuorum capitur semel pro uita ea, quæ protinus mortalem istam sequitur. Iterum pro carnis resurrectione, quæ futura est ultimo die. Item nonnonquam autem pro ultimo & uniuersali omnium hominum ponitur, quomodo dicitur: Videbit omnis caro salutare Dei, quum care quocunque uertas non recipiat salutarem Christum in hac uita, sed caro pro hominibus accipitur. Aliquando uero pro quotidiano quod iuge est, quomodo Christus dixit: Nunc iudicium est mundi, iudicium pro quotidiana Dei ultione" (Westheimer, Collectanea Troporum Commmnium Bibliorum, fo. 314v). Cf. supra p. 204.


602 "Item Surgere, idem est nonnunquam quod proferre, declarare contra hostem, & plerunque Deo attribuitur. Lacere enim cæu quiescere Deus dicitur, dum sinit malos pro eorum libidine ferri, Psalm.3. Surge Domine, id est, profer, declara contra hostem,
Another practical polemical preaching aid was compiled by the German former Carthusian monk Otto Brunfels (c.1488–1534), who is also remembered as a good botanist. His *Pandectarum Veteris et Noui Testamenti*, one of the first Protestant biblical concordances, was first published in 1527, became very influential, and was reprinted several times in subsequent years (among others by Westheimer). Brunfels collected biblical passages on articles of faith and theological concepts arranged according to twelve subjects. In his foreword, dedicated to Lefèvre d’Étapes, whom Brunfels called the most learned and pious of all Frenchmen, the German writer claimed that his collection contains the words of the living God, which He desired us to know for our salvation. His work was...
a novelty, Brunfels pointed out, because the book was not a commentary but a consistent application of the Protestant principle of *sola scriptura* by virtue of presenting the pure text of Scripture without any notes. The apostles did not have commentaries, Brunfels argued, and the sole reason the Jews do not believe in Jesus is that they depend on the rabbinical commentaries while neglecting to consult the pure word of the Scriptures. That his own contemporaries were thrown into such a dense darkness of ignorance is explained by their perpetually relying on the works of scholars instead of scrutinizing Scripture itself. Therefore, Brunfels asserted, most commentaries are wrong.

The tenth chapter is a gathering of texts relating to the Four Last Things (death, judgement, Heaven, and Hell) and other issues of the afterlife. The first title is *De resurrectione*, where the following texts are adduced: Job 19:25; Is. 26:19; Ez. 37:1–14; Zeph. 3:7–8; Mt. 22:31–32 and 25:31; Lk. 14:15–14; Jn. 5:21–25; Rom. 6:8; 1 Cor. 15; Phil. 3:20–21; Col. 3:4; 1 Thes. 4:14; Acts 23:6 and 24:15; and Rev. 20:6. This list is followed by the references to those who denied the resurrection: Mt. 22:23; 1 Cor. 15:12; 2 Tim. 2:17–18; and Acts 23:8. It should be pointed out that some of the passages in this list do not contain the term resurrection or any cognate of it at all.
but speak about a (future) life (e.g. Jn. 5:25) and that some of them cannot refer logically to the general resurrection of the flesh at the end of the world (e.g. 2 Tim. 2:17–18).

At the end of the chapter Brunfels included a heading on the immortality of the soul (Septimo, De Animæ immortalitate). Contrary to his general practice, here Brunfels judged it necessary to introduce the texts adduced under this heading with a few words that carry a clear anti-Jewish message. With the marginal note Error Iudaicus, Brunfels wrote that the immortality of soul can be proved by many texts of the Scripture, yet the Jews tell tales that these promises of God are only temporal, relating to this earthly life. But they talk nonsense, Brunfels added, because they err, not knowing the Scripture. Interestingly, in his rebuttal of the Jews’ questioning the immortality of the soul Brunfels alluded to Christ’s words to the Sadducees about the question of resurrection (Mt. 22:29 et par). After his anti-Jewish remark, the Lutheran writer listed the following proof texts in favour of the immortality of the soul: Gen. 37:35; Num. 16:30; 1 Sam. 28:3–25 (with the remark that if Saul had not believed in ‘the resurrection and immortality,’ he would not have cared to resuscitate Samuel); 2 Sam. 2:13; and 1 Kgs. 17:17–24 (with the remark that the resuscitated son of the widow must have been alive prior to the resuscitation, even if his flesh was dead). The next proof is a general remark on the parlance of the OT: when the people passed away from

---

614 Brunfels, Pandectarum Veteris et Noui Testamenti, pp. 295–96. Other headings are: Secundo de morte. Mors omnib. incumbit, & horror illius (280), Mors non timenda homini Christiano, sed viriliter subeunda pro nomine Christi (282), Non libenter quidam ex patribus mortui sunt (283). Etiam mai optant mori morti iustorum (283), Mors peccatorum & tyrannorum pessima, & horribilis semper fuit (283), Tertio, de iudicio domini, seu aduentu Christi ad iudicium. Aduentus domini ad iudiciwm certus (286), Dies Aduentus domini in iudiciwm incertus (289). Licet incertus sit iudiciwm dies, tamen semper expectandum (289), Christo datum est iudiciwm facere (290), Quarto, De vita beata. De gaudio felicitatis eternae (290), Quinto, de diabolo. Lucifer de caelo precipitatus (292), Diabolus non cessat die ac nocte infidiari nobis quarens quem deuoret (292), Diabolus non habet potestatem in quenquam, nisi Deus permittat (293), Diabolus mendax (293), Sexto, De Spiritibus & Angelis bonis ac malis. Spiritus quidam mali sunt (293), Angeli boni assistunt hominibus, & custodiunt eos (294), Angeli sunt nuncij dei & executores mandatorum eius (295).

615 “Animae immortalitas ex multis scripturis probari potest, tametsi fabulentur ludæi, omnes promissiones temporales esse, & huuii uite, nihilque adeo meminisse deum de promissione uite future. Id autem nugantur, quia errant, nescientes scripturas” (Brunfels, Pandectarum Veteris et Noui Testamenti, p. 295).

616 “Saul nisi credidisset resurrectionem & immortalitatem, non curasset suscitari Samuelém” (Brunfels, Pandectarum Veteris et Noui Testamenti, p. 295).

617 “Viuebat igitur, etiam carne mortuus” (Brunfels, Pandectarum Veteris et Noui Testamenti, p. 295).
this world, Scripture says that they slept (with their fathers); but if they sleep, Brunfels argues, then they are going to be raised and are not dead (cf. 1 Kgs. 12:1; 21:10; and 11:21). The list of proof texts continues: Tob. 2:18; Eccl. 12:7; Wis. 5:14–15; Is. 14:4–41 (with the remark that the Babylonian king was surely defeated in the netherworld); 2 Macc. 6:26; 7; and 14:46; and Mt. 10:28. The following proof text is Jesus’ debate with the Sadducees in Matthew, listed with the remark that the Sadducees denied ‘resurrection and immortality.’ Also, the parables of the wicked steward (Lk. 16:1–8) and Lazarus and the rich man (Lk. 16:19–31) prove the immortality of the soul, Brunfels stated. The last four proofs are Rom. 7:24; 2 Cor. 5:1; Phil. 1:23; and Acts 7:59.

Although resurrection and immortality of the soul are seemingly two distinct concepts for Brunfels, it is not difficult to understand how anyone who had read Zwingli, Melanchthon, and Westheimer would discover in Brunfels’ collection of proof texts and remarks a confirmation of the idea that the Hebrew and Greek original of the Latin term ‘resurrectio’ could refer to the immortality of the soul.

**William Roye, Simon Fish, and William Tracy**

At the end of the year 1527, just around the time when Joye probably arrived there, a tract of forty-eight unnumbered leaves was published in the city of Strasbourg. The book, which became known as *A Brefe DialoGE*
bitwene a Christen Father and his stobborne Sonne, was an English adaptation of Wolfgang Capito’s (1478–1541) *De pueris instituendis*, which appeared earlier in the same year in the same city. The adaptation was the work of the English Protestant Reformer William Roye, an apostate Franciscan Observant of the Greenwich house. Roye was born in Calais and was of Jewish descent. He was a former collaborator of Tyndale who had helped Tyndale in Cologne and in Worms with the publication of his NT. The tract was the first Protestant catechism ever to be published in English, providing a popular understanding of the New Learning in the vernacular, and only the fourth known Protestant publication in English. Even if the claim on the jacket of the critical edition—that “the Brefe Dialogue electrified the spiritual imagination of English-speaking reformed believers as intensely as Tyndale’s 1526 English New Testament”—is probably overstated, the book certainly formed a practical corollary to Tyndale’s Lutheran translation of the NT in propagating the cause of the Reformation. Roye started his preface To the Right nobles Estates/ and


624 Roye’s Jewish origin is called into question by some (see PK, *A Brefe Dialoge*, p. 12), but it is difficult to interpret Roye’s following words other than a complaint about an anti-Semitic remark made about his late father by his adversaries in order to defame Roye himself: “Ye and where as they hade no thynge wher to grounde theym selves agaynst vs/ they were nott aschamed faulcely to diffame theym/ which longe be fore that tyme were deed and rotten/ as my father. Thynkinge that defamyng of hym/ they shoulde qwenche and dercken the cleare and evident light of god [. . .] sayinge/ his father wolde eate noo porke/ what frute can soche a tre brynge forthe" (Roye, *A Lytle treatous or dialoge*, A1v; PK, *A Brefe Dialoge*, p. 99.) On Roye and his work, see: Edward Arber, *The First Printed English New Testament Translated by William Tyndale*, London: s.n., 1871, pp. 27–36; Clebsch, *England’s Earliest Protestants*, pp. 229–40; Anthea Hume, *William Roye’s ‘Brefe Dialoge’* (1527). An English Version of a Strassburg Catechism, in *HTR* 60 (1967), pp. 307–21; and the introduction by Parker and Krajewski: PK, *A Brefe Dialoge*, pp. 3–76.

625 Entered as “Guilhelmus Roy ex landino,” Roye matriculated in Wittenberg on 10 June 1525, approximately one year after Tyndale’s alleged matriculation. (See supra on p. 14.) Smith suggested that they might have met there (*Album Academiae Vitenbergensis* I, p. 125, as cited by Smith, *Englishmen at Wittenberg in the Sixteenth Century*, p. 422).

626 Hume and the introduction of the critical edition claim that it was the third (the first being Tyndale’s 1526 Worms NT edition, and the second Tyndale’s *A compendious introduccion/ prologe or preface vn to the pistle off Paul to the Romayns* (Worms, 1526), but they forget the abortive NT edition of Cologne (1525), of which the already printed sheets were published (HUME, William Roye’s ‘Brefe Dialoge’ (1527), p. 307; PK, *A Brefe Dialoge*, P. 3).

627 Cf. Clebsch, who introduces the section on Roye, Jerome Barlowe, and Simon Fish with the following words: “A few men of rather more zeal than ability, apprentices who never became journeymen, enlisted in the early English Protestant literary endeavor led by Barnes, Frith, Tyndale and Joye. Often they helped, occasionally they hindered, the
to all wother of the toune of Cales with an advertisement for the Worms NT and recommended it be read, despite its suppression by “soche cruell/ and infame dogges.”628 He also urged the reader to read his own catechism, not only once but ten times, hoping that both “yonge and olde” would learn what “greate vniversites/ and notable Rabys knowe nott,” i.e. the Gospel (understood in a Lutheran sense).629

The book is construed in the form of a dialogue between the Protestant father and his interested but ‘stubborn’ son.630 Over the course of their dialogue the father introduces the son to the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith, explains the Creed and the two sacraments (baptism and a spiritualized Eucharist in symbolic terms), advises his son on how to meditate on the Ten Commandments and how to pray the Lord’s Prayer (again a spiritualistic interpretation), and offers practical tips on how to live a good Christian life. The book is seasoned with railings against pilgrimages, auricular confession, and the veneration of saints.

Expounding upon the articles of the Creed about Christ’s death, burial, descent into Hell, and resurrection, the father explains that Christ died the same death as every other human, and that with Him Christians will also die and be buried, which can only be achieved if “we forsake all flessshely workes/ and soffre god only to worke in vs.”631 This, the true sanctification of the Sabbath, cannot be realized in the flesh, but only after death.632 Christ descended into Hell in order “that all his therby shuld be delivered both from death and also hell.”633 To answer the son’s question of in what

---

628 “It is not vnknowne to you all my lordes/ and masters/ and all wother my singuler gode frendes and brethren in Christ/ howe that this last yere/ the newe testament of oure saveour/ was delyvered vnto you/ through the faythfull and diligent stody/ of one of oure nacion/ a man no doute/ ther vnto electe and chosen of God/ named William Hitchyns/ vnto whome I was (after the grace geven me of the lorde) as healpe felowe/ and parte taker of his laboures/ that every christen man/ myght therby heare and vnderstonde/ at home/ and in his owne housse/ the sprete of God speakynge therin/ and thorowe his holy apostels” (Roye, A Lytle treatous or dialoge, sig. A1; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 99).

629 Roye, A Lytle treatous or dialoge, sig. A3; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 100. “For good thynges ten tymes redde agayne please” (Roye, A Lytle treatous or dialoge, sig. A3; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 101).

630 In Capito’s original work the roles are just the other way. The Father poses questions of the catechism, and the son answers them according to his Protestant faith.

631 Roye, A Lytle treatous or dialoge, sig. C6; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 120.

632 “For this is the halowyng of the Saboth daye which fryst after this lyfe shalbe fulfild” (Roye, A Lytle treatous or dialoge, sig. C6; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 120).

633 Roye, A Lytle treatous or dialoge, sig. C6; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 120.
sense Christians can be called free from death, when Scripture also affirms that all persons have to die, the father replies by denying the mortality of the soul and claims that the souls enter heavenly bliss instantaneously upon death, despite the fact that they “slepe in the lorde” and “rest” until their resurrection. Roye’s words are undoubtedly made in reference to the doctrine of soul sleep as opposed to the immortality of the soul. Admittedly, Roye’s words are somewhat misleading at a casual reading (cf. his terminology “slepe” and “rest”), yet it is clear that Roye thought of the soul’s situation between death and resurrection as an active life, the beginning of the perpetual blissful life. At the end of the world, all people will be judged and will be admitted to “life eternall” or to “perpetuall fyre of hell” according to God’s predestination.

It should be noted that Roye, not unlike Joye, was only a year later to suffer Tyndale’s ingratitude and carping. While Roye regarded Tyndale as “the electe and chosen of God,” Tyndale depicted Roye as dishonest and reckless. In the preface to The parable of the wicked mammon, Tyndale characterized Roye as “a man somewhat craftye when he cometh vnto new accoyntaunce and before he be thorow knowen and namely when all is spent.” Tyndale’s remark that he could ‘control’ his helper

---

634 “Though christen menne slepe in the lorde. yett dye they not/ for the soule departynge out of this wretched body entreth immediatly into grett ioye and rest/ for remaynynge vntill that oure lorde shall a wake it agayne” (Roye, A Lyttele treatous or dialoge, sig. C6r; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 120).

635 “Christ is oure lyfe in whom yf we dwell withouten dout through mercy obtayned yn hyme/ we shall perpetually live/ and with hym arise agayne” (Roye, A Lyttele treatous or dialoge, sig. C6r–v; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 120). The commentators of the critical edition have the following baffling remark: “A reference to the doctrine of soul-sleep as opposed to resurrection. [sic] The controversy over this issue arose between the reformers themselves, the most serious in England being between William Tyndale and George Joye. […] The view represented in lines 713–716 [quoted here in this note and in n. 1185] would seem to support the soul-sleep doctrine, endorsed by both Zwingli and Joye” (PK, A Brefe Dialoge, pp. 200–01). The Latin original by Capito had the following dialogue: “P. Qui vero credis Carnis resurrectionem? F. Qui in domino hinc demigrant, in fide, hoc est, sinu Abrahae quiescunt, redemptionem corporis eorum expectantes, donec appetat iudicii dies, Rom.8. Tum gloria Dei, tam diu et tantopere desyderata, revelabitur in nobis, creaturae a servitute corruptionis liberabuntur. Mali iuxta ac boni resurgent in carne, mortaleque, si in nobis reliquum est, a vita absorbebitur.” The following question is about eternal life. In his answer the son affirms that “translati vero in aliam vitam, liberi erimus et a peccato et morte, victuri semper in Deo. Contra impii, ubi vitae huius umbra evanuerit, in ipsam mortem transferentur” (PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 282).

636 Roye, A Lyttele treatous or dialoge, sig. C7r; PK, A Brefe Dialoge, p. 122.

637 Tyndale, The parable of the wicked mammon, sig. A2r.
only as long as Roye was penniless is interesting for two reasons.\textsuperscript{638} (1) It betrays Tyndale’s feeling of superiority: apparently Tyndale did not treat his co-worker as equal to him but thought that it was his business to ‘rule’ Roye.\textsuperscript{639} (2) Tyndale’s remark also reveals his interest in financial matters. Tyndale also intimated that as soon as he could get rid of Roye, Tyndale dismissed him with the hope of never seeing him again.\textsuperscript{640} And speaking about a rhyming lampoon on Cardinal Wolsey, the Church, and the Eucharist authored by Roye and Jerome Barlowe that was published in the same year, Tyndale announced that Roye “whose tonge is able not only to make foles sterke madde/ but also to disceave the wisest that is at the first sight and accoyntaunce […] set him [i.e. Barlowe] a werke to make rimes/ while he him selfe translated a dialoge out of laten in to englisch.”\textsuperscript{641}

It is evident that “Tyndale recalled the association with bitterness and calumny.”\textsuperscript{642} Clebsch accurately observed that Tyndale took the same “stance of injured superiority that he later assumed toward Joye” because Tyndale had the impression that Roye “had both tricked Barlowe and betrayed Tyndale.”\textsuperscript{643} Since Tyndale knew that the English authorities, on the basis of reports from Cochlaeus and Rinck, identified Roye as one of two Englishmen who printed the NT in Cologne and Worms, Tyndale feared that Roye’s activities would bring him into discredit through guilt.

\textsuperscript{638} “As longe as he had money/ somewhat I could ruele hi[mm], but as sone as he had goten him money/ he became lyke him self agayne” (Tyndale, \textit{The parable of the wicked mammon}, sig. A2\textsuperscript{r–v}).

\textsuperscript{639} Cf. also Tyndale’s supercilious remark: “And when he had stored him of money he gote him to Argentine where professeth wonderfull faculties and maketh bost of no small thinges” (Tyndale, \textit{The parable of the wicked mammon}, sig. A2\textsuperscript{}). This condescending attitude cannot be explained by Tyndale’s alleged superior linguistic abilities. Roye’s command of languages is attested to by a letter from two former confreres of Roye dated 12 June 1529, who refer to Roye as “sometime the familiar of our convent at Richmond” who “does speak all manner of languages” (cited in \textit{CWTM VIII/3}, p. 1159). Roye, when he emphasized the importance of the knowledge of the three biblical languages, seems clearly to have spoken from experience: “Thou mayst in maner with one laboure learne as moche greke and hebrewe with thy laten/ as shall suffyse. For one tonge healpeth/ and garneseth another. Insomoche that by them a manne sone maye come to the trewe meanynge and intent off the authoure. and obtayne a profownde iudgement in all thynges” (Roye, \textit{A Lytle treatous or dialoge}, G3\textsuperscript{2}; PK, \textit{A Brefe Diailogue}, p. 158).

\textsuperscript{640} “Never the lesse I suffered all thinges till yt was ended which I could nor doo alone without one both to write & to helpe me to compare ye textes to gether. When that was ended I toke me leve and bode him farewell for oure two lyves/ and as men saye a daye longer” (Tyndale, \textit{The parable of the wicked mammon}, sig. A2\textsuperscript{}).

\textsuperscript{641} Tyndale, \textit{The parable of the wicked mammon}, sig. A3\textsuperscript{2}.


by association. Therefore, Tyndale, who deemed himself to be the Apostle of England, warned his readers with the following fitting simile: “Let it not offende the that some walke inordinatly let not the wickednes of Judas cause the to despice the doctrine of his fellows.” In 1529 *A proper dyaloge/ betwene a Gentillman and a husbandman* and another volume, which contained the English translation of Erasmus’ *Paraclesis* and a translation of Luther’s commentary on 1 Cor. 7, were published by “Hans Luft in Marburg” (vere Antwerp: Merten de Keyser). The first work has

---

644 Cf. Clebsch, *England’s Earliest Protestants*, p. 231. Cochlaeus later recounted the story of the abortive printing of Tyndale’s NT in Cologne in his *Commentaria de Actis et scriptis Martini Lutheri* (St-Victor near Mainz: Francis Behem, September 1549). Cochlaeus only mentioned two English apostates who had been in Wittenberg (*Duo Angli Apostatae, qui aliquandiu fueant Vuittenbergae*) and who wanted to print and hide the copies of a Lutheran NT in English among other merchandise and to smuggle them secretly into England (*occulte sub alijs mercibus deueherent inde in Angliam*) (pp. 132–35. For a more detailed account, see: Juhász, Cat. 93, pp. 149–51). Cochlaeus’ two earlier (shorter) reports of the same story are similarly vague (Cochlaeus, *An expediat laicis, legere Noui Testamenti libros lingua vernacula?*, Dresden, vi. Idus Junij [=10 June] 1533, sig. A5, and Cochlaeus, *Scopa [. . .] in araneas Richardi Morysini Angli*, Lipsiae, March 1538, sig. B2). In a letter by Hermann Rinck, a senator of Cologne, whom Cochlaeus had approached to take measures against the plans of the two Englishmen, the names of Tyndale and Roye are mentioned in connection with the Worms NT. The letter is dated 4 October 1528 and is written to Wolsey, who apparently had asked Rinck to buy up everywhere books printed in English and to arrest Tyndale and Roye (“Literæ gratiae vestra ad me […] de commercandis undique libris Anglica lingua excussis, et de capiendis Roy et Huckyngc”). Rinck wrote that they had not been seen in Frankfurt since Easter and the market after Lent (April 1528), and that he did not even know if they were still alive, but he would do everything in his power to arrest them (“Insuper et summa opera curabo in praedictis Roy et Huckyng cæterisque regiæ gratiæ et vestrae æmulis et rebellionionibus, tum capiendi, tum ubi locorum agant, percipiendo”). He also reported that he questioned Johannes Schott (the publisher of Roye), and Schott had no knowledge of their whereabouts but had told Rinck that their books were pawned to the Jews of Frankfurt. Rinck reported that he had seized all of the books, but he not only had to pay the pawning costs to the Jews but also had to provide remuneration for the paper and the work of the printer. He also intimated that if he had not discovered them and interfered, the books would have been shipped to England and Scotland, hidden in paper covers and packed in ten bundles covered with linen so that they would not incite suspicion, under the guise that they were destined to be sold as blank paper. Rinck was confident that none or only very few books were sold that way. (“Debeant autem libri ipsi, nisi percepismus et intervenissim in thecas chartaceas compingi et occultari et decem inclusas narcinis, lino obductis, callide et sine omni suspicione, per mare, tempore transmittæ in Schotiam et Angliam, ut ibidem ac sola et nuda papirus venderetur, sed admodum paucos aut nullos transvectos vel venditos puto.”). Rinck’s letter was published in: *ARRER, The First Printed English New Testament*, pp. 32–36. On the Cologne printing, see: Guido Latré, *William Tyndale: Reformer of a Culture, Preserver of a Language, Translator for the Ploughboy*, and Cat. 92 in *TT*, pp. 11–23 and 148–49. See also *supra* on p. 14.


646 Jerome Barlowe & William Roye, *A proper dyaloge/ betwene a Gentillman and a husbandman/ eche complyaynyge to other their miserable calamine/ through the ambition of the clergye*, Marburg: Hans Luft [vere Antwerp: Merten de Keyser], 1529; William Roye
been ascribed with much probability to the joint efforts of Jerome Barlowe and William Roye, and the second to Roye alone.\textsuperscript{647} If these ascriptions are correct, then Roye and Barlowe were issuing their tracts at the same press Tyndale was using at the same time.\textsuperscript{648} This, according to Clebsch, could suggest that “Tyndale’s temper may have cooled somewhat since he had vowed lifelong separation from Roy in 1528.”\textsuperscript{649}

In early 1529, a little over a year after Roye’s \textit{Brefe Dialego}, an anonymous pamphlet called \textit{Supplicacyon for the Beggers} appeared from the press of the Antwerp printer Johannes Grapheus (fl. 1520–69). The booklet amounted to only a few pages, but its importance can hardly be underestimated.\textsuperscript{650} And although its author intended to write a (mainly) political tract, the book gained its importance due to a couple of lines bearing doctrinal importance on the Catholic teaching on Purgatory. The author was a certain Simon Fish, an Oxford graduate and amateur actor who went to London around 1525 and entered Gray’s Inn, where he became one of the most important dealers of Tyndale’s N Ts.\textsuperscript{651} He was denounced as a heretic, fled to the Continent in 1527, and died in the plague of 1531.\textsuperscript{652} In his satire of the Church and religious practice of his age, Fish called upon “the King Ovre souereygne lorde” to take measures against the unruly members of the Church, the minions of Satan. Fish “most lamentably compleyneth” that the “wofull mysery” of “lepres, and other sore people, nedy, impotent, blinde, lame, and sike” did not receive the generous “almesse” given by “all the weldisposed people” of Henry’s realm because of the “Bisshops, Abbottes, Priours, Deacons, Archedeacons, Suffraganes, Prestes, Monkes, Chanons, Freres, Pardoners and Somners,” who “haue gotten ynto theyre hondes more then the therd part of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{648} Cf. supra on p. 15.
\item \textsuperscript{649} Clebsch, \textit{England’s Earliest Protestants}, p. 237.
\item \textsuperscript{650} Simon Fish, \textit{Supplicacyon for the Beggers}, Antwerp: Joannes Grapheus, 1529. That the book was taken seriously is proved by the fact that it was considered dangerous enough to be put on the list of forbidden books in England and to generate a lengthy reaction by Sir Thomas More. Although there is no reliable evidence for it, Henry VIII might have read the book. (In his martyrlogy Foxe has preserved two different accounts of how the King became familiar with Fish’s pamphlet.)
\item \textsuperscript{651} On Simon Fish, see: Clebsch, \textit{England’s Earliest Protestants}, pp. 240–51.
\item \textsuperscript{652} After his death, his wife married James Bainham, who was executed as a heretic in 1532. (Lester Warren Fish, \textit{The Fish Family in England and America. Genealogical and Biographical Records and Sketches}, Rutland (VT): Tuttle, 1948, p. 15).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
all youre Realme" and steal the money from the poor “by probates of testamente, priuy tithes, and by mennes offeringes to theyre pilgrmages, and at theyre first masses.”653 Therefore, Fish claimed, the wealth and legal autonomy of the Church were the cause of much social tension and moral corruption. The greediness of the Church is the cause of the poverty of the people, and consequently of all of the difficulties to levy “taxes, fiftenes and subsidies” by the King, which Henry “most tenderly of great compassion hath taken emong your people to defend them from the threatened ruine of their common welth.”654 Accordingly, Fish appealed to the monarch to make them ‘obedient’ by subordinating the hierarchy of the Church (“this vnkind idell sort”) to himself.655 One of the tricks of the clergy to extract the money from the people was the Catholic teaching on Purgatory, Fish asserted, which maintained that only by the prayers of the clergy and by the pardon of the Pope can souls be freed from Purgatory.656 Yet Purgatory had been questioned by knowledgeable persons who had risked their reputation by claiming that the Catholic teaching had no scriptural basis and was invented as a false device by the Church to rob the commonwealth.657 If Purgatory existed, Fish argued, and if the Pope had the power to liberate the souls from Purgatory, then the Pope is a cruel tyrant because he could liberate everyone from there out of charity, but he only liberates those who pay for it.658

653 Fish, *Supplicacyon for the Beggers*, fo. 1r.
654 Fish, *Supplicacyon for the Beggers*, fo. 2r.
655 Fish’s repeated use of the term ‘obedient’ throughout the pamphlet is a clear allusion to Tyndale’s *Obedience* (see supra on p. 15). Cf. CWTM VII, pp. lxvii–lxx passim.
656 “Nether haue they eny other coloure to gather these yerely exaccions ynto theyre hondes but that they sey they pray for vs to God to deluuer our soules out of the paynes of purgatori without whose prayer they sey or at lest without the popes pardon we coude neuer be deliuered thens, whiche if it be true then is it good reason that we gyue theim all these thinges all were it C times as moche” (Fish, *Supplicacyon for the Beggers*, fo. 6r).
657 “But there be many men of greate litterature and judgement that for the love they haue vnto the truth and vnto the comen welth haue not feared to put them silf ynto the greatest infamie that may be, in abiection in this matter, whiche is that there is no purgatory but that it is a thing invented by the coutiousnesse of the spiritualtie onely to translatte all kingdomes from other princes vnto theim and that there is not one word spoken of hit in all holy scripture” (Fish, *Supplicacyon for the Beggers*, fo. 6r).
658 “They say also that if there were purgatory, and also if that the pope with his pardons for money may deliuere one soule thens: he may deliuer him aswel without money: if he may deliuere one soule thens: he deliuer a thousand: yd he may deliuer a thousand he may deliuer theim all, and so destroy purgatory. And then is he a cruell tyrant without all charite if he kepe theim there in pryson and in paine till men will glue him money” (Fish, *Supplicacyon for the Beggers*, fo. 6r).
The third pamphlet that receives our attention in this section was written by someone who probably had no intention of achieving any fame during his lifetime, let alone after his death. Yet it was his testament that made William Tracy famous. Tracy, a Gloucestershire man like Tyn-dale, died shortly after his testament (dated 10 October 1530) was drawn up. Two years later, however, his body was exhumed by Thomas Parker, vicar general of the bishop of Worcester, and burned as that of a heretic. All this was done on account of the fact that in his testament Tracy forbade payments for masses for his soul, supported by his belief that faith in Christ is the sole means of justification. Tracy’s testament also contained his confession of his faith in the remission of his sins by Christ’s merits through His death and resurrection, and expressed his hope in the resurrection, founded on Job 19:25–27. Tracy used the peculiar formulation “resurrection of bodye and soule,” which, seen in the light of Luther’s doctrine of soul sleep, caused problems to the effect that Tracy would have believed in the mortality of the soul, but this cannot be established

---


660 Tracy’s son, Richard Tracy, sued Parker for the exhumation and disgrace of the body of his father, and the vicar general was fined £300 (CLEBSCH, *England’s Earliest Protestants*, p. 107). Tracy’s will was found among Tyndale’s belongings at the time of his arrest. The exhumation of Tracy’s body in 1532 would become the subject of one of Tyndale’s posthumously published works.

661 “And as touching the wealth of my solew/ ye faith yt I haue and rehersed/ is suffi- cient (as I suppose) with out any other mannis worke/ or workes/ My gronde & my belefe
is/ that ther is but one god & one mediatour betwene god & man/ whiche is Jesus christ. So that I do except none in heauen nor in earth to be my mediatoure betwene me and god/ but onely Jesus Christ/ al other be but petitioners in receyuing of grace/ but none able to geue influence of grace. And therfore wil I bestowe no part of my goodes for that intent that any man shulde saye/ or do/ to healp my sole for therin I trust onely to the promyse of god/ he that beleueth and is baptyzed shalbe saued/ and he that beleueth not shalbe damned/ marcke the last chapter” (William Tracy, *The Testament of master Wylliam Tracie esquier/ expounded both by William Tindall and Ihon Frith. Wherin thou shalt perceyue with what charitie ye chaunceler of worcetter Burned and made asshes of hit after hit was buried, 1535* [vere Antwerp: Merten de Keyser, 1536], sig. A3*”).

662 “First/ and before all other thinge, I commyt me vnto God/ and to his mercye/ trust- inge with owt any dowte or mistrust/ that by his grace and the myerxes of Jesus Christ/ and by the vertue of his passion/ and of his resurrection, I haue and shall haue remission of my synnes/ and resurrection of bodye and soule/ accordinge as hit is written Job. xix. I beleue that my redeamer lyueth/ and that in the last day I shall ryse owt of the erth/ and in my fleshshal see my sauiour/ this my hope is layde vp in my bosome” (Tracy, *The Testament of master Wylliam Tracie*, sig. A3*).
unequivocally on the basis of his testament. For obvious reasons, the testament became extremely popular among English Protestants, and by 1531, only a year after Tracy’s obscure death, the possession of a copy of his testament “had become part of a standard litany of evidence of heresy.”

**John Fisher and the Defenders of Purgatory**

It was only three and a half years after the appearance of Luther that the English Church took open steps to repudiate the teachings of the German Reformer. The first such public performance was a sermon to refute Luther, delivered at St Paul’s Cross on 12 May 1512 by John Fisher, bishop of Rochester (1504–35) and former Chancellor of the University of Cambridge (1504–14). In his sermon the bishop focused on the operation

---

663 See *infra* on p. 274.
664 DAY, *William Tracy’s Posthumous Legal Problems*, p. 108. Cf. "In any case, whether printed or copied by hand, Tracy’s will, because of its brevity, because it was in English, and because it so boldly asserted salvation through faith alone and the uselessness of masses for the dead, became, within six months of its presentation in the ecclesiastical court, a ‘sacred text’ and prima facie evidence of heresy" (*ibid.* p. 107). “Tracy’s confession was used in their wills by people of evangelical persuasion as far as mid-Suffolk and Yorkshire: some of the best evidence we have of a kind of jungle telegraph in action in these early stages of the English Reformation” (Patrick COLLINSON, *William Tyndale and the Course of the English Reformation*, in *Reformation* 1 (1996), pp. 72–97). See also: Donald Dean SMEETON, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale*, (SCES 6), Kirksville: SCJ, 1984, p. 69.
666 John Fisher, *The sermon of Iohan the bysshop of Rochester made/ agayn the pernicious doctryn of Martin luther within the octaues of the ascensyon by the assingnement of the most reuerend fader in god the lord Thomas Cardinal of Yorke and Legate ex latere from our holy father the pope*, Wynkyn de Worde, 1521. Critical edition: Hatt, *English Works of John Fisher*, pp. 77–144. Tyndale made several references to Fisher’s preaching at St Paul’s Cross, randomly scattered over twenty-three pages in his *The obedience of a Christen man*, Critical edition: Hatt, *English Works of John Fisher*, pp. 62–72. David Daniell, mistakenly believing that Tyndale’s references hinted at a later sermon by the bishop, thought that Tyndale’s “23 page section” was “a grand refutation. Under it Fisher looks not just wrong, but small” (Daniell, *William Tyndale*, p. 235). Besides the fact that Tyndale had no intention of systematically refuting Fisher, “the picture [Tyndale] paints in the *Obedience*, of a rabidly furious prelate, soused in malice, sorts oddly with the patiently pacific tone of Fisher’s letter introducing [Fisher’s later] sermon. Nor does it readily harmonize with the bishop’s known character, and this, oddly enough, may be part of the reason for Tyndale’s splenetic comments” (HATT, *English Works of John Fisher*, p. 55). Hatt calls Daniell’s remark “a judgement which surely stretches partisanship to breaking-point” (HATT, *English Works of John Fisher*, p. 54, n. 26). Tyndale abused Fisher in other works, too. In his *Obedience*, Tyndale described the bishop as “Rochester both abominable & shamelesse: yee and sterke mad with pure malice/ & so abased in ye braines/ of spite that he can not overcome the trouth that he seith not or rather careth
of the Holy Spirit in the world through the Church, especially through the successor of Peter; but the principal subjects of Luther (the supreme authority of Scripture and justification by faith) were treated only as topics of minor importance. King Henry VIII joined the polemics with his *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*, confirming papal authority and the validity of indulgences.

Fisher's voluminous *Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio* came out in Antwerp in 1523. He reacted to Luther's rejection of the Pope's authority to grant indulgences systematically and refuted all forty-one articles of Luther's *Assertio*. The bishop's book contained numerous mentions of Purgatory in various articles (4, 17, and 18 on indulgences, and 37–40 addressing the question of Purgatory itself). Although Fisher recognized that the teaching on Purgatory was not accepted by the Eastern Church and that the early Church Fathers do not mention it frequently, he insisted that the existence of Purgatory cannot be called into question.

The silence of the early Church on Purgatory is explained by the fervour of the Church Fathers to do penance for their sins during their earthly life, and only when the fear of the pains of Purgatory diminished did the

---


669 The popularity of Fisher's book can be illustrated by the fact that the tract saw nineteen editions up to 1564, and a German translation was reprinted four times before 1536. (Hatt, *English Works of John Fisher*, p. 10). I have used the following edition from the Opera: John Fisher, *Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio*, in Ioannis Fischerii Roffensis in Anglia Episcopi Opera, quae hactenus inveniri potuerunt omnia, singulari studio diligenter conquista, partim antea quidem excusa, nunc autem sedulo recognita; partim iam primum in lucem edita, Würzburg: Apud Georgium Fleischmannum, 1597.

670 See supra on p. 168.

671 “Nemo certè […] iam dubitat orthodoxus, an purgatorium sit, dequo tamen apud priscos illos, nulla, vel quàm rarissima fìebat mentio. Sed & Grecìs ad hunc vsque diem, non est creditum purgatorium esse. Legat qui velit Græcorum veterem commentarios, & nullum quantum opinor, aut quàm rarissimum de purgatorio sermonem inveniet” (Fisher, *Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio*, col. 496).
institution of indulgences start. Yet the Church Fathers are not the ultimate authority on matters of faith, the bishop pointed out, for the Church has not approved every single tenet of the Church Fathers, nor has it accepted every article written by Thomas Aquinas, as their human nature is often manifested in their writings and they do err. To Luther’s assertion that Purgatory lacks a scriptural basis, Fisher replied that even if that is the case, the existence of Purgatory has always been held by all Christians, and the ancient custom of the Church of praying for the souls of the dead proves this. Augustine had already used this argument, Fisher pointed out, after having proved the existence of Purgatory by biblical arguments. For Scripture does contain teaching about Purgatory, but the places have to be interpreted in the same spirit as the Church interprets them—“secundum orthodoxorum interpretationem,” because heretics use the same passages but attribute a different meaning to them. Besides Augustine, other Church Fathers (Chrysostom, Gregory the Great, Jerome, and Ambrose) also found biblical foundations for the teaching, especially in Mt. 12:32 and 1 Cor. 3:11–15. More proof of Purgatory can be found in 1 Jn. 5:16, with its distinction between sins that lead to death and those that do not. Both Phil. 2:20 and Rev. 5:13 speak about the praise

---

672 “Cœperunt igitur indulgentiae, postquam ad purgatorij cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum erat. Tunc enim credibile est sanctos patres accuratiūs cogitasse, quibus modis aduersus illos cruciatus, suis gregibus consulere potuissent, & ijs præsertim, quibus ætas non sufficerent, ad complendam per canones institutam pœnitentiam” (Fisher, Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio, col. 497).


674 “Tametsi non possit ex scripturis probari purgatorium, veritas eius nihilominus Christianis cunctis credenda est & maximè cum ex Ecclesie vetustissima consuetudine, pro defunctorum animabuses, quæ in purgatorio esse creduntur, commemoratio specialis à Sacerdotibus in missa fieri consueuit. Propter quod & Augustinus libro dè cura pro mortuis agenda, postquàm ostenderit ex scriptura, prodesse defunctis ea suffragia, quæ post mortem eorum fiunt, docet nihilo minus eius rei sufficientem probationem capi posse, ex longa totius ecclesiæ consuetudine” (Fisher, Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio, col. 728).

675 For Augustine, see supra on p. 99.

676 For Chrysostom, Gregory the Great, Jerome, and Ambrose see supra on pp. 96, 106, 93, and 94, respectively.
of God by those in the netherworld, which, Fisher argued, cannot be Hell, only Purgatory. But Jesus' own words in the parable about poor Lazarus and the rich man (Lk. 16:19–31) and in Mt. 12:36 prove the existence of Purgatory beyond any doubt.\textsuperscript{677} When Ps. 65:12 speaks about passing through fire and water, this refers not only to the martyrs (as in Luther's interpretation), but also to the souls in Purgatory.\textsuperscript{678} Augustine understood Paul's words in 1 Cor. 3 as transitional fire, Fisher argued, which purged the minor sins. This fire was more painful than any pain that one can feel or even imagine on earth.\textsuperscript{679} Further, Fisher denied Luther's alleged assertions that the souls in Purgatory are uncertain of their future destination (art. 38), that souls in Purgatory sin incessantly (art. 39), and that souls liberated from Purgatory by the prayers of the living would enjoy less bliss than if they had themselves provided satisfaction for their sins (art. 40).\textsuperscript{680}

Fisher had previously touched upon Purgatory in one of two sermons he preached publicly in 1521.\textsuperscript{681} These were published by John Rastell only in 1532, as \textit{Two fruitful Sermons}.\textsuperscript{682} In the first sermon, preached on the Feast of All Saints, Fisher concentrated on the fate of the dead and the spiritual solidarity between the Church Militant, the Church Triumphant, and the Church Suffering in the form of prayers for the intercession of the saints and for the relief of the souls in Purgatory.\textsuperscript{683} His purpose was to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{677} With the parable of Lazarus and the rich man Fisher proved that there are some people who are already in Heaven, and some who are in Hell. But it is not credible, he argued, that all those who are not cast into Hell should enter right away into Heaven without any purgation from their venial sins: "Nec est credible, quod ij omnes, qui non fuerint in gehennam coniecti, quod euestigio migrarurint in caelum. Quamobrem & interea pro vuluptatibus venialibus, quibus in hac vita plusculum quam par fuit, indulserunt, molestias aliquas oportet subeant, quibus emaculentur & expientur, dignique reddentur illa caelesti civitate in quam (vti n Apoca. [21,27] traditur) nihil intrabit coinquinatum" (Fisher, \textit{Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio}, col. 720).
\item \textsuperscript{678} Fisher, \textit{Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio}, col. 721. Cf. Ambrose \textit{supra} on p. 94.
\item \textsuperscript{679} See \textit{supra} p. 99.
\item \textsuperscript{680} Fisher, \textit{Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio}, cols. 729–41.
\item \textsuperscript{681} For the dating of the sermons, see: Hatt, \textit{English Works of John Fisher}, pp. 211–18.
\item \textsuperscript{683} "Now for this day, because it is the feest of all sayntes, it is conuenyent somwhat to speke of the soueraygne loyes and pleasures which be aboue in the kyngdome of heuyn/ where these blessed Sayntes be present now with our sauyour Chryst. And for asmoche also as many blessed soules whiche are ordeyned to come thyder into the same kyngedome, be let and taryed by the way in the greuouse paynes of Purgatory (of whome the chyrche as to morow maketh specyall remembranunce): we shall also by the grace of God
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
exhort his audience so that upon their death his hearers would not have to be ‘imprisoned’ in Purgatory but could enter heavenly bliss immediately.684 Fisher turned to Augustine’s commentary on Genesis for inspiration, which he repeatedly quoted.685 The bishop took Mt. 5:20 (Vg: Nisi abundauerit iustitia vestra plus quam Scribarum et Pharisaearum non intrabitis in regnum caelorum; in Fisher’s translation: “Oneles your ryghtwyse lyfe be more habundaunt than was the lyuynge of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall nat entre into the kyngdome of heuyn.”)686 as the text for his sermon, although it appears only a few verses after the gospel of the day (the Beatitudes, Mt. 5:1–12).687 Having compared the heavenly bliss with the pleasures of this world and having underlined the exceeding superiority of the joys of Heaven, in which “nat a seuen or eyght thousandes, but many hundred thousandes, ye many thousandes thousandes […] of blessyd sayntes, Patryarkes, Prophetes, Apostels, Martyres, Confessours, vyrgyns, wydowes, and such as haue trewly kept theyr bonde of matrymony” are partakers, Fisher turned to the “other blessed soules which lykewyse be departed out of this myserable worlde/ but they for theyr dettes lye now deteyned in the pryson of Purgatory.”688 Quoting Augustine, Fisher claimed that “the fyre of Purgatory is more greuouse than any maner of payne that can be sene in this worlde, or felte, or yet thought” and that the souls in this hellish pain “crye vnto vs for helpe.”689 There are “manyfold bondes,” Fisher maintained, between the souls in Purgatory and his own audience. The souls in Purgatory are part of the same Church—they share the same faith, hope, and charity; they share the same Saviour and the same Father;

somewhat speke of the greuouse paynes which be there” (Fisher, Here after ensueth two fruytfull Sermons, sig. A2r–v. Hatt, p. 226). The other sermon, delivered on the First Sunday of Advent, concentrated on the duties and needs of the Church Militant (e.g. how temptation should be dealt with, the operation of free will), and the two other facets of the Church, namely—the Church Suffering and the Church Triumphant—are only present in an abstract way. See: HATT, English Works of John Fisher, pp. 218–19.

684 “As concernynge our owne soules, which as yet be abdyngye in this worlde: we may by te remembraunce of bothe those two places, somwhat quyckem and styre theym so to lyue here, that after our departure hence we be nat arested by the waye, and so cast into the pryson of Purgatory, but streyght to be receuyd into that moost gloryouse place and kingdom of Heuyn, whithouten any great delayes” (Fisher, Here after ensueth two fruytfull Sermons, sig. A2r, Hatt, p. 226).

685 HATT, pp. 219–20 and 254–88 passim. For Augustine’s commentary see: supra on p. 99.


688 Fisher, Here after ensueth two fruytfull Sermons, sigs. B3r–B4r, Hatt, pp. 231–32.

and they even shared the same sacraments during their earthly life—and they can now be helped by the prayers of the living. This is profitable for both parties involved because prayers help not only the souls in Purgatory but “our owne profyte and our owne welth hangeth therby.”

Fisher accentuated the personal responsibility of the individual in the process of salvation: Christ “dyd shede all the precyouse blode of his moost noble and blessed body” for every soul, so the penitent would apply Christ’s merits wilfully for his or her own salvation during his or her earthly life and trust in the prayers of others after his or her death.

Fisher was not alone in his concern about defending the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory: the Protestants’ rejection of it prompted many other Catholic apologists to defend its existence and to show that it is a biblical teaching also attested to copiously by the Church Fathers. Best known among them was Johann Eck, whose *De purgatorio contra Ludderum* saw the light of day in 1523. The Catholic Humanist Johannes Cochlaeus—initially not unsympathetic to Luther, whom he regarded as a friend of Johannes Reuchlin—became one of the most effective apologists against the ‘New Learning’ after 1520. On 15 October 1523, Guillaume Briçonnet circulated the decree of a diocesan synod in his bishopric.

---

690 Cf. “Though shalt be rewarded of these blessyd soules for whom thou prayest. For whan they shall be delyuered out of that paynfull pryson and set aboue in the kyngdome of heuyn, they shal there agayn be as myndefull of the, and a meane for thy delyueraunce” (Fisher, *Here after ensueth two froyfull Sermons*, sigs. C1–C2, Hatt, p. 235).


693 On Cochlaeus, see: Juhász, Cat. 93 in *TT*, pp. 149–51.

warned against the “venom of Luther’s pestilent sect,” and it claimed that those who deny the existence of Purgatory and the effectiveness of the invocation of the saints abuse the Gospel and expound upon it according to their own mind in order to seduce the common people with the novelty of their teachings. The bishop threatened with excommunication those who bought, read, or sold Luther’s books, or propagated his ideas, and exhorted his flock to believe in Purgatory and invoke the Blessed Virgin and the other saints, and to pray the litany frequently to this effect.

More’s brother-in-law, John Rastell, a barrister and printer in London, also ventured to publish *A new boke of purgatory* in 1530 to prove the necessity of the existence of Purgatory by logical arguments. Rastell’s book took the form of three dialogues between the Turkish Gyngemyn (a Muslim) and the German Comyngo (a Christian). They agree that neither the Koran nor the Bible can be cited. Each dialogue proves a point on the basis of rational arguments that can be accepted even by a Muslim: (1) that there is an eternal God who is the perfection of every good, and accordingly is the perfection of justice and of mercy; (2) that the human soul is immortal; and (3) that consequently there must be a place where some souls are purged after death. John Frith wrote a refutation to Rastell’s book. According to John Foxe, Rastell countered Frith’s reply while the latter was imprisoned in the Tower. Rastell’s pamphlet was then answered by Frith so effectively that Rastell accepted Frith’s arguments.

---

697 John Rastell, *A new boke of purgatory/ whiche is a dyaloge & dysputacyon betwene one Comyngo an Almayne a Christen man/ & one Gyngemyn a turke of Machometes law/ dysputyng by naturall reason and good philosophye/ whether there be a purgatorye or not purgatorye. which boke is deuyded into thre dylogys.// The fyrst dyaloge sheweth and trea-
teth of the merueylous exystens of god.// The seconde dyaloge treateth of the immortalyte of manynes soule.// The thyrde dyaloge/ of purgatory*.
699 See *infra* on p. 266.
and became a Protestant.\textsuperscript{700} From Rastell’s second book only two tiny fragments survive.\textsuperscript{701} Based on Frith’s second reply (printed posthumously), some of the line of thought can be reconstructed, but this falls outside the scope of our present subject.\textsuperscript{702}

**Thomas More**

Although Thomas More was a twice-married layperson and not a clergyman, a lawyer and not a theologian, he engaged himself, with royal approval and by episcopal commission, in the theological debates with the growing ‘sect of Luther’ and became one of the champions of Catholic apologetical writers of the early Reformation period.\textsuperscript{703} But even prior to Luther’s appearance, More had showed his interest in theological matters. In his *Utopia*, he wrote that although King Utopus decreed religious freedom, he made one remarkable exception, namely, that nobody should fall so far below human dignity as to deny the immortality of the soul by asserting that the soul dies with the body at death, because such people undermine society and advocate lawlessness by taking away the possible retribution or reward after death. Accordingly, More informed his readers, Utopians ostracized such people.\textsuperscript{704} The question at that time was only

\begin{footnotes}
\item[701] “The cause why yt Rastell made his boke of purgatory wtout aleggyng any textes of holy scripture” and “I marvell gretely that my broder Fryth doth hold this” (both of them cited by Reed, *Early Tudor Drama*, p. 221).
\item[704] “Itaque hanc totam rem in medio posuit, & quid credendum putaret liberum cuique reliquit. Nisi quod sancte ac sewere uetuit, ne quis usque adeo ab humanae naturae
relevant to philosophical discussions, and More's negative judgement was, no doubt, provoked by Pomponazzi and the debate in Renaissance Italy about the natural mortality or immortality of the soul, producing *inter alia* the pronouncement of the Fifth Lateran Council.  

By the time of the publication of his *Dialogue concerning Heresies* (1528), the question had taken on another dimension, because Luther in the meantime had advocated the tenet that souls sleep after death. More therefore addressed the issue in chapter 8 of book II, where he answered the objections against praying to saints that had been raised by the Messenger, More's Lutheran-inclined partner in the dialogue. The souls of the saints, filled with heavenly love, do intercede for the living, More asserted, because even the rich man of Jesus' parable (Lk. 16:19–31), despite being in Hell, pleaded for his kin out of "carnal love". If the souls of the saints are alive, More argued, then they, too, pray for the living. And that they are indeed alive can be seen in Christ's answer to the Sadducees, in which He called Himself the God of the living (Mt. 22:32 *et par*). In the last book of the *Dialogue*, More returned to the question in the passage IV,2, where he listed the errors in Luther's teaching. The Chancellor criticized Luther

---

705 For Pomponazzi, see *supra* on p. 120. For the Fifth Lateran Council, see *supra* on p. 123.


707 "yf ye the ryche man that lay in hell/ had yet not onely for fere of encreace of his owne punysshment/ by his brothers dampancyon growyng of his euyll eample/ but also of carnall loue & flesshly fauour towards his kynne (whiche flesshly affecccyon beynge without grace of vertue may peraduenture stande with ye state of dampancyon) had a cure & care of his fyue brethrene/ were it lykely that sayntes than beyng so full of blessed charyte in heyn/ wyl nothynge care for thyer brethrene in Cryst/ whom they se here in this wretched worlde?" (CWTM VI/1, p. 212).

708 "And as lytell doubte/ but that they be alyue/ if god be theyr god/ as he is in dede/ and he not the god of ded men but of lyuyng/ as our sauyour sayth in ye gospell" (CWTM VI/1, p. 212).
for denying the efficacy of the mass, the invocation of the saints, and the existence of Purgatory, and for believing that souls lie still and sleep until Judgement Day.\footnote{For he techeth also yt the masse auayleth no man quyck nor dede/ but onely to ye preste hym selfe. […] Item he techeth that there ys no purgatory. Item that all mennys soulys lye still & slepe tyll the daye of dome. Item that no man sholde pray to sayntes nor sette by any holy relyques nor pylgrymagys/ nor do any reuereence to any ymagys (CWTM VI/1, pp. 354–55).} The subject is mentioned again in the author’s reply to the Messenger in IV,8, where More argued that the sect itself is the cause of the malice that is inflicted on them. One of the examples to illustrate this was Luther’s belief in predestination combined with soul sleep, which, according to More, is the basis of immorality.\footnote{What harme shall they care to forbare/ that blyeue Luther/ that god alone wythout theyre wyll worketh all the myschyef that they do them selfe? What shall he care how longe he lyue in synne/ that blyeueth Luther/ that he shall after thy lyfe neyther fele well nor yll in body nor sowle tyll the daye of dome? Wyll not he trowe you saye as the Welshe-man sayde? (CWTM VI/1, p. 373).} A last mention appears in IV,10, where again More wrote that the followers of Luther, who attribute the responsibility for all evil deeds to God by advocating predestination, do not care about damnation, since they believe that judgement will not affect them for a long time.\footnote{And yf they shall be dampned/ yet they say yt shall be long or they fele it. For Luther sayth that all soules shall slepe and fele neyther good nor bad after thy lyfe tyll domes day. And than they that shall be dampned/ shall be dampned for such euyll dedys/ as god onely forced and constreyned them vnto but as a ded instrument/ as a man heweth with an hachet (CWTM VI/1, p. 377). In his Confutatation of Tyndale’s Answer, More will again make several mentions of Tyndale’s and Luther’s adherence to soul sleep: CWTM VIII, pp. 288, 626, and 796.}

In his \textit{Dialogue}, More also criticized Tyndale for wilfully mistranslating certain frequently used, theologically important keywords (“wordes of grete weyght”) in his NT translations.\footnote{For so had Tyndall after Luthers counsayle corrupted and chaunged it from the good and holsom doctrine of Cryste to the deuylysh heresyes of theyr owne/ that it was clene a contrary thyng (CWTM VI, p. 285).} Three words were of particular importance: instead of the usual “preste,” Tyndale translated the Greek πρεσβύτερος by “senior” in his first edition of the NT, which, More argued, is neither good English nor theologically correct.\footnote{Later Tyndale used “elder” in his other works and in his second edition of the NT.} The second term is ἐκκλησία, which is rendered by “congregacion” in Tyndale’s version, instead of the traditional “chyrche.” And the third criticized term was Tyndale’s “love,” instead of the established “charyte,” for the Greek ἀγάπη.\footnote{For he hath mysse translated thre wordes of grete weyght and euery one of them is as I suppose more than thryse thre tymes repeted and reherced in the boke […] The one is quod I this worde prestys. The other the chyrche. The thyrde charyte (CWTM VI, p. 285).}
is sometimes believed to have faulted Tyndale’s translation only because he objected to the translator, for Erasmus’ translation also used the words *congregatio* instead of *ecclesia*, and *senior* instead of *presbyter*.\(^{715}\) In what way, then, was Tyndale’s translation worse than that of Erasmus? The difference, according to More, is in the intent (and, we can add, the intended recipient) of the translation. Erasmus’ intention was a new, elegant, and etymologically correct translation for a well-educated audience. He meticulously clarified his motives for differing from the Vulgate in his annotations. But More was convinced that Tyndale was moved by other motives. The Lord Chancellor condemned Tyndale’s translation because Tyndale did not make those changes on the grounds of closer etymological correspondence with the Greek text but on theological grounds, which contradicted the orthodox interpretation of the text and were clearly intended to undermine the Catholic Church.\(^{716}\)

After the publication of Simon Fish’s *Supplicacyon for the Beggers*, the Lord Chancellor wrote an able reply entitled *Supplycacyon of Soulys*.

More’s work had a twofold structure: while the first book refuted Fish’s statements about the covetousness of the clergy, the second established the theological basis of the Catholic position. More accepted his opponents’ tactics and based his argumentation predominantly on Scripture. He used ten biblical passages to prove the Catholic teaching of Purgatory: four out of the OT and six out of the NT, “climaxing with two sayings ascribed to Christ himself.”\(^{718}\)

The first argument is taken from 2 Kgs. 20:3: when Isaiah foretold to King Hezekiah that he would die, the King wept bitterly. According to More, Hezekiah’s “heuynes and lothenes at that tyme to depart and dye” can be explained by his fear of Purgatory.\(^{719}\) More acknowledged that this argument was not a proper proof but a “probable reason taken of

\(^{715}\) Cf. Bruce, *History of the Bible in English*, p. 41


\(^{717}\) Thomas More, *Thesupplycacyon of soulys Made by syr Thomas More knyght councelour to our souerayn lorde the Kynge and chauncellour of hys Duchy of Lancaster. Agaynst the supplycacyon of beggars*, 1529.

\(^{718}\) CWTM VII, p. lxxiv.

\(^{719}\) “And fyrst yt semeth very probable and lykely/ that ye good kyng Ezechias for non other cause wept at the warnyng of hys deth geuen hym by the prophete/ but onely for the fere of purgatory. […] Now consyderyd he so the weyght of hys offence/ yt he thought and estemyd the onely losse of thys present lyfe farre vnder the iust & condygne ponyshment therof/ and therfore fell in gret drede of farre sorer ponyshment after” (CWTM VII, p. 176).
the scripture,” and that there are more and better arguments. Yet Fish, Luther, and Tyndale maintain without any scriptural or rational foundation, More stated, that the souls of the departed sleep until Judgement Day and that Purgatory is the invention of the Popes. Nonetheless, More claimed, the immortality of the soul is held not only by Christians and Jews but also by most of the pagans, including the Turks and the Arabs, who also believe in some kind of post-mortem purgation for those who were neither completely wicked nor entirely spotless.

The following argument from the OT is 1 Sam. 2:6: “Dominus deducit ad inferos et reducit: our lord bryngeth folke downe in to hell and bryngeth theym thense agayne,” which can only refer to Purgatory, More believed, because that is the only part of Hell from where deliverance can be obtained. The third argument is a quote from Zech. 9:11: “Tu quoque in sanguine testamenti tui eduxisti vinctos tuos de lacu in quo non est aqua: Thou hast in the blood of thy testament brought out thy bounden prisioners owte of the pyt or lake in whych there was no water.” For More it is evident that this waterless lake where the spirits are kept in the “pryson of punyshement” is Purgatory, the “drye pyt of fyre/ where in there is no refreshyng: For as hote are we here as they are in hell.”

---

720 CWMT VII, p. 178.
721 “For albeity thy beggars proctour sayth yt ryght wyse & connynge men wyll say yt there ys no purgatory at all/ by which wyse men he menyth Luther and Tyndall & him self: yet was there neuer any of them all that yet layed anye substancyall thynge eyterh reason or authoryte for them/ but onely geste and rayle/ and saye that purgatory ys a thyng of the popeys awne makynge/ and that souls do nothyng tall domis day but lye styll and slepe” (CWMT VII, p. 177). “For now in hys [i.e. Luther’s] dronken sermon that he wrote yppon the gospell of ye ryche man & Lazare/ where as he had in hys othyr bokys before framyed of hys owne fantasy/ new fond fassyons of purgatory/ and told them forth for as playn mat ters as though he had bene here and sene them: now in thys mad sermon of hys he sayth playnly that there ys none at all/ but that all souls ly still and slepe/ and so slepe shall/ vntyll the day of dome” (CWMT VII, p. 212). For Luther’s sermon, see supra on p. 170.
722 “For surely not onely among christen peple and lewyse/ of whom the tone hath/ the tother hath had/ perceuyng and lyght of fayth/ but also amonge the very myscreaunt and ydolaters/ Turkys/ Saracens/ and Paynyms/ exepte onely suche as haue so fare fallen from the nature of man in to a brutyshe bestely persuasyon as to byleue yt soule & body dye both at onys: ellys hath allwy ye remanaunt comenly thought & byleued/ yt after the bodyes ded and deceaced/ the soylus of such as were neyther dedely damnpned wrecches for euer/ nor on the tother syde/ so good but that theyre offences done in this world hath desered more punyshement then they had suffred and sustayned there/ were punyshed and pourgy by payn after ye deth ere euer they were admytted vnto thynere welth and reste” (CWMT VII, pp. 172–73).
723 CWMT VII, p. 178.
724 CWMT VII, p. 178.
725 CWMT VII, p. 179.
Christ spoke about “the rych gloton lyeng in such a lake from whensene at syght of pore Lazarus in Abrahams bosom/ he desyred heuely to haue hym sent vnto hym wyth one droppe of water to refreshe hys tongue.”

More’s reasoning is the same as in the previous proof: this lake cannot be Hell, “for in yt hell ys there no redempcyon.” The last proof from the OT is the *locus classicus*, 2 Macc. 12:39–46. More is aware of the fact that Protestants doubted the canonicity of the book, because they followed the Jewish canon. Nonetheless, More argued, the Hebrew canon cannot be authoritative in this question, because then the Gospel of John has to be rejected as well, since the Jews do not accept it in their canon.

The series of proof texts from the NT starts with 1 Jn. 5:16: “Est peccatum ad mortem/ non dico vt pro eu roget quis. There ys sayth he some synne that ys vnto the deth/ I bydde not that eny man shall praye for that.” John’s words imply, More advocated, that there are other people, too, who do not die in mortal sin, and for them one should pray when they die, which can only refer to the souls in Purgatory, for those in Heaven do not need prayers, and no prayer can help those in Hell. The second NT argument is found in the text of Rev. 5:13. By creatures “vnder the yerthe” John refers to the souls in Purgatory, for those in Hell do not praise God. Peter’s quote of Ps. 16(15):10 in Acts 2:24 is the next proof text. “In these wordes he [Peter] sheweth that paynys of hell were losed” cannot refer to Hell, for those pains were not loosened, nor can it refer to the *limbo patrum*, because the OT saints were not in pain. Consequently, More believed, Peter could only speak about Purgatory. After Peter’s words, More moved on to Paul’s words in the other *locus classicus* (1 Cor. 3:11–15) and expounded upon it in the traditional way as speaking about the purgatorial fire that cleanses all works that cannot enter Heaven. The Chancellor pointed out that Origen, Augustine, and Gregory the Great

---

726 *CWTM* VII, p. 179.
727 *CWTM* VII, p. 179.
729 *CWTM* VII, p. 184.
730 “Then appereth yt clerely that saynt Iohan meaneth that there be other whyche dye not in such case for whom he wolde men shuld pray/ because yt prayour to such sowlys may be profytable. But that profyte can no man take neyther beyng in heuen where yt nedeth not/ nor beyng in hell where yt boteth not. Wherfore it appereth plaine yt such prayour helpeth onely for purgatory: whych they muste therfore nedys graunte/ excepte they deny saynt Iohan” (*CWTM* VII, p. 184).
731 *CWTM* VII, p. 184.
732 *CWTM* VII, pp. 185–86.
understood the text as referring to Purgatory. The series of proof texts ends with two sayings of Christ: Mt. 12:32 and v. 36, the first one serving as proof for the existence of sins that can be forgiven “in the worlde to cum after mannys lyfe,” and the second presenting an example for such a sin (idle words) that is punished in Purgatory.

John Frith

‘Young’ John Frith (1503–33), as he was called by Joye, is usually seen as having “the finest mind, the most winsome wit, and the boldest spirit among the men who wrote theology in English between 1520 and 1535.” His theological attention was focused on attacking the Catholic teachings on Purgatory and the sacraments. His translation of Luther’s Ad Librum Magistri Nostri Magistri Ambrosii Catharini was published in 1529 with the title A pistle to the Christen reader. The Revelation of AntiChrist. Although Frith omitted parts of Luther’s treatise, he translated the short passage on Purgatory implying that the Catholic claim about the Pope’s ability to deliver souls from Purgatory is only a lie for financial purposes. At this stage, Frith did not yet call into question the existence of Purgatory.

---

733 CWTM VII, p. 190. For Origen, see supra on p. 91. For Augustine, see supra on p. 99. For Gregory the Great, see supra on p. 106.
734 CWTM VII, pp. 191–94.
735 Clebsch, England’s Earliest Protestants, p. 78. Studying first at Cambridge, then at Oxford, Frith became one of the earliest English followers of Luther. On account of heresy he and some other people were incarcerated in the fish-cellar of Cardinal Wolsey in February 1528. After his escape he fled to the Continent around the end of the same year, where he spent most of his time in Antwerp in the company of Tyndale. In 1531 he secretly visited England, where he was arrested as a vagabond and put in the stocks, but he escaped. A year later, in the summer of 1532, he sailed again to England but was arrested just when he was about to take a ship back to Antwerp, and he was executed after spending more than a year in the Tower. See: Clebsch, England’s Earliest Protestants, pp. 78–136. On Frith’s understanding of salvation, Purgatory, and other eschatological issues, see: Carl R. Trueman, Luther’s Legacy. Salvation and English Reformers, 1525–1556, Oxford: Clarendon, 1994, pp. 121–55.
736 “Who is able to numbre the monstrouos mervels/ only of them that are departed. Good lord, what a see of lyes hath envaded vs/ of aperinges, coniuringes and answers of sprites by the which it is brought to passe/ that the Pope is also made the Kinge of them that are dead and raigneth in purgatorye/ to the great disprofite of his prestes (if he continew) which haue all their liuinge/ riches/ and pomp out of purgatory” (Richard Brightwell [vere John Frith] (trans.), A pistle to the Christen reader. The Revelation of AntiChrist. Antitheses/ wherin are compared to geder Christes actes and oure holye father the Popes, At Malborow in the land of Hesse: by me Hans luft [vere Antwerp: Merten de Keyser], The .xii. of Julye MCCCC.xxix, sigs. F8r–v). See supra p. 168.
Two years later, in 1531, Frith published in Antwerp his *A Disputacion of Purgatory*, in which he flatly denied the existence of Purgatory. The work was meant as a reply to three books: John Rastell’s *A new boke of purgatory*, Thomas More’s *The supplycacyon of soulys*, and John Fisher’s *Assertionis Lutheranae Confitatio*, all of which treated (to some extent) the Catholic teaching on Purgatory. Frith agreed to the outcome of the first two dialogues in Rastell’s book (there is a just and merciful God, and the soul is immortal), even if he thought that the way Rastell arrived at those points was dubious. He questioned Rastell’s methodology, because reason alone cannot be trusted, Frith argued, but has to be controlled by Scripture: anything that contradicts Scripture cannot be true, even if it seems logical. “Rastell wythe his turke” excluded Christ and His death from their reasoning, and so they arrived at a false conclusion: for without Christ we indeed cannot enter Heaven, but one has to first enter Purgatory and then Hell. Then, in a lengthy and somewhat wearisome manner, Frith set forth scriptural proof texts against Rastell’s reasoning that all amount to saying that salvation is achieved only by the Blood of Christ and that seeking another way is blasphemous: salvation is God’s free gift to the elect. For Frith the belief in Purgatory seemed to attribute God’s salvific action to human efforts and to the clemency of the hierarchy in the Church, and as such it was contradictory to the Gospel.

---

737 John Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye made by Ioh[a]n Frith which is deuided in to thre bokes. The first boke is an answere vnto Rastell, which goeth aboute to proue purgatorye by naturall philosophye. The seconde boke answereth vnto Sir Thomas More, which laboureth to proue purgatorye by scripture. The thirde boke maketh answere vnto my lorde of Rochester which most leaneth vnto the doctoure, Antwerp: Symon Cock, July 1531 (NK 3043, STC 11388).

738 On these books, see *supra* pp. 259, 260, and 254.

739 “The fyrst dialogue goeth aboute to proue by reason that there is a god/ which is mercyfull and ryghtwyse. The second entendeth to proue/ that the soule of a man is immortall. Agaynst these two dyaloges I wyll not dispute/ partlye because this treatyse shuld not be ouer longe and tedyous/ and partlie because that those two pointes whiche he there laboureth to proue are such as no chrysten man wyll denye (although manye of his probacions are so slender/ that they maye well be improued) but as concernynge his thyrd dialogue wherein he wolde proue purgatorye/ it is hollie injurious vnto the bloude of Christ and the instruccyon of al chrysten fayth/ yf men wer so mad as to beleue his vayn persuasions” (Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sig. B1’).

740 “Naturall reason must be ruled by scrypture If naturall reason conclude agaynst the scrypture/ so is it false/ but yf it be agreinge to scrypture then it is to be harde” (Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sig. B1’).


742 Upon the Rastell apology, Frith replied in his *An other boke against Rastel named the subsedye or bulwark to hys fyrst boke*, which was published posthumously in London in 1537. See *supra* on p. 260.
The second part of the book, answering Thomas More, is similar but more adroit. Frith denied that More's argument, which claimed that even most of the pagans believe in Purgatory, would be compelling for Christians. He omitted to refute More's “disputation by natural reason,” which More presented on “a leffe and an halfe,” because this section of More's book constituted the source for Rastell’s entire book, and those arguments had been refuted in the first part of Frith’s book. But he remarked that if Augustine had to prove the existence of Purgatory in his *Enchiridion to Laurentius*, it means that this was not yet an undoubted article of faith 400 years after Christ. What is more, More’s scriptural arguments are incorrect, continued Frith. For Hezekiah is not portrayed as a sinner but as a holy man, so he had no reason to fear Purgatory or Hell. Death itself was the reason for Hezekiah’s fear, because even Christ felt fear when His death was approaching (Mt. 26:39). More’s second argument (based on 1 Sam. 2:6) testifies to his ignorance, Frith argued, because More does not know “that the hebrue worde/ sheol/ doth not sygnyfye hell/ but a graue or a pytte that is dygged,” and he does not understand the parallelism of the verse, a commonly used figure of speech in Hebrew, in which the two halves of a verse are synonymous and clarify each other. If he had looked at the first part of the verse

---

743  "I answere/ if it were law full to requye wisdom in a man so wyse as Master More is counted/ here wold I wysh him a little more witte/ for I thinke there is no wyseman that wyll graunte this to be a good argument/ the turkes/ Saracenes/ paynims & Jewes beleue it to be true/ ergo we must beleue that it is true: for I wyll shew you a lyke argument. The Turkes/ Saracenes/ paynims & Jewes beleue that we haue not the ryght Chryst/ but that we are all damnned which beleue in Chryste. Is it therfore true? shall we turne our faith because they beleue that we be deceaued? I thinke there is no man so folysh as to graunte hym this" (Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sigs. F8v–G1r). For More’s argument, see supra on p. 264.


745  For Augustine’s argument in the *Enchiridion*, see supra on p. 99.

746  Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sig. G1r. For More’s argument, see supra on p. 263.

747  “Chryste feared and swette so sore: what wold you answere me? that it was for feare of the paynes of purgatorye? forsouth he that wolde so answere shulde be laughed to skorne of al the world/ as he were well worthye. wherfore was it then? Uerelye euyn for feare of deeth/ as it playnlye appeareth after: for he prayed vnto his Father/ sayenge: my Father yf it be possyble lett this deeth passe fro me. Mathewe. xxvi. So fearefull a thynge is deeth euyn vnto the moost purest flesshe. And euyn the same cause wyll I assygne in Ezechias/ that he wept for feare of deeth and not for purgatorye" (Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sig. G2v).

748  “Besydes that he is clene ignoraunte of the comen maner of all prophetes whiche for the moste parte in all psalmes/ himnes and other songs of praise (as this is) make the fyrst ende of the verse to expounde the last & the last to expounde the fyrst. He that obserueth
(“The lorde doth kylle & quicken agayne”), he would have realized that the verse refers to the resurrection of the dead rather than to Purgatory as fulfilled in Lazarus (Jn. 11:44) in the literal sense. But the verse can refer figuratively to the afflictions visited on people by God in order to convert them as the Prayer of Azariah confirms (Dan. 3:88(87) NRSV: Prayer of Azariah 1:66). More’s third argument from Zech. 9:11 is contradictory to Fisher’s argument from Ps. 66(65):12, Frith pointed out, because the Psalm speaks about water and fire, while the passage in Zechariah mentions a waterless pit. Zechariah’s text does not prove Purgatory, but instead “sheweth the vertue of chrystes redemption which thorowe his bloude redeemed his captiues & prisoners that is to say them whom he founde bounde with the strong bonndes of synne to euerlastynge dampnacion which were subiectes vnto the deuell & the extreme enemies of god.” Nor does More’s argument from 2 Maccabees hold water, Frith maintained, because Jerome only accepted the book together with the other deuterocanonical books for its pious content, not to prove any article of faith from them. But even if 2 Maccabees could be used with the same authority as Isaiah, Purgatory cannot be proved by it. For the text does not speak of fire or pain, but of a sacrifice offered for the dead, that they might be liberated from their sins, because there is a resurrection of the dead that is painless and without any fire. According to Frith not even a child would believe that this text could possibly support the idea of a painful, fiery Purgatory to punish God’s elect. Furthermore, it is not

---

749 “That is/ he bryngeth men in to extreme affliccyon and myserye (whych is sygnifyed by deeth and hell) and after tourneth not his face vnto them & maketh them to folow hym” (Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sig. G3r). For More’s argument, see supra on p. 264.

750 Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sig. G3r. For More’s and Fisher’s arguments, see supra on pp. 264 and 256, respectively.


752 “But yet for this once/ to do the man pleasure we wyl let slyppe oure shoteanker and take the sees with him. And for all theyr furyous wyndes and frothye waues/ we wyl neuer stricke saile/ so stronge is oure shyppe & so well belanched. Be it in case that this boke of the Machabees were of as god auctoryte as Esay: yet can he not proue this furye and paynefull purgatorye therebye” (Frith, *A disputacio[n] of purgatorye*, sig. G7v).

certain, Frith believed, that Judas Maccabees’ action was good or should be followed by Christians who are not bound by the Jewish law.\textsuperscript{755}

Frith thought that More’s arguments from the NT were no better. In 1 Jn. 5:16, More took death for physical death, but according to Frith this is wrong because the verse also contains the word life, which should thus be taken for physical life. But the sin to which the epistle is referring is explained by Christ in Mk. 3:29: it is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which is, in Frith’s understanding, the refusal of faith.\textsuperscript{756} Nor does Frith agree with More’s interpretation of Rev. 5:13: the creatures that praise God under the earth are not the souls in Purgatory, but the worms and similar creatures within the earth.\textsuperscript{757} Furthermore, Frith argued, even devils and the damned souls in Hell praise God as part of their punishment.\textsuperscript{758} More’s argument from Acts 2:24 (Peter quoting Ps. 16:10) is also false: although the Vulgate uses the noun \textit{infernus}, which can refer to death, grave, or Hell, the Greek text has ‘pains of death,’ as is evident in Erasmus’ Latin translation, and not ‘pains of Hell,’ Frith explained, which More then interprets as Purgatory.\textsuperscript{759} Furthermore, this would mean that Christ spent the time between His death and resurrection in suffering in Purgatory.\textsuperscript{760} The words of the \textit{locus classicus} (1 Cor. 3:11–15), Frith maintained, are also used out of

\textsuperscript{755} Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sigs. G7r–H1v.

\textsuperscript{756} Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sigs. H4r–H5r. For More’s argument, see \textit{supra} on p. 265.

\textsuperscript{757} “And where he taketh the creatures vnder the erth for the soules in purgatorye: I take it for all manner of creatures vnder the erth/ bothe worms vermyn and all other” (Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sig. H6r). For More’s argument, see \textit{supra} on p. 265.

\textsuperscript{758} “I dare be bolde to adde that euen the verye deunls [sic] and damped soules are compelled to prayse him. For theyr just punyshment commendeth his puysante power and ryghtwysenes” (Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sig. H6r).

\textsuperscript{759} “Here in steade/ of these wordes/ the paynes of deeth/ he settheth the paines of hell (as it is most lyke) euuen of a purposed deceyte. For all be it the man wolde not take the payne to reade the greke/ yet ye hau had but once loked vppon the translacion of his olde fynnde and companion Erasmus/ it wolde hau auhte taught hym to haue saied solutis doloribus mortis/ that is/ dissoluynge the paynes of deeth/ accordyng to the greke & verye wordes of Luke which wrote these actes in the greke tongue. And alveit [sic] the olde translacion vseth this worde infernus/ which is dyversly taken in scrypture/ both for deeth/ for a graue & for hell/ yet in this place is Master More wythout excuse which calleth it hell in oure Englysshe tongue. For al be it the worde of it selle were indifferent in the laytne/ yet it is not indifferent in the Englysh. For there is none Englysh man that taketh this worde hell/ eyther for deeth or for a graue/ noo not Master More himselfe. For fyrst he translateth the texte falselye callyng it hell/ & then he discanteth on a false grounde & calleth hell not deeth/ but purgatorye” (Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sig. H6r–v). For More’s argument, see \textit{supra} on p. 265.

\textsuperscript{760} “Besides that/ yf it shulde serue for purgatorye (which no wyseman wyll graunte when he seeth the processe of the texte) it shulde prove nothinge but that Chryste shulde lye in the paynes of purgatorye/ vntyl god his father had holpe him out/ for the paynes
their context when they are interpreted as referring to Purgatory, because fire means temptations, tribulations, and persecutions in which the preaching of each of “goddes workmen” is tried and revealed whether their doctrine is built on Scripture or not. Yet even these preachers can be saved, since their false preaching is not out of malice but out of ignorance. And even if More is so “styfnecked” that he still takes this place as referring to Purgatory, then Purgatory, Frith said, applying Luther’s and Bugenhagen’s argument, is only for preachers. Nor can the young English Protestant accept the Lord Chancellor’s last two biblical arguments in Mt. 12:32.36, because there is no biblical foundation for the possibility of remitting sins after death and because More left out the last clause of v. 36, “in the daye of judgement,” which clearly shows that this text refers to the Last Judgement on Doomsday and not to Purgatory.

The last part of the volume is dedicated to refuting Fisher’s arguments. Most of the bishop’s scriptural arguments are already refuted in the second part of that same volume, Frith pointed out, because More took his arguments from Fisher, so the lion’s share of the attention is given to the abundant Patristic arguments of Fisher. Frith expressed his

which he speaketh of/ were Chrystes paynes/ whiche no man can denye yf he reade the text” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sigs. H6v–H7r).

Yf the worde that a man hath preached do abyde all assautes & temptations/ it is a token that they are surelye grounded on the scripture of god/ and then shall the preacher receyue his rewarde If any mannes worke be burnt/ then is it a token that they are not well grounded on scripture/ and so shall he suffer hurte/ for it shall be a greate cross and vexacyon to the preachers harte that he hath bene so deceyued himselfe and hathe also led other in to his errore” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sigs. H8v). For More’s argument, see supra on p. 267.

Notwithstoninge he shalbe saued/ because of his fayth in the fundacyon/ which is Chryst and his ignorauncce shalbe pardoned by the erreth not of a malicous purpose but of a good zeale. But yet shall it be as it were a fyre to him/ for it shal greue his harte to se that he had laboure in vaine & that he must destroye the same whith he before thorow ignorauncce preached: this is the process & pure vnderstondynge of the texte” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sigs. H8v–H9v).

“How be it the chefest of his scryptures hath master More pervsed & hath in a maner nothinge but that was before wryten by my lord of Rochestre/ sauiinge that he maketh the selye soules to pule to helpe his matter wyth all. My lord of Rochestre is the
amazement at Fisher’s tactic to prove the existence of Purgatory using Patristic arguments, since the bishop himself acknowledged that the Church Fathers make no or very few references to this doctrine. Now, the Church Fathers lived many centuries after Christ and they reacted to various heresies, Frith explained, so their testimony has to be seen in the context of these heresies. When Augustine used Paul’s words in 1 Cor. 3, he reacted against those who abused these words of the apostle and claimed universal salvation for all humankind through Purgatory. Augustine, to come ‘near’ the position of his adversaries, admitted that besides tribulations on earth, by fire Paul can also mean the purgatorial fire; however, the bishop of Hippo denied that everyone was going to be saved. But his acceptance of his adversaries’ position was only tactical, Frith maintained, and in another work Augustine confessed his true belief that all souls enter either Hell or Heaven immediately after death according to their merits. According to Frith, neither Ambrose

---

first patrone & defender of this phantasye. And euen as master More toke his work out of my lord of Rochesters/ euen so plucked Rastell as his boke out of Master Mores” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. K3'). The expression “selye soules” (silly souls) is used by More repeatedly to denote the helpless, miserable condition of the souls in Purgatory. The expression goes back to the Middle English seli or silli, and the Old English gesælig, meaning blessed, innocent. See: art. silly in AHD, ad vocem.

766 “I wondre what obliuiousnes is comen vppon him that he so cleaueth vnto the doctoures/ whom he affirmed before eyther to make no mencion of it or els verye seldome” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. K3'). For Fisher’s statement, see supra on p. 254.

767 “To speke of the doctoures & what their mynde was in this matter/ it were necessarie to declare in what tyme they were and what condicion the worlde was in in theyr dayes. S. Austyne, Ambrose and Hierome were in one tyme/ euen aboute iiiii. hundred yeare after Chryste/ & yet before theyr tyme were there arysen infinite heretykes by hole sectes/ as the Arryans/ Domitians/ Eunomians/ Vigilancians/ Pelagians wyth infinyte other/ whiche had in swerued fro the truth and wrested the scriptur out of frame that it was not possible for one man/ no nor for one mannes age to restore it agayne vnto the true sense” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. K3’).

768 “They affirmed that euerie man were he neuer so vicious shulde be saued thorowe that fyre” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. K4’). On the idea of universal salvation, see supra on p. 90.

769 “But after in his boke whych he entytled de vanitate huius seculi/ there doth he fullye sheue his minde in these wordes: Scitote quod cum anima a corpore auellit/ statim aut pro meritis bonis in paradiso collocatur aut pro meritis malis in inferni tartara precipitatur. That is/ wete ye well that when the soule is departed from the body/ eyther is it by & by put in paradise according to his good deserties: or els it is thruste hedlying in to hell for his synnes. Here he clene condemneth purgatorye. For if this be done by & by assone as the soule is departed from the bodie/ then can there be no purgatory” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. K4’). Frith is referring to a Pseudo-Augustine work that was considered to be authentic in the Middle Ages and was later frequently printed among Augustine’s works: e.g. in November 1472 in an anonymous publication in Lauenig (De vanitate saeculi), in 1475–76 by Conrad Fyner in Esslingen (De vanitate saeculi), in 1490 by
nor Jerome believed in the possibility of remission of sins after death.\textsuperscript{770} Further, if the Church Fathers do err, as Fisher asserted, how can one discern, Frith asked, which of their doctrines should be accepted and which not?\textsuperscript{771} According to the young theologian, this discernment cannot be the Pope’s task, because he is only a human being and can err just like the Church Fathers did. Consequently, only the Word of God, the touchstone of every doctrine, can be used to discern whether a certain teaching of the Church Fathers is true or not.\textsuperscript{772} But even when Scripture is applied to prove a point, Fisher misinterpreted those texts. It is impossible, for instance, to deduce anything about post-mortem existence, Frith contended, from Christ’s parable about the rich man and the poor Lazarus (Lk. 16:19–31).\textsuperscript{773} If there are some souls that are already in Heaven or Hell prior to the end of the world, as Fisher argued, then according to Frith, the resurrection of the flesh is in vain, and Christ’s and Paul’s arguments are worthless (Mt. 22:23–32 \textit{et par.; 1 Cor. 15}).\textsuperscript{774} Frith believed that the unfaithful are damned, but those who believe pass from death to life, and so when they die they rest in peace (Jn. 3:15,18; 5:24; Wis. 3:3). The souls of the righteous are therefore in the hand of God and are not tormented by

\begin{footnotes}
\item[770] Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sigs. K4v–K5v. For Ambrose, see \textit{supra} on p. 94. For Jerome, see \textit{supra} on p. 93.
\item[771] “Now sith the doctours somtyme erre & in certayne places are not to be admytted (as he graunteth him self) how shulde we knowe when to approue them/ & when to denye them?” (Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sig. K6v). For Fisher’s statement, see \textit{supra} on p. 255.
\item[772] “Therfore we must haue a iudge to discerne betwene trueth and falsehed. And who shuld that be: the pope? Nay verely for he being a man (as well the doctoures were) maye erre as they dyd/ and so shall we euer be vncertaine. Our iudge therfore must not be perciall flexible nor ignoraunte (& so are all naturall men excluded) but he must be inalterable/ euen serching the botome & grounde of all thynge. who muste that be? verelye the scripture and worde of god: which was gyuen by his sonne/ conffyrmed and sealed by the holy ghost/ & testyfied by myracles & bloude of all martyrs. This worde is the iudge that muste examyne the matter/ the perfeyte touchstone that tryeth all thynge and daye that dyscloseth all iuggeling mistes. If the doctoures saye anye thynge not dissonaunte from this worde then is it to be admytted & holden for truth: But yf any of theyr doctrine dyscorde from it it is to be abhorred and holden a curste” (Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sigs. K6v–K7v).
\item[773] Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sigs. K7v–K8v. For Fisher’s argument, see \textit{supra} on p. 256.
\item[774] “Notwithstandinge let me graunte it hym/ that some are all ready in hell & some in heauen (which thynge [sic] he shal neuer be able to proue by the scripture/ yee & which playnye destroyeth the resurrexxion & taketh awaye the argumentes wherwyth Chryste and Paule do proue that we shall ryse) yet I saye let me graunte it him to se howe he wyll conclude” (Frith, \textit{A disputacio[n] of purgatorye}, sig. K8v).
\end{footnotes}
the pains of Purgatory (Wis. 3:1), but God wanted us to be ignorant of the exact place where they are.\footnote{775} And the expression “Abrahams bosome” denotes “nothinge els than Abrahams fayth.”\footnote{776} Those who depart in this faith rest in peace and await the resurrection of the flesh.\footnote{777} It should be noted that Frith here does not explicitly affirm the doctrine of soul sleep, yet his agnosticism about the fate of the departed souls of the faithful and his explicit denial that they would already be in Heaven do seem to suggest such a tenet.

Frith claimed that some of the arguments Fisher, More, and Rastell put forward contradict each other—that they are illogical and the scriptural passages they used are actually arguing to the contrary. In fact, Frith asserted, he could not find any scriptural basis for the Catholic teaching at all. The human person is only purged by two things: the Word of God received through faith, and the spiritual cross of Christ borne through tribulations and adversities. “But our perfect purgacion is the pure bloude of Chryst whiche wasweth away the synne of the worlde.”\footnote{778} Anybody seeking any other satisfaction for sins than Christ’s blood despises His death.\footnote{779}

While in England in 1532, Frith composed a short commentary on the testament of William Tracy. This was only published posthumously

\footnote{775} “All that lyue are faythful or onfaythfull. If he be vnfaytfull then is he dampedned. Joan. 3. If he beleue then is he not condempned/ but is gone from deeth to lyfe. Joan. 3.5. The ryghtwyse man when he dyeth shall rest in peace. Sapi. 3. And every faythful man is ryghtwyse before god (as the hole pytstle/ to the Romans proueth: Ergo then every faythfull man shall rest in peace & not be tormented in the paynes of purgatorye. And as touchyng this ponyte where they rest/ I dare be bolde to saye that they are in the hande of god & that god wolde that we shulde be ignorau
te where they be/ & not to take vppon us to determine the matter’ (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. K8v–v).


\footnote{777} “He that departeth in this fayth resteth in peace and wayteth for the last daye when god shal geue vnto his faythful/ that is/ to his electe (for only are the electe fay
thfull and the faythfull electe) the crowne of his glorye which he hath prepared for them that loue him. This crowne doth paule say that he shall receaue it in that daye. 2. Tim. 4.[v. 8] that is in the daye of iudgement. And in the meane ceason god hath so prouyded for vs/ that they shall wayte vntyll the numbre of theyr brothren which dailie suffre & shall suffre for chryst/ be hoely fulfylled/ & so shall they not be made perfeyte wyth out vs. Hebre. xi. [v. 40]” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sigs. K8v–L1r).

\footnote{778} Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. L1v.

\footnote{779} “The scrypture knoweth no nother satisfactio
n to be made for synne towardes god/ but onlye the bloude of his sonne Jesu Chryst/ for yf there were an other satisfacion then dyed chryst in vayne: yee and he that seketh anye other satisfactyon for his synne (towards god) then chrystes bloude (which must be receiued with a repeeting heart thorow faith) doth despyse chrystes bloude & tredae it vnder his fete” (Frith, A disputacio[n] of purgatorye, sig. I5v).
around 1536, together with Tyndale’s comments on the same testament, found among Tyndale’s papers after his execution.\footnote{Antwerp: Merten de Keyser, 1536.} In a somewhat cryptic way, Frith hinted at the problems around Tracy’s peculiar expression “resurrection of bodye and soule.”\footnote{See supra on p. 252.} Tracy trusted that through the resurrection of Christ, he would have the resurrection of body and soul, Frith explained, and this is no reason to blame him, because Tracy followed Paul’s reasoning in 1 Cor. 15: “yf Christ be rysen/ then shall we also ryse.”\footnote{Tracy, The Testament of master Wyliam Tracie, sig. Cr.} But Christ is risen, Frith continued the explanation, “for his sowle was not lefte in hell/ therfore shall we also ryse (whom Christe shall bringe with him) and be immortalle/ both bodye and sowle i.Cor.xi.”\footnote{Tracy, The Testament of master Wyliam Tracie, sig. Cr.} Tracy’s trust is therefore both justified and devout.\footnote{“And therfore he [i.e. Tracy] doth both rightwislye and godlye deduce his resurrec-
tion by christes/ by whom the Father hath geuen vs all thinges/ or els we shulde not be” (Tracy, The Testament of master Wyliam Tracie, sig. Cr’).} Nonetheless, Frith’s commentary suggested, there were some people who blamed Tracy for advocating the mortality of the soul, but Frith thought that this charge cannot be based on Tracy’s words.\footnote{“But there are some/ that gather of his wordes/ that he shulde recounte the sawle to be mortall which thinge after my judgement is more suttellye gathered then eyther truely or charitabyle” (Tracy, The Testament of master Wyliam Tracie, sig. Cr”).} Tracy’s accusers claimed that the idea of the mortality of souls is unprecedented among Christians or pagans, but these are only unjust accusations, Frith argued, because no sensible person would even dream of holding such views; Tracy’s accusers must therefore be deliberately misunderstanding him.\footnote{“For seynge ther was neuer Christen man that euer so thoughte/ no not the verye pagaynes/ what godlye zele/ or brotherlye loue was there whiche caused them so to surmyse/ for a good man wolde not once dreame suche a thinge” (Tracy, The Testament of master Wyliam Tracie, sig. Cr’).} In fact, Tracy’s choice of words is perfectly acceptable because the soul does rise from the filth of sins at the resurrection, when together with the body it enters a new stage of life, in
which no sinning is possible. The verb ‘to rise’ is also used in Is. 2:19.21 (יהשע) to describe God’s manifestation of power and presence, so the same verb can also be applied to the soul, which lies in secret between death and resurrection, and manifests its power and presence only at Judgement Day, when it is reunited with the body. The language of Tracy’s testament is therefore only objectionable for nitpicking and malicious people, concluded Frith. Whom Frith was targeting in this passage is not entirely clear, but I believe that he could have been hinting at either More or Joye, and probably at both of them.

The Anabaptists

While the uniformity of their teachings spread over extended geographical regions and the exact origins of Anabaptism have been called into question, Tyndale, Joye, and their contemporaries used the term (in variation with Catabaptists) to describe certain groups of Reformers with radical teachings. In the eyes of Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Bucer, Tyndale, Joye, and their contemporaries used the term (in variation with Catabaptists) to describe certain groups of Reformers with radical teachings.

---

787 “But I praye yow why shulde we not saye that the sowle doth vererlye ryse which thorowe Christe risinge from ye fylthe of synne/ doth enter with the bodye into a newe concueracion of lyfe/ whiche they shall leade to gether with oute possibilite of synninge” (Tracy, The Testament of master Wylliam Tracie, sig. Cr).  
788 “We saye also of god (by a certayne phrase of scripture) that he arisethe/ when he openythe vnto vs his power/ and presence: And why maye we not saye the same thinge of the sowle which in the meane ceasone semeth to lye secret/ and then shall expresse vnto vs thorowe Christe her powe and persence/ in takynge agayne her naturall bodye” (Tracy, The Testament of master Wylliam Tracie, sig. Cr).  
789 “Why shulde ye then condempe these thinges/ Ther is no man that can receyue venome by those wordes/ excepte he haue suche a spiderowse nature that he can turne an honye combe into perelous poysone” (Tracy, The Testament of master Wylliam Tracie, sig. Cr).  
790 Surprisingly, Clebsch, who goes into great detail to explain that Joye defended the conscious state of the souls against psychosomnolence, wrote that Germen Gardynare published an attack on Frith in 1534 in which he “chided Frith for sharing Joye’s views on the somnolence of the souls of the dead until judgement day” (Clebsch, England’s Earliest Protestants, p. 129). Of course, Gardynare shared Joye’s views of the conscious state of the souls and chided Frith for advocating psychosomnolence (Germen Gardynare, A letter of a yonge gentylman named mayster Germen Gardynare, wryten to a frend of his, wherin men may se the demeanour & heresy of loh[n]n Fryth late burned/ & also the dyspycysons & reasonyne vpon the same, had betwene the same mayster Germen and hym, London: William Rastell, 1534). For More’s accusations of Lutherans advocating soul sleep, see supra on pp. 261–263. For Joye’s position, see infra on pp. 306ff and 366ff.  
and Bullinger, they were “disciples of and fellow-travellers with Müntzer, the Zwickau prophets, and the revolting peasants,” and as such were a danger to society and the Church of Christ. Their Catholic contemporaries held similar views. They were expelled and persecuted throughout Europe, even prior to the Münsterite adventure.

A radical group of Zwingli’s adversaries in Zürich was led by Konrad Grebel (c.1498–1526) and Felix Manz (c.1498–1527), who in October 1523 openly questioned Zwingli’s teachings and authority in Zürich. On the basis of a lack of scriptural foundation as well as a lack of willingness and ability to understand the gravity of the commitment, these radical Reformers denied the validity of infant baptism and had themselves as adults rebaptized, and therefore they became known as the Anabaptists. Their teaching spread very rapidly. One of their most renowned followers was the Bavarian Balthasar Hübmaier (1480–1528). During his visit to Zürich in 1523 he met Zwingli and they became friends. Although in a conversation on 1 May 1523 Zwingli apparently admitted to Hübmaier that the baptism of infants had no biblical foundation, he later turned vehemently against him and the Anabaptists. In 1525 Anabaptists were banned from the city. Nonetheless, when fleeing from his home in Austria in December 1525, Hübmaier sought refuge in Zürich. Contrary to Hübmaier’s expectations, Zwingli let him be seized, racked, and tortured. The torments made Hübmaier recant some of his beliefs, and as a result he...
was allowed to leave Switzerland. On 7 March 1526 the Zürich Council decreed that Anabaptists should be drowned. On 5 January 1527, Felix Manz became the first victim of the edict, and he was the first Swiss Anabaptist to be executed at the hands of the Protestants.  

A year after the open confrontation between Zwingli and the radical Reformers, in the autumn of 1524, Karlstadt sent his brother-in-law, Gerhard Westerburg, as an envoy to Zürich. Westerburg spent some six days in the town. By the time of his arrival the Zürich Anabaptists had already read his book about Purgatory, as is clear from Konrad Grebel’s letter to his renowned brother-in-law Vadian (Joachim von Watt, 1484–1551), reformer and mayor of St Gallen: “Nuncii nomen est Gerardus Westerburg, so forte legisti eius de sopore Animarum libellum.” It is also clear from Grebel’s remark that he understood Westerburg’s position as advocating the idea of soul sleep. While it is not entirely clear from Grebel’s letter whether he shared Westerburg’s opinions, it is not at all improbable. We do know, as has been seen, that according to Zwingli’s *Elenchus* (1527), one of the teachings of the Anabaptists was that the soul at the moment of death either sinks into a ‘sleep’ (an unconscious state) or dies with the body. Zwingli also intimated that they held that the soul only regains its active capacities and consciousness at the Day of Judgement, when it will be reunited with the body in the resurrection of the flesh.

This idea of soul sleep was, in fact, geographically widespread among Anabaptists. The tenet was clearly professed by Michael Sattler (c. 1495–1527), who fled from Strasbourg to Schleitheim (Switzerland), where he presided over the Anabaptist synod that formulated the famous Schleitheim Confession. He was, however, captured together with his wife and some other members of his circle. When Archduke Ferdinand suggested a ‘third baptism’ (drowning) for them, they were taken into Austrian territory (Hither) and brought to court. During his trial Sattler opposed the veneration of the saints on account that they, like the rest of the souls of 

---

796 Grebel was also imprisoned, but with some help he was able to escape and flee to his sister, who quickly afterwards he died of the plague in 1526.
798 See *supra* on p. 193.
the faithful, were sleeping and waiting for the judgement at the end of the world.\footnote{\textit{The Radical Reformation}, 1962, p. 186.} Psychosomnolence was also held by Augustine Bader, who held that the judgement of the world would arrive on Easter 1530, until which date all souls were sleeping.\footnote{\textit{The Radical Reformation}, 1962, pp. 188–89.} The Anabaptists of Esslingen also confessed to being adherents of soul sleep (November 1531).\footnote{The genuineness of their confession can be questioned, as it was given as a result of torture. See: \textit{The Radical Reformation}, 1962, p. 191.} Closer to Antwerp, the spiritualist Anthony Pocquet (\textit{c}.1500) from Enghien taught that the departed souls are sleeping until the end of the world.\footnote{\textit{The Radical Reformation}, 1962, pp. 354–55. For Calvin’s reaction, see: \textit{Contre la secte phantastique et furieuse des Libertins que se nomment Spirituels}, in \textit{Calvini Opera VII}, cols. 149–248. See also: Carlos M.N. Eire, \textit{Calvin and Nicodemism. A Reappraisal}, in \textit{SCJ} 10 (1979), pp. 44–69, esp. p. 52; Carol Thysell, \textit{Gendered Virtue, Vernacular Theology, and the Nature of Authority in the Heptaméron}, in \textit{SCJ} 29 (1998), pp. 39–53, esp. p. 46.} A barber-surgeon charged with believing in soul sleep was drowned in the Moselle at Metz.\footnote{\textit{The Radical Reformation}, 1962, p. 400.}

Coming from Switzerland, Strasbourg, and other main Anabaptist centres, Anabaptists also appeared almost simultaneously in France. Calvin found it necessary to react in 1534 when he wrote his celebrated book on the subject of soul sleep. The book was only published in 1542 under the title \textit{Vivere apud Christum, non dormire animis sanctos, qui in fide Christi decedunt.} Three years later it was republished with a changed title that became definitive: \textit{Psychopannychia, qua refellitur quorundam imperitosorum error, qui animas post mortem usque ad ultimum iudicium dormire putant.} Calvin again criticized the Anabaptists’ teaching about soul sleep in his \textit{Briefe instruction pour armer tous bons fideles contre les erreurs de la secte commune des Anabaptistes} (Paris: Iehan Girard, 1544).\footnote{Published in \textit{CR XXXV}, cols. 49–142. Calvin treats the subject of the immortality of the soul in cols. 127–42.}

As Anabaptism spread like wildfire, it soon found many followers in Antwerp, too.\footnote{I. Schöffer, H. van der Wee & J.A. Bornewasser, (eds.), \textit{De Lage landen van 1500 tot 1780}, Amsterdam: Agon, 1988, p. 63; Henry Pirenne, \textit{Histoire de Belgique}, vol. III, Brussel: Henri Lamertin, 1912, pp. 331–70, \textit{passim}.} In 1531 Mary of Hungary (1508–58), the regent of the Netherlands, issued an ordinance in which she commanded the city councils and governors of the provinces to search out Anabaptists everywhere and to take all necessary measures required by the situation.\footnote{\textit{Inventaire des Archives départementales du Nord}, tome V, Lille, 1885, pp. 44–45.} Despite
every effort by the religious and civil authorities, Anabaptism continued to spread. By 1534 Anabaptists abounded in practically every city and town in the Low Countries.\textsuperscript{809} In the city records of Antwerp we find several individuals being banned in the beginning of the very year of 1534 on the charge of Anabaptism.\textsuperscript{810} The sect was at last banned from Antwerp for good on 25 February 1534, under the threat of burning for men or drowning in the Schelde for women.\textsuperscript{811} Later ordinances tell us that the Anabaptists' presence in Antwerp did not cease instantaneously.\textsuperscript{812} A proclamation of 12 February 1535 explicitly names several adherents to the sect, and five days later Ieronymus Pael, “droogscheerder, van Keulen” and “herdoper,” was executed.\textsuperscript{813} On 7 March 1535 Dietrich Bitter complained in a letter from Cologne to Heinrich Bullinger that the Anabaptist heretics had spread all over the Low Countries: “Wyder synt angestochen an dusser verdoempter ketzeryen Denventer, Amsterdam, Hantwerp und vill kleyner vleckes Nidderlandts.”\textsuperscript{814}

In 1534, the Dutchmen Jan Matthys of Harlem and Jan Beukels of Leiden established their Anabaptist reign of terror in Münster. Their ideas about the earthly and immediate realization of the ‘New Jerusalem’ in a


\textsuperscript{812} We find later ordinances that prescribe e.g. the punishment of those who offer accommodation in secret to Anabaptists (Gérard, \textit{Antwerpisch Archievenblad}, vol. 2, p. 332, no. 26).

\textsuperscript{813} See supra on p. 5.

sort of fanatical eschatological communism became “la crise suprême de l'anabaptisme.” The affair started on the eve of Epiphany 1534, when two disciples of Jan Matthis arrived in the city. They converted and rebaptized Bernard Rothmann (c.1495–c.1535), who had been the leading Lutheran preacher in the town. Rothmann had been outlawed by Charles V, but the guildsmen of Münster protected him and the acts of the city council in August 1532 approved his teaching, against the will of prince-bishop Franz von Waldeck. When Matthis’ disciples arrived 1400 citizens were rebaptized on Rothmann’s authority within eight days, and more Anabaptists arrived, including Matthis himself and Jan Beukels. On 25 February Matthis announced his programme of cleansing the town of the ‘godless’ (all those who refused to accept adult baptism). Catholics and Lutherans had until 2 March to flee, after which date they could be killed if found within Münster. Matthis himself executed Hubert Ruescher, who had dared to call him a deceiver. When the city was besieged by the prince-bishop’s army, Matthis called on the “Covenanter” of the Netherlands to liberate the “holy city of Münster” and thus avoid the approaching Judgement of God. Monasteries were plundered and all privately owned money collected. Food and property were declared common possessions, although households could keep using whatever had belonged to them. Doors had to be kept open at all times. In a fanatic sortie on Easter Sunday (4 April 1534), Matthis, who believed that with God’s help he could beat the besiegers single-handedly, was killed together with thirty of his men. The control of the city fell into the hands of Jan Beukels, who appointed twelve Elders to govern the city and introduced a strict military regime of terror in the city. Crimes such as “blasphemy, seditious language, scolding one’s parents, disobeying one’s master in a household, adultery, lewd conduct, backbiting, spreading scandal, and complaining” were to be punished by death. On the testimony of the OT, polygamy was introduced in the “New Israel” that the Lord had restored in Münster, and unmarried women initially had no right to refuse the men who claimed them for

816 Rothmann had been criticizing infant baptism for some time, but his teaching, except on the Eucharist, was mainly Lutheran.
their wives. Having successfully resisted the attack of the episcopal troops in early September 1534, Jan Beukels had himself anointed and crowned by Jan Dusentschuer as “a king of righteousness over all.” This anachric crisis, threatening Catholics and Protestants alike, ended only on 25 June 1535, after the long siege of Münster and the military actions of the Count of Hoogstraeten. The whole story of the bloody terror of Jan Beukels in the role of King of Zion ruling over the starving population of Münster was published during the same summer in Dutch and in English by the same Merten de Keyser who published Tyndale’s works. But when Joye’s quarrel with Tyndale took place, the outcome of the story was not yet clear. In England Anabaptist beliefs were probably introduced by Dutch and Flemish adherents of the movement who fled from the persecutions on the Continent, but there is no significant presence of Anabaptist ideas in the British Isles prior to the late 1530s.

Conclusion to Chapter Three

Having reached the end of this chapter, the reader probably feels lost among such a wealth of literature. If this is the case, then I have achieved my goal. The number of works on beliefs concerning post-mortem existence in the early Reformation period is indeed overwhelming. Keeping in mind that my overview presents only a limited account of less then two decades of those authors and works that can be directly linked with the Tyndale–Joye debate, the reader’s own feeling of being overwhelmed by this account disproves the frequently repeated argument of what I called

824 Even the fall of Münster did not put a definitive end to the bloody history of Anabaptism. Various groups and offshoots continued to strive for a mystical revolution in a semi-religious, semi-anarchist way for the rest of the century. These incidents are nonetheless sporadic, and are of much less importance than the that of the Münsterites.
the conservative consensus on Joye—namely, that Joye’s “obsession” with post-mortem existence was an unprecedented, singularly strange interest in “obscure, irrelevant dogmatic problems” which jeopardized the reputation and unity of the Reformers.826 In fact, as is evident from what has been said, beliefs concerning post-mortem existence were not at all unified, and they constituted one of the pillars of Protestant Reformation. Leaving them out of consideration is therefore a misrepresentation of the subject.

This long and admittedly technical chapter had, of course, purposes other than simply disproving the aforesaid statement of the conservative consensus. As will be clear, and as Joye himself acknowledged, Joye was indebted to many of the above-mentioned authors and ideas. It is therefore useful to recapitulate the most important points discussed in this chapter before we turn to the actual debate.

The Protestant Reformation started with Luther’s stand against the practice of ‘selling’ indulgences to liberate souls from Purgatory. While Luther initially did not deny the existence of Purgatory, he and his followers were convinced that the Roman Catholic Church was wrong about Purgatory. There was, however, no consensus reached among the Reformers about its existence, its location, or its role in salvation.827 In the beginning Luther, influenced by Wessel Gansfort, believed in a spiritual purgation. His ideas were developed further by Karlstadt and Westerburg, who held that it was impossible to influence the fate of the souls in purgation. Later, Luther abandoned Purgatory altogether, and on the basis of Paul’s choice of words in 1 Thes. 4 and the language of the OT, the German Reformer began to advocate the idea of soul sleep, i.e. that (at least some) souls enter an unconscious state after death (psychosomnolence) and regain consciousness only at the end of the world, on Judgement Day, when people are resurrected both body and soul. Both Karlstadt and Westerburg were understood by their contemporaries as holding similar views, and the idea was held by various individuals and some radical groups of Reformers whom their contemporaries called Anabaptists. These groups were treated with much hostility not only by Catholic authorities but also by Protestants, because they were seen as representing a threat to public order, social peace, moral conduct, and religious stability. By the time of

826 See supra on pp. 44, 54, and 57.
827 Koslofsky, Separating the Living from the Dead, p. 143.
the Münsterite adventure in 1534–35, they had been expelled from various places under the threat of the death.

Other Protestant writers, such as Melanchthon, Zwingli, Bucer, and Bullinger, turned vehemently against Anabaptists. In the eyes of these Reformers, the Anabaptists’ advocacy of *psychosomnolence* is nothing less than the advocacy of *thnetopsyehism*, i.e. the idea that the souls die after death. These South German/Swiss Reformers were convinced that such a belief induced immorality because it removed the fear of and hope for a post-mortem retribution or reward. They argued that the Anabaptists were ignorant of the manner of speaking of the Bible, according to which ‘sleep’ is used as a euphemism for the death of the body, but the soul cannot cease to be, and so it is judged immediately after leaving the body at the moment of death. To support their position, the Anabaptists’ opponents referred to the Hebrew verb קָוֵם (translated by forms and cognates of the Latin *re)surgo* in the Vulgate), which term (together with the Greek counterparts derived from the verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω in the LXX and in the NT) can refer, according to them, not only to the resurrection of the flesh/body, but also to the immortality of the soul, or, more precisely, the intermediate state, the life of the separated soul between the time of death and the final resurrection at the end of the world. They were certain that this was the case in Jesus’ debate with the Sadducees (Mk. 12:18–27 *et par*). Also, Jesus’ parable about the poor Lazarus and the rich man was commonplace as a proof of the immortality of the soul. Westheimer’s and Brunfels’s practical publications, which were more accessible for a less educated readership than the theologically complex writings, filled with quotations in Greek and Hebrew, of the above-mentioned writers, popularized these arguments on a large scale among Protestants.

The Reformation was not exclusively shaped by theologians of importance; the early Reformation period also witnessed many popular upheavals and local movements that formulated criticism on various aspects of the Catholic Church. Many, if not all, of these related to dogmatic issues (such as the veneration of the Virgin Mary, veneration of the saints, and the existence of Purgatory), which also had a practical aspect in popular piety in relation to the beliefs of some kind of post-mortem existence.828

---

828 E.g. Pierre Bar, a convert to Judaism who was burnt at Rouen in 1528 for calling the Virgin Mary a whore; Pierre Rivière, an apothecary from Port-Ste-Marie in the Agenais who denied the existence of Hell and that Judas was damned; the adolescent son of a shoemaker who said that miraculous images were no different from the stone gods of the heathens and should be removed from Christian churches; and a sixty-year-old Parisian
In my chapter I have presented three English authors—William Roye, Simon Fish, and William Tracy—whose writings became a common heritage and source of inspiration of the early English Protestants.

The last three authors that were treated in this chapter were the Catholic apologists and martyrs Thomas More and John Fisher, and John Frith, the last of whom was an early companion of Tyndale and Joye during their exile in Antwerp and was also killed for his convictions. More and Fisher regarded Luther and ‘his sect’ in much the same way as Zwingli, Melanchthon, Bucer, and Bullinger looked upon the Anabaptists: a danger to social order and moral behaviour. Their fear was that by denying the existence of Purgatory; breaking the spiritual solidarity between the Churches Militant, Suffering, and Triumphant; and advancing predestination, Protestants undermine the fear and hope for a post-mortal retribution or reward, and thus provoke immoral behaviour just like those who believe that the souls die or sleep after death. Frith’s reaction was the denial of the mortality of the soul, but his agnostic approach to the fate of the departed souls seemed to a lot of his contemporaries to be an affirmation of such a belief.

In his study of popular dissent in the Low Countries in the 1520s, A.C. Duke discerned a development of points of attack, starting with indulgences and then moving on to Purgatory, then the veneration of the Blessed Virgin and intercession of the saints, and then finally the mass.829 David J. Nicholls has argued that this schema may be applied in a broad sense to France as well.830 It is worth noting that the issues mentioned by Duke and Nicholls all relate to the belief in a post-mortem existence. Even if it is impossible to prove or disprove the applicability or relevance of such a scheme to the early Reformation period in general on the basis of my cursory presentation of the beliefs concerning the issues of post-mortem existence in this chapter, the studies of Nicholls and Duke confirm my point that such beliefs were not only a ‘hot topic’ among the

---

who sustained several propositions on the invocation of saints against the monks and said that all Christians are priests (Nicholls, The Nature of Popular Heresy in France, pp. 273–74). Cardinal Giovanni Morone (1509–80), bishop of Modena, would write with horror that the people in Modena “nelle boteche si parla contra il purgatorio, contra la messa, contra la potestà ecclesiastica, contra l’invocazione de sancti et altri articoli non altrimente che si faccia in Germania” (Ludwig Cardauns (ed.), Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland 1533–1559 nebst ergänzenden Aktenstücken, VI, Berlin: A. Bath, 1909, no. 270, p. 91).


Reformers, but they constituted one of their main concerns.\textsuperscript{831} This concern was a quest to grasp and reformulate the original Christian message, based on Christ’s salvific death and bodily resurrection, for the faithful of their own era. Rather than be based on philosophical concepts, Patristic writings, or Scholastic theology, the formulation of this Christian message had to be based exclusively on biblical grounds, in the language and mindset of the Bible.

\textsuperscript{831} Cf. Trueman, \textit{Luther’s Legacy. Salvation and English Reformers, 1525–1556}, p. 130.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE TYNDALE–JOYE DEBATE IN ANTWERP

With Thomas More and John Frith in the previous chapter, we have already landed in the middle of the Tyndale–Joye debate. Therefore, we have to go back in time to the beginning of the course of events that led to the clash between these two characters of the early Reformation period. The story has to begin with the publication of Tyndale’s first NT edition in Worms, its early reprints in Antwerp by Christoffel van Ruremund, and the Protestant standpoint, shared by Tyndale and Joye, of rejecting the Catholic teaching on the invocation of the saints. Their diverging opinions on the state of the deceased are witnessed in Tyndale’s *Answere to Sir Thomas More* and in his *Exposition of the fyrste epistle of seynt Ihon* on the one hand, and in Joye’s *Letter to Hugh Latimer* on the other. Tyndale’s and Joye’s views clashed openly when the widow of Christoffel van Ruremund published Tyndale’s NT with Joye’s revisions in August 1534, in response to which Tyndale wrote his acerbic second foreword in November 1534. After a reprint of the NT with Joye’s editorial interventions, the climax of their debate was reached with Joye’s *Apologye*, published on 27 February 1535.

**TYNDALE’S WORMS NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS ANTWERP REPRINTS (1526–33)**

After an abortive attempt at Cologne, Tyndale printed his first full NT translation at Worms in 1526. Tyndale’s translation is important in the history of the English Bible because it is the very first English NT in print. Furthermore, by choosing one of Erasmus’ NT editions as *Vorlage* for his work, Tyndale produced the first English NT ever based directly on a Greek text. Notwithstanding Tyndale’s unquestionable but sometimes over-emphasized merit in going back to the original language, his choice was somewhat unfortunate because Erasmus’ text, based on late manuscripts,

---

1 On the abortive attempt at Cologne, see *supra* on pp. 14 and 247ff., esp. n. 644 on p. 249.

2 Tyndale probably used Erasmus’ 1522 Greek-Latin NT edition, usually referred to by the letter γ. See Juhász, *The Bible and the Early Reformation Period*, in *TT*, p. 29.
comprises many secondary readings, and in some cases is less reliable than the Vulgate. Furthermore, at times there are incongruities between the Greek text, Erasmus’ Latin translation, and Erasmus’ Latin commentary. The latter often seems to have been based on a Greek text that is different from the one included in his edition, and there are quite a few discrepancies between the commentary and Erasmus’ Latin translation. In addition, Erasmus’ Greek text includes some of his own translations from the Latin Vulgate into Greek. Therefore, a much more fortunate option for Tyndale could have been to base his translation on Cardinal Ximénez’ Complutensis, which encompassed a significantly better Greek text. Moreover, Tyndale followed Luther’s version in wording and theology. For contemporaries, it was unmistakably clear that Tyndale’s Testament was partial to Luther-

---

3 “Ironically, Erasmus also at times relied on late Byzantine manuscripts for his translation, and consequently, because of their late date, ended up accepting texts that were inferior to those which had faithfully been preserved in the Vulgate” (Joi CHRISTIANS, Erasmus and the New Testament. Humanist Scholarship of Theological Convictions?, in Trinity Journal 19 (1998), pp. 51–80, here p. 56). See also supra in n. 54 on p. 135.


5 The best known example is the case of the last few verses of the Apocalypse. Erasmus had difficulties in acquiring a Greek manuscript of the Revelation of Saint John for the printing of his 1516 bilingual edition. At last, the Hebraist Johannes Reuchlin lent him a copy, which Reuchlin had borrowed from a Dominican cloister. In this manuscript, however, the last six verses of the book were wanting. Because Erasmus was keen to be the first on the market with his edition, and because he knew that his competitor, Cardinal Ximénez, had already printed his Complutensis and was waiting only for the Pope’s approval to publish, Erasmus decided to translate the missing verses from the Vulgate back into Greek. In his Annotationes to the NT, he admitted his procedure, and eleven years later, in the fourth edition, he supplied the originally missing verses on the basis of the text in the Complutensis. There are, however, many other places where Erasmus preferred the Vulgate’s rendering to the Greek text. On Erasmus’ ‘back-translations’ and his use of the Vulgate, see: De JONGE, The Character of Erasmus’ Translation of the New Testament, pp. 82–83; Henk Jan De JONGE, Erasmus’ New Testament Translation Method, in The Bible Translator 37 (1986), pp. 135–38; Irena BACKUS, The Church Fathers and the Canonicity of the Apocalypse in the Sixteenth Century: Erasmus, Frans Titelmans, and Theodore Beza, in SCJ 29 (1998), pp. 651–66; Henk Jan De JONGE, Ex ipsis venis, ex ipsis fontibus. On the Importance and Necessity of the Critical Edition of Erasmus’ New Testament Works. De l’importance et de la nécessité d’une édition critique des œuvres d’Erasme sur le Nouveau Testament, Voor-thuizen: Florivallis, 2002. On Cardinal Ximénez and his Biblia Polyglotta Complutensis, see: JUHÁSZ, Cat. 29 in TT, pp. 84–85. See also: A. NEUBAUER, Alfonso de Zamora, in JQR 7 (1895), pp. 398–417; BENTLEY, Humanists and Holy Writ.

6 Admittedly, the large volumes of the Complutensis would have been much more cumbersome for someone on the move, although Tyndale did own at least one Hebrew Bible, which must have been of a comparable size.
anism and was prepared on a Lutheran basis. This is most evidently manifested in Tyndale’s choice of words. An example of this was seen in Tyndale’s preference to render the Greek πρεσβύτερος with the English ‘senior’ instead of the usual ‘priest.’ Although etymologically correct, the choice was seen as dogmatically motivated. Furthermore, despite its generally good readability, Tyndale’s text is not without fault; some of his renderings are less fortunate, and he left out words, clauses, and even entire sentences from his translation.

Tyndale himself was aware of the shortcomings of his version and in an epilogue he asked the “Christenly learned” reader not to take offence at the “rudnes off the worke” but to take into consideration that Tyndale was pioneering in the area of Bible translation and there was no antecedent that could have helped Tyndale’s work. Therefore, the reader should “count it as a thynge not havyng his full shape, but as it were borne afore hyse tyme, even as a thing begunne rather then fynesshed.” Tyndale promised in the epilogue to revise it “in tyme to come.” This revision, Tyndale specified, will include the reduction of redundancies and the supply of omitted phrases. In his revision, Tyndale also intended to give a clearer and better rendering of certain places: “to geve lyght where it is requyred and to seke in certayne places more proper englysshe.” He also called upon the educated reader to “bestowe unto the edyfyinge of Christis body (which is the congregacion of them that beleve) those gyftes whych they have receaved of god for the same purpose.”

7 Cf. More’s criticism supra on pp. 262ff, See also Cochlaeus’ words: COCHLAEUS, Commentaria, pp. 132–35.
8 In his later works Tyndale would render it with ‘elder.’ Similarly, Tyndale used ‘oversears’ instead of the traditional ‘bishop’ for the Greek ἐπίσκοπος in Acts 20:28. But he kept ‘bishop’ and ‘deacon’ (for διάκονος) in other places (e.g. Phil. 1:1; 1 Tim. 3:1f and 3:12; Titus 1:7). Tyndale held that priests had no sacramental (in the Catholic sense of the word) function, but only a teaching function: “Another worde is there in greke called presbiter/ in laten/ senior/ in english an elder and is nothinge but an officer to teach and not to be a mediator betwene God and vs. […] By a prest then in the new testamente vnderstonde nothynge but an elder to teach the younger and to bringe them vnto to the full knowlege and vnderstondinge of Christe and to minister the sacramentes which Christe ordeyned/ which is also nothynge but to preach Christes promises” (Tyndale, The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man, fos. 91v–92r).
9 For some of the omitted texts that were supplied by Joye, see infra n. 168 on p. 325.
10 T1526 344v.
11 “We will geve it his full shape: and putt out yf ought be added superfluusly: and add to yff ought be oversene thorowe negligence” (T1526 344v).
12 T1526 344v.
13 T1526 344v.
With the exception of the short epilogue, Tyndale’s Worms NT, unlike other scriptural publications of the time, lacked any aid that would assist its reader. The book contained no calendar, no maps, no list of Sunday readings, no concordances to parallel passages, no indices of passages or matters contained (save for a table of contents), no marginal notes, and no introductions at all. This was probably due to the hastiness of the edition.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite its deficiencies, the first printed English NT was immediately a bestseller. Tyndale clearly found an opening on the early English book market with his NT. For prior to the appearance of T\textsubscript{1526} (or rather the Cologne fragment), more than seventy years after the invention of the printing press with movable type and fifty years after the first printed English book,\textsuperscript{15} only a few dozen biblical verses had become available in print.

\textsuperscript{14} Modern scholarship tends to account for the lack of marginal notes (and introduction) in Tyndale’s first complete NT edition by pointing to the Protestant principle of \textit{sola scriptura} or by claiming that Tyndale consciously avoids polemics that take the reader’s attention away from the text. I believe this is mistaken. Tyndale argued against \textit{false} glosses but not glosses as such (cf. “Nowe yf thou geue the lawe a false glose . . .”; William Tyndale, \textit{An exposycyon vpon the.v.vi.vii.chapter of Mathewe}, fo. 3r). The Cologne fragment as well as every other biblical translation (and, in fact, every other work) by Tyndale did contain introductions and marginal notes. The fact that he thought it necessary to write commentaries on Jonah, the First Letter of Saint John, and the Sermon on the Mount shows that he thought that the biblical text needs explanation. Tyndale believed that just as nobody can read unless the alphabet is taught to him or her, nobody can understand the Scripture unless he or she has the evangelical faith and commitment in his or her heart. (“AS a man can by no meanes reade/ excepte he be first taught the lettres of the crosserowe/ euen so it is vnpossible for a man of what so euer degre or name he be of/ to understonde ought in the scripture vn to the honoure of god/ and healthe of his soule/ excepte he be first taught the professione of his baptym and hauet it also written in his herte”; William Tyndale, \textit{The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon with a Prologge before it: by W. T.}, A2r). Accordingly, as the title page of his commentary on the Sermon on the Mount shows, Tyndale thought that his own “exposycyon [was] the restorynge agayne of Chrystes lawe corrupte by the Papystes,” and that his “prologe [was] very necesary” because it contained “the whole sum of the couenaunt betwene God and vs, vpon which we be baptysed to kepe it.” Joye explicitly mentioned that on that point he differed from Tyndale: while Tyndale and his disciples argued for the use of notes and glosses, Joye preferred the plain text without notes. See \textit{infra} on pp. 417f.

\textsuperscript{15} The invention of the printing press with movable hand-set types cast in moulds is traditionally connected with Johann Gutenberg’s (c.1400–1468) name. Around 1450 he set up a press in Mainz, where he issued a large Latin Bible and some smaller books and leaflets. The printing of his Latin Bible (known variously as the Gutenberg Bible, Mazarin Bible, or 42-Line Bible) was finished before the end of 1456. The first book printed in English was issued about 1473 at Bruges (Brugge). The \textit{HEre begynneth the volume intituled and named the recuyell of the historyes of Troye, composed and drawnen out of dyuerce bookevs of latyn in to frensshe by the ryght venerable persone and worshipfull man. Raoul le ffeure, preest and chapelayn vnto the ryght noble gloryous and myghty prync e in his yme Phelip duc of Bourgoynue of Braband &c in the yere of the incarnacion of our lord god a thousand foure
in English; among the most important of these was Bishop John Fisher’s translation of the penitential psalms and the scattered scriptural quotations Fisher used in his commentary and the English version of the Our Father. The lack of availability of biblical texts in the vernacular was due to a century of strict ecclesiastical control over the translation of the Scripture. This exacting ecclesiastical control can also partly account for Tyndale’s success: general curiosity was undoubtedly awakened by the excessive reaction of the English hierarchy. In addition to the (sometimes overemphasized) genuine interest to read the Bible in the vernacular, the air of prohibition, recalcitrance, and secrecy made Tyndale’s NT very appealing to the public.

It comes as no surprise, then, that Tyndale’s NT was reprinted by an adventurous but commercially astute printer in Antwerp within a year. The original octavo edition at Worms had a run of at least 3000

---

honderd sixty and foure, and translated and drawen out of frenshe in to englisshe by Willyam Caxton mercer of ye cyte of London, at the commaundement of the right hye myghty and vertuouse pryncesse hys redoubtyd lady. Margarete by the grace of god. Duchesse of Bourgoyne of Lotryk of Braband &c., whiche sayd tranlsacion and werke was ...fynysshid in the holy cyte of Colen the. xix. day of septembre the yere of our sayd lord god a thousand foure honderd sixty and enleuen [sic] &c... was originally composed by Raoul Lefèvre, chaplain to Philip, duke of Burgundy, in 1464, and was translated from the French in 1471 by William Caxton (c.1425–1491), encouraged by Margaret, duchess of Burgundy. In 1476 Caxton returned to England and set up the first English printing press at Westminster.

16 Psalms 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, 130, 143. John Fisher, *This treatyse concernyng the fraytfull saynges of Davyd the kynge & prophete in the seuen penytencyall psalmes*. deuyded in seuen sermons was made and compyled by the ryght reuerente fader in god Iohan fyşher doctour of dyuynyte and bysshop of Rochester at the exortacion and sterynge of the moost excellente pryncesse Margarete countesse of Rychemount & Derby, & moder to our souerayne lorde kyngge Henry the. vii, London: Wynkyn de Worde, 1508. The English version of the Our Father was published in a primer in 1523 by Christopher van Ruremund, whose wife later published Joye’s *Apologye*: see supra in n. 71 on p. 20.

17 See supra n. 39 on p. 13.

18 The interest in Bible reading was already awakened by Lollardism, which was present in all levels of the society. This interest is clearly attested to by the pamphlet of Richard Ullerston (d. 1423), *A compendious olde treatyse, shewyng howe that we oughte to haue ye scripture in Englysshe*. It has been suggested that the pamphlet was edited by Jerome Barlowe, William Roye, or William Tyndale, for publication by Merten de Keyser with his usual false address “at Marlborow in the lande of Hessen: Be my Hans Luft” in 1531. On the influence of the Lollard Bible, see: Margaret Deanesly, *The Significance of the Lollard Bible*, (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought), Cambridge: UP, 1966; Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation. Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1988; Smeeton, *Lollard Themes in the Reformation Theology of William Tyndale*.

19 Andrew Hope has argued in a lecture at a meeting of the Tyndale Society that the Antwerp publications were not secondary to the Worms edition (private communication by Guido Latré). Joye, however, clearly speaks about the Antwerp publications as based on an acquired printed copy and not as publications commissioned by a publisher. (“Tindal aboute.vijj. or. ix. yere a goo translated and printed the new testament in a mean great
(possibly 6000) copies. The first Antwerp reprint, a handy little sextodecimo, is estimated to have had a print run of between 2000 and 3000 copies.\textsuperscript{20} Although the text was not changed, the addition of a calendar and the usual marginal references to parallel passages made the edition more appealing for the reader compared with Tyndale’s original work. Due to its reduced size, the book was easier to hide than the “mean great volume” of T\textsubscript{1526}.\textsuperscript{21} Nonetheless, the edition was produced without an English-speaking corrector, with the predictable consequences regarding the spelling.\textsuperscript{22}

The unremitting supply of English Lutheran NTs troubled the English authorities. Although printers of clandestine publications resorted to pseudonymity to mislead the censors (some claimed to have been printed in Utopia, others in St Peter’s at Rome [\textit{cum privilegio apostolico}], and still others in Basle by Adam Anonymous), the evidence trail led to Antwerp. Both Archbishop Warham and Cardinal Wolsey sent their envoys to Antwerp to detect and eliminate its source. In May and June 1526 Warham’s representative bought up all of the available copies of Tyndale’s Testament in order to destroy them. This, of course, had just the opposite effect: instead of cutting the supply of English Lutheran NTs, it improved the financial situation of the printer, and indirectly that of the English Protestant community in Antwerp. A few months later, by the middle of November 1526, Wolsey’s agents identified the printer in the person of Christoffel van Ruremund, also known by his place of origin as Christoffel van Endhoven (active 1522–31). He was by no means new to printing Protestant books: in 1525 he had put out a Dutch translation of Luther’s German NT. This Dutch version was not only based on Luther’s text but also contained a Lutheran prologue, and the text was furnished with numerous Protestant glosses, so the book was soon suppressed.\textsuperscript{23} Due to diplomatic pressure from Henry VIII and from Cardinal Wolsey exercised through John Hackett, the newly appointed English ambassador to the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{20}Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. C\textsubscript{5r}.
\item \textsuperscript{21}Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. C\textsubscript{4r}.
\item \textsuperscript{22}“But yet/ for that they had no englishe man to correcke the setting/ thei themselue haung not the knowlege of our tongue/ were compelled to make many mo fautes then were in the copye/ \& so corrupted the boke that the simple reder might ofte tymes be taryed \& steek” (Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. C\textsubscript{4r}).
\item \textsuperscript{23}A year later he republished his NT in a slightly revised adaptation (based on the Vulgate or Erasmus’ Latin translation) and left out the annotations and the prologue. See \textit{Arblaster, Cat. 60 in TT}, p. 119.
\end{itemize}
Court of Margaret of Austria, governess of the Low Countries, Christoffel van Ruremund was arrested. Yet both the Antwerp authorities and Margaret of Austria were reluctant to act against their own citizens merely upon a foreign demand, so they demanded that the books be translated into Dutch so that they could be assessed. Since the translation of Tyndale’s English NT into Dutch made little sense, Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall provided a certificate in December 1526 that the translation was indeed heretical. But the Antwerp authorities, who were obviously concerned with the predictable negative mercantile effects of a possible condemnation of the printer, found Tunstall’s certificate insufficient for a conviction. Ultimately, a compromise solution was found: on 16 January 1527 a proclamation was published that ordered the confiscation and burning of all discoverable copies at Antwerp and Bergen-op-Zoom. Christoffel van Ruremund was released without trial.24

Encouraged by the fortunate outcome of his indictment, Christoffel van Ruremund republished Tyndale's NT around 1530–31 in order to meet the unceasing demand for the new English translation of the NT. Similarly to the original Worms edition, this publication, again with a run between 2000 and 3000 copies, took the form of an octavo. This time, the book also contained illustrations for the book of Revelation.25 In order to encourage the sale of his newly printed English NT, van Ruremund himself travelled to England. The English authorities, however, were much less tolerant towards religious dissent, and as a result the Flemish printer was soon arrested for selling the Lutheran NTs of Tyndale and was imprisoned in Westminster, where he died in 1531. His business was taken over by his wife, Catherine, who ran the press until the middle of the 1540s.

When the 1530–31 reprints were sold out, the widow decided to publish a reprint of Tyndale’s translation. The previous two reprints had been set and published without any English-speaking corrector, a fact which resulted in a corrupted text that was difficult to read.26 This, of course, could be disadvantageous from a commercial point of view, so for the new edition the widow van Ruremund turned to Tyndale (who in the meantime had moved to Antwerp) to ask him to revise and correct his original text, as he had promised in his epilogue of T1526. Tyndale did not

24 See Hope, Cat. 94 in TT, pp. 151–52.
25 “After this thei printed it agein also without a correctour in a greater letter & volume with the figures in the apocalipse” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C4*).
26 “After this thei printed it agein also without a correctour […] whiche were therfore miche falser then their firste” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C4*).
comply with the widow’s request. Perhaps he was discontented with the fairly moderate remuneration the widow offered him, or he had already reached an agreement with Merten de Keyser for the publication of his revised version. At any rate, Tyndale’s own revision was not yet finished, so the widow had to look for an English-speaking corrector for her edition, as she was determined to put out the book again. And thus George Joye, another Protestant English exile in Antwerp, was asked to do the job.

Catherine van Ruremund’s choice of Joye as corrector was, so to speak, self-evident. George Joye already had several years of experience as a Bible translator. His translations provided the texts for the first English printed versions of a series of OT books. As has been pointed out, the first of these was the first printed English Psalter in 1530, which was based on Bucer’s pseudonymous psalm commentary. Prior to that (probably in 1529), Joye had published a Primer, the first Protestant prayer book in English, which already contained the English translation of some thirty psalms. The Primer was reissued under the title Ortulus animae in the same year that the first Psalter appeared. He also published the first printed English versions of the Book of Isaiah (1531), Proverbs (1533), and Qohelet (1533). At the time, Joye was working on his other OT translations for a rival press—namely, those of Jeremiah and a fresh translation of the Psalms, both of which were to appear over the course of the year 1534 from the press of Merten de Keyser.

The widow’s request to Joye concerning the correction of the corrupted text, however, was turned down. Joye, like Tyndale, refused the widow’s offer. He tried to dissuade her from publishing the reprint, arguing that while he would be doing the correction, Tyndale might publish his own, 

27 Joye tells us that he received the total sum of 14 Flemish shillings for his corrections. This is about one tenth of the money Tyndale worked for (£10). (Joye, Apologye, sig. C5v). See infra pp. 354–55, exp. n. 316 and pp. 358–61.
28 Tyndale’s rejection is usually explained as his desire to write his other works, and that he wanted to translate the whole of the OT first. Nonetheless, he did find time to revise his translation of Genesis, of which the first version was only produced in 1530.
29 See supra on pp. 21 and 208.
30 This Primer is no longer extant.
31 See supra on p. 21.
32 Joye, The Prophete lsaie. Proverbs (1533) and Qohelet (1533) have only survived in their London reprint dating from a year later: [George Joye (trans.),] The prouerbes of Solomon/ newly translated into Englyshe, London: Thomas Godfray, 1534; [George Joye (trans.),] Here foloweth the boke of Solomon called Ecclesiastes/ (which is to say in Englishe a precher), London: Thomas Godfray, 1534. (The two are bound in one volume.) See infra n. 608 on p. 415.
33 Joye, Jeremy the Propheete; Joye, Davids Psalter.
corrected translation, in which case the widow could not publish the old version (and thus Joye’s corrections would be done in vain) or her books would not sell. Nonetheless, Catherine van Ruremund went on with the publication, and the third van Ruremund edition of Tyndale’s NT came from the press around the end of 1533 or early 1534. This reprint, in the form of a sextodecimo, had a print run of around 2000 copies. In spite of the fact that the readability was even worse than that of the previous two editions, the stock was soon sold out.

A Common Protestant Basis

Before advancing the story that will lead to the open clash between Tyndale and Joye, their common theological ground should be pointed out. For although, as will be apparent, Tyndale and Joye had developed differing theological views by this time (1533/1534) on the fate of the deceased, their opinions were founded on common ground: the rejection of the Catholic teaching on salvation. Dissatisfied with the contemporary English Church, both Tyndale and Joye embraced the cause of a Reformation and sought a renewal to return to what they believed was the original message of Christ. Both English divines believed that justification can be achieved only by faith (sola fide) and that salvation is a free gift of God (sola gratia) through Christ’s meritorious death, which is the token of the new covenant between God and humankind sealed with Christ’s blood. They consented that God’s Word, as preserved in the Bible, is the sole authority in matters of faith (sola scriptura) and that everything that cannot be founded on Scripture is human tradition that accreted to and covered the true sense of God’s Word. They both had reservations vis-à-vis the Vulgate and advocated the priority of the original texts. On the basis of these principles they both came to the conclusion that the Catholic teaching on post-mortem issues was wrong. Since Tyndale’s theology has been studied frequently and comprehensively, his position will be presented only concisely, and most of this section will be dedicated to presenting Joye’s position.

The picture of the Church that emerges from Tyndale’s works is one of greedy and hypocritical prelates, of selfish bishops and deceitful priests

34 Joye, Apologye, sig. C5’.
35 “The dewch men prynted it agen the thyrde tyme in a small volume lyke their firste prynt/ but miche more false then euer it was before” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C4’).
and monks headed by the Pope, whose only authority is to preach God's word; but the Pope neglects this duty and usurps God's place. They are all “shameless jugglers,” the Antichrist's agents who have one common goal: to deceive the common people, to conceal Christ's Gospel, to hide the key of knowledge, to “stoppe vpp the kingdom of heuen,” and to indulge in their own pleasure, in “fylyth lucre and abhorringe couvetousnes.”

Tyndale believed that part of this deceit was the various Catholic doctrines relating to the post-mortem existence. The Gospel does not require satisfaction or good works for sins (for “vnto Godwarde Christ is a perpetuall and an euerlastinge satisfaction for euer moare”) but repentance from sin, which is followed by faith in Christ and in His salvific death and should be a lifelong attitude of a Christian. This faith achieves justification. Accordingly, Tyndale saw Purgatory as unscriptural, an invention of the Pope to extract money from the people. The idea is superstitious, adopted from pagan religions, and thus sinful. So is the teaching on indulgences, which applies Christ's and the saints' merits to redeem souls from Purgatory, and the teaching on the sacrament of penance, which uses superstitious ceremonies and concords with the teachings of the Pharisees, who put their hope “in the dedes of the ceremonyes whych god ordeyned not to iustifie but to be signes of promises by which they that beleued were iustified.”

No mass can save the deceased from his sins, and sometimes people keep praying for those benefactors who bequeathed their fortune to pray for their souls, even after they have been declared saints and their prayers are sought by the living. Furthermore, praying to the saints is meaning-

---


37 Tyndale, The obedient[ience of a Christen man, fo. 99v. See also: “Penaunce is a worde of their awne forginge to disceave vs with all/ as many other are. In the scripture we fynde penitentia repentaunce. Agite penitentiam/ do repente/ Peniteat vos/ let it repente you. Metanoyte in greke/ forthinke ye/ or let it forthinke you. Of repentaunce they/ have made penaunce/ to blynde the people a


less, as they are not better than anybody else who believes in Christ: once
the Christian man has come to the full knowledge of Christ, he or she
is “as safe as Paul” and is “fellow with Paul.” The saints were not saved
on account of their own merits, but “by Christes merites only,” so their
merits cannot save anyone else. According to God’s promise, Christ’s
merits are enough to save everyone, so no saints’ merits are needed. The
only reason “to hire freres/ monkes/ nunnes/ chanons/ and prestes” and
“to hire the sayntes that are deed to praye for vs” is to enrich them, but
these prayers are not only ineffective but “kepe vs from Christ.” In fact,
the saints, even though they are dead, rob people faster than they ever
did in life.

Joye’s position was similar. His first publication in Antwerp was his
Primer, which is now lost but was described by the Publick Instrument
as well as by More. Primers, as has been noted, were popular prayer
books for the laity. As primers were not official ecclesiastical publica-
tions, there had been little or no strict regulation of their exact contents.
They were from the beginning a compilation centred around the Book
of Hours. They generally contained an almanac or table to find the date
of Easter, a calendar of feasts of the saints, the Paternoster, the Creed,
and the Ten Commandments. They could include short expositions on
religious themes or edifying treatises, as well as approved special prayers
and graces and some formula for the confession of sins. The heart of a
primer always consisted of the shortened form of the canonical hours, the
litany, the Dirge, the seven penitential psalms, and other observances of
the Church for the use of laymen.

Both More and the Publick Instrument mention that Joye tendentiously
omitted some of the standard elements from his compilation and that his
prayerbook advocated heretical tenets. These omissions and unortho-
dox opinions deserve our attention here, as they are relevant to our topic.
According to the Publick Instrument, it is declared in “the kalender of the

---

41 Tyndale, The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man, fo. 117r.
42 Tyndale, The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man, fos. 103r and 118r–v.
43 Tyndale, The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man, fo. 103r.
44 Tyndale, The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man, fo. 117v.
45 See supra on n. 72, p. 21.
48 See supra p. 21.
prymar” that “God toke Enoche away (that is to say) he departed owt of this worlde like other men.” This is, according to the royal commission, a mistranslation of the biblical text, which says that God transferred (and not took away) Enoch. Moreover, the author of the Primer wrote also in “the kalender” that the meritorious intentions of David and Nathan were worthless when they built the Temple in Jerusalem. Another objection against the compiler was that “He puttith in the boke of the vii. Psalmes, but he leveth owt the whole latanye/ by which apperith his erronymous opynyon agenst praying to saintes.” This criticism is repeated by More, who, based on hearsay information, correctly credited Joye with the authorship: Joye’s Primer, More intimated, contained the seven penitential psalms, but not the litany “leste folke shold pray to sayntes.” Also, the hymns and anthems to Our Lady were left out, as was the “Dirige,” “leste a man might happe to pray theron for hys fathers soule.” In his second Primer, the Ortulus anime, Joye omitted the prayers addressed to the Blessed Virgin and the collects of saints from the canonical Hours and replaced the traditional antiphon of the invitatory Psalm, “Ave Maria gratia plena, dominus tecum,” with “Come vnsto me all ye that labour and are laden: and I shall refreshe yowe” (Mt. 11:28), although the illustrating woodcut still illustrates the Annunciation. At the end of Compline, Joye included the Salve Rex, a paraphrase of the Salve Regina addressing Christ instead of the Blessed Virgin, which became immensely popular among the Reformers.

Evidently Joye shared Tyndale’s views on the ineffectiveness and blasphemous character of the prayers to the saints. He believed that “all men ar synners: yat as many as shalbe saved shulde by saved by goddis mercy

---

49 “Primo male vertit, nam scriptura dicit, transstulit, non abstulit” (quoted by Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, vol. 3, p. 727).
50 Wilkins, Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, vol. 3, p. 727.
53 Joye, Ortulus anime, sig. Li’. After the Sign of the Cross, the Creed, and the Paternoster, however, Joye also included the simplified version of the Hail Mary (containing only the first, scriptural part of the prayer) in the section entitled A fruteful & a very Christene Instruccion fore childrene (sigs. H1r–H5r): “HAyle Mary/ greaty in goddis favoure/ the Lorde is withe the/ blessid arte thou above wemen for the blessed frutes sake of thy wombe. Amen” (sig. H2r).
54 “Hayle (Iesu christe) kinge of mercye ower lyfe/ ower swetnes/ and ower hope/ We salute the: vnsto the we krye which are ye banneshed chyldren of Eue: vnsto the we syghe/ sobbinge and wepinge in this vale of wretchednes: haste ye therfor ower mediator: turne vnsto vs those thy mercyfull eyes” (Joye, Ortulus anime, sig. Q3r–r).
onlye." Faith alone justifies the human person, without any works. The Christian hope is therefore based on the faith in Christ and His promises, "for if we gete vs faithe of owre owne fasshoninge wherby we beleve and truste in eny wother thinge then god, then make we vs an idole: for it is the faithe and truste only in owre hartes that maketh other god or ydole." This, however, did not keep Joye from creating a new saint by ‘canonis-ing’ Thomas Hitton, one of the English Protestants who was executed on 20 February 1530 for his beliefs; Joye inserted the feast of “Sainte Thomas mar.” into the calendar of his Ortulus anime at the date 23 February. Yet Joye believed that Hitton’s martyrdom did not justify him; it only testified to his faith, to God’s grace, and to the fact that he was one of God’s elect according to God’s predestination. As they are for Tyndale, the saints are but examples for Joye. Therefore, Joye gave a new interpretation for the expression “the relics of the saints” in order to offset the veneration of saints’ relics. This expression does not signify the earthly remains and bones of the saints, but the few elected people who remained faithful to God, as Joye explained in connection with the feast Relic Sunday, the Sunday after the feast of St Thomas of Canterbury in July.

---

58 Cf. “And More amonge his other blasphemies in his Dialoge sayth that none of vs dare abyde by our fayth vnto deeth: but shortlye therafter/ god to proue More/ that he hath euer bene/ euen a false lyare/ gaue strenght vnto his servaunte syr Thomas Hitton/ to confesse and that vnto the deeth the fayth of his holie sonne Iesus/ whiche Tomas the bishopes of Caunterburye & Rochester/ after they had dieted and tormentend him secret-lye murthered at Maydstone most cruellye” (Tyndale, *The practysye of Prelates*, sig. R6r). Later More criticized Joye’s *Ortulus*: “In theyr calendar before theyr deuelout prayers, they haue sette vs a new saynt/ syr Thomas Hitton the heretyke that was burned in Kent, […] they haue as I sayde sette his name in the cale-ndar before a boke of theyr englyshe pray-ours, yn the name of saynt Thomas the martyr, in the vigyle of the blessed apostle saynte Mathye, the xxiii. daye of February” (More, *The confutation of Tyndales answere*, sigs. Bb2r and Bb3r).
59 “Whom God knows before his electe and chosen (saith Paule. Rho.8.) them hath he determined to make like ye ymage of hys sonne/ for it is he yat was ye firste begoten emonge many that are his brotherne” (Joye, *Ortulus anime*, sigs. A6v–A7v).
61 “The sondaye after the feste of Saynte Thomas is ever Relique Sondaye. If ye childrene of Israel were as many in nowmbre as the sandes of the see: yet shall there be saued but thereire reliques that is to saye but very fewe esaye in the tenthe chapter and alleged of Paule in ye nyenthe to the Rhomans” (Joye, *Ortulus anime*, sig. A7v*). See also: Butterworth, *The English Primers*, p. 29.
Christ died for humankind, and by his death and resurrection He obtained justification for the believer. The circumcision in the OT, Joye argued, was the prefiguration of baptism, which in turn is the prefiguration of the cross. Through baptism the believer participates in Christ’s death and resurrection; so by Christ’s death on the cross and through the Holy Ghost, the believer is revived in baptism “in fassheninge daylye to be like Christ to suffre/ to dye and to ryse with him in a gloriouse immortale state.” It is this daily suffering, the daily mortification of the flesh, that is the true purgation of the human person, “of this fyer of purgatory spoke Johan baptist. Mat.3. and Luc. 3.” But no other Purgatory exists, Joye maintained, for Christ’s meritorious death purged all sins.

Tyndale and Joye were thus seemingly in agreement on issues with regard to matters concerning post-mortem existence. They both rejected Purgatory and the intercession of the saints. They both believed that God punishes wicked and faithless people with damnation and that God saves the elect who believe in Him and gives them eternal life. But as subsequent events will make clear, there was one important question on which they disagreed: when will this reward or punishment take place?

DIVERGING OPINIONS: TYNDALE’S POSITION ON SOUL SLEEP

Shortly after publishing his NT at Worms, Tyndale himself moved to Antwerp, where he started to translate the OT. His translation of Genesis appeared in 1530, followed by the other books of the Torah. Besides his Bible translations he also produced two apologetical works and two short
commentaries in Antwerp. Our interest here lies in one of his apologetical works and in one of his commentaries, viz. his *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge*, and *The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon*, both published in 1531.

While in his *Obedience* (1528) Tyndale was still careful not to give away that he followed Luther and believed the souls of the dead to be inactive, three years later in his *Answere* he was more outspoken on the issue. As the reader will remember, More, while arguing for the existence of Purgatory, had alleged that Christ’s answer to the Sadducees proved that the saints are alive and are already in Heaven (Mt. 22:32). Tyndale, as has also been observed, believed that the veneration of the saints was something utterly un biblical, and therefore heretical and idolatrous. Hence, he took great pains to disprove More’s argument. He claimed that More’s reading of Jesus’ answer to the Sadducees is not correct and that More “steleth awaye Christes argument where with he proueth the resurrection.” In fact, Tyndale stated, More made “Christes argument

---

67 See supra on p. 15.
68 Tyndale, *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge made by Uvillyam Tindale*, Antwerp: Symon Cock, July 1531; Tyndale, *The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon*. In his *Apologye*, Joye wrote that “Frith wrote tindals answers to More for tindale/ and corrected them in the prynte/ and printed them to at Amelsterdam” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. E1v). This has been sometimes interpreted as if Joye suggested that Frith was the author of the book. Nonetheless, the other references to the *Answere* in the *Apologye* do not mention anything about Frith, but constantly call it Tyndale’s work. And even in this particular passage Joye clearly identifies Tyndale as the author of the work: “and whether he [i.e. Frith] winked at T. opinio[n] as one haung experience of Tindals complexion, or was of the same opinion I ca[n] not tel” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. E1r–v). Clebsch is therefore probably correct in his interpretation of Joye’s words. He pointed out the difference in style between the discussion on what the church is, the explanation of Tyndale’s choice of words in the NT, the discussion on worship, the discussion of the possibility that the Church might err, etc. on the one hand, and the section entitled *The solutions and answeres vnto M.Mores [books]* on the other—the section that refutes the Lord Chancellor’s work point for point. Clebsch also observed that in this section the use of biblical passages is foreign to Tyndale’s practice: the quotations diverge from Tyndale’s own translation (often choosing an inferior word), and the author frequently uses the Latin text as the basis from which to argue. According to Clebsch, Joye’s words have to be taken in the literal sense, meaning that Frith not only supervised the printing and did the proofreading of the book but actually “wrote [the] answers” (in the plural!) to More’s criticism, which were then used by Tyndale in his work. “Joye’s accusation taken literally is fully credible, and Frith may be assigned the rôles, with respect to the Answer to More, of research assistant and supervisor of printing” (Clebsch, *England’s Earliest Protestants*, pp. 94–98, here 97).
69 In *Obedience*, Tyndale described how intercession might work with the conditional: “If Paul were here and loved me […]” (Tyndale, *The obedie[n]ce of a Christen man*, fo. 117r).
70 See supra on p. 261.
of none effecte” because Christ’s point in that passage is to prove that there is a resurrection, and “so [Christ] proueth that Abraham must rise agayne.”

According to Tyndale, More’s interpretation of the passage necessarily denies the resurrection by asserting that the souls of the blessed are already in Heaven. But if this is the case, Tyndale argued, then Paul’s proof of the resurrection is worthless in 1 Cor. 15, where the Apostle wrote: “if there be no resurrectio, we be of all wretches the most miserablest.” Here on earth, there is “no pleasure/ but sorrow/ care/ and oppression,” as Tyndale interpreted Paul, and “therefore if we rise not agayne/ all our sufferinge is in vayne.”

But if More is right, Tyndale maintained, then Paul’s argument was pointless, because in that case we would not be the most miserable, even if there were no resurrection of the flesh, because our soul would enjoy heavenly bliss upon death. Yet it is strange, Tyndale argued, that Paul did not comfort the Thessalonians with this doctrine when he wrote to them about the fate of the dead. Apparently, in the eyes of Tyndale, the immortality of the soul, or rather the participation of the soul in heavenly bliss immediately after death, rendered the resurrection of the flesh superfluous. Evidently he regarded these two possibilities (the bodily resurrection and the soul’s participation in heavenly bliss immediately after death) as mutually exclusive.

In the last part of his work (An answere vnto Master Mores fourth boke) Tyndale returned to the theme of soul sleep. More had criticized him for claiming that “all soules lye and slepe tyll domes daye.” Tyndale did not deny More’s charge. Instead he claimed that More, by “puttynge them

73 Cf. Tyndale’s sarcastic remark: “I deny christes argument and saye with More/ that Abraham is yet alieue/ not because of the resurrectio/ but because his soule is in heuen” (Tyndale, An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialogue, sig. I8v (O’Donnell, p. 117)).
76 “Nay Paul/ thou art vnlerne: goo to master More and lerne a newe waye. We be not most miserable/ though we rise not agayne/ for oure soules goo to heuen assone as we be dead/ and are there in as greate ioye as christ that is rysen agayne” (Tyndale, An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialogue, sig. Kr (O’Donnell, pp. 117–18)).
77 “And I maruell that Paul had not comforted the Thessalonians with that doctrine/ if had wist it/ that the soules of their dead had bee in ioye/ as he did with the resurrectio/ that their deed shuld rise agayne” (Tyndale, An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialogue, sig. Kr (O’Donnell, p. 118)).
78 “If the soules be in heuen in as greate glorie as the angels aftir youre doctrine/ shewe me what cause shulde be of the resurrectio” (Tyndale, An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialogue, sig. Kr (O’Donnell, p. 118)).
[i.e. the souls of deceased] in heuen hell and purgatory/ destroy[e[s] the argumentes wherewith Christ and paule proue the resurreccion.”

Tyndale believed that what happens to the souls of the dead is God’s secret. At any rate, Tyndale asserted, the immortality of the soul is only maintained by the heathen philosophers who denied the resurrection of the body. This pagan belief was mixed up with Christ’s teaching by “the pope” (sic!). But “the true faith putteth the resurrection which we be warned to loke fore every houre.” Again, it is clear here that in Tyndale’s view the resurrection and the immortality of the soul are mutually exclusive ideas because the survival of the soul (and the individual judgement after death) makes the bodily resurrection unnecessary. For if the elect and the saints were already in Heaven, Tyndale argued, then they would be participating in the beatific vision of God together with the angels. What extra joy could the resurrection of the body possibly add?

In his commentary on the First Letter of John, Tyndale repeated his agnostic stance about the fate of the soul after death. Commenting on 1 Jn. 2:28, he wrote that according to the Bible, all people will receive their rewards at the same time in the resurrection at the second coming, regardless of when they lived. But Scripture does not say anything about the question of what happens to the souls in the meantime except that

---

81 “Moses sayth in Deute./ the secret thynges perteyne vn to the lorde/ and the thynges that be opened pertayne vn to vs/ that we doo all that is written in the boke. Wherfore Sir if we loued the lawes of god and wold occupye our selues to fulfill them/ and wolde on the other syde be meke and lett god alone with his secretes and sofre him to be wiser then we/ we shuld make none article of the faith of this or that” (Tyndale, *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge*, sigs. O8v–P1r (O’Donnell, p. 182)).
82 “The hethen philosophoures denyenge that [i.e. the resurrection of the body]/ did put that the soules did euer liue. And the pope joyneth the spirittuall doctrine of christe and the fleschly doctrine of philosophers to gether/ thynges so contrary that they can not agre/ no moare then the spirite and the flesh do in a Christen man. And because the fleschly mynded pope consenteth vn to hethen doctrine/ ther fore he corruteth the scripture to stablish it” (Tyndale, *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge*, sig. O8v (O’Donnell, p. 182)).
83 “And agayne/ if the soules be in heuen/ tell me whi they be not in as good case as the angelles be? And then what cause is there of the resurreccion?” (Tyndale, *An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge*, sig. P1r (O’Donnell, p. 182)).
84 “A nother thinge is this/ al the scripture makyth mention of the resurrection and commynge agene of Christ: and that al men/ both they that go before/ and they that come after shal then receaue their rewardes to gether/ and we are commaundyed to loke euerye houre for that daye” (Tyndale, *The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon*, sig. E3r).
“they rest in the lorde and in their faith.”86 “What God doeth with them is a secret laide vp in the treasury of God,” Tyndale asserted, and therefore the faithful “ought to be patient/ beinge certified of the scripture that they which die in the faith are at rest/ & ought no moare to serche that secret/ then to serche the houre of the resurrection whiche God hath putt only in his awne power.”87 Accordingly, anyone who “determyneth ought of the state of them that be departed/ doeth but teach the presumptuouse imaginations of his awne brayne: Nether can his doctrine be any article of our faith.”88

Tyndale’s agnostic attitude was rooted in his mistrust of human logic and philosophy. Seeking the knowledge of good and evil was the original sin infecting all humankind with its poison, Tyndale argued, because Eve wanted to gain knowledge in matters of which God wanted the human being to be ignorant.89 Following human reason in subjects on which Scripture remains silent is of the devil.90 In the Prologue to his commentary he warned the reader that Scripture should be read in the light of “feeling faith” founded in one's baptism and not with human logic, because if one does not have faith, “thoughe Peter/ Paule or Cryst hym selfe dyde expounde it vnto the,” Scripture remained “lockyd and shut op from the/ and so darke that thou couldest not vnderstonde it.”91 Anybody who relies on his or her own wisdom and knowledge builds “strange Doctrine” upon Scripture and becomes “a maker of deuision and secktes and a defendre of wylde and vayne opinions.”92

---

86 “And what is done with the soules frome theyr departinge their bodies vnto that daye/ doethe the scripture make no mention/ saue only that they rest in the lorde and in their faith” (Tyndale, The exposition of the fyreste Epistle of seynt Ihon, sig. E3’).
87 Tyndale, The exposition of the fyreste Epistle of seynt Ihon, sig. E3’.
88 Tyndale, The exposition of the fyreste Epistle of seynt Ihon, sig. E3’.
89 “But this remembre/ that the hole nature of man is poysонned and infecte with synne. And the hole life of synne must be mortified. And the roote of al sinne and first vice we were infecte with/ is that we wold be wise where God hath not taught vs/ as ye se how Eue wold haue bene as god in knowlege of good and bad. And therfore hath god hid many things in his power and commaundyd that we shal serch none of his secretes further/ then he hath openned them in his scripture/ to mortifie this poysen of al poysens/ the desire to appere wise and that we be asshamed to be ignorant in eny thinge at al” (Tyndale, The exposition of the fyreste Epistle of seynt Ihon, sig. E3’).
90 “Werfore they that violently make articles of the faith without Gods worde ar yet alie in the roote of al sinne and vice/ & growe out of the deuell and not out of Christ. And their articles are of the blindnes of the deuell/ & not of the light of Christ/ for Christes light hath testimoni of the scriptur every where” (Tyndale, The exposition of the fyreste Epistle of seynt Ihon, sig. E3’’’).
91 Tyndale, The exposition of the fyreste Epistle of seynt Ihon, sig. A4’.
92 Tyndale, The exposition of the fyreste Epistle of seynt Ihon, sig. A4’.
Although Tyndale warned against “deuision and sektes” and “wylde and vayne opinions,” it should be recognized that in fact it was Tyndale himself who diverged from mainstream Christianity in his belief, as has been seen in the previous chapter. Admittedly Tyndale never professed explicitly that the souls would sleep (psychosomnolence). His position both in his Answer and in the Exposition is that the Bible does not reveal anything about it overtly, and therefore it is impossible to pronounce anything on the matter. Nonetheless, his explicit denial of the biblical origin of the doctrine of the survival and active life of the souls, his irritation with More’s arguments to prove the contrary, his advice to Frith to argue from the negative and to evade a straightforward answer to questions in connection with post-mortem issues, the fact that the passage about Jesus’ answer to the Sadducees in his Answer is indexed as “soul sleep,” and his harmony with Luther’s position on most theological subjects all suggest that Tyndale did in fact believe that the souls sleep “out of” Heaven.93

Anyhow, this was certainly the perception of his contemporaries, for whom Tyndale’s position amounted to the assertion of the mortality of the soul (thnetopsychism).

Although Tyndale’s warning against “a maker of deuision and sektes and a defendre of wylde and vayne opinions” in his Exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon remained implicit and did not name names, his criticism about a person teaching “the presumptuouse imaginations of his awne brayne” on the fate of the departed souls was aimed (at least partly) at George Joye.94 Joye certainly understood Tyndale’s words as an anonymous attack on him, but Joye decided not to react openly in order to preserve the air of peace and unity of the ‘brethren.’95 What the exact

93 “Syr as concernyng Purgatory, and many other things, if your be demaunded, you may say, if you erre, the spiritualtie hath so led you, & that they haue taught you to beleue as you do. For they preached you all such thynges out of Gods word, and alledged a thousand textes, by reason of which textes you beleued as they taught you. But now you finde them lyers, and that the textes meane no such thynges, and therfore you can beleue no longer, but are as you were before they taught you, and beleue no such thing. Howbeit you are ready to beleue, if they haue any other way to proue it. For without profe you van not beleue them, when you haue founde them with so many lyes.&c.” (Tyndale to Frith, printed in Foxe, Whole workes, p. 456). It has been suggested that the index of Tyndale’s Answer was compiled by his amanuensis, who, according to Joye, was Frith at that time. (Joye, Apologye, sig. E1r–v).

94 See supra on p. 304.

95 “In hys exposicion vpom lohn he stretched forth his penne agenst me as farre as he dirst/ but yet spared my name/ at the whiche chaleng I winked/ yet taking yt not as ment of me because I loued quyetnes not wylling that any man shuld know what hatred he did euer beare me sence I came ouer” (Joye, Apologye, sig. D8r–v).
occasion was for Joye and Tyndale to discuss their beliefs on the subject is not entirely certain. It might have been Frith’s *A Disputacion of Purgatorye* or Tyndale’s *Answere* to Thomas More (both printed in July 1531 by the Antwerp printer Symon Cock). At any rate, Joye reported that they often had discussions that usually ended with Tyndale calling Joye names and humiliating him. Joye also stated that Tyndale had been unfriendly to Joye from the time Joye arrived in Antwerp. But there was still no open hostility between them.

**JOYE’S LETTER TO LATIMER AND THE LETTER TO BROTHER WILLIAM**

(29 April 1533)

On 29 April 1533, a year and half after the publication of Tyndale’s *Exposition* and some months before he was asked by Catherine van Ruremund to correct the edition that was soon to appear, George Joye wrote a letter to Hugh Latimer. This is the sole known surviving letter by Joye bearing Joye’s name. From the letter it is clear that Joye had been asked by someone to explain why there was a difference between his translation of Isaiah’s prayer (Is. 64:1–4) in his *Ortulus anime* and his translation of the same text in his version of *The Propheete Isaye*. The identity of the person who had raised the question is unknown: Joye ostensibly thought it unsafe (or unwise) to name that person. He only refers to him in his letter as “one,” and later in his *Apologye* as a “yonge man” who is “seduced by his [Tyndale’s] false doctryne” and who “so wholly dependeth […] vpon Tindals mouth addicte vnto hys wordis, that the soulis sleap oute

---

96 See supra on pp. 16, 266, and 301. The copies of the two books preserved in Cambridge University Library are actually bound together into one volume with an old leather binding (shelfmark: Syn.8.53.43).

97 “Thorow his impacieence our disputacion euer ended with chyding and brawling […] For when he coude not avoyd the manyste scriptures nor soyle the reasons brought agenst him/ then the man began to fume and chaafe calling me folle/ vnlerned/ with other obprobriouse names: then I knew not the scriptures nor what I sayd &c.” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. D8v–r).

98 See supra in n. 95.

99 Joye’s letter to Latimer is preserved on a sizeable sheet of paper (almost exactly the size of an A4) among the State Papers in the Public Record Office. For a correct transcription preserving the original line breaks, see: infra on pp. 433–34 in the Appendix. See also n. 1 on p. 433.


101 “I cannot tell his name that askyd me the questione and vnto whome I sent the letter” (Joye to Latimer, ll. 11–12).
of heuen tyll domes daye.”

Joye, however, did name both the carrier of his former letter (“one William hill Mr Cosens servaunt”) and the bearer of his letter to Latimer (a certain Henry Smith). Joye’s answer to the young man, now no longer extant, was shown to the imprisoned John Frith, who got offended by the fact that Joye’s answer contained the belief “that the sowles departyd slepe not nor lye ydle tyll domes daye.” Therefore, Frith wrote from the Tower to Tyndale, who, as mentioned before, shared Frith’s view on the matter, to ask Tyndale to stop Joye from spreading such beliefs because they would cause dissent among the brethren.

Concerning William Hill, there is another mention of a certain “Willem Hils, corier vuyt Engelant” in the Antwerpse Certificatieboeken from 1565 (CB 24, fo. 11v). The relatively large time span between the two dates makes it less likely that the two references are about the same person, although the possibility cannot be excluded. Another unlikely candidate for the identification of the carrier of Joye’s letter is William Hyll, a merchant from Minehead, who was accused of shipping unlicensed beans to Spain (G.R. Elton, Informing for Profit. A Sidelight on Tudor Methods of Law-Enforcement, in Cambridge Historical Journal 11 (1954), pp. 157–58). The name, of course, might just be a pseudonym. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that sometimes acting in partnership with Thomas Raynalde, the printer “William Hyll dwelling/ in Paules Churche yearde”, “at the signe of the Hyll, at the west dore of Paules” published several works of the Antwerp English Protestants, including Simon Fish’s translation of Henricus Bomelius’s The summe of the holy Scripture (1549), William Tyndale’s The obedyence of a Christian man (1548), an edition of the ‘Matthew Bible’ (1549) and an anonymous compilation from Tyndale’s and Coverdale’s work with the title: The Christen rule or state of all the worlde from the hyghest to the lowest (c.1548). It is not at all impossible that this is the person who acted as carrier for Joye. We also know of a certain Richard Hylles (°1514), who was an apprentice to a merchant called Nicholas Cossyn at the sign of the Anchor on London Bridge. This Richard Hylles showed also a definite interest in religious issues and was in the Low Countries around that time: before the end of 1532, “on one Sunday afternoon when [he] was idle,” Hylles wrote a treatise “on the part of St. James’ Epistle how Abraham was justified by works” and sent it to Cromwell (L&P VI, no. 99). Six days before Christmas in 1532, Cossyn was just about to send Hylles to Flanders in order to be made free when Cossyn heard that Hylles’ book attracted the attention of John Stokesley (c.1475–1539), bishop of London (1530–39). Out of fear of the bishop, Cossyn and another merchant examined Hylles. Hylles remained ‘opynatyffe,’ was laid off, left for the Continent, and wrote to Cromwell from Rouen (L&P VI, no. 99). He returned to England only in 1535, around the same time when Joye moved back to England. It is not unlikely that the printer William was his brother, and that Richard might have been the one who asked Joye to explain the differences between his translations. Being approximately eighteen years old at the time, he perfectly fits Joye’s description as ‘a yonge man.’ Joye then might have thought that the association with an ‘opynatyffe’ runaway would not advance his cause with Latimer, and that is why he did mention his name in the letter.

Joye to Latimer, l. 12–13.17. I could find no further information on Henry Smith. Concerning William Hill, there is another mention of a certain “Willem Hils, corier vuyt Engelant” in the Antwerpse Certificatieboeken from 1565 (CB 24, fo. 11v). The relatively large time span between the two dates makes it less likely that the two references are about the same person, although the possibility cannot be excluded. Another unlikely candidate for the identification of the carrier of Joye’s letter is William Hyll, a merchant from Minehead, who was accused of shipping unlicensed beans to Spain (G.R. Elton, Informing for Profit. A Sidelight on Tudor Methods of Law-Enforcement, in Cambridge Historical Journal 11 (1954), pp. 157–58). The name, of course, might just be a pseudonym. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that sometimes acting in partnership with Thomas Raynalde, the printer “William Hyll dwelling/ in Paules Churche yearde”, “at the signe of the Hyll, at the west dore of Paules” published several works of the Antwerp English Protestants, including Simon Fish’s translation of Henricus Bomelius’s The summe of the holy Scripture (1549), William Tyndale’s The obedyence of a Christian man (1548), an edition of the ‘Matthew Bible’ (1549) and an anonymous compilation from Tyndale’s and Coverdale’s work with the title: The Christen rule or state of all the worlde from the hyghest to the lowest (c.1548). It is not at all impossible that this is the person who acted as carrier for Joye. We also know of a certain Richard Hylles (°1514), who was an apprentice to a merchant called Nicholas Cossyn at the sign of the Anchor on London Bridge. This Richard Hylles showed also a definite interest in religious issues and was in the Low Countries around that time: before the end of 1532, “on one Sunday afternoon when [he] was idle,” Hylles wrote a treatise “on the part of St. James’ Epistle how Abraham was justified by works” and sent it to Cromwell (L&P VI, no. 99). Six days before Christmas in 1532, Cossyn was just about to send Hylles to Flanders in order to be made free when Cossyn heard that Hylles’ book attracted the attention of John Stokesley (c.1475–1539), bishop of London (1530–39). Out of fear of the bishop, Cossyn and another merchant examined Hylles. Hylles remained ‘opynatyffe,’ was laid off, left for the Continent, and wrote to Cromwell from Rouen (L&P VI, no. 99). He returned to England only in 1535, around the same time when Joye moved back to England. It is not unlikely that the printer William was his brother, and that Richard might have been the one who asked Joye to explain the differences between his translations. Being approximately eighteen years old at the time, he perfectly fits Joye’s description as ‘a yonge man.’ Joye then might have thought that the association with an ‘opynatyffe’ runaway would not advance his cause with Latimer, and that is why he did mention his name in the letter.

102 Joye to Latimer, l. 4; Joye, Apologye, sigs. D8v–E1r.
103 Joye to Latimer ll. 12–13.17. I could find no further information on Henry Smith.

104 Joye to Latimer, ll. 7–8.
105 “And [Joye’s letter to young man] were sent vnto Frithe in the tower/ wherof Frith wrote thys warnyng to Tin. whyche he […] menCyonyeth” (Joye, Apologye, sig. E1r). See also Joye to Latimer, ll. 3–6.
Figure 2. Letters by “George Joye to Hugh Latimer” and “John Coke to Brother William” [vere George Joye to William Hill] [Antwerp], 29 April 1533. Public Record Office (London), State Papers SP 1/75, fo. 210, no. 183.
vindicate himself, wrote to Hugh Latimer to ask him for his opinion and, if possible, for his support for Joye’s theological views on the state of the deceased, or at least to receive an unbiased judgement on the question.106

Surprisingly, there is another letter on the same page, underneath Joye’s letter. This one was apparently written by one John Coke, was addressed to a certain “Brother William,” and was dated on the exact same day. This letter also mentions a previous letter on the difference between Joye’s two translations of Isaiah’s prayer and asks Brother William to send a copy of a previous letter—of which it was also thought that said letter caused dissension among the Reformers—to Latimer. Furthermore, there is another, smaller piece of paper in volume 1/75 of the State Papers that was previously attached to the larger sheet containing the two letters.107 This piece of paper contains the words “George Joye to mr Latymer affirminge that soules lye not ydle/ vntill domes daye.” in a completely different, spidery hand (here enlarged):

Figure 3. Cataloguing note once attached to the document described in Figure 2. Public Record Office (London), State Papers 1/75, fo. 211, no. 184.

The obvious incongruities, or at least peculiarities, of these two letters and the attached piece of paper have resulted in various conjectures. James Gairdner has suggested that the second letter was addressed to William Tyndale and was originally composed by John Coke, the Secretary to the Merchants Adventurer at the English House in Antwerp, but Joye copied it into his letter to Latimer.108 Mozley follows Gairdner’s conjecture in

---

107 See infra on p. 436.
108 L&P VI, no. 402 on pp. 183–84.
his Tyndale biography. Oskar De Smedt follows Mozley (and implicitly Gairdner) in saying that the second letter was originally written by John Coke, the Secretary to the Merchants Adventurer who showed an active interest in the theological debates of his time and stood on Tyndale’s side in this matter. De Smedt also shares the presupposition that Joye copied Coke’s letter underneath his own letter to Latimer. De Smedt, however, suggests that the addressee of Coke’s letter is more likely William Johnson, whom Vaughan mentions as “my brother Will. Johnson” in a letter to Cromwell dated from Bergen-op-Zoom on 16 December 1531. This William Johnson, according to De Smedt, might have been a chaplain in the English House. De Smedt also mentions that there was a merchant adventurer called William Johnson mentioned in 1535.

A more plausible solution is put forth by Butterworth and Chester. They suggest that both letters were originally written by Joye but were intercepted and copied by Cromwell’s ubiquitous spies. The original letters were sent forth on their way, and the copies were forwarded to Cromwell, whose note for classification might be the attached smaller piece of paper. Butterworth and Chester also argue that the addressee of the second letter is the same William Hill whom Joye mentions in his letter to Latimer as the carrier of Joye’s original letter to the unknown young man. The intention of the second letter, then, is obvious: Joye asks Hill to procure the original letter or a copy of it from the person to whom he delivered it and to convey it to Latimer. According to Butterworth and Chester, the appearance of John Coke’s name at the bottom of the second letter might be explained by a misreading by the copyist or by the fact

---

109 “In the discussions in Antwerp, John Coke, secretary of the merchant adventurers, took a part against Joye, and a letter of his is still extant, addressed to a certain ‘Brother William.’ This can hardly be any other than Tyndale” (Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 272).
111 L&P V, no. 585.
112 De Smedt, De Engelse Natie te Antwerpen, vol. II, p. 627, n. 44. De Smedt, in fact, misrepresents Mozley’s position as if Mozley had suggested that the addressee of Coke’s letter should be Tyndale because Coke complains about the carrier suddenly departing without taking the letters with him as promised: “Hij [Mozley] meent dat die [Brother William] bezwaarlijk iemand anders dan Tyndale kan zijn, want Coke klaagt er over, dat zijn correspondent zo plots opgebroken is zonder zijn brieven mede te nemen, zoals hij beloofd had” (De Smedt, De Engelse Natie te Antwerpen, vol. II, p. 627, n. 44). Mozley, however, does not give any reason for speculating Tyndale to be the addressee of Coke’s letter. Cf. supra n. 109.
that Coke might have played "some role in making the letters available for copying, and thus had his name brought into the record."114

Their cogently reasoned proposition rests upon the following arguments: (1) Joye, who is complaining both about the lack of time to write ("I woulde wryte vnto youe more but this berer goethe hastely hense and may not tarye me") and about the pain letter writing causes him ("it is so paynefull to me to wryte yt I coulde not leve any copye with me/"), is very unlikely to have copied a letter that adds no new information to what he already had written. (2) The erasures of the words "is" and "his" in the first letter (ll. 14 and 26, respectively) "are such as would be natural to a copyist."115 (3) Joye, being a trained theologian and Bible translator, could not possibly refer to the non-existing twenty-third chapter of the Gospel of John (l. 16). Instead, he is most likely to have made a reference to "John 5 and Acts 23," since both passages belong to those in which the translation of resurrectio will be altered in Joye's edition of the NT and both are used later by Joye in the Apologye.116 "A copyist, however, might easily have produced "John 23" through omission of part of Joye's citation."117 (4) In both letters the writer claims that he left no copy of a previous, confidential letter. (5) Characteristically of Joye, the author of the second letter seeks to warn the addressee "of the folly of spreading dissension."118 (6) Butterworth and Chester also argue that the use of "the same curious turn of speech, 'as concerning'" points to Joye's authorship for both letters.119 This argument—a claim which they consider "a stronger argument"—is less convincing, since the expression is not peculiar to Joye and is copiously testified to in the epoch.120

114 BC, George Joye, p. 97.
115 BC, George Joye, p. 97. Their transcript does not contain many other corrections in the letters.
116 See infra on pp. 383 and 375.
117 BC, George Joye, p. 98.
119 BC, George Joye, p. 98.
120 The expression is used several times by Tyndale, too: "As Concernyng the thynge wherof ye wrote vnto me" (1 Cor. 7:1; Tyn1526, fo. 223r); "as concernyng the lawe, a pharisaye, and as concernyng fervetes I perseuted the congregacion" (Phil. 3:5f; Tyn1526 262r); "Hymeneos and Philetos which as concernyng the trueth have erred sayinge that the resurreccion is past all redy and do destroye the fayth of divers persone" (2 Tim. 2:18; Tyn1526 fo. 280v); "as concernyng oure worke and sorowe of oure handes which we haue aboute the ethre that the LORde hath cursed" (Gen. 5:29; Tyn1530). "Syr as concernyng Purgatory, and many other things," (Tyndale to Frith in Foxe, Whole workes, p. 456); "As concerning all I have translated or other wise written" (Tyndale's Second Foreword in T1534, sig. **9r.). Another noteworthy attestation dates from 1527, found in one of the first references to Tyndale's Cologne fragment by Robert Ridley, chaplain to Bishop Cuthbert Tunstall (1474–1559), then bishop of London (1522–30, later that of Durham: 1530–52,
The proposal of Butterworth and Chester, which I accept, can be corroborated by the following arguments:

1. With regard to the identity of the addressee of the second letter, there is no apparent reason why Coke, being in the same town as Tyndale, would write a letter to Tyndale on such a sensitive question. The likelihood that Tyndale acted as postman for Coke is even slighter. On the other hand, William Hill, mentioned by Joye in the first letter as the bearer of his original letter (the one Frith saw in the Tower), constitutes a very plausible candidate as the person to whom the second letter was addressed.

2. With regard to the authenticity of the letters, it is clearly identifiable—on the basis of the numerous examples available from John Coke’s genuine correspondence—that the manuscript was not written by John Coke himself. The manuscript containing both Joye’s and Coke’s names does not bear any resemblance to John Coke’s own nice, neat handwriting; therefore, it is certainly not a letter written or copied by him personally (Figure 4 shows Coke’s authentic signature, Figure 5 the signature under the letter to Brother William):

Figure 4. Signature of John Coke from his letter to Cromwell, Antwerp, 4 February 1532. Public Record Office (London), State Papers SP 1/75, fo. 123, no. 128.

Figure 5. Signature from the second letter described in Figure 2.

1553–59), in a letter to Henry Golde, nephew and chaplain to Bishop William Warham (1450–1532), archbishop of Canterbury (1503–32): “As concernyng this common and vulgar translation of the New Testament into English done by Mr. William Hichyns, otherwise called Mr. W. Tyndale, and frear William Roy [...]” Further instances from the period: “as concernyng the ordenyng of the beggars [...]” (York Civic Records, Book XVIII, fo. 37b published in York Civic Records, IV, ed. Angelo Raine, (Yorkshire Archaeological Society Record Series CVIII), 1945, p. 145); “To every Moneth, as concernyng this purpose, shall be appointed just xxx dayes. [...] But nowe as concernyng those persone, whiche peradventure will bee offended for that some of the olde Ceremonys are retayned still [...]” (Book of Common Prayer, Worcester: Ihon Oswen, 1549, sigs. A4v and Li.2v (=fo. 34v)); “As concernyng any words then spoken of the kyng” (Informations against Bachelor Newman, parish priest of St Peter Mancroft in Norwich Mayor’s Court Book (unpublished manuscript), August 1540, Norwich City Records, NRO, NCR 16A/5, p. 21); “as concernynge bokes of
3. There is no incontrovertibly genuine handwriting available from Joye to which the manuscript could be compared. The only possibly available basis of comparison could be the few scattered words in the margin in one of the 1545 copies of *The exposicion of Daniel the Prophete* in the British Library. These are seemingly from a different hand (Figure 6 shows a marginal note supposedly in Joye's handwriting, Figure 7 is a detail from the letter to Hugh Latimer):


![Figure 7. Detail from the document described in Figure 2.](image)

4. It is very difficult to understand why two letters addressed to two different persons and signed by two different persons would appear on the same page in the same hand, unless we presume that these are copies and not originals. For it is very unlikely that Joye, as Gairdner, Mozley, and De Smedt suggested, would have copied Coke's letter underneath his own letter to Latimer without mentioning it in any way in his letter. Furthermore, as Butterworth and Chester rightly pointed out, there is absolutely no new information contained in the second letter.

5. It is also very difficult to see how Joye would have been able to gain access to a letter written by John Coke on the same matter on the exact same day, especially if Coke was opposed to Joye's position on the question.

---

antiquite not printed" (John Bale in a letter from 1560 to Archbishop Parker, published in *Cambridge Antiquarian Communications* 3 (1864–76), p. 157).

Joye, *The exposicion of Daniel the Prophete*. Butterworth and Chester suggest that the British Library copy (with shelfmark C.23.a.1) was perhaps owned by Joye himself, who made the corrections in the translation (*BC, George Joye*, p. 240).
6. Besides the two erasures mentioned by Butterworth and Chester, there are numerous other scribbles, deletions, and corrections in the actual manuscript that are not recorded in their transcription. These, just like the duplication of “gett” in line 13 of the first letter, are mistakes that would be very likely to be produced by a copyist and are far less expected to occur in an original letter, even if the writer was working exceedingly carelessly.

7. With regard to the identity of the author of the second letter, the somewhat irritated and slightly patronizing style of this letter does not correspond to Coke's always well-mannered letters. It squares, however, very well with Joye's manner of writing, and both letters show many typical characteristics of Joye's writings: in both letters, he complains about the hastiness of the carrier of his letters and about the pain writing causes him, and how he therefore was not able to make copies of his previous letter. Furthermore, he expresses his concerns about the blame of causing dissension among the Protestants' ranks.

8. Also, the subject of the second letter makes Coke's authorship highly questionable. There is no apparent reason why Coke would have sent someone a letter (whom he later did not dare to name) and then ask someone else (either Tyndale or William Hill) to discuss religious ideas with the primary addressee and to urge him to send his original letter or a copy of it to Latimer, whom Coke probably only knew by reputation.

9. Coke dated all of his letters by stating not only the date but also the location of writing. As the secretary to the Merchants Adventurers,

---

122 See my revision of their transcription in the Appendix on p. 433.

123 In l. 2, the manuscript reads: “his spirytt of trewthyte to <h> lede youe in to him that said/ I am the <te>trewthyte and is.” If we suppose that the sheet is a copy, it is not difficult to explain the mistake: after having copied the words “trewthyte to,” the copyist's eye jumped from the first occurrence of ‘to’ in the line to the second (a form of homoioteleuton). It is, however, problematic to see how an original letter, even if written by a sloppy and inattentive writer, could produce such an error. Note also the mistake in dating the letter: “the <9> 29 daye of apryll” (l. 31), a very unlikely mistake for an original document. Most of the other blunders originate from accidentally dropping a letter.

124 Coke's undisputedly genuine letters are all directed to Thomas Cromwell, who was a member of the privy council (from 1531), Chancellor of the Exchequer (from 1533), Henry's secretary (from 1534), and to whom Coke owed some favours (see e.g. his letter dated on 4 February 1533, PRO, SP 1/74, fo. 145, a synopsis of which was published in L&P VI, n. 188). Understandably, these letters were written in a particularly courteous manner. Nonetheless, Coke's style is clearly distinct and his interest seems to be aroused only by instances of disgrace to national pride, England, or the royal family.


126 E.g.: “from barowe vpon the zome the iiijth day of ffebruary. Anno xv< <xxxij>0” (SP 1/74, fo. 145); “from Andwarp the Last day of June” (SP 1/77, fo. 107); “from Andwarp the xvxijth day of July” (SP 1/78, fo. 39).
his whereabouts were known to everyone. Joye, on the other hand, had good reason to hide his exact place of residence, as he does in many a false colophon address in his printed publications. Therefore, the fact that both letters contain only the date but no place is given, also points to the authorship of Joye for both letters.

10. Furthermore, Coke never signed his letters with only his name, but always added some formula of courtesy.\textsuperscript{127} The letter underneath Joye’s letter has only the laconic marking “your John Coke.”

11. John Coke, as the Secretary of the English House, kept in frequent contact with Cromwell, and in his correspondence there is evidence that he intercepted and copied letters for Cromwell. He reported “in moost humble maner” to his “right honorable […] especiall and syn-guler good master” on a regular basis about religious and political matters.\textsuperscript{128} In his letters he “aduertises” Cromwell about the religious and political ideas of various English subjects (and others) staying in and around “this towne of Andwarpe” and equips Henry’s chief minister with, for example, the text of a song mocking Henry VIII, a \textit{Pronostication} [sic] put out “by a folissh medceyn,”\textsuperscript{129} and other proofs of opinion. In a letter dated from Antwerp on 30 June 1533, Coke wrote

\textsuperscript{127} Coke customarily mentioned his function: "John Coke Secretary to the Marchantes Adventurers" (PRO, SP 1/74, fo. 145) or “By your humble seruant John Coke, clarck to the Merchantes Adventurers” (SP 1/77, fo. 107) or “your humble seruant John Coke, Secretary vnwoorthy to the merchants Adventurers” (SP 1/78, fo. 39). Instead of mentioning his title, Coke sometimes signed his letters only expressing his loyalty to Cromwell: “by the hande of your humble seruant John Coke” (SP 1/78, fo. 186); or “your seruant duryng his naturall lif John Coke” (SP 1/79, fo. 6).

\textsuperscript{128} E.g. PRO: SP 1/74, fo. 145; SP 1/77, fo. 107; SP 1/78, fos. 39 and 186; SP 1/79, fos. 6 and 41; and SP 1/80, fo. 185; BL: \textit{Acta inter Angliam et Belgium}, Galba B.x., fos. 43 and 79. Excerpts and abstracts of these are published in \textit{L&P VI}, nos. 118, 518, 726, 900, 1029, 1066, 1100, and 1493.

\textsuperscript{129} \textit{L&P VI}, no. 1493. The \textit{Pronostication} Coke mentions is probably one of the publications of “Gaspar Laet The yonger docter yn physic” (as opposed to Gaspar Laet de Borchloen) from the presses of Christoffel van Ruremund and Michiel Hillen van Hoochstraten. Later, in 1553, John Coke, by that time the “clarke of the Recognysances, or vulgarly called clerk of the Statutes” translated \textit{A Pronostication for diuers yeares, ryght vtyle and profitable to al sortes of people […] gathered together by Master Arnold Bogarde doctour in medecyne, resident in Bruxels}. This translation, together with the short booklet entitled \textit{The Debate Betwene the Heraldes of Englande and Fraunce, compiled by Joh[n]n Coke, clarke of the kynges recognysaunce, or vulgarly called clarke of the Statutes of the staple of Westmyster}, which he published in 1550 in London, are the only surviving published writings of Coke. Coke’s words in the colophon of this latter volume exemplify nicely the influence of the polyglot Antwerp of his times: “Fynished by me John Coke Le dernier Jour Doctobre, Den yaer ons here duisent vijf. hunderd negen ende vierich. Finis laudat opus.”
to have made “moost secreteous inquire”\textsuperscript{130} about books by one friar “Petowe”\textsuperscript{131} against the King's marriage with Queen Anne (Boleyn) and to have intercepted three letters, which he sent enclosed.\textsuperscript{132} He also assured Cromwell's “right honorable mastership” that the secretary of the Antwerp Merchants Adventurers would continue to spy for the “Counceliour to the king”: “And as I here more/ I shall with all diligence aduertise you therof.”\textsuperscript{133}

12. The suspicion that the Engelse Natie in Antwerp housed secret agents is well attested.\textsuperscript{134} Joye himself accused William Castelyn, the Governor of the Merchants Adventurer in 1543, of spying on the Protestant

\textsuperscript{130} PRO, SP 1/77, fo. 107 (abstract available in \textit{L&P VI}, n. 726).

\textsuperscript{131} Friar William Peto of Greenwich (d. c.1588), provincial of the Observant Franciscans ('Grey Friars'), confessor to Queen Catherine of Aragon and to Princess Mary. According to Stow and Howes, Peto was “a simple man, yet very devout” (John Stow & Edmond Howes, \textit{The annales, or generall chronicle of England}, London: Thomas Adams, 1615, p. 543). On Easter Day (1 March) 1532, friar Peto was the first to warn King Henry publicly in a sermon against his false and selfish counsellors ('lying Prophets') and declared Henry's divorce unlawful. The \textit{Annales} reports how Peto prophesied that "even where the dogges licked the bloud of Naboth, even there shall the dogges lick thy bloud also O King [...] take heed least you being seduced, you find Achabs punishment, which was to haue his bloud licked by of the dogs" (cf. 1 Kgs. 21:19; 22:38). Later, when the King summoned him, the friar repeated his concerns about the King's marital doings in a private audience ordered by the King. Henry had him suspended from his office and ordered him to leave England but later intended to imprison him. After their release, Peto and a confreere of his, Elston of Canterbury, fled to the Continent. After a short stay in France, they both went to Antwerp, where they published a Latin treatise upholding Queen Catherine's rights according to canon law. One of Cromwell's Antwerp agents, Stephen Vaughan, made inquiries about Peto’s book. Vaughan received his information about the endeavours of the friars from George Joye. In return, Vaughan praises Joye (“George Gee”) in his letter to Cromwell as “undoubtedly [...] a right and true subject to the Kyng [...] whome yowe [i.e. Cromwell] maye rytgh well trust and take for an honest and feythfull subject of the Kyng” (\textit{State Papers}, vol. VII, p. 489.) However, Joye's name (except for the first occurrence), together with every favourable allusion to his name, was as a policy struck out from Vaughan’s letter to Cromwell. This might have happened with the intention of preparing the report to be read out to Henry, who was most certainly unsympathetic towards Joye. (See BC, \textit{George Joye}, p. 103.) In 1557 Peto was created a cardinal and was appointed Papal Legate in place of Cardinal Pole, who was charged with heresy and called to Rome. Reportedly, the night when Henry's body—on its way to Windsor for burial—rested in the chapel of Syon House (a Bridgettine Abbey in Brentford), the lead coffin, weakened by the motion of the carriage, burst open, and some liquid from the body seeped onto the church pavement. The next morning there was a dog with the plumbers who came to repair the coffin, and it was seen to lick up the blood from the floor (\textit{Stow & Howes, The annales}, p. 543).

\textsuperscript{132} “Sir, by policy I am comyn to three Lettres, delvered by certeyn of the same friers to a// symple and Innocent person of Cantorbury to be delvered in Englond/ Which Lettres// herin enclosed I sende to your mastership” (PRO, SP 1/77, fo. 107).

\textsuperscript{133} PRO, SP 1/77, fo. 107.

English refugee authors in Antwerp. The suspicion of letters being intercepted in the course of their passage through the English House during the office of John Coke is also documented by the mercer William Loke, another acquaintance and informant for Cromwell. In a letter dated from Antwerp on 26 July 1533, he wrote that he was told to bring his letters to the English House in order to have them surely conveyed to Henry VIII. Nonetheless, Loke suspected that this was only a device to acquire information by intercepting letters, which the “lords” of the English House called “aforethynkkyng.”

As indicated above, Oskar De Smedt suggested that Coke showed much interest in religious affairs. His only support for such a claim is the supposed letter of Coke’s underneath Joye’s own letter. On the other hand, Coke’s genuine letters betray no interest in religious matters as such. In fact, the only interest Coke shows in questions of religion is limited to the extent of their political concerns and to the intention of reporting them to Cromwell. He had no religious training and it is very unlikely that he discussed, let alone urged others to discuss, religious matters of the sort.

Once we accept the presupposition that both of the letters dating from 29 April 1533 were originally written by Joye and were then copied by someone for Cromwell, everything falls into place. Joye wrote to Hugh Latimer for an impartial—or, if possible, friendly—opinion in support of his thesis on the survival and active blessed life of the souls in the intermediate state. The choice to write to Latimer was no mere accident, for Joye had known Latimer for a very long time: manors in Renhold, Joye’s birthplace, had been in the possession of the Latimers since 1351, and the family also owned quite a significant part of Bedfordshire. During his stay in Cambridge, Joye was undoubtedly in personal contact with Hugh Latimer. In 1510 Latimer, while still an undergraduate, had already been elected a fel-

---

135 “Gardiner […] casting of his blodhowndes into every cytie and towne to hunte oute the christen simple sely flocke of chryst as he of late made William Castelyn Gouerner of the merchaunt aduenturers at Amwerpe/ [sic] cheiffly to hunte oute siche as purely and fre-lye wryte and set forth bokes vnto the glory of god edifyng of christes chirche and to warn men of Win. false doctrine. For this Gouerner of other men/ whiche coulde neuer well gouerne himselfe/ is more meate to rowe in a galey or to holde the plough tho to gouern so worshiple and honeste a companye” (George Joye, George Ioye confuteth Winchesters false Articles, Printed at Wesill in Cliefe lande [vere Antwerp], June 1543, fol. 22r–v).

136 PRO, SP 1/78, fo. 38. An abstract was included in L&P VI, no. 899.

low of Clare College, the second oldest of Cambridge’s colleges (founded in 1326). He took his B.D. there in 1524, only a year before Joye took his own B.D. in the same college. Later, as Butterworth and Chester suggest, it might have been Hugh Latimer who warned Joye about the position of the royal commission with regard to the fault found by the commission in the calendar of Joye’s edition of the Prímer.\textsuperscript{138}

In his letter to Latimer, Joye informed his old friend about the original question concerning the difference in the translations of Isaiah’s prayer, and about Joye’s answer. In his answer to this question, Joye expressed his conviction about the advantages of variation or plurality in translations. Joye gave the example of the translation of the word \textit{resurrectio} as an illustration for such an advantage. This, however, touched upon his theological position on the question of the souls of the departed. Hoping that Latimer would be able to procure a copy of his original letter, Joye only gave a very short summary of his argumentation in his letter to Latimer, but his reasoning—in the light of the later discussion—is very clear. Joye, as opposed to Tyndale, believed that the Bible, and Jesus in particular, taught the survival and active life of the souls between the death of the body and the bodily resurrection. To this effect, Joye referred to five scriptural NT passages: “Marc. 12. et c. 2 cor. 5. philipp. 1. Jo. [5. Act.] 23.”\textsuperscript{139} The first reference is “chrystes answer to the saduceys” about the husband-wife relationship of the seven brothers and their common wife ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει (Vg: \textit{in resurrectione}) (Mk. 12:23). Acts 23, too, refers to the (dis)belief of the Sadducees about the ἀνάστασις in the passage where Paul sets the Pharisees in the council against the Sadducees by claiming that he is being charged περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (Vg: \textit{de spe et resurrectione mortuorum}) (23:6). Joye probably explained in his original letter to the “yonge man,” as he later did in his Apologye in detail, that the Latin \textit{resurrectio} (and its Greek counterparts) in these places does not denote the bodily resurrection but the survival of the soul in the intermediate state, even if the noun \textit{resurrectio} can (and does) refer to the bodily resurrection in many other places. That such an intermediate state existed was proven by the other two references (Phil. 1:18b–25 and 2 Cor. 5:1–11), which did not contain any form of ἀνίστημι or ἐγείρω in the Greek or \textit{resurrectio} in the Latin, but which in Joye’s opinion did


\textsuperscript{139} Joye to Latimer, ll. 16–17.
shed light on the life of the souls of the departed. In Philippians, Paul expresses his wish to depart and be with Christ. The alternative to that would be to remain in the body for the benefit and joy of the Philippians. However, these two choices represent real alternatives to each other only if Paul’s being with Christ follows immediately upon his death, and not after an inactive sleep. And in 2 Corinthians, Paul describes what happens to the individual after his or her death. Joye obviously reached (or at least verified) his belief in the active life of the souls of the departed over the course of his search for the meaning of the Scripture. His belief is the result of his exegesis of several scriptural places, all pointing in the same direction. Of course, his exegetical insights, as he will openly acknowledge in his Apologye, were influenced by the works of Westheimer, Melanchthon, Bucer, Bullinger, and Zwingli.

Joye’s position on the survival and active state of souls prompted the objection and aversion of Frith, who, as we have seen, followed Luther and agreed with Tyndale in believing that the souls of the departed sleep between death and resurrection. Thus, Frith wrote from the Tower to Tyndale in Antwerp with the request to stop Joye from spreading such ideas. In his letter to Latimer Joye expressed his regret about not being able to provide a copy of his original letter, but he told Latimer how he could acquire it, or at least a copy of it. Accordingly, Joye wrote a second letter to William Hill, the carrier of Joye’s original letter, to ask him to get the original letter or a copy of it from the person (the “yonge man”) to whom Hill had delivered it, and to pass it on to Hugh Latimer.

John Coke, Cromwell’s local agent in Antwerp, who as the Secretary of the English House was responsible for the post of the English community in Antwerp, intercepted Joye’s letters and either had them copied for Cromwell or made them available to one of Cromwell’s agents, who copied the two letters on the same page and inadvertently introduced some errors. By some accident he also wrote Coke’s name instead of

---


141 “Op de Secretaris rustte ten slotte de zorg voor het organiseren van het postverkeer met het binnenland en met Londen, dit laatste niet alleen voor het Bestuur, maar voor al de leden van de Natie gezamenlijk. Ieder van hen had blijkbaar vergunning, zijn correspondentie te laten adrezenen aan het Engels Huis en daar brieven voor Engeland af te
Joye’s underneath the second letter. The formerly attached smaller piece of paper is indeed, as Butterworth and Chester suggest, very likely to be the classification or summary of the letters for some sort of cataloguing, as many other papers (including many genuine Coke letters) among the State Papers are summarized on their verso (address) side in a similarly spidery hand.\footnote{See e.g. SP 1/77, fo. 107; SP 1/79, fo. 41.}

By the time of the writing of the Apologye (February 1535), Joye had received back a copy of his original letter, which had precipitated the whole discussion: “And yet haue I here the copye of my letters sent vnto this man.”\footnote{Joye, Apologye, sig. E1r. See also Joye, Apologye, sig. D7r.} These letters and their copies, not at all contrary to the intention of their author, “went thorow many handis as I vnderstode aftir.”\footnote{Joye, Apologye, sig. E1r.}

This remark from Joye, as Butterworth and Chester suggest, makes it very plausible that Latimer was also able to procure the letter and was one of those through whose hands either the original letter or a copy of it went. Regrettably, there are no available data on how (if at all) Latimer reacted to Joye’s position. Joye also disclosed in his Apologye that he had written on the matter directly to Frith to explain his position, to which, Joye complained, he never received any reply, despite the fact that Frith would have had enough time to react. Joye interpreted this as a sign of Frith’s uncertainty about his own position.\footnote{“I answered him [Frith] agene by my letters/ but aftir I answered him/ I neuer herde more from Frith of this mater/ and yet had he a longe tyme aftir in the tower to haue wryten/ if he had sene his parte good” (Joye, Apologye, sig. E1r).} It is, however, more likely that Tyndale was right when he wrote that it was he who prevented Frith from answering Joye.\footnote{George Joye, Tyndale wrote, “hath also (though he hath been reasoned with ther of & desyred to cease) yet sown his doctryne by secret lettres on that syde the see/ & caused great division amonge ye brethere. In so moche that John Fryth beynge in preson in the toure of London/ a lylte before his death/ wrote yat we shuld warne him & desyer him to cease/ & wolde have then wrytten agaynst him/ had I not withstonde him” (T1534, sig. **.v0).}

Joye’s letter to Latimer is important because this is the very first available direct evidence in which Joye gives a short but tangible account not only with regard to his belief about the life of the souls of the departed, but also about his motivations for embracing such a belief. His scriptural arguments will be recapitulated later in his Apologye.
As was indicated earlier, due to the great demand, Tyndale’s NT was reprinted three times in seven years, with a total number of around 7000 copies. The reader will also remember that with the multiplication of the editions, the number of errors in them (due to the lack of a native speaker corrector) grew accordingly. In spite of the fact that it cost her husband his life, when the third Antwerp edition of Tyndale’s NT was sold out, Catherine van Ruremund decided to reprint the book, one of her best-selling publications, once again.

The fourth edition of Tyndale’s NT translation from the van Ruremund enterprise was started in 1534. The first page was corrected by an Englishman whose identity is unknown. But he must have either abandoned the work and left, or displeased the widow, because after the first page had been printed and corrected she once again called upon Joye to do the proofs. Joye tried to dissuade the widow again by saying that her publication would not sell if Tyndale’s promised corrected edition came onto the market. But she was determined to publish it “for if he [Tyndale] printe. ii.m. & we as many/ what is so little a number for all england?” Furthermore, the widow intended to sell her edition “beter cheape” than Tyndale’s publisher would. Joye saw that whether he “had correcked theyr copie or not/ thei had gone forth with their worke” anyway and had brought out “.ii.m. mo bokes falselyer printed then euer […] before.” Tyndale’s original NT was first printed almost a decade earlier, and Joye had not received any sign from Tyndale that he would ever publish his promised corrections, in spite of the fact that he had two assistants to help him. Therefore, after some financial negotiations, Joye decided to

147 A short summary of this section has been published in Juhász, Cat. 102 in TT, pp. 159–60.
148 “Then the dewche began to printe them the fowrth tyme because thei sawe noman els goyng aboute them/ & aftir thei had printed the first leif which copye a nother englissh man had correcked to them/ thei came to me & desiered me to correcke them their copie” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C5r).
149 Joye, Apologye, sig. C5r.
150 Joye, Apologye, sig. C5r.
151 Joye, Apologye, sig. C5r.
152 “Then I thus considired with myself: englund hath ynowe & to many false testaments & is now likely to haue many mo: ye & that whether T. correck his or no, yet shal these now in hand goforth vn correcked to/ except some body correck them: And what T. dothe I wote not/ he maketh me nothing of his counsel/ I se nothinge come from him all this longe whyle. wherein with the helpe that he hathe/ that is to saye one bothe to wrye yt and to correcke it in the presse/ he myght haue done it thryse sence he was first moud
undertake the job. His job was to prepare and correct the original copy “wherby and aftir whyche the printer dyd sette his boke,” and also to do the proofs: “and correcked the same himselfe in the presse.”

The fourth van Ruremund English NT again took the form of the handy, small sextodecimo publications. The book contains 446 carefully printed folios and is illustrated with woodcuts at various places. As we know from the recently discovered unique copy of the Worms NT, which has to the present day preserved the sole extant title page, the fourth van Ruremund edition of Tyndale’s Testament (almost certainly like the three earlier editions) copied exactly Tyndale’s original title: *The new Testament as it was written/ and caused to be written/ by them which herde yt : Whom also oure Saueoure Christ Iesus commaunded that they shulde preach it vnto al creatures.* The colophon reads as follows: “Antwerpe: By me wydowe of Christoffel of Endhouen, In the yere of oure Lorde. M.CCCCC. and. xxxiiij. in August.” The only known copy is to be found in the British Library.
It is emblematic of the prejudice against Joye among the Tyndale scholars that before the time of the discovery of the Stuttgart copy, the title page of the fourth van Ruremund edition was often criticized. Mozley called Joye’s title (and thus, unknowingly, Tyndale’s wording) a “somewhat pompous title.” Demaus referred to it as “a pompous and affected title.” Westcott thought that it was “singularly affected.” Even Butterworth, one of the biographers of Joye, described it as “curious.” Had Mozley, Demaus, or Butterworth known that Joye (or rather the widow van Ruremund) was merely following Tyndale, there can be no doubt that they would have passed a different judgement concerning the title, perhaps something along the lines of that formulated by Eberhard Zwink, who, considering the fact that Joye took over Tyndale’s title literally, shows much understanding towards Tyndale’s fury (which will be discussed later). In any event, the ultimate responsibility for copying the original title in all probability lay with the van Ruremund family. As they had no English-speaking corrector for the first three editions (1526, 1530, and 1533/34), they were very unlikely to have changed the title for those editions. And since Tyndale had not reacted to any of those editions, the widow could justifiably presuppose that he was concerned about neither the editions nor their unchanged title. As to the effect of oddity, affectation, or pompousness of the wording, Eberhard Zwink rightly calls attention to its conspicuous parallel with the title of a 1524 Dutch NT edition from the Delft printer Cornelis Heyrinck:

DAt nieuwe Testament. welc is dat leuende woert Goods/ wtghesproken doer onsen salichmaker IESUS Christus/ dye welcke was God ende mensch/ beschreuen doer ingeuen des heyligen geests/ vanden heyligen Apostelen ende Euangelisten/ ende is dye wet der gracien/ der liefden/ ende des barmherticheyts/ met groter naersticheyt

157 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 270.
158 Demaus, William Tyndale, p. 359.
162 “Furthermore, we are also able to understand more clearly the sharpness of his [i.e. Tyndale’s] rebufke to fellow-reformer and translator George Joye, for publishing an edition containing important changes to which the reviser failed to own. Not only that, for as we now see, the original titlepage wording is imitated by Joye as if deliberately to pass of [sic] his revision as a reprint of Tyndale’s work” (IS Zwink, Good News from Stuttgart).
ouergeset ende gheprent in goede plattenduytsche. There can be very little doubt that Tyndale allowed himself to be inspired by this “curious” and “pompous” title, whether being acquainted with it directly through the Delft edition or through the Dutch NT from Antwerp, which Christoffel van Ruremund himself put out with a similar title (presumably inspired by the Delft example) in 1526. So it was just a matter of self-evidence that the fourth van Ruremund edition, too, bore the same title as the previous three.

Just like in Tyndale’s own edition, the name of the translator is left unmentioned. The book also follows T1526 in that there are no marginal notes, summaries, or prologues, only scriptural cross-references. Joye, or more likely the van Ruremunds, left out (very logically) Tyndale’s epilogue, the only place where the translator in the original Worms edition would have been indicated. Furthermore, J1534, like its forerunners from the van Ruremund press, contains “An almanacke for xviii yeres” (with the dates of the movable feasts) and a liturgical calendar at the beginning of the volume, and a table of the readings of the Gospels and the epistles for Sundays and the feasts of the saints according to the Sarum (Salisbury) use at the end.

---

163 IS Zwink, Verwirrspiel um eine Bibel.
165 David Daniell is incorrect when he writes that the title page contained Tyndale’s name: “all this was done silently, appearing under Tyndale’s name on the title-page” (Daniell, William Tyndale, p. 325).
166 There is one marginal note at 1 Cor. 15:33: “Menander.” Francis Fry mistakenly writes that the note reads “Menander against evil communications” (Fry, A Bibliographical Description, p. 38). The note possibly goes back to Erasmus’ NT edition, in which Erasmus comments in the Annotationes that Paul is quoting here from the Greek poet Menander (342–291 BC): “Corruptum mores. ϕείδρουσιν ἥνῃ χρηςα ὁμιλίαι κακαί. [sic] Senarius est Menandri, quemadmodum indicat diuus Hieronymous, & constat suis pedibus si seruetur apostrophus ϕείδρουσιν ἥνῃ χρηςα ὁμιλίαι κακαί. Nos carmen carmini reddidimus. Mores bonos colloquia corruptum mala” (Erasmus, Novum Instrumentum, 1516, p. 480. Cf. Menander, Thäis, fragment 218, printed among the Sententiae e codicibus Byzantinis, in Menandri sententiae, ed. Siegfried Jäkel, Leipzig: Teubner, 1964, p. 42, li. 808). It is, however, possible that Joye’s source was Jerome, another Church Father, or a later, secondary source (cf. Jerome, Commentaria in Epistolam ad Titum, ad I,12 and Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas, ad II,24; Maurus Magnentius Rabanus, Ennarationum in Epistolis Beati Pauli, ad Gal. IV,12). The quote from Menander’s Thäis had become a popular saying by the time First Corinthians was written (Gordon D. Fee, The First Epistle to the Corinthians, (The New International Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987, p. 773).
The biblical text of J1534 follows Tyndale’s earlier rendering closely. Joye did an outstanding job of correcting the text, because there are virtually no typographical errors left in the edition, an astounding achievement in his time. Joye, however, went beyond the mere amendment of misprints. Meticulous scholar that he was, he took the biblical text and put it side by side with Tyndale’s translation. Since his knowledge of Greek was not sufficient to rely on a Greek text, and the widow was urging him to hurry, Joye turned to Latin sources. As a basis of comparison he chose the Vulgate, and in all probability the same 1522 bilingual edition of Erasmus’ NT that Tyndale had used in preparing T1526. Following the Latin texts of his sources, he introduced stylistic changes wherever he deemed it necessary for a better understanding of the biblical texts and supplied the omissions Tyndale had made in his work. Joye’s corrections are usually belittled by scholars without them giving any evidence to support their negative evaluation. If any reason is given, it is usually related to Joye’s alleged lack of knowledge of Greek and that he foolishly followed the Vulgate. A fairly detailed survey of the changes presented by Butterworth and Chester, and the very appreciative study by Vivienne Westbrook render a very different picture of Joye’s editorial work. A few of Joye’s corrections were obsolete or not as well chosen, but a good many

167 “Most writers on the subject have asserted that Joye’s textual corrections (aside from his revisions) were trifling in number. But this is not fair to Joye. It is based on a comparison of [J1534] with [T1526]. But [T1526] is not the text which Joye was correcting. He was correcting the corrupt Endhoven text, no copy of which survives for comparison. Under the circumstances, it is a fair assumption that the fewer the points of divergence between [T1526] and [J1534], the more efficiently did Joye perform his assigned task. […] On the whole, considering the state of the printing trade at the time and the fact that both texts had been set up by non-English compositors, [J1534] and [T1526] are remarkably close” (BC, George Joye, pp. 154–55).

168 “Where I founde a worde falsely printed, I mended it: & when I came to some derke sentenciis that no reason coude be gathered of them whether it was by the ignorance of the first translatour or of the prynter, I had the laytene text by me & made yt playn: & where any sentence was vnperfite or clene lefte oute I restored it agene: & gaue many wordis their pure & natiue significacion in their places which thei had not before” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C7r). Joye supplied Tyndale’s omitted clauses in e.g. Jn. 6:15 and Rom. 12:13. For further examples of Joye’s editorial work, see: BC, George Joye, pp. 154–63; 269–72; and Vivienne Westbrook, George Joye’s New Testament in Vivienne Westbrook, Long Travail and Great Paynes. A Politics of Reformation Revision, (Studies in Early Modern Religious Reforms 1), Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2001, pp. 1–13.

169 E.g. Daniell, William Tyndale, pp. 322–26. Joye’s first biographer and friend, John Bale, wrote that Joye was “utraque lingua Latina & Graeca peritus” (Bale, Illustrium majoris Britannieae scriptorum summarium, fo. 239v), but there is no evidence for this claim in Joye’s works or in any other source.

170 See supra in n. 168.
did bring improvement to the text, and some twenty of them made their way into later versions, including Coverdale, Matthew's, Geneva, and the King James Version.\(^{171}\) In some instances, Joye’s changes were rejected by the subsequent versions, but modern scholarly Bible translations vindicate Joye’s work. For example, in Lk. 7:49, Jesus’ table company at the house of Simon the Pharisee see themselves, “Who is this which forgivest synnes also?” In Joye’s NT the same passage is rendered with, “Who is this whych forgeueth euen sinnes?” Although Coverdale, the Geneva Bible, and the King James Version all followed Tyndale’s wording, modern translations (ASV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, NIB, NAS, NAU, etc.) support Joye’s change.\(^{172}\) At any rate, the result of Joye’s editorial endeavours was a smoothly readable, carefully printed text.

There is, however, one noteworthy feature in the fourth van Ruremund edition of Tyndale’s NT that still needs to be mentioned here. Joye translated the Latin word *resurrectio* (or another form or cognate of the *resurgo* verb) in twenty-two places as “the lyfe after this” or a similar expression.\(^{173}\) Of these twenty-two places, eighteen have to do with the belief denied by the Sadducees (Mk. 12:18–27 *et par.*; Acts 23–24). The other four instances are scattered occasional instances in three different verses (Lk. 14:14; Jn. 5:29 (twice); and Heb. 11:35), where the biblical author speaks about a *resurrectio* immediately after death or evidently before the end times. In all of these places Tyndale’s original translation reads *resurreccion* (or a form of the verb ‘to rise’). In the other seventy-three instances, where the Latin texts read *resurrectio* or another form of the *resurgo* stem, Joye retained Tyndale’s original ‘resurreccion,’ to ‘ryse agayne,’ ‘rysing from deeth,’ and so on.\(^{174}\) This choice of words, of course, in light of his letter to Latimer is not entirely surprising. Yet it resulted in what is now usually called the ‘Tyndale–Joye Debate’ and is dealt with in what forms the core of this book.

---


\(^{172}\) For further examples see BC, *George Joye, passim*, esp. 133–34, 141–42, 155–62, and 269–72. For other possible improvements to Tyndale’s biblical translations suggested by Joye and vindicated by later versions, see *infra* on p. 398.

\(^{173}\) Mt. 22:23, 28, 30, 31; Mk. 12:18, 23 (twice), 25, 26; Lk. 14:14; 20:27, 33, 35, 36, 37; Jn. 5:29 (twice); Acts 23:6, 24:15, 21; and 11:35. See in *infra* in the *Appendix* on pp. 440ff.

\(^{174}\) Mt. 11:15, 16, 21, 17, 19, 23 [Vg. 17:22], 20:19, 26:32, and 17:53, 63; Mk. 1:4, 8, 31, 39, 10 [Vg. 9:8, 9], 9:30, 14:28, and 16:14; Lk. 2:34, 7, 22, 16:31, 18:33, and 24:46; Jn. 2:22, 11:23, 24 (twice), 25, and 209; Acts 1:22, 2:31, 4:23, 10:41, 17:3, 18:32, and 26:23; Rom. 1:4, 42, 6:5, 7, 4, and 8:34; 1 Cor. 15:4, 12 (twice), 13 (twice), 14, 15, 16 (twice), 17, 20, 21, 29, 32, 35, 36, 42, 51, 52; 2 Cor. 5:15; Phil. 3:10, 11; Col. 2:12; 1 Thes. 4:14, 16; 2 Tim. 2:8, 18; Heb. 6:2; 1 Pt. 1:3, 2:11; and Rev. 20:3, 6.
Tyndale's Second Foreword in His First Revised New Testament (November 1534)\textsuperscript{175}

In November 1534, only three months after Joye's edition, Tyndale's own revised edition (promised almost a decade earlier) finally appeared from the press of Merten de Keyser. In fact it is quite plausible that George Joye's edition might have given Tyndale the final impetus to finish up his own revision as quickly as possible.\textsuperscript{176} In this revised edition, for the first time in any of his biblical translations, Tyndale put his full name on the title page, which reads: ¶The newe Testament/ dylygently corrected and compared with the Greke by Willyam Tindale. The volume, an octavo of 424 folios, is printed in black-letter type and is nicely illustrated with woodcuts, some of which also appear in other Antwerp publications.\textsuperscript{177} The text bears witness to Tyndale's diligent correction, which was a very serious revision of the 1526 Worms edition. He introduced changes in the text in many places and improved the translation a great deal.\textsuperscript{178} On a few occasions he accepted Joye's corrections.\textsuperscript{179}

\textsuperscript{175} A summary of this section has been published as: Juhász, Cat. 103 in TT, pp. 160–61.


\textsuperscript{178} "Here thou hast (moost deare reader) the new Testame\textsuperscript{n}t or covenaunt made wyth vs of God in Christes bloude. Which I have looked over agayne (now at the last) with all dylygence/ and compared it vnto the Greke/ and have weded oute of it many fautes/ which lacke of helpe at the begynninge and oversyght/ dyd sowe therin" (T1534 ¶ W.T. vnto the Reader., sig. *1v (verso of the title page)). On the differences between the 1526 and 1534 editions, see: Daniell, William Tyndale, pp. 316–32; Tibor Fabiny, 'This day is health come unto this house.' When 'Health' Disappears in Favour of 'Salvation' in William Tyndale's Two Translations of the New Testament (1526 and 1534), in Kathleen E. Dubs (ed.), What Does It Mean?, (Pázmány Papers in English and American Studies 3), Piliscsaba: Pázmány Péter Catholic University, 2004, pp. 116–38.

\textsuperscript{179} E.g. Mt. 11:18; Lk. 16:22–23; Jn. 5:45; and Heb. 13:21. Butterworth and Chester believe that Tyndale and Joye worked independently from each other and arrived at the same results by accident (BC, George Joye, p. 158). Note, however, that Tyndale explicitly claimed to have seen Joye's edition, and that he exhibited a thorough familiarity with Joye's translation (cf. infra on p. 335). O'Sullivan also gives Rom. 12:13 as an example (O'Sullivan, The Bible Translations of George Joye, p. 34). This, however, was not corrected in the November 1534 edition of Tyndale, but only in his next revision, published in 1535 (William Tyndale, (trans.), The newe Testament yet once agayne corrected by Willyam Tindale, Antwerp, [Merten de Keyser] for G[odfried] v[an] der Haghen, 1534/1535 [1535]); however, it certainly serves as an example of where Tyndale followed Joye in a later edition. She also makes mention of the correction of the confusing marginal notes at 1 Jn. 3, pointed out by Joye in his Apologye (sig. G1v). This, too, is a reference to Tyndale's 1535 edition, because
There is no evidence that would show—and we have no reason to believe—that Tyndale had reacted to any of the previous three van Ruremund editions of his NT translation. But his reaction to Joye’s redaction of the fourth van Ruremund English NT was one of fury. In this November 1534 edition, Tyndale inserted a fuming second prologue, entitled: “Willyam Tindale/ yet once more to the christen reader.” This second prologue is a direct attack on George Joye and his edition. Tyndale’s words were inspired by his *furor theologicus*. Namely, Tyndale was infuriated both by Joye’s role in the fourth van Ruremund edition and by his theological presuppositions. The fact that the edition was published anonymously exasperated Tyndale even more, because he was concerned that the edition would be mistakenly associated with his name: his revised edition had been expected to appear, and the translation of the NT was inextricably bound to his name. He did not want people to connect such an ‘unorthodox’ revision with his name. His reputation, or rather his ‘honour,’ a key notion for his contemporaries, was endangered. Probably the fact that the van Ruremund Testaments now constituted competition that undersold his own edition, and thus endangered Tyndale’s financial interest, played a certain role in his discontent.

In the works on Tyndale, there are three further factors that are customarily listed as contributing to Tyndale’s fury: (1) that the edition was “pirated,” (2) that it was prepared secretly without Tyndale’s knowledge, and (3) that it was prepared by “a supposed friend, one of his own party.” However, as will be apparent from the following discussion, none of these arguments can be rightfully sustained.

1. The idea of copyright was undeveloped in the early 16th century. The idea that came the closest to it was the various privileges granted

there were no marginal notes in the Worms edition. She does mention “two editions of his [i.e., Tyndale’s] New Testament a matter of months before his arrest” (ibid.), yet it is not altogether clear what change appeared in which of Tyndale’s revisions.

181 Cf. Bugenhagen’s concern at the publication of his Psalter in Bucer’s translation and the eagerness of the Dutch translators to clear Bugenhagen’s name from the imputation of heresy, *supra* on pp. 212ff.
182 Cf.: “But his [i.e. Tyndale’s] indignation was aroused in the first instance because this fourth Endhoven edition had been corrected secretly be a supposed friend […] who, knowing that Tyndale’s own revision was well advanced, nevertheless entered into a contract with a competitor in order to anticipate Tyndale and thus catch a trade” (BC, *George Joye*, p. 165).
by monarchs, governments, and other civil authorities. These ensured the exclusive rights of a **printer or publisher** to issue a certain book in order to safeguard his or her financial interests and investments. More often than not, these privileges were limited in their time frame (usually lasting a few years until the necessary investment of the initial print run was recuperated) and geographic location (by the jurisdiction of the granting authorities). The very fact that such privileges were requested testifies to the existence of innumerable reprints of popular books in the first century of printing. But texts and wording as such were not at all regarded as the intellectual property of their **authors**. Therefore, to speak of ‘pirated’ editions is rather anachronistic. In the case of printing a Bible, the notion of literary property was even less problematic. No one could possibly claim the rights of the author, and Tyndale certainly rejected the claim of the Catholic Church to be the true heir and only rightful possessor and interpreter of the Scriptures. Thus, the rights of translations and their translators were even less in question. Hence, claiming the rights of a translation of the Bible is an idea completely alien to the mindset of the 16th century. Furthermore, the official licenses served as

---

**Witcombe, Copyright in the Renaissance. Prints and the Privilegio in Sixteenth-Century Venice and Rome**, (SMRT 100), Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2004; Paulina Kewes (ed.), **Plagiarism in Early Modern England**, Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. Although Daniell emphasizes that there was no copyright or literary ownership, he repeatedly uses expressions such as “piracy,” “pirated,” etc. (Daniell, *Tyndale, Roye, Joye & Copyright*, p. 94).

185 Witcombe, *Copyright in the Renaissance*, passim, see e.g. pp. xxv and 21–23.

186 For example, Erasmus’ first bilingual edition of the NT (*Novum Instrumentum*, Basel: Froben, 1516), was published with the imperial privilege: “CVM PRIVILEGIO MAXIMILIANI CAESARIS AVGVTI, NE QVIS ALIVS IN SACRA ROMANI IMPERII DITIONE, INTRA QVATVR ANNOS EXCVDAT, AVT ALIBI EXCVSVM IMPORTET” (title page). The privilege was meant to safeguard Johannes Froben and not Erasmus.

187 “Modern writers have tended to speak of the Endhoven editions of Tyndale’s New Testament as ‘pirated.’ To do so is probably an anachronism. For decades after the invention of printing, as in all literate centuries which preceded, the notion of literary ‘property’ was rudimentary, if it existed at all. Innumerable cases might be cited from the first century of the trade in printed books of a single work issued in several editions by as many different printers or publishers with no question of literary ‘piracy’ arising” (BC, *George Joye*, p. 165).

188 “The fact that the literary work we are here considering was a translation of the Holy Scripture made the problem even less difficult. No one could claim the author’s rights in the Word of God, and as yet the question of the rights of the translator had not been raised” (BC, *George Joye*, p. 165).

189 Cf. Joye’s words in his *Apologye*: “And euene here for all his holy protestacio[n] yet herd I neuer sobre & wyse man so praye his own workis as I herde him praise his exposition of the .v. vj. and .vij. ca. Mat. In so myche that myne eares glowed for shame to here him/ & yet was it Luther that made it/ T. onely but translating and powldering yt here and there with his own fantasies” (Joye, *Apologye*, sigs. F3–F4r).
a means of control over the material that was being printed, and as such they functioned as “an effective censoring device.”\textsuperscript{190} Being as heterodox as it was, Tyndale’s work could not under any circumstances make any claim for such a protection. As we mentioned, Tyndale had not reacted to any of the previous van Ruremund editions. In 1535 Tyndale’s NT was reprinted by another Antwerp printer, Johannes Steels, too.\textsuperscript{191} This edition was left without comment by Tyndale.\textsuperscript{192}

2. Since Tyndale himself complained in the second foreword that he was unaware of the preparation of the fourth van Ruremund Testament, this will be treated together with his other “charges” against Joye. Here, it will suffice to remind the reader that according to Joye’s testimony, the widow van Ruremund turned first to Tyndale for his correction before the publication of their third edition.\textsuperscript{193}

3. The breach of friendship is the most serious charge for which Joye’s 20th-century biographers “condemn” him.\textsuperscript{194} Butterworth and Chester believe that Tyndale would not even have complained about the fourth van Ruremund edition “had its text been corrected by some Englishman unknown to him.”\textsuperscript{195} There is, however, no support for that belief in Tyndale’s words, and their understanding of the breach of friendship seems to differ from the charge Tyndale brings against Joye. This question, too, will be treated in detail below.

Turning to the content of Tyndale’s second foreword, its line of reasoning gives the impression of being rather incoherent and unsystematic. Tyndale wrote vindictively and with much irritation. In seemingly random order, he brought both \textit{ad hominem} charges against George Joye, and philological and theological arguments against Joye’s changes and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{190} \textit{Witcombe, Copyright in the Renaissance}, p. xxv.
\item \textsuperscript{191} \textit{New Testament}, Antwerp: Johannes Steels, [1535].
\item \textsuperscript{192} The fact that literary ‘property’ was not recognized does not mean that any idea of plagiarism was completely absent, even if the term itself is anachronistic. While liberal ‘borrowing,’ adaptation, redaction, or reworking of other people’s ideas or even entire books (cf. Karlstadt and Westerburg) happened frequently, claiming the authorship for someone else’s work without any (considerable) contribution was, of course, recognized as fraud. (see Joye’s words \textit{supra} in n. 189). This was, however, not the case in the Tyndale–Joye controversy, as Joye did not claim any authorship over Tyndale’s translation.
\item \textsuperscript{193} See \textit{supra} on p. 294.
\item \textsuperscript{194} “Of this charge [i.e. breach of friendship] Joye stands condemned” (BC, \textit{George Joye}, p. 166). The very idea of charging, condemning, or acquitting Joye of any charge at all comes across as a surprise in a supposedly scholarly and objective work.
\item \textsuperscript{195} BC, \textit{George Joye}, p. 165.
\end{itemize}
the alleged underlying theological assumptions. Nevertheless, Tyndale's words, as will be demonstrated, were very carefully chosen.

On a personal level, Tyndale accused Joye of being dishonest in his translation by not putting “his awne name thereto and call it rather his awne translacion: & that he playeth boo pepe.” For in some of his books, Tyndale claimed, George Joye did put his own name on the title page. However, it is surprising to find such an argument put forth in an NT that is the first of all of William Tyndale’s biblical translations to bear his full name. At the same time, Tyndale accused Joye of seeking “vayne glorie”: not a very convincing argument to pronounce about an anonymous edition. As he repeatedly but unjustly accused Sir Thomas More of “couetousenesse,” Tyndale also wrote that Joye, too, was moved by greed when accepting the correction of the van Ruremund NT.

Tyndale also claimed that the whole business was done secretly: he did not know anything about Joye’s intentions and theological opinions, or about the printing and correction of the NT for the van Ruremumps. This is, however, not entirely correct. As has been observed, Tyndale was well...

---

196 T1534, sig. **7r. Cf. Erasmus’ reaction to Bucer’s pseudonymity supra on p. 214.
197 See supra in n. 85 on p. 23.
198 T1534, sig. **4r.
199 “These things to be euen so M. More knoweth wel ynowngh. For he understandeth the greke/ and he knew them longe yer I. But so blinde is couetousenessse and drunken desire of honoure.” (Tyndale, An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialogue, sig. B4r). Cf: “But verelie I thinke that as ludas betraid not christ for any loue that he had vnto the hie prestes/ scribes and pharases/ but only to for that wherfore he thirsted: euen so M. More (as there are tokens evident) wrote not these bokes for any affeccyon that he bare vnto the spirituallie or vnto the opinions which he so barelie defendeth/ but to obtayne only that which he was an hongred fore [. . .]” (Tyndale, An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialogue, sig. A7r”). “[More] Fynally couetousnes maketh many (whom the truthe pleaseth at the begynnynge) to caste it vppe agayne and to be afterwarde the moste cruel ennemyes thereof after the ensample of Symon Magus. Actes. viii. Ye and after the ensample of Sir Thomas More. K. whiche knewe the truthe & for couetousnes forsoke it agayne and conspyred fyrst with the Cardynal to dysceauke the kyngge and to leade hym in darchenes [. . .] Couetoues blynded the eyes of that glerynge foxe more and more and hardened hys harte agaynst the truthe/ with the confyndence of hys paynted poetry, babyllynge eloquence and iuggelynge arguments of sutle sophrystry, grounded on his unwritten verytes, as true and as autentycke as hys storie of Vtopia” (Tyndale, An exposycyon vpon the. v.vi. vii. chapter of Mathewe, fo. lxxxiir). With this false accusation, Tyndale, as Mozley rightly points out, “does his enemy a serious injustice” (Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 220).
200 T1534, sig. **4r. Joye’s relation of his financial affairs with the van Ruremund enterprises, which we have no reason to call into question, contradicts any possibility of greed on Joye’s account. See infra on p. 354.
201 “George Joye secretly toke in hand to correct it [i.e. Tyndale’s first translation] also by what occasyon his conscience knoweth: & prevented me/ in so moche/ yat his correcyoun was prynted in great nombre/ yer myne beganne” (T1534, sig. **4r).
aware of Joye’s theological position. Tyndale himself acknowledged that he knew about Joye’s views: just a few lines after professing that he “was astonyed & wondered not a lytle what furye had dryuen him [i.e. Joye] to make soche chaunge,” he recognized that he knew that “George Joye hath had of a longe tyme marvelouse ymaginacio

s about this worde resurreccio

n, yat it shuld be taken for the state of the soules after departinge from their bodyes.” Tyndale also mentioned that he had argued and reasoned with Joye and that Frith, who was only dissuaded by Tyndale from writing against Joye, had asked Joye to cease spreading such ideas among the Protestants in England.

If we can believe Joye’s account in his Apologye, Tyndale’s claim that the fourth van Ruremund edition was done in secret is also incorrect. According to Joye, as has been pointed out, Tyndale was asked by the widow for his corrections but refused the job. On the basis of the general reliability of Joye, which can be witnessed in his Apologye, it is very unlikely that Joye would have willingly misrepresented the truth or would have been misinformed.

Tyndale’s philological arguments are more solid than the personal ones. He criticized Joye on two grounds. First, for his “chaunge/ to turne resurreccion into lyfe after this lyfe” as being unprecedented in “saynt Jeromes and all ye translatours that ever [Tyndale] heard of in what tonge so euer it be.” Second, that an arbitrary change to the translation of a certain word might bring the whole question of translation into jeopardy by prompting others to follow the example and bring about even more changes in the text. Joye’s modern biographers are seemingly in accord with Tyndale’s criticism, namely, that “Joye, in the interest of advancing one of his own theological views, had wilfully mistranslated an important word.”

Paradoxically, Tyndale’s own translation can be criticized on the basis of both arguments. It is surprising to observe, in fact, that Tyndale’s attitude shows a lot of similarity to those of his own critics. When Tyndale

202 See supra on p. 305.
203 T1534, sig. **4v.
204 T1534, sig. **5v.
205 T1534, sig. **5r.
206 T1534, sig. **4v.
207 “Now by ye same auctorite/ & with as good reason shall another come […] & so put in his diligent correccion & mocke oute ye text” (T1534, sig. **5v).
criticized Joye for the translation of the word *resurrectio*, he may not have realized that he did exactly the same thing for which he had been criticized by Thomas More and other Catholic parties: formulating philological criticism on the basis of theological arguments. In other words, both Tyndale and Joye ventured down a path that is very sensitive: viz. the replacement of the translation of a well-established, theologically heavily charged word (such as ἐκκλησία, μετανοέω, or πρεσβύτερος in Tyndale’s case, or *resurrectio* in Joye’s case) with another phrase that does not carry the same connotations. James Andrew Clark rightly says that

> For those who would render sacred texts, the choice between lexical and semiotic ideas of translation is especially important. The idea that rules the translator’s practical consciousness will draw or at least diffract the boundary line between permissible and impermissible license in the rendering, that is to say, between norm and heresy. Moreover, as Tyndale’s case shows, that boundary may also be contested by one’s readers, intended or otherwise.209

One could apply Clark’s remark to Joye’s case as well. And as for stimulating others to bring about even more changes, Joye can justifiably be seen as a good student of Tyndale who in the history of English Bible translations took the first steps towards changing the traditional biblical terms.

When it comes to theological arguments, Tyndale is frequently presented as if he had accused Joye of denying the bodily resurrection. And indeed, that is the immediate impression one gets from reading Tyndale’s second foreword:

> thorow out Mat. Mark & Luke perpetually: and ofte in the actees/ & sometyme in John & also in the hebrues/ where he [i.e. Joye] fyndeth this worde Resurreccio/ he chaungeth it into ye lyfe after this lyfe/ or verielyfe/ and soche lyke/ as one that abhorred the name of resurrection.210

The careful reader, however, notices that Tyndale here does not claim that Joye did not believe in bodily resurrection. He only says that Joye in those instances avoids the use of the word resurrection as someone who does not believe in the resurrection would do. Tyndale’s words, however, make the casual reader believe that Tyndale meant to say that Joye did

---

209 J.A. Clark, *Norm and License in Tyndale’s New Testament Translation*, in J.A.R. Dick & A. Richardson (eds.), *William Tyndale and the Law*, (SCES 25), Kirksville: SCJ Publishers, 1994, p. 60. Clark, however, does not seem to realize the consequences of his own words and speaks ironically of Joye’s “correction.” He also seems to approve of Tyndale’s attitude towards Joye, when “Tyndale rejects as heretical license the liberties that Joye has taken with his normative text” (ibid., pp. 66–67).

210 T1534, sig. **4r**.
not accept the resurrection of the body.\footnote{Cf. the myriad of disparaging secondary literature along the lines of the conservative consensus that rely solely on Tyndale’s words and assume that Joye actually denied the bodily resurrection. Just one illustration: “The reason for his emandation: a rejection of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.” (Gerald Snare,\textit{ Translation and Transmutation in William Tyndale and Thomas Watson}, in \textit{Translation and Literature} 12 (2003), p. 195.)} This impression is strengthened by Tyndale’s claim that “George Joyes correcion doth manyestlye affirme” that there will be no resurrection of the flesh.\footnote{T1534, sig. **5v.} Here again, Tyndale does not say that Joye denied the resurrection of the flesh but that his \textit{translation} manifestly denies it. It is not surprising, then, that Tyndale’s second foreword creates the impression that Joye actually denied the resurrection of the body. This is also how Joye himself understood Tyndale’s words, and we have reason to believe that it was precisely the way Tyndale wanted his text to be understood. He most likely wanted to create the impression that George Joye rejected the bodily resurrection, without saying it in so many words.\footnote{This is corroborated by Joye’s account in the \textit{Apologye}: “the tother [disciple of Tyndale] harped on his masters vntwned string, saying that because I englissh Resurreccio the lyfe after this, men gatherd that I denied the general resurreccion: which errour (by their own sayng) was gathred longe before this boke was printed” (Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. C6v). Also: “he [i.e. Tyndale] must now reuoke his sclaunderouse & lying pistle wher in he sayth that I abhorre the name of the resurreccion &that I shuld denye it” (Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. D6v).}

Although Tyndale never thought so, scholars of the ‘conservative consensus,’ on the basis of Tyndale’s words quoted above, frequently tend to present Joye as having a peculiar and bizarre interest in matters of post-mortem existence. As the reader will surely remember, the theological positions dicussed in chapter three clearly give the lie to any such suggestion. In fact, in June 1534 Archbishop Thomas Cranmer issued an order that forbade preachers to discuss topics that might cause dissension and would endanger the ‘unity and quietness’ of the realm, viz. “purgatory, honouring of saints, that priests may have wives, that faith only justifieth, to go on pilgrimages, to forge miracles.”\footnote{Cranmer, \textit{Miscellaneous Writings and Letters}, pp. 460–61.} It is significant that the first two items on the archbishop’s list refer to beliefs concerning post-mortem existence.

We have seen that Tyndale, as if offhandedly, enumerates the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, as well as the Acts of the Apostles and the Letter to the Hebrews, as examples of places where Joye replaces the word ‘\textit{resurreccion},’ as Tyndale noticed while casually looking through
Joye’s NT edition. This long list of places (re-enforced by Tyndale’s over-statement “perpetually”)\textsuperscript{215} gives the reader the impression that Joye struck out every single occurrence (or at least most of them) of the word ‘resurreccion.’ In fact, it should be noted that Tyndale enumerates here all of the twenty-two places where Joye does not translate the Latin \textit{resurrectio} into English with the word resurrection.\textsuperscript{216} As was already indicated, of these twenty-two places, more than seventy per cent refer to the belief denied by the Sadducees.\textsuperscript{217} At the same time, Tyndale remains silent about those seventy-three instances where Joye did keep Tyndale’s original ‘resurreccion,’ ‘ryse agayn,’ ‘rysing from deeth,’ etc. for the translation of \textit{resurrectio} and its cognates.\textsuperscript{218} And these seventy-three occurrences where Joye retained the word ‘resurreccion’ or its cognates are not just incidental references to the resurrection; they include every single reference to the resurrection of Jesus, as well as the core Pauline texts that describe the final resurrection of the body in 1 Thes. 4–5 and 1 Cor. 15. It will suffice to illustrate this by means of this latter, renowned passage of Paul where the various forms of ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι (all of these are translated by the forms of the \textit{resurgo} stem in the Vg and by Erasmus) are found no fewer than thirteen times in this short text.\textsuperscript{219} The biblical text is presented here as it is found in the edition of Joye in the fourth van Ruremund publication of Tyndale’s Testament:

\begin{quote}
If Christ be preached howe that he rose from deeth/ howe saye some that are amonge you: that there is no resurreccion from detth? [sic] If there be no rysynge agayne from deeth/ then is Christ not rysen. Iff Christ be not rysen/ then is oure preachynge vayne/ and youre fayth is also in vayne, yee/ and we are founde falce wytnesses of God: For we haue testified against God howe that he raysed vppe Christ/ whom he raysed not vppe agayne/ For yf the dead ryse not agayne/ then ys Christ not rysen agayne. Iff yt be so that Christ rose not/ then is youre fayth in vayne/ and yet are ye in youre synnes/ Also they which are fallen a slepe in Christ/ are perysshed. Iff in thys lyfe only we beleue on Christ/ then are we of all men the most miserablest.
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{See supra p. 326.}
\footnote{Cf.: “Tyndale does not charge Joye, as many later writers have done, with casting out the word \textit{resurrection} altogether, but only with altering it in some places, and when we compare his list of places with the book itself, the two exactly correspond” (MOZLEY, \textit{William Tyndale}, p. 277).}
\footnote{See supra on p. 326.}
\footnote{See supra n. 174 on p. 326.}
\footnote{Additionally, in 1522 Paul also uses the word ζωοποιήσονται (rendered by \textit{vivificabuntur} in the Latin), which Tyndale translated into English by “shall be made aliue.”}
\end{footnotes}
Nowe is Christ rysen from deeth/ and is become the fyrst frutes of them that kept. For by a man cam deeth/ and by a man cam resurreccion from deeth. For as by Adam all dye/ euen so by Christ/ shall all be made aliue.220

If Tyndale found the irrelevant example in an insignificant and vague passage in the letter to the Hebrews (referring to a/some resuscitation, and not to a resurrection in the strict theological sense of the word),221 it is unthinkable that he, knowing the Scriptures as well as he did, could possibly have overlooked these far more relevant passages. One cannot but conclude that it was Tyndale’s intention that his foreword should be understood as if Joye had eliminated all or most of the occurrences of ‘resurreccion.’222

A few paragraphs later Tyndale brought up the subject again. He informed his readers “that George Joye hath hath of a longe tyme marvellouse ymaginacio[n] about this worde resurreccion/ yat it shuld be taken for the state of the soules after their departinge from their bodies.”223 Tyndale mentioned his discussion with Joye on the matter and the latter’s letters which resulted, according to Tyndale’s information, in that no small nomber thorow his curiositie/ vtterly denye the resurreccion of ye fleshe & bodye/ affirminge yat the soule when she is departed/ is the spirituall bodye of the resurreccion/ & other resurreccion shall there none be. [...] And of this all is George Joyes vnquyet curiosite ye hole occasion/ whether he be of the sayde faccion also/ or not/ to that let him answer him selfe.224

To whom Tyndale referred here is uncertain, for no such belief was documented in England at the time. But the accusation that Joye’s ideas would have initiated this heresy is later rejected very emphatically by Joye.225 Most likely Tyndale was misinformed. But his unwarranted assertion that this belief was started by Joye and the insinuations that Joye shared

220 J1534, sigs. Ff3r–Ff4r (1 Cor. 15:12–22).
221 See infra on p. 379.
222 Cf. Demaus, who is surprised to find out that “the changes which thus excited Tyndale’s indignation were, not, indeed, so numerous as he seems to have imagined” (DEMAUS, William Tyndale, p. 373).
223 T1534, sig. **5r. This is probably the text that made David Daniell believe that “Joye had already published his ideas about resurrection” (DANIELL, Tyndale, Roye, Joye and Copyright, p. 98). Joye, however, had not put anything out in print on the question. He did write his letters to the “yonge man” and to Latimer, which were meant and thus treated as open letters, but nothing had been published in the strict sense of the word.
224 T1534, sig. **5r.
225 See infra on p. 357.
these ideas are enough to create the lasting impression in the reader that George Joye factually denied the resurrection of the body.

This feeling is strengthened when Tyndale states his own faith in the corporal resurrection based on the resurrection of Jesus Christ:

 Wherfore/ concernynge the resurreccion/ I protest before god and oure savioure Jesus Christ/ and before the vniversall congregacion that beleueth in him/ that I beleve accordyng to the open and manyfest scriptures & catholyck fayth/ that Christ is rysen agayne in ye flesshe which he receaved of his mother ye blessed virgin marie/ & bodye wherin he dyed. And yat we shall all both good and bad ryse bothe flesshe & bodye/ & apere together before the judgement seat of christ/ to receave every man accordyng to his dedes. And that the bodyes of all that beleve and contynew in the true fayth of christ/ shalbe endewed with lyke immortalyte and glorie as is ye bodye of christ.226

It is needless to say that there is not a word in this that George Joye would have called into question. Tyndale, from his many discussions with Joye, must have known this. Since Tyndale has already distanced himself from Joye's edition, his orthodoxy in the area of the bodily resurrection cannot possibly be called into question. The only plausible reason for Tyndale's manifest statement of his orthodox faith is the implied allegation that Joye denied anything that was professed by Tyndale with such theatricality.

It must not be forgotten that in the 16th century, depicting Joye (even without actually saying it in so many words) as somebody who denied the bodily resurrection and who caused schisms and dogmatic dissent entailed a serious endangerment of his life. Tyndale's charges against Joye came dangerously close to saying that Joye was an Anabaptist, or at least that his ideas inspired Anabaptists.227 With burning or drowning as punishment, such an allegation, as was pointed out earlier, could have cost anyone his or her life in 1534, even in the relatively tolerant Antwerp, where the authorities were reluctant to act against ‘ordinary’ Lutherans.228 Furthermore, given that Anabaptists were abhorred equally by Catholics and Protestants, branding Joye (unjustly) as Anabaptist was an extremely powerful instrument to discredit him and his work in circles of mainstream

226 T1534, sig. **6r.
227 Tyndale’s identification of Joye as an Anabaptist is perhaps the result of an unconscio- us ‘guilt by association’ reasoning on Tyndale’s part. As has been pointed out, Joye’s most probable first place of stay on the Continent, Strasbourg harboured a number of radical Reformers on the run (see supra on pp. 19 and 278). Eventually they were imprisoned or ousted from there on the initiative of Bucer (see supra on p. 208).
228 See supra on p. 280.
Christianity, an instrument that would have its lasting effects down to present-day scholarship in the ‘coservative consensus.’

But Tyndale knew exactly what Joye’s real reasons were for those changes in the translation. As he himself acknowledged, and as was later to be confirmed by Joye in his Apologe, Tyndale had long been familiar with Joye’s “marvelous ymaginacion” and knew that Joye was not so much concerned about the bodily resurrection, which Joye never denied, as with the question of the present state of the souls of the deceased. In that regard, as has already been observed, Joye shared the commonly accepted belief of his time that the souls of the departed are active, and the blessed are together with Christ. In Joye’s view, it is exactly this active state in the company of Christ, as will be observed later, to which those altered biblical places refer. That Tyndale was well aware of that, and that therefore it was not such an unprecedented idea as he claimed, is quite clear from Tyndale’s own words: “George Joye wyll saye (as I wot well he will) that his chaunge/ is the sence & meaninge of those scriptures.” This remark shows that Tyndale knew about Joye’s arguments, and he knew the scriptural references Joye used to support his idea. Tyndale knew that Joye was arguing for the meaning of the word *resurrectio* (or its Greek counterparts from the ἀνίστημι/ἐγείρω roots) in those places only, and not about resurrection in general, let alone the existence of bodily resurrection.

Tyndale, then, as cited above, seemingly to refute Joye’s position, stated his own belief in the bodily resurrection. In a new paragraph, he continued to explain his creed regarding the real question in the case, viz. the state of the souls after death. He professed to hold that “the soules departed in the fayth of Christ & loue of the lawe of God/ to be in no worse case than ye soule of Christ was/ from the tyme yat he delivered his sprite into the handes of his father/ vntyll the resurreccion of his bodye in glorie & immortalite.” Nonetheless, he doubted “yat they be all readie in the full glorie that Christ is in/ or the elect angels of god are in.” The reason behind this is based not on biblical grounds, but on a purely theoretical theological reasoning: “for if it so were,” Tyndale explained, “I se not but then the preachinge of the resurreccion of the flesshe were a thinge in vayne.” In other words, if the souls of the dead are already with Christ

---

229 See *infra* on p. 354.
230 T1534, sig. **5r.
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232 T1534, sig. **6v.
233 T1534, sig. **6v.
in the final bliss, in what sense could the resurrection of the body add anything more to that? Or to put it yet another way, if the resurrection of the dead—the final bliss, the most perfect state of happiness—is the ultimate reward of the faithful, then the souls of the departed cannot already be consorts of the angels and partaking in this happiness while they are awaiting their definitive glory at the end of the world.

It should not be left unnoticed that while Tyndale “desyred George Joye to take open textes that seme to make for yat purpose,” he himself did not use any biblical arguments to refute Joye, not even a single scriptural reference. Of course, Tyndale does make mention of the scriptural passages where Joye altered the translation of *resurrectio*. He also spells out one of these instances (Jn. 5:28–29). There Tyndale shows that if someone followed Joye’s reasoning then the sentence could be altered even further and the claim could be made that the souls (instead of the dead) will hear God’s voice. Such a claim would thus deny the resurrection of the flesh. The example is simply given as an illustration of Joye’s changes and what consequences they could have if taken to the extreme, but it is not meant to be a theological argument against them. The reader has to take Tyndale’s word for it that the original text has the meaning Tyndale presents. Tyndale uses no scriptural arguments, and no exegesis is presented to support his point of view. He, however, declared himself to be “readie to beleve

---
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235 “As for an ensample, when Christ sayth Jo. v. The tyme shall come in ye which all that are in the graves shall heare his voyce & shall come forth: they that have done good vnto resurreccion of lyfe, or with the resurreccion of lyfe, & they have done evell, vnto ye resurreccion or with the resurreccion of damnacion. George Joyes correccion is, they that have done good, shall come forth into the verie lyfe, & they that have done evell into the life of damnacion, thrustinge cleane oute this worde resurreccio. Now by ye same auctorite, & with as good reason shall another come & saye of the rest of yeat text, they yat are in ye sephulcres, shall heare his voyce, that ye sence is, the soules of them that are in the sephulcres shall heare his voyce, & so put in his diligent correccion & mocke oute ye text, that shall not make for ye resurreccio of the flesshe, which thinge also George Joyes correccion doth manyfestyke affirme” (T1534, sig. **5v).
236 Tyndale’s language contains many allusions to biblical expressions from his own translation (e.g. “vayne glory” cf. Phil. 2:3; “my parte be not in ye bloude of Christ” cf. 1 Cor. 10:16).
237 Of course, Tyndale’s agnostic position is precisely that Scripture remains silent on the question of what happens to the souls between death and resurrection. Accordingly, there could be no scriptural arguments used to support his view. Yet, he could have offered
it/ [i.e. that the souls of the departed are already in Heaven] if it maye be
proved with open scripture.”

The only reference to a biblical passage in Tyndale’s second foreword besides the instances of Joye’s alterations can be found in the expected answer Tyndale anticipated Joye would give. This reference is made to the passage where Jesus, according to the Gospel of Luke (23:43), declares to the repentant criminal who is crucified with him: “To daye thou shalt be with me in Paradise.” Tyndale mentions this passage only *passim* and makes no sense of it, but he ridicules any attempt Joye might make to use it as a possible text to support the existence (and active state) of souls after death. In fact, as Joye informs us in his *Apologye*, this is one of the references Joye had used in his discussions with Tyndale to support his case, prior to the appearance of Tyndale’s revision of the NT.

Before concluding our survey of Tyndale’s second foreword, one important aspect of this text still has to be mentioned. Tyndale introduced his attack on Joye at a very strategic point in his NT: it is placed after his first foreword and his “Prologe into the .iiii. Euangelystes” (an introductory note on the four evangelists and on their gospels), just before the beginning of the actual biblical text, in “the most public place he c[ould] find.” This is the place where the “Christen reader” is usually addressed by the editor, translator, or printer of the book in order to encourage or educate him about how to read and use the book most beneficially. Tyndale himself wrote such an introduction (first foreword: *W.T. vnto the Reader*), where he presented his elucidatory remarks. Tyndale used this crucial place to attack his fellow exile, to discredit him by making him appear as a heretic, and to discourage and prevent people from buying and reading the NT in Joye’s edition.

---

238 T1534, sig. **6v*. The question remains whether he was genuinely open to argument or only wanted to create a false sense of openness, as he indeed suggested to John Frith to do in his letter. See *supra* on p. 305.

239 See *supra* n. 235.
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242 DANIELL, Tyndale, Roye, Joye, and Copyright, p. 94.

243 Tyndale gives a fairly precise description of the colophon of the fourth van Ruremund NT in order to warn his readers not to buy that particular edition: “Finally that new Testament thus dyligently corrected/ besyde this so ofte puttinge oute this worde resureccion/ and I wote not what other chauenge/ for I have not yet reede it over/ hath in the ende before the Table of the of the Epistles and Gospelles this tytle: (Here endeth the new Testament dylygentlye ouersene and correct and printed now agayne at Andwarp/ by me
But Tyndale did not confine his reaction to Joye’s changes to the second prologue. He alluded to their dispute in his first foreword as well, and he changed his translation in Heb. 11:35, where he himself seemed to have translated ἀνάστασις by the phrase “to life again” in his first translation. He also added a note to the margin of 1 Pt. 4:6 claiming that “(The deed) are the ignoraunt of God, for they that be deed from this worlde haue no flesshe.” Finally, he included one more dig at Joye on the very last page of his NT. He placed it among his scriptural notes, which he included only to fill up the empty space on the last two folios:

{math.v.}Hell: it is called in Hebrue the valeye of Hennon. A place by Ierusalem/ where they burnt their chyldren in fyer vnto the ydole Moloch/ & is vsurped & taken now for a place where the wycked and vngodlye shalbe tormented both soule and bodye/ after the generall judgement.

Tyndale included these last two clauses against Joye, viz. to imply that the souls of the dead are indifferent, insensible, and unconscious before the general judgement.

Tyndale’s attack on Joye in his revised NT edition has always been regarded as an understandably angry and therefore justified rebuke to Joye. However, an unbiased study of Tyndale’s accusations, contrasted with the available facts and with Joye’s report, presents us, as has been

wydow of Christophell of Endhouen. In the yere of oure Lorde. A. M. D. xxxiiii. in August.) Which tylte (reader) I have here put in because by this thou shalt knowe the booke the better. Vale” (T1534, sigs. *8v–*8r). The actual colophon reads: “¶ Here endeth the new Testament diligently ouersene and corrected/ and prynted now agayn at Antwerpe/ by me wydowe of Christoffel of Endouen In the yere of oure Lorde. M. C C C C C. and xxxiiij. in August.”

244 “If any man fynde fautes ether with the translacion or ought besyde (which is easyer for manye to do/ then so well to have translated it them selves of their awne preg- nant wythes/ at the begynnynge withoute foresample) to the same it shalbe lawfull to tra- nslate it them selves and to put what they lust thereto. If I shall perceave ether by my selfe or by the informacion of other/ that ought be escaped me/ or myght be more playn- lye translated/ I will shortlye after/ cause it to be mended. Howbe it in manye places/ me thynketh it better to put a declaracyon in the margent/ then to runne to farre from the text. And in manye places/ where the text semeth at the first choppe harde to be vnder- stonde/ yet ye circumstances before and after/ and often readinge together/ maketh it playne ynoth. &c.” (W.T. vnto the Reader., T1534, sig. *t*).

245 For the Greek ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν, Tyndale has “The wemen receaved their deed to lyfe agayne” in his 1526 Worms edition, which he changed in his November 1534 revised edition to “And the wemen receaved their deed raysed to lyfe agayme” (emphasis mine). Joye points out this modification in his Apologye (Joye, Apologye, sig. B5†). See infra on p. 379.

246 T1535, fo. ccxcv.

247 ¶ These things have I added to fill vp the leffe with all” (T1534, sigs. Ee7v–Ee8r).

248 T1534, sig. Ee7v.
established in this section, with a different picture. To some degree, Tyndale’s anger is indeed understandable. It is perfectly reasonable that he distanced himself from an anonymously published NT edition that could be mistaken for his soon-to-appear new edition; the edition was based upon his own work but was seriously altered in a crucial point, which Tyndale considered to be an utter mistranslation. On the other hand, that Tyndale in all likelihood deliberately presented Joye (without actually saying it in so many words) as a heretic who denied the bodily resurrection, endangered Joye’s life and impaired his reputation for centuries.

JOYE’S SECOND NEW TESTAMENT (NOVEMBER 1534–JANUARY 1535)249

Joye felt unjustly and gravely impaired by Tyndale’s attack.250 As soon as it was published, Joye set out to write a “defence to pourge and clere [his] name whyche [Tyndale] had defamed & defiled.”251 And since Tyndale’s accusations were made in public, Joye intended to publish his defence too, as soon as he was ready. Mutual friends, however, intervened, called them together, and moved them to come to an agreement.

Mozley suggests that this agreement between Joye and Tyndale included two actions. First, that Joye withhold his defence completely, and second, that Tyndale recall and rewrite the preface for his fresh revision of the NT that he was putting into print.252 “In fact,” Mozley specifies, this “new preface was to be a joint affair (this was Tyndale’s own proposal), each man giving his reason for his rendering of resurrection, and leaving the matter to the judgement of the learned, and saluting with a common salutation as a mark of amity.”253 But Tyndale “had no great confidence that Joye was in earnest, when the reconciliation was engineered by mutual friends.”254 And, according to Mozley, this was rightly so, because the agreement, to Mozley’s understanding, was broken by Joye when the fifth van Ruremund edition came out on 9 January 1535, again containing Joye’s corrections and an additional short postscript by Joye. This postscript, in Mozley’s interpretation a renewed attack against Tyndale, would

249 A summary of this section has been published as: JUHÁSZ, Cat. 104 in TT, p. 161.
250 Cf. Bucer’s reaction to attacks on his person as a result of his translation of Bugenhagen’s Psalter (see supra on p. 214).
251 Joye, Apologie, sig. A2r.
252 MOZLEY, William Tyndale, p. 278.
253 MOZLEY, William Tyndale, p. 278.
254 MOZLEY, William Tyndale, p. 284.
certainly lead Tyndale to “consider the treaty of peace to be at an end.”
Accordingly, Tyndale, instead of publicly retracting his criticism of Joye, simply left it out when he published his second revision in January 1535. But Joye did not give up the struggle, and he published his Apologye on 27 February 1535.
Butterworth and Chester share Mozley’s understanding of the agreement that mutual friends dissuaded Joye from publishing the defence at all, and that they suggested that Tyndale should tone down his preface, at which point Tyndale proposed that he and Joye should publish a joint statement about their firm belief in the corporal resurrection. On the other hand, they doubt that the publication of the fifth van Ruremund NT was taken by Tyndale as a breach of agreement on Joye’s part: “the publication of [T1535] followed so closely the publication of [J1535] that it is possible that Tyndale’s decision [to omit the second prologue altogether] was made before he had any knowledge of the contents of [J1535].” In fact, they seem to suggest that it was Tyndale who did not live up to their agreement by not recalling his attack on Joye, and that this provoked Joye’s outrage, which he voiced in his Apologye.
David Daniell gives yet another presentation of the events that followed the publication of Tyndale’s second foreword. According to him, when Joye visited Tyndale, it was Joye who suggested that “they should jointly publish their views.” Yet Daniell denies, without any apparent reason, that there was ever any agreement between Tyndale and Joye: “Tyndale declined, in spite of some pestering from Joye.” Therefore, according to Daniell, Joye published his “tendentious and intemperate Apology.”
However, all of these scholarly speculations have their own shortcomings. None of them can satisfactorily explain the motives behind Joye’s publications, nor do they fully account for Tyndale’s silence and for Joye’s unmistakably irritated words. Furthermore, David Daniell’s presentation, without presenting any argument for doing so, clearly contradicts (or misinterprets) on several points both accounts by Joye, the exclusive sources for the course of events. An attentive study of Joye’s twofold accounts of the story shows some discrepancies between Joye’s own words on the one

255 Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 279.
258 Daniell, William Tyndale, p. 325.
259 Daniell, William Tyndale, p. 325.
260 Daniell, William Tyndale, p. 325.
hand and how they are understood by either Mozley or Joye’s biographers on the other.

Yet the more one studies the matter, the clearer the terms of the agreement—or at least the manner in which Joye must have understood it—become. Joye demanded that Tyndale revoke his false accusations which “nether he nor no man els shall neuer proue” and that he purify Joye’s name of the blemish Tyndale had created. This was to be accomplished by revising and correcting his second foreword, which was to appear in Tyndale’s next edition, on which Tyndale was already working: “T. on his parte shuld cal agein his pistle into his hand/ so to redresse it/ reforme it/ & correcke it from siche sclaunderous lyes as I was therwith offended.” It seems that Tyndale agreed to do so and promised to revoke his words. Further, Joye also demanded that Tyndale’s changed foreword should receive Joye’s approval or should at least appease him: “that I shulde be therwith wel contented.” All this, at least in Joye’s understanding, was agreed to by Tyndale. In return Joye would not publish his defence at full length but would confine it to simply the explanation of his motives for altering the translation of resurrection in those twenty-two places. This way the readers would be able to judge the matter for themselves: “I shoulde for my parte (a reason and rekenyng firste geuen why I translated this worde Resurrectio into the lyfe after this) permyt & leaue my translacion vnto the iugement of the lerned in christis chirche.” Apparently, Tyndale and Joye agreed to await the opinion of two commonly recognized authorities: Robert Barnes (1495–1540) and Johannes Aepinus (1499–1553). The idea was to receive a balanced and

265 “And then leaue the mater to the iugement of Doctour Barnes and of his [i.e. Tyndale’s] felowe called Hijpinus pastour of. s. nicholas parisse in Hambour” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A3v’). Robert Barnes (c.1495–1540), an Augustinian friar, went to study in Leuven, where he obtained his doctor’s degree in theology (1523). He returned to Cambridge and was elected prior there. Under the influence of Luther’s writings, and due to the personal insistence of Thomas Bilney, Barnes embraced his German confrere’s ideas. In 1525 he was summoned to Cardinal Wolsey, and the following year he had to appear before Bishop Stephen Gardiner to account for his beliefs. In 1530 he fled to the Continent, visited Wittenberg, and stayed for a while in Antwerp. After Henry’s break with Rome, he moved back to England, where he became Chaplain to the Court. As such, he made several ineffective attempts to reconcile Henry with the German Protestants. In 1534 Barnes went on a mission to Hamburg to explore the possibility of an alliance with Christian III (see supra on p. 5). In the following two years he made three more journeys to Germany, first
more or less impartial judgement. While Doctor Barnes was a Cambridge man whom Joye certainly knew quite well from the time he was studying and teaching there, Aepinus, to whom Joye refers as Tyndale’s “felowe,” was probably an old friend of Tyndale’s, possibly from the time when Tyndale reputedly sought refuge in Hamburg. The choice of persons to act as judges in the matter was also to be justified to some degree by their explicit interest in the theology of the afterlife, as attested to in their later publications. When this much was accepted, Tyndale suggested something which Joye understood to be that Tyndale would not only rewrite his

to seek Luther’s opinion on ‘the King’s great matter,’ second to persuade Melanchthon to visit England, and finally as a member of the English delegation to the Lutheran Council of Wittenberg, where the so-called Wittenberg Articles were drawn up. In 1540, Barnes was burned at Smithfield together with Thomas Garret and William Jerome. (See: Carl R. Trueman, art. Robert Barnes in IS ODNB; Neelak Serawlock Tjernagel, The Reformation Essays of Dr. Robert Barnes, London: Concordia, 1963; Clebsch, England’s Earliest Protestants, pp. 42–77; Maas, The Reformation and Robert Barnes. Johannes Aepinus (Johann Hoeck, also spelled as Epinus, Hoch, and Huck) was the son of a councillor in Ziesar. He studied under Johannes Bugenhagen in the monastery school of Belbuck (Pomerania). In 1520 Aepinus received his bachelor’s degree at Wittenberg, where he befriended Martin Luther and Philipp Melanchthon. While teaching at a school in Brandenburg, he was arrested for heresy, and when he was released, he had to flee. After spending some time in Pomerania in close association with the leaders of the Reformation there, he was put in charge of a school in Stralsund around 1524. In 1529 he became pastor of Saint Peter’s in Hamburg, and three years later he was appointed the first Lutheran superintendent of Hamburg. During this period he hosted Barnes in his own home. On Henry VIII’s invitation (who probably acted on the advice of Barnes and Cromwell), Aepinus went to England in 1534 to discuss the divorce and his separation from Rome. Aepinus returned to Hamburg the following January and subsequently made various journeys as a representative of the city. He took an active part in the Reformation movement and frequently had the deciding vote in disputed matters of faith. (See: Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz, art. Aepinus, in Friedrich Wilhelm Bautz (ed.), Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon, I, 1990, Hamm: Traugott Bautz, cols. 48–49; Maas, The Reformation and Robert Barnes, p. 26.)

266 In 1542 Aepinus was challenged by Johannes Garcaeus the Elder concerning Aepinus’ teaching of Christ’s descent into Hell. His sermon commenting on Ps. 16(15):10 discussed this article of the Creed. The sermon was published by his assistant, Johann Freder (Johann Aepinus, Auszlegung D. Johannis Epini/ vber den XV. Psalm Davids An eynen Erbarn Radt zu Hamburg geschrieben/ Darinn von disen nachfolgenden stucken allen Christen notwendig zu wissen gehandelt wirdt, Franckfurt am Meyn: Peter Brubac, 1543), and eventually Melanchthon’s advice was sought, although he refrained from taking either side. (See: Ernst Kähler, art. Garcaeus (Gartze[-en], -ius, cius), Johannes d. A., in Otto Stolberg-Wernigerode (ed.), Neue deutsche Biographie, vol. 6 Gadi—Grasmann, Berlin, 1964, pp. 70–71.) In a letter to Aepinus dated 21 June 1540, Barnes mentions his own “fierce controversy” with Bishop Gardiner of London “respecting justification by faith and Purgatory,” a controversy in which he only received the support of Latimer (Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation, ed. Hastings Robinson, vol. 2, Cambridge: UP, 1847, pp. 616–17). See also his earlier denial of the biblical grounds for Purgatory: Robert Barnes, A Critical Edition of Robert Barnes’s A Supplication Unto the Most Gracyous Prince Kyng Henry the VIII, ed. Douglas Harold Parker, Toronto: UP, 2008, p. 198, ll. 2276–77, p. 402.
foreword, but that said foreword would be replaced with a jointly written preface in Tyndale’s forthcoming next edition of his NT. This would bear witness to the reader that the breach between the two men had ended.\footnote{“T. addyng with hys own mouthe that we shulde with one accorde in his next testament then in printing in the stede of this vncharitable pistle wherwith I was offended/salute the reders with one comon salutacion to testyfye our concorde” (Joye, 
*Apologye*, sig. A2\textsuperscript{v}).} This, in the understanding of Joye, would not affect the publication of his defence, which, according to their agreement, would still be restricted to the mere explanation of Joye’s reasons for the changes in the translation of the word *resurrectio*. “[O]f these condicions we departed louyngly,” Joye remembers.\footnote{Joye, *Apologye*, sig. A2\textsuperscript{v}.}

There is little doubt that Joye must have misunderstood Tyndale. It is improbable that Tyndale would have frankly consented to, let alone suggested, such an agreement. In light of what was going to happen, it is much more plausible that Tyndale suggested something totally different, viz. that both Joye’s reasons for altering the translation of the word *resurrectio* and Tyndale’s “reformed pistle” should be published together in Tyndale’s imminent revision of the NT. For Tyndale was without a doubt aware of the fact that Joye was planning to publish his defence in Cathe-rine van Ruremund’s next edition of Tyndale’s NT (the fifth edition from the press of the van Ruremund family), which was already on its way to the press. The book was to be published once again with George Joye’s corrections. Tyndale, however, wanted to prevent any further spread of Joye’s ideas and thought that he could restrict its effect if Joye’s defence were to be published along with his own foreword, in which he was going to invalidate Joye’s arguments. As this was going to be published in Tyndale’s own revision of his NT translation (where the word *resurreccion* was used in all of those places in question), the reader would get the impression that the judgement of the translators was settled according to Tyndale’s position in that matter after all.

As to the events that followed, there is no obvious reason why we should reject Joye’s account as found in his *Apologye*. Five or six days after the agreement, Joye went to see Tyndale again to enquire about Tyndale’s corrected foreword. Tyndale, according to Joye, excused himself by saying that he had not thought about the question since their agreement.\footnote{“Then after v. or xj. dayes I came to Tin. to se the correccion and reformacion of hys pistle/ & he sayd he neuer thought of it sence” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. A2\textsuperscript{v}).} After another five or six days, Joye asked Tyndale about it again, and Tyndale

\footnote{“T. addyng with hys own mouthe that we shulde with one accorde in his next testament then in printing in the stede of this vncharitable pistle wherwith I was offended/salute the reders with one comon salutacion to testyfye our concorde” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. A2\textsuperscript{v}).}
now replied that Joye would not be able to read his handwriting.\footnote{There are two documents that are believed to contain Tyndale’s own handwriting. One of them is preserved in the State Archives in Brussels in the form of a letter from his prison in Vilvoorde (Brussels, \textit{Algemeen Rijksarchief}, Officie Fiscaal van de Raad van Brabant, liasse 1330. English translation by Mozley: Mozley, \textit{William Tyndale}, p. 329, republished in \textit{TT}, p. 172). The other alleged evidence of Tyndale’s own handwriting is a recently discovered manuscript of a Lollard tract. See: W.R. Cooper, \textit{A Newly Identified Fragment in the Handwriting of William Tyndale}, in \textit{Reformation} 3 (1998), pp. 323–48. If these are genuine, they testify to the readability of Tyndale’s handwriting.} Even after Joye’s assertion that he was well acquainted with Tyndale’s handwriting, Tyndale rejected his request.\footnote{“I prayd him to make yt redy shortly (for I longed sore to se it) and came agene to him after .v. or vj. dayes. Then he sayd it was so wryten that I coude not rede it: & I sayd I was wel aquainted with his ha\n\nde & shulde rede it wel ynough: but he wolde not let me se it” (Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sigs. A2\textsuperscript{v}–A3\textsuperscript{v}).} But Joye persisted, and he went a third and a fourth time as well, for he was anxious to see his name cleared from the imputation of heresy. After many cavillations, Joye was finally told what Tyndale’s real plans were: “he [i.e. Tyndale] wolde firste se my reasons & wryte agenst them ere I shulde se this his reformacion & renouacion.”\footnote{Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. A3\textsuperscript{v}.} But to Joye’s understanding this was a breach of their agreement: not Tyndale but the reader—and especially the two learned readers, Doctor Barnes and Johan Aepinus—should judge Joye’s arguments: “Then thought I/ syth [=since] my parte and reasons be put into the iugement of the lerned/ T. ought not to write agenst them tyl their iugement be done/ no nor yet then nether/ syth he is content before these men to stonde to their iugement/ & not to contende any more of thys mater with me.”\footnote{Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. A3\textsuperscript{v}.} Tyndale, however, would not comply and wanted to see Joye’s tract first in order to be able to counter it.\footnote{“He persisted in his laste purpose and wolde fyrste se my reasons & wryte agenst them” (Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. A3\textsuperscript{v}).}

The agreement between Tyndale and Joye must have taken place over the course of December 1534 or during the very first days of 1535. In the meantime, the widow went on with the printing of the fifth edition of Tyndale’s NT from the van Ruremund press. The volume appeared on 9 January 1535, again in the form of a handy little sextodecimo.\footnote{William Tyndale (trans.) & George Joye (ed.), \textit{[The New Testament]}, Antwerp, Catharyn wydowe [of Christoffel van Ruremund], 9 January, 1535. The only known copy is in the British Library (shelf number: C.36. bb.3).} Like its immediate predecessor, the fifth van Ruremund English NT also contained Joye’s corrections. From the only extant copy, the title page together with the first six following leaves is wanting. Butterworth and Chester raise the
question of whether “Joye, in the light of Tyndale’s criticism, had caused his [i.e. Joye’s] name to be put on the title page.”276 In all likelihood, the answer to that question is affirmative: at the time, Joye was seeking reconciliation with Tyndale, and he certainly judged it to be safe enough to put his own name on the title pages of both of the other two publications appearing that same year.277 Tyndale’s later silence about the matter certainly suggests that Joye complied with Tyndale’s request and put his name on the title page. At any rate, the epilogue does contain Joye’s name, so the reader could have had absolutely no doubt about the fact that this was a “new Testament prynted after the copye corrected by George Ioye: wherin for englisshyng thys worde Resurrectio/ the lyfe after this.”278 The text is a remarkably close reprint of the earlier biblical text (including, of course, Joye’s original corrections). Joye also introduced a few minor changes, most of which follow Tyndale’s 1534 edition, and for typographical reasons he altered some of the layout.279 After the NT text a chapter called “Pistles of the Olde Testament” was added. This contained the OT readings according to the Sarum (Salisbury) use for Sundays and the feast days of the saints. A table to these and to the NT readings was also included. The book contained the customary calendar at the beginning of the volume, and the marginalia were again limited to biblical cross-references.280 In other words, this was a ‘deluxe’ version of the former edition. At the very end, Joye’s three-page–long address “Unto the Reader” was added.281

The fact that Joye placed his defence at the very end of his NT is already a statement, for this is a much less prominent location than the one Tyndale’s second foreword occupies in T1534.282 In his defence, Joye held himself strictly to their agreement, or at least to what he thought was their agreement, and confined his defence to the explanation of why he translated the Latin resurrectio by “the lyfe after this” in those twenty-two places in question. He does give a very brief account of their agree-

---

277 The Apologye and A compendyouse Somme of the very Christen relygyon, London: John Byddell, September 1535.
278 Joye’s address “Unto the Reader” in his J1535, sig. C7r (see Appendix on p. 436).
280 With the exception of the note on Menander at 1 Cor. 15:33 (see supra on n. 166, p. 324) and five additional marginal notes to some of the OT readings (four in Is. 4 and one in Hos. 14).
281 A full reprint of this address can be found infra among the Appendices on p. 436.
282 As books were customarily sold unbound, the outer pages of a volume were the most fragile (and therefore less significantly esteemed) places.
ment with practically the same wording as referred to above from the *Apologye*, but he quickly passes over to cautioning the reader not to take offence at his dispute with Tyndale. Their variation in the translation of a single term should not cause the reader to avoid either his own books or those of Tyndale. Joye’s main concern is the spread of the doctrine and Gospel of Christ, which should not suffer because of theological differences between the Reformers. His fervent but irenic tone contrasts with Tyndale’s: in the most public place he could find, Tyndale asked his readers to avoid reading the NT in Joye’s edition. Joye, by contrast, asked his readers at the end of his NT to continue to read Christ’s Gospel and doctrine as edited either by Tyndale or by himself.

Joye then shortly explained the reasoning behind his choice of words: his conviction that the souls of the departed are not indifferent but receive their judgement immediately upon death. Joye was deeply troubled by the Anabaptists’ teaching about the idle, inactive, and insensitive sleeping state of the souls between the moment of death and the bodily resurrection at the end of the world. He feared that this teaching would actually engender in some readers the exact charge that was put against him (or so he understood)—the denial of the resurrection—and thus promote immorality. In other words, his concern about the Anabaptists’ denial

---

283 “W. Tindale was so sore offended that he wrote hys vncharitable pistle agenst me prefixed his newe corrected testament/ prynted. 1534. in November/ entytled. W.T. yet once more to the Christen redere. Which pistle W.T. hath promysed before certayne men & me (orels I wolde my selfe haue defended my name & clered myselfe of those lyes and so correcte yt/ redresse yt/ and reforme yt accordinge to my mynde that I shulde be there wyth contented/ and vs bothe (as agreed) to salute the readers withe one salutacion in the same reformed pistle to bet set before this testame

284 “Let yt not therefore in the mean ceason offende the (good indifferen rede) nor yet auerte thy mynde nether from W. Tindale nor fro me: nor yet from redyng bokin which teche and declare the very doctryne and Gospel of Christe/ because yt thus chaunceth vs to varye and contende for the trewe englishhyng of this one worde Resur-rectio in certayne places of the newe Testament” (J1535, sig. C7v).

285 “Noman to thinke hence forth that the soulis departed slepe with out heauen feling nether payne nor ioye vntill domes daye as the Anabaptistis dreame but to be a lyue in that lyfe after thys white in Christe in blysse and ioye in heuen/ as the scripture doctryne/ that is to weyt/ that they sleap out of heauen nether feling payn nor ioye/ minystar and geue perellous audacite and bolde suernes to the vngodly here to lyue styl and
of the bodily resurrection motivated him to not translate the Latin resurrec-
tio by the English word “resurrection” in those twenty-two places.

But Joye’s concern about the possible damage caused to the unity and
harmony of the faithful was even greater. Therefore, he did not ponder the
debated question too much; instead, he reminded the reader that to have
dissent among good friends is normal when they “stryue for the knowlege
of the trowth with a meke and godly contencion.” He pointed out that
even the apostles quarrelled among themselves. Joye was also confi-
dent with regard to the final outcome of their debate, which is the bet-
ter understanding of the meaning of the Scriptures: “For I doubt not but
that God hathe so prouyded yt/ that our stryfe and dyssent shalbe vn
to hys chirche the cause of a perfayter concorde & consent in thys matter.”
Thus, he expressed his hope that the end of their debate was near: the dis-
pute will last only “a lytle ceason (as I trust in god this shal not continuw
longe betwene vs two).”

The publication of the fifth van Ruremund English NT edition, and
especially Joye’s postscript at the end of the volume, has sometimes been
interpreted as a conscious breach of an agreement between Joye and Tynd-
ale. However, this position, as has been demonstrated previously in this
book, can hardly be supported by the available evidence. Joye complied
with Tyndale’s request to put his own name on the NT that he corrected.
Both Joye’s irenic tone and the content of the postscript showed that he
was honestly looking for an edifying solution to their disagreement. Joye
was apparently confident with regard to the end of their quarrel, for as far
as he was concerned, he kept to their agreement (at least as he understood
it) and confined his defence to a very brief explanation of his motives for
changing the translation.

continew in their wickednes/ sith they se & be so taught that aftir their departing there
is no punysshment but sleap and reste as wel as do the soulis of the good and ryghteous
tyll domes daye. Which daye as some of them beleue it to be very long ere yt come/ so do
many of these beleue that yt shal neuer come286 (J1535, sigs. C7v–C8r).

286 J1535, sig. C8r.
287 “Also to stryue for the knowlege of the trowth with a meke and godly contencion
hathe happened vnto farre perfayter men then we be bothe/ Nether haue there bene euer
any fellowship to fewe and smal/ but some tyme syche breache and imperfeccion hath
hapened emonge them for a lytle ceason (as I trust in god this shal not continuw longe
betwene vs two) ye and that euen emonge the apostles as betwene Paul & Peter/ {Gala.
ij.} and Paul and Bernabas. {Acto.xv.}” (J1535, sig. C8r).

288 J1535, sig. C7v.
289 J1535, sig. C7v.
Joye’s hope for a speedy and satisfactory end to their quarrel proved futile. Tyndale never wrote his “reformed pistle”; he simply left it out of his next edition of the NT. Since the fifth van Ruremund NT could no longer be mistaken for his own work, Tyndale, probably realizing the unjustness of his attack and seeing no point in including the confutation of Joye’s “translational and theological folly” (as he surely thought of it) without Joye’s own statement, omitted his second foreword altogether from his second revision of the NT. The publication (T1535) came out in January 1535 and is commonly known as the GH edition, after the initials of the publisher Godfried van der Haeghen.

Joye had been trying to convince Tyndale to live up to their agreement up until the very last moment: when Tyndale, after having cavilled for a while, made it clear that he wanted Joye’s arguments in writing before he would rewrite his second foreword, Joye applied to two of the mutual friends who were “present at the condicions of our agrement.” He spoke to one of them personally and wrote to the other, “desyering them al to moue him [i.e. Tyndale] & aduyse him to holde his promyse.” But Joye had to realize that Tyndale had no intention whatsoever of setting the matter right publicly. T1535 appeared without containing anything to clear Joye’s name. Joye felt that he did not deserve this treatment by Tyndale and that he himself was compelled to do something to clear his name of the imputation of heresy. Therefore, he decided that the readers should be able to make an objective but informed judgement about the matter. To this end he not only went on with the publication of his original, lengthier defence, which he had wanted to publish in the first place, but he also extended it. This revised defence came out of the press about six weeks later, on 27 February 1535, as a separate volume in the form of a thin, small octavo, entitled ¶An Apologye made by George Ioye to satisfye (if it maye be) w. Tindale: to pourge & defende himself ageinst so many sclaunderouse lyes fayned vpon him in Tindals vncheritable and vnsober Pystle so well wor-thye to be prefixed for the Reader to induce him into the vnderstaning of hys

---

290 Cf. Joye’s words: “But in conclusion I perceyued that T. was half ashamed to reuoke according to his promyse al that he coude not iustifye by me, and whiche I was so offended” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A3v).
293 “I am compelled to answere here now for my selfe: which I desier euery indiffererent reder to iuge indifferentely” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A3v).
new Testament diligently corrected & printed in the yeare of oure lorde .M. CCCCC. and xxxiiij. in Nouember.294 Underneath the title, towards the bottom of the page, Joye added the following telling words: “¶ I knowe and beleue that the bodyes of euery dead man/ shall ryse agayne at domes daye.” And after some space: “¶ Psalme .cxx. Lorde/ delyuer me from lyinge lyppes/ and from a deceatfull tongue. Amen…1535.”

As has been noted above, Joye’s Apologye has been disparaged by scholars for being a lengthy and self-righteous piece of writing inspired by personal resentment, through which Joye achieved only one thing: he made “Tyndale seem as petty as himself.”295 Daniell found it “tedious in the extreme.”296 Also, according to the assessment of Mozley, Tyndale’s usually more balanced biographer, Joye’s Apologye “is a long and rambling document” in which Joye “exhibits a ludicrous medley of conflicting emotions.”297 Even Joye’s biographers depict the Apologye as incoherent, repetitious, intemperate, and filled with heavy irony far beyond the standards of his time.298 This judgement, I believe, is passed too easily. Joye’s work is clearly structured and is far from being incomprehensible or unconvincing. Admittedly, his argumentation is fairly concise at times, reflecting the mind of a philosophically and biblically well-trained scholar. Accordingly, his line of reasoning is not always easy to follow for a non-specialist, but his arguments are clear, and anyone with the necessary theological background can follow his thrust. As for Joye’s style, which will be discussed in detail later, it is repetitive but not beyond what is rhetorically or pedagogically prudent. His satirical and injured tone can be explained by the circumstances, and it certainly corresponds with the standards of his time and the conventions of the genre.

Joye’s work is structured by means of running titles and can be divided on that basis into two main sections, as Joye’s 19th-century editor, Edward Arber, did in his reprint. In the form of an acrostic, the first section (sigs. A2r–C2v) starts with the letter ‘A’ and the second section (sigs. C2v–G4v) with the letter ‘B.’299 Although Joye surely structured his writings con-

---

294 The sole known existing copy can be found in Cambridge University Library (Shelfmark: Syn.8.53.75).
295 DANIELL, William Tyndale, p. 325.
296 DANIELL, William Tyndale, p. 325.
297 MOZLEY, William Tyndale, pp. 280 and 283 (resp).
298 BC, George Joye, p. 175.
299 Section A: “After that w. Tyndale had put forth…”; Section B: “But let vs now here Tindales vncharitable pistle set before hys newe Testament thus tytled…” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. A2r and C2v; Arber, Apology, pp. 3 and 19).
sciously and was aware of the importance of such poetic structuring devices as the acrostic, this is probably just by coincidence, for unlike the reprint, the original publication prints only the letter A as an adorned initial.300 Section A contains five running titles: “How we were once agreed” (sigs. A2r–A3r); “Tindals opinion of the soules departed” (sigs. A3v–A4r); “The confutacion of Tindals opinion” (sigs. A4v–A7r; B1v–C2v); “The text is declared” (sigs. A7v–A8v); and “A rekeninge is gyue of my translatioun” (sig. B1r). Section B has only one running title: “The Apologie & answere vnto Tindals pistle.”301

In all probability, Section B was the original defence that Joye prepared immediately after the publication of T1534, and Section A was meant as an introduction to the subject. Accordingly, Section A deals with the past: clarifying Tyndale’s position with regard to the souls of the departed on the basis of Tyndale’s An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialohe and The exposition of the fyrrste Epistle of seynt Ihon, as well as giving an account of their discussions on the subject prior to the publication of Tyndale’s attack.302 It also contains their agreement and a short explanation of Joye’s translation of the Latin word resurrectio. Section B answers Tyndale’s second foreword in the customary technique of the time: by citing smaller or larger portions of Tyndale’s text and refuting them point by point.

In the rest of this chapter, Joye’s Apologye will be analysed in detail: first, his argumentation (both his theological and his other arguments), and then his scholarship, style, and translational strategy.

Joye’s Non-Theological Arguments

The non-theological arguments of Joye’s defence can be divided into three groups: (1) Joye’s version of the events leading to their clash; (2) his rejection of Tyndale’s charges; and (3) ad hominem counterattacks sneering at Tyndale’s personality, scholarship, and translation.

1. Just as Tyndale recounted the motives that engendered his anger and moved him to write his second foreword, Joye, too, gave in the Apologye his version of their dealings that led to the Apologye’s publication. In addition to the events prior to the publication of his Apologye, which

---

300 In his introductory paragraph to his translation of the Lamentations of Jeremiah, Joye drew attention to the fact that the original Bible text uses acrostic: “Euery verse hauinge before it orderly an Hebrew letter aftir their. A.B.C.” (Joye, Jeremy the Prophete, sig. L1r).
301 Sometimes printed with the contraction of the first two words: “Thapologye & answere vnto Tindals pistle.”
302 Cf. supra on p. 301.
have already been presented in the previous sections, Joye also relates the frequent disputations between him and Tyndale. For Joye, having learned about Tyndale’s belief about soul sleep as manifestly exemplified in his books, went to discuss the matter with him a number of times. During these discussions, Joye tried to argue the matter on a biblical basis, but instead of refuting his arguments with biblical or logical arguments, Tyndale acted, at least in Joye’s experience, derogatorily and arrogantly. This arrogant attitude—which, according to Joye, was partly the reason behind Tyndale’s not living up to their agreement—finally moved Joye to treat the matter of the fate of the souls of the departed in writing.

2. Joye’s defence against Tyndale’s non-theological charges boils down to the following five themes: (I) the denial of being greedy; (II) the denial of being dishonest; (III) the denial of being vainglorious; (IV) the denial of secrecy; and (V) the denial of misleading others.

I. One of Joye’s personal motivations for correcting the fifth van Ruremund NT was, according to Tyndale, his greed. To reject Tyndale’s accusation, Joye gives a detailed description of the financial aspects of his editorial work for the van Ruremund establishment. Originally, the widow had offered him two and a half Flemish stivers per sheet (a gathering of sixteen leaves) for the correction, but Joye bargained and required a groat more, i.e. three stivers per quire. For comparison: a master mason would earn a daily wage of 6–9 stivers on a summer day in 1534–35. A barrel (approx. 66 litres) of bay salt cost that year around 10 stivers, a pound of wax around 6 stivers, a pound of butter almost 3 stivers, a pound of Flemish cheese a little over 1 groat (half a stiver), and a Lier gelte (2.84 litres) of Rhine wine around 10 stivers. According to the proceedings of the suit of the van Ruremunds against Frans Birckman (active 1503–29), a copy...
of Tyndale’s NT from the van Ruremund press cost 4.5 stivers in 1530. For his English-speaking readers’ sake, Joye also gives the value in English money: “iiij. pense halfpeny starling.” Since there are 28 sheets in J1534, Joye earned scarcely 84 stivers, or 14 Flemish Shillings, the equivalent of 10s6d in English money, or little more than half a pound sterling. By way of comparison: a German landsknecht in Henry’s army would receive 12s qd. p.m. in March 1544, “but there would be 10 percent double pays, while the 37s. received by the cavalry was doubled for ‘barded’ horse.”

The Bedford Franciscans in Joye’s native county received, according to the survey of monastic property in 1535, the annual sums of £1, £2, and £1, respectively, for letting two parcels of 7 acres (ca. 2.83 ha) and a parcel of 3 acres (ca. 1.21 ha) of pasture. Newnham Abbey possessed 16 acres (ca. 6.75 ha) of wood in Joye’s birthplace, Salpho manor, Renhold, which was worth 16s in 1534. A few years later, around 1538, the church of Houghton Conquest, just north of Ampthill, Bedfordshire, is recorded to have paid £1 4s for a Bible when it was obliged to do so by the injunction of Cromwell, the King’s vicegerent for spiritual affairs: “Item for a byble when the parryssh were commaunded to have one in the church xxiiij s.”

While imprisoned in the Tower of London in 1534–35, Thomas More had to pay the weekly sum of 10s for his upkeep and 5s for his servant, whom as a knight he was required to keep. According to the calculations based on the retail price index, 10s6d English money would have had the same “purchase power” in 1534 as £209, $417, or €285 in the year 2008. This

310 Joye, Apologye, sig. C5v.
311 Joye, Apologye, sig. C5v. Arber (blindly followed by Mozley) gives 12s English money, but he probably made a mistake in his calculations (Arber, Apology, p. 22; Mozley, William Tyndale, p. 270).
315 Value in British pounds sterling is based on the calculations of the Economic History Services (IS EHS). Values in US dollars and euros are based on the exchange rates of 1 January 2008 available at The FX Historical Currency Exchange Rates (IS FX HCER). Mozley’s estimate of “£9 in modern value” is about double our approximation (his nine pounds sterling of 1937 would be about £433 in 2008, according to the same IS). This can only partly be explained by Arber’s miscalculations (see n. 309). Based on “average earnings,” the site suggests the figure of £2,590 in 2008 for the value of 10s6d from 1534. To compare Joye’s wage with the money Tyndale earned, see infra on p. 358.
is, by all standards, a fairly modest remuneration for the time-consuming work of the corrector, which easily could have taken three months of full-time work in the case of printing a NT.\textsuperscript{317} And, as was pointed out, Joye not only did the proofs, but compared the text with his Latin sources and applied textual corrections in the translation. We therefore have no reason to doubt Joye’s honesty when he claims that “the goodnes of the deede & comon profyte & helpe to the readers compelled me more then the money.”\textsuperscript{318}

II. Joye also denied that it was out of dishonesty that he neglected to put his name on the fourth van Ruremund edition. Quite the contrary, he explains in the \textit{Apologye}—to call the work his own translation would have been an untruth; he only mended a few places, and he calls his work “but a dyiligent correction and no translacion/ for yt had ben but a lye to cal yt my translacion for translatyng and mending a fewe certayn doutful and derke places”\textsuperscript{319} Joye’s modern-day critics share his views.\textsuperscript{320} Had he put his name on the title page and had he called it his own translation, Joye explained, then Tyndale would have had every reason to call him vainglorious. But as Tyndale published T\textsubscript{1526} anonymously, so too did Joye, in order “to avoyd vayneglory.”\textsuperscript{321} And if he for that reason can be said to have played “bo peep,” then the same can be said, Joye claimed, not only of Tyndale himself, but also of Saint Paul, who wrote his letter to the Hebrews anonymously.\textsuperscript{322}

III. Joye points out how ridiculous it is on Tyndale’s part to charge him with secrecy and dishonesty for not calling the volume his own translation while simultaneously accusing him of seeking vainglory. How could he possibly seek his own laurels, asked Joye, if the work was prepared in secret, as Tyndale alleged, and if Joye’s name did not appear in the volume

\textsuperscript{317} Joye complains about the tediousness of his work because of the terrible state of the \textit{Vorlage}, in particular in the tables of the readings: “I wolde not haue done yt for v. tymes so miche, the copie was so corrupt & especially the table” (Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. C5v).

\textsuperscript{318} Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. C5\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{319} Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. F6\textsuperscript{r}.

\textsuperscript{320} E.g. Butterworth and Chester, who claim that the unintentional changes are fairly small in number, while the effect of the more numerous intentional modifications is negligible: “Certainly it would be absurd to speak of Joye’s \textit{version} of the New Testament” (italics in the original). BC, \textit{George Joye}, p. 162).

\textsuperscript{321} Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. D4\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{322} Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. D4\textsuperscript{r–v}. Joye, like most of his contemporaries, believed that the \textit{Letter to the Hebrews} was written by the apostle Paul.
at all so it could be mistaken for Tyndale’s work?323 And with regard to Tyndale’s claim of Joye’s vainglorious attitude in putting “his title” in some of his publications, Joye explains: “I cannot tell what he meaneth by my title: except yt be, that in some of my bokis I write that I was some tyme fellow of Peter College in Cambride for the more difference betwene a nother man that perchaunce might haue the same name that I haue.”324 But Joye readily concedes: “And yt thys be the tytle that offendeth T. I will hence forthe leaue yt oute.”325

IV. Joye also denied both the secrecy of the printing and correction business and the rush to be first on the market. On the contrary, it was not only not kept in secret, but Tyndale himself “was pricked forthe to take the testament in hande, to print it & correcke it as he has professeth and promiseth to do in the later ende of his first translacion.”326 Later, Tyndale was “called vpon agen.”327 Nonetheless, Tyndale felt no need for hurry and “prolonged & differed so necessary a thing and so iust desyers of many men.”328 The “dewche” printer lost his patience at last and went on with the publication.

V. Finally, Tyndale accused Joye that his ideas caused others to believe that there will be no resurrection, because the spiritual body of the resurrection is the soul after death. Joye rejects this allegation with very strong language in his Apologye.329 Joye was deeply aggravated by Tyndale’s

---

323 “He that doth a thing secretly & putteth out hys name/ how seketh he vaynglory?” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C7v).
324 Joye, Apologye, sig. D.iiiiv. Joye’s “title” is found only on the title page of his translation Jeremine the Prophete, translated into Englishe: by George Joye: some tymwel fellowe of Peter College in Camebridge. Tyndale’s friend, Robert Barnes, also put “his title” on the title page of his pamphlet: Robert Barnes, A supplicatyon made by Robert Barnes doctoure in diuinite/ vnto the most excellent and redoubted prince kinge henrye the eyght [Antwerp: Symon Cock, 1531?].
325 Joye, Apologye, sigs. D4v–D5v. No further publication contained Joye’s position at Cambridge University in the title page, but at the end of his life, during his second exile in Antwerp, Joye complained, embittered with understandable reminiscence and melancholy, that he had lost his tenure when he had to flee from England: “I my selfe was then […] compelled to lese my college a perpetuall sufficient lyuinge, & all that I had” (Joye, A present consolacion for the sufferers of persecucion for ryghtwysenes, [Antwerp: Catherine van Ruremund?] September, 1544, sigs. A6v–A7r).
328 Joye, Apologye, sig. C4v.
329 “This informacion T. bringeth in, in the seconde leif of his pistle to confirme the same sclaundrouse lye ymagened of hys owne brayne. […] This shameles lye and sclan-drouse afirmacion T. is not ashemed to prynte, onely because I saye that there is a lyf aftir this wherein the blessed spirits departed lyue in heuen with criste […] but also because he is so enformed. Bersydis thys condempnacion of me by hearsaye or enformacion of hys
accusation, not only because Tyndale attacked Joye on the basis of what was at best hearsay information, but also because Joye was concerned about the unity of the Protestant community.

3. Joye, however, not only rejected Tyndale’s charges but went further and claimed that all of these charges and then some can be laid against Tyndale himself. Although Joye claimed that he did not want to pass judgement on Tyndale, he incessantly expressed his disapproval of Tyndale and his behaviour. This was certainly not uncommon in the era or in the genre. In fact, Joye’s use of polemics resembles very strongly other polemical writings of his time that are marked with *ad hominem* arguments. To snare, snub, and spurn the opponent was considered an acceptable rhetorical tactic to prove one’s own right: for “it is a great shame to the teacher when his owne deedis & wordis reproue and condempe himself.”

I. To counterattack Tyndale’s charges of greed, Joye discloses his hearsay knowledge that Tyndale received £10 for his corrections, suggesting that if anyone can be found guilty of greed, it is Tyndale himself.

alcon: he is not ashamed of hys owne brayne to affirme & to wryte it, saying in the same fourthe peise of his pistle” (Joye, *Apologye*, sigs. C7r–C8r). In a similar vain: “Al this forsyad peise therfore is nothinge els (I take god to recorde) but a continuall shamelesse lye & perpetual sightfuld sclauder maliciously blowyng togeyther vpon me out of Tin. mouthe” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. D7v). See also sigs. D8v–En v and E2v–E3r.

330 “But I wyll not be his Phisicion & decerne his water at this tyme” (Joye, *Apologye*, C6v–C7v). Joye’s words refer to the techniques of his time when doctors used appearance, odour, and taste of urine as indicators of health and disease. (Paul G. Brewster, *Physician and Surgeon as Depicted in 16th and 17th Century English Literature*, in *Osiris* 14 (1962), pp. 13–32; [SS] *Urine Glucose Analysis Kit Teacher’s Manual*, Burlington: Carolina Biological Supply Company, 2000, p. 2.) Cf. Shakespeare’s *Henry IV*, part II, Scene 2: “Falstaff: Sirrah, you giant, what says the doctor to my water? | Page: He said, sir, the water was a good healthy | water; but for the party that owned it, he might | have more diseases than he bargained for.” And Molière’s *Le Médecin volant*, Scène IV: “GORLIBUS: Oui-da; Sabine, vite allez quérir de l’urine de ma fille. […] Hé quoi? Monsieur, vous l’avalez? | SGANARELLE: Ne vous étonnez pas de cela! Les médecins, d’ordinaire, se contentent de la regarder; mais moi, qui suis un médecin hors du commun, je l’avale, parce qu’avec le goût je discerne bien mieux la cause et les suites de la maladie. Mais, à vous dire la vérité, il y en avait trop peu pour asseoir un bon jugement; qu’on la fasse encore pisser.”


333 “If this be couetousnes/ then was Tindal moche more couetouse/ for he (as I herd saye) toke .x. ponde for his correccion” (Joye, *Apologye*, sigs. C5v–C6r). Unfortunately, Joye does not disclose in which currency this amount is expressed. As the readership of the
Of course, the comparison, even if Joye’s information about Tyndale’s remuneration was correct, is somewhat misleading, for Joye’s task was different from Tyndale’s: Joye corrected the sheets of a corrupt copy of the NT, which he compared to the Latin text to make his emendations, while Tyndale prepared a thoroughly reworked edition, amending it on the basis of the Greek text. On the other hand, the comparison was quite justified from the standpoint of the printer or publisher (the person who financed the edition), who cared only for the result: a correctly printed English text of the NT. As for the value of £10: ten years earlier, Tyndale’s annuity promised by the London merchant Humphrey Monmouth when arranging his flight to the Continent was exactly ten pounds.334 The cost of living between 1525 and 1535 more or less stagnated, and in fact there was monetary deflation in 1535. In 1528, the records of St John’s College, Cambridge, state that the 32-foot-wide, 14-foot-deep, and 46-foot-high new organ of the chapel was built for 10 pounds.335 In 1534, Newnham Abbey held £10 temporalities in the very manor in which Joye was born: Salphobury, Renhold.336 Around 1534, Joye’s fellow Bedfordshire man, Sir William Harper, rented his magnificent house, “the largest and stateliest house of this citie,” at the annual sum of £10. Later, the house was described as “a Burse to be more fair and costly byyled in all points than is the Burse at Antwerp.”337 In Antwerp, the house called De Vette Hinne (The Fat Hen), located on the Cammerstraat adjacent to the Pand of Our Lady near its northwest corner, together with its warehouse (packhuyse) was rented from the Church by the printer Frans Birckman for his wife and children in 1520 for the staggering annual sum of twelve pounds, suggesting that it was a huge complex.338 Most neighbouring houses were rented

---

Apologye is English and there was no conversion to English money, and furthermore the probable source of Joye was English, we will assume that the value is given in English money. If the sum is expressed in the local money, the figure should be multiplied by 0.75 based on the conversion rate given by Joye.

335 “Sondry and diuers marchauntes in London gave emongist theyme X li towards the byeing of the newest Orgaynes” (Quoted by Crotchet, St. John’s College, Cambridge, p. 779). Some thirty years later, the Audit Book of 1557–58 records a donation of two shillings to cover the costs of a lectern for the organ: “Item for makyng a lecterne for ye orgaines in the quere” (ibidem).
338 Archieven van de Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekathedraal, Antwerp, OR 12, 1520, fo. 8. The Birckman family was a well-established and productive printing family with extended business relations throughout Europe and with shops in Cologne, Paris, London, and
for one or two pounds a year.\footnote{Dan Ewing, \textit{Marketing Art in Antwerp, 1460–1560: Our Lady’s Pand}, in \textit{The Art Bulletin} \textbf{72} (1990), p. 568.} The free Chapel of Fenne in Fishtoft, in the Diocese of Lincoln, was receiving an annual pension of five pounds

Antwerp. They employed the address “The Fat Hen” for their offices in Cologne (\textit{zo der vetter henne}), Antwerp (\textit{De Vette Hinne}), and Paris (\textit{À la poule grasse}), which served as an easily recognizable brand (a franchise logo \textit{avant la lettre}). Its Latin translation (‘In Pingui Gallina’) was also used as a motto for their imprints. A biblical allusion to their address ‘Quoties volui congregare filios tuos, quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos’ (Mt. 23:37) and the more commercially oriented slogan ‘Utilia semper nova saepius profero’ can also be found in some of their printer’s marks. Both the family and the address of their offices originate from Cologne, where the street is still called \textit{Unter Fettenhennen Straße} and the printer’s house can be visited at no. 17. Abutting the store stood the \textit{Brothalle} where the chickens were fattened. (IS Köln Tourismus Office) Their devices varied, but they always incorporated a fat hen. In London, their shop was situated under the fourth arcade of St Paul’s, vacated by Peter Kaetz (the London address was ‘In St Paul’s Churchyard at the sign of St Augustine’ or ‘in cimiterio sancti paulli sub intersignio sancti Augustini’). The Birckmans played an important role in supplying the English market with English NTs and other books. Writing from Cambridge on 21 December 1513, Erasmus claimed that Frans Birckman is the person who imported nearly all books into England (\textit{qui libros ferme omnes solius est huc importare}, Allen, I, p. 547, Ep. 283). However, he did not have a high opinion of Birckman. Erasmus satirized the printer as a spider weaving webs of intrigue and deception, charging the buyer with more than he had, falsifying the book of accounts, applying all sorts of business tricks, intercepting and opening other people’s letters, etc. (Erasmus, \textit{Philemytus et Pseudocheus} in \textit{Colloquia}, ASD I, 3, 1972, pp. 321–24). Erasmus spoke from experience: Birckman denied a debt of thirteen guldens which he owed to Erasmus. (Allen, V, p. 566). The Dutch scholar voiced his contempt of Birckman’s unreliability, the ‘Sicambrica fides’ (Geldrian honesty), on several occasions (Ep. 283, line 162; cf. \textit{Colloquia}, p. 571). The Birckmans also had an extensive business cooperation with Joye’s publishers, the van Ruremunds. This collaboration had its own problems, too. In 1530, after the death of Frans Birckman, the van Ruremunds demanded through their agent Jan Silverlinck £25 10s Flemish from the heirs of Birckman as the balance on £28 17s 3d, the price of 725 English NTs (Antwerp, Stadsarchieven, \textit{Vonnisboek} 1236 (1529–32), fo. 70v, published with photograph as Cat. 96 in \textbf{TT}, p. 153; full transcription of the text and translation: Juhász, \textit{Antwerp Bible Translations in the King James Bible}, pp. 102 and 118). The Birckman family stayed in business for almost 300 years, and they frequently reprinted liturgical books according to the Sarum use, works by Tyndale, and other publications for the English market. On the Birckman family, see: Paul Arblaster, Cat. 36 in \textbf{TT}, pp. 90–91; Andrew Hope, Cat. 96 in \textbf{TT}, p. 153. Charles Béné, Henri VIII et Thomas More, lecteurs de Marulić, in Bratislav Lučin (ed.), \textit{Colloquia Marulliana V.} (1996), Split: Književni krug, 1996, p. 90; Anne Rouzet, \textit{Dictionnaire des imprimeurs, libraires et éditeurs des XVe et XVIe siècles dans les limites géographiques de la Belgique actuelle}, (Collection du Centre national de l’archéologie et de l’histoire du livre 3), Nieuwkoop: B. de Graaf, 1975, pp. 17–20; Josef Benzing, \textit{Die Buchdrucker des 16 und 17 Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet}, Wiesbaden, 1982, p. 239; Kronenberg, \textit{Notes on English Printing in the Low Countries}, pp. 139–63; Jean-Dominique Mellot & Elisabeth Querol, \textit{Repertoire d’imprimeurs/libraires XVe–XVIe siècle}, Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale de France, 1997, p. 444; Avis, \textit{England’s Use of Antwerp Printers}, pp. 234–40; John D. Fudge, \textit{Commerce and Print in the Early Reformation}, (The Northern World: North Europe and the Baltic c. 400–1700 AD: Peoples, Economies, and Cultures 28), Leiden: Brill, 2007, pp. 129–64 passim.
from the Rectory of Fishtoft in 1535.\footnote{John Parkinson, History of St Guthlac’s Church.} According to the retail price index, ten pounds had the same ‘purchase power’ in 1534 as £3,990, $7,968, or €5,421 in 2008, quite a generous payment for a few months’ worth of work by an illegal immigrant worker.\footnote{Using “average earnings,” £10 from 1534 is worth £49,300 in 2008 (IS EHS). On the method of calculations, see supra n. 316 on p. 355.} That Tyndale was not short of money is also attested to by Foxe, who recounts that Henry Phillips, just before he had Tyndale arrested, was clever enough to borrow 40s from Tyndale under the pretext that he had lost his wallet on the way.\footnote{“Then went he [i.e. Phillips] fourth agayne, I thynke to prouyde and sett the officers whiche he brought with hym from Bruxelles in the streate, and aboute the doore, then aboute noone he came agayne and went to M. Tyndal, and desyred hym to lende hym fortie shyllynges, for sayde he, I loste my purse thys mornyng, comyng ouer at þe passage betwene this and Machelyn” (Foxe, A&M, 1563, p. 520).}

II. If Tyndale accused Joye of dishonesty, Joye, too, depicted Tyndale as being dishonest: Tyndale knowingly and willingly included unjust charges against Joye in his attack. The most important of these was the assertion that Joye denied the resurrection and that this belief led others astray and engendered dissent among the early English Protestants. These assertions, Joye suspected, were invented by Tyndale himself or originated from Tyndale’s co-workers. Tyndale, however, knew very well that these charges were untrue, yet dared to include them in his attack.

III. It is not he himself, Joye declared, who is motivated by the possibility of vainglory, but rather Tyndale. For Tyndale seeks glory and respect for the merits of his translation, but he is not really concerned with improving the translation itself. According to Joye, this was the reason behind the delay of the promised revised edition, and this is why it was prepared so promptly upon Joye’s editorial work.\footnote{Cf. Joye, Apologye, sigs. C4’–C5’.}

IV. It is not only not true that Joye was rushing the work in order to be the first on the market, Joye affirmed, but it was Tyndale’s reluctance that caused the printer to lose patience. Joye had warned the Dutch printer several times of Tyndale’s supposed preparatory work, but this was dragging so much that the printer went on with the publication.\footnote{“But this testament was printed or T. was begun, & that not by my preuencion, but by the printers quicke expedicion T. own longe sleaping” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C7’).}  

V. Joye pointed out that it was not his, but rather Tyndale’s doctrine that was unorthodox and led others to heresy. Joye, as has been observed, believed in the immortality of the soul. But Tyndale embraced Luther’s new teachings and (possibly) “infected” Frith with what Joye regarded
as the malicious belief of the soul sleep and the denial of the particular judgement following immediately upon death.345

VI. To strike back at Tyndale’s statements that vainglory and covetousness were the two things blindly guiding the correction of the van Ruremund NT, Joye claimed that Tyndale was being blindly guided by malice and envy.346 According to Joye’s assertion, Tyndale knew that he had accused Joye wrongfully, and if Tyndale willingly made false accusations, then it could be only malice and envy that moved Tyndale to act against his own conscience.347

VII. Joye expresses in his Apologye that he is very much aggrieved by the fact that Tyndale relied on hearsay and unverified information, some of which Tyndale must have known not to be true.348 On the other hand, Joye himself does not feel reticent about disclosing information that he only has on hearsay.349

VIII. Joye, a former university lecturer, was quick to point out and ridicule Tyndale’s fallacies in formal philosophical reasoning and logic: “I meruell that Tin. is so sclenderly lerned in the forme of arguyng that he se not howe his antecedence may be true & consequenece false: seyng that the contrary of his consequenece is necessary.”350

IX. Furthermore, Joye argued, it was Tyndale himself who called upon his readers to correct his work.351 “God forbyd,” Joye wrote, “that T. shulde so thinke of hymself, that he hathe so exquysitly, (ye & that at firste) translated the testament that yt cannot be mended, for he aknowlegeth

346 “And yet is the man [i.e. Tyndale] not ashamed to wryte that vaynglory & couetousnes where [sic] my two blynde goides, but I tell Tin. agen, that if malyce & enuy (for all his holy protestacions) had not bene his two blynde goids, he wold neuer thus falsely, vncharitably, ayn and so spightfully belyed & sclaunderd me with so perpetual an infamie” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C6r).
347 Cf. Joye, Apologye, sigs. A2r and C2r–v. On sig. C8r–v Joye wrote: “may ye not se then the maliciouse entent, shrewed purpose, and corrupt conscience of this man for all his holy protestacions, thus temerariously and abominably to write to defame and sclaunder me? Ar not these the venomouse tethe of vepers that thhus gnawe a nother mannis name? ar thei not spearis & dartis & their tongues as sharpe as swerdis as the prophet paynteth them? whetet thei not their tongues lyke serpeyns: norysshe thei not adders venome with their lippes? yisse verely. For the trowth is not in their mouthes sayth Dauid: They are {Psal.5} corrupted within, their throte is an open stynking graue, wyth their tongues they flater and deceyue. Here may ye smel out of what stynkyng breste and poysoned virulent throte thys peivisshe Pistle spyrete and breathed forthe.”
348 Cf. Joye, Apologye, sigs. C7r–C8r and D7r.
349 See supra on p. 358.
350 Joye, Apologye, sig. A4r.
351 Joye’s argumentation remarkably resembles Bucer’s. See supra on p. 211.
Joye's correction work was

accordance to his owne desier in the ende of hys [i.e. Tyndale's] first new testament desyerung all that be able to mende that at [sic] was amysse in it & to geue the wordis (where he did not himself) their right significacions: for he confesseth euene there that hys first translation was a thinge borne before the tyme, rude & imperfit, rather begun then fynisshe, not yet hauing her right shape

Joye quoted from the epilogue of T1526. He did only what Tyndale had asked. It is striking to observe how fundamentally Joye and Tyndale differed from each other in their attitude towards Bible translation. Joye fundamentally believed that no translation puts a definite end to the history of Bible translations: after Origen's translation, Jerome was asked by Pope Damasus to translate the NT, and even Jerome's translation was later corrected by many others. According to Joye, no translation can represent a final say, and one should not be discontented, but rather pleased if one's work is corrected:

And I doute not but there be, & shal come aftir vs, that canne & shall correct our workes and translacions in many places & make them miche more perfayt & better for the reader to vnderstande, and shulde we therfore brawll & wryte agenst them as T. dothe agenst me? god forbyde, but rather thanke them and geue place as Paule teacheth.j.Corinth.xiii.j.355

Joye's words stand out against Tyndale's claim that he “nether can ner will soffre of anye man/ that he shall goo take [his] translacion and correct it without name.”

X. In fact, Joye argued, Tyndale's attitude towards his own Bible translation is the manifestation of his intellectual pride. According to Joye, this same intellectual pride and self-importance made Tyndale blind to recognizing that the Latin word *resurrectio* (and its Greek counterpart) had two different meanings. In another passage Joye claimed that Tyndale's

352 Joye, Apologye, sig. D5*.  
353 Joye, Apologye, sig. B4*.  
354 Joye, Apologye, sig. D5*.  
356 T1534v, sig. F6v. Quoted by Joye, Apologye, sig. F6v. (Spelling follows Tyndale’s original.)  
357 “Of which ignoracne this his errour springeth God so suffring vs to fal standing to miche in our own consaigntes/ thynking our self so highly lerned/ & to translate & write
intellectual pride prevented Tyndale from admitting that he could be corrected by someone whom Tyndale despised because of his seemingly inferior abilities.\(^{358}\)

XI. As Tyndale charged Joye with wilful mistranslation of the biblical text in order to prove his theology, Joye, too, laid the same charge against Tyndale. According to Joye, Tyndale wilfully ignored or altered tenses and moods of verbs in his translation with the intention of supporting his own theological ideas about soul sleep.\(^{359}\)

XII. But wilful mistranslation was not the only reason, Joye claimed, for the mistakes in Tyndale’s translation: they could also stem from Tyndale’s allegedly insufficient knowledge of the biblical languages.\(^{360}\) Joye also expressed his low opinion of Tyndale’s scholarship in general on several occasions.\(^ {361}\)

XIII. One of Joye’s recurring arguments is that Tyndale passed judgment on Joye in a matter of conscience, and by doing so Tyndale assumed God’s place and role and passed a judgement on Joye before and instead of God.\(^{362}\) By acting thusly, Tyndale showed that he was not acting as a good Christian, Joye argued, because Tyndale showed no respect for “his [Jesus’] terrible threatening, saing Juge noman lest ye be {mat.7.Luc.6.}

---

\(^{358}\) “So proud and arrogant are they that stonde so hyghly in their own consayght and false opinion, pertinatly to defend it though they se it right false, rather then thei wolde seme conuicted especially of any simpe and one that apereth no so wel lerned as thei be them selues” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A4\(^{v}\)). Cf. sig. C5\(^{v}\).

\(^{359}\) “T. in hys dilignt last correccio turneth the presentence [Vg: de mortuis autem quod resurgant for the Greek περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ὅτι ἐγείρονται in Mk. 12:26] into the future. and verbe pessiue into a neuter [i.e. present active] to stablish his errour thus corrupting the text. And lyke wyse he plaiith with the verbe in Luke [20:37] & in Marke [12:23,25] he englissheth the verbe of the pretertence [i.e. perfect subjunctive] resurrexerint/ for the future. So fayne wolde he wrest the words from their natyue sence to serue for hys errour […] I wounder wherfore T. flitteth from the text in these places” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A8\(^{r–v}\)). When writing, Joye probably only had Tyndale’s last edition at hand because Tyndale translated the verb with the future: “shall ryse agayne,” already in T\(_{1526}\).

\(^{360}\) Cf.: “and I wounder how he coude compare yt with the greke sith himselfe is not so exquisitely sene thereyn” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C3\(^{v}\)).

\(^{361}\) E.g. “Tind. but a man, farre interrior vnto them [Origen, Jerome and the other Church Fathers] both in lerning, jugement, & vertew” (Joye, Apologye, sig. D5\(^{v}\)).

\(^{362}\) “Lo good Reder/ here mayst thou se of what nature & complexion T. is so sodenly fyercely & boldly to choppe in to any mannis conscience & so to vsurpe & preuent the office of god in jugement which is onely the enseer & sercher of herte & mynde” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C3\(^{v}\)). Cf. “thus fyercely & sodenly of lyght & false coniecture & temerariouse jugement (I wil say no worse) to preuent bothe the jugement of god & man and to vsurpe the ofyce of god before he come to iuge vs bothe” (Joye, Apologye, sig. Dv\(^{v}\)).
iuged, condemyne not lest ye be condemyned your selues.” Paradoxically, Joye never reflected upon the fact that his Apologye does exactly the same thing when Joye pronounces his judgements upon Tyndale: Joye repeatedly claimed that Tyndale accused him contrarily to Tyndale’s own conscience.

XIV. But even if Tyndale were right, Joye maintained, Tyndale should have first corrected Joye privately, as the Scripture teaches Christians to do (Mt. 18:15–17). Only if Joye remained obstinate should Tyndale have made his charges public against Joye. Tyndale should “haue had compassion rather vpon me,” Joye wrote, “to warne, to exhorte me,” because after the publication of Tyndale’s second foreword, Tyndale “can […] not reuoke it, & restore it me agene.”

To summarize Joye’s non-theological arguments, it can be recognized that Joye’s critics are certainly right when they point out the stinging character of the Apologye. Joye’s account, albeit a bitterly angry retort, appears to be quite reliable in (1) recounting the preceding events and (2) his rejection of Tyndale’s charges; however, (3) Joye often embellished the facts or was inaccurate when he made remarks about Tyndale. In fact, Joye’s ad hominem attacks on Tyndale do appear strange in the eyes of the modern reader. On the other hand, Joye’s cynical remarks about Tyndale’s personality and his criticism of Tyndale’s translation are certainly not incomparable to the stinging nature of Tyndale’s own words or, for that matter, to almost any other writing in the same genre at that

---

363 Joye, Apologye, sig. D1v.
364 Cf. “so falsely belye & sclaunder me of syche crymes which I neuer thought/ spake/ nor wrote/ and of sich which I knowe wel his owne conscience doth testifye the contrarie” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A2v).
365 “But ere T.had thus by open writing & printing it to, accused & dampened me, yt had become him (yt he had wyyled to be taken for a cristen man) firste to haue these vices priuately correced betwene me & them whom I had with these synnes offended and eft affir for my uncorrigible and vntractable hardnes not hearing the chirch, to haue also offended yt openly casting me out of yt, as crist techeth vs” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. C8v–D1v). Obviously, Joye refers here to Tyndale’s charges on account of the publication of the NT and not to their differing theological views, which had been discussed several times in private, according to Joye’s own testimony.
366 Joye, Apologye, sig. D1v.
367 Cf. Edward Arber’s words in the introduction to the reprint of the Apologye: “We may believe Joy in what he says about himself; but not so much what he says about Tyndale: whom, notwithstanding all, he unconsciously admires and thoroughly respects; though he is vexed at having been injured, as he thought, by so powerful an author” (Arber, Apologye, p. vi).
Having surveyed Joye’s non-theological arguments, which, as has been observed, are alienating to the modern reader, it will be more satisfying to turn to his theological arguments. To understand Joye’s theological argumentation, the reader should remember that Joye’s reasoning is intrinsically rooted in his dualistic anthropology, which corresponded to that of his times. According to this, “man consisteth of two parts/ bodye and soule: of ye which one is sensible/ heuey/ & flesshly: and ye tother intellectual/ subtyle/ and spirittuall.”\(^{370}\) In other words, the human person is made up of two distinct components: a physical body and an incorporeal soul. At the moment of death the soul escapes from the body and lives in an intermediary state as \textit{anima separata} until the end of the world. After death, the soul immediately undergoes the individual judgement, and it can enter Heaven or Hell accordingly.\(^{371}\) The souls of the righteous are therefore already with God, but their full, final bliss will come only at the end of time, when the general resurrection will take place—when the dead bodies will be raised and will join their souls.

This metaphysical dichotomy of body and soul did not necessarily involve a concurrent ethical dichotomy. Admittedly, the body was usually regarded as inferior, at times even cumbersome, to the soul. So Joye can, for example, speak about “the imbecilite and dwolnes of our flesshe.”\(^{372}\) Yet the body was not at all considered a ‘necessary evil,’ but rather something that is less valuable yet essential to the fullness of humanity: the final bliss was only due when the soul was reinvested in the glorified and perfected body. The fullness of humanity, the human person in his or her true self can only be the reconstituted human person in body and soul. Joye is quite consistent in pressing this point in the \textit{Apologye}.\(^{373}\)
As the reader will remember, this commonly accepted view was challenged by Luther’s early works. Luther’s position, partly intended as a critique of some of the pronouncements of the Fifth Lateran Council, influenced both Frith and Tyndale. The reader will also remember the reaction from the Catholic side as it was promulgated by Fisher, Rastell, and More. Joye, despite his reverence for Luther, Tyndale, and Frith, could not help but think of this new teaching as something illogical or heretical. And indeed, it is not very difficult to see how the position of soul sleep would appear nonsensical to anyone trained in the philosophy of his time. But neither Luther nor Tyndale argued on the basis of a coherent philosophical system. Their ultimate criterion was their own understanding of Scripture read in the light of their own, in Tyndale’s captivating expression, “feeling faith.” Joye, on the other hand, reasoned on the somewhat eclectic remnants of his manifestly sound Scholastic studies. Surely, the ultimate touchstone for him, too, was Scripture, yet his reading and making sense of the biblical text clearly show his traditional academic training.

In order to facilitate the understanding of Joye’s theological arguments I have divided them into six groups. (1) First, the arguments to invalidate Tyndale’s theological arguments are considered. Then, (2–6) Joye’s scriptural arguments to support his own standpoint are studied. These, in turn, are arranged in the following way: (2) passages about the belief of the Sadducees, (3) passages containing the word *resurrectio* in the Latin and altered by Joye but not referring to the belief of the Sadducees, (4) passages referring to the bodily resurrection proper, (5) passages not containing the word *resurrectio* in the Latin but proving the immortality of the soul and the interim state, and finally, (6) Joye’s other exegetical arguments, which can be grouped into three subjects: (I) the exemplary role of Christ’s soul for the Christians, and the biblical usage of the verbs (II) ‘to stand up’ and (III) ‘to sleep.’

1. *The Refutation of Tyndale’s Theological Arguments.* Joye’s main concern, of course, was to clear his name of the imputation of heresy. Tyndale’s words, as will be remembered, gave the impression to the reader that he

---

374 See *supra* on p. 125.
375 On the Fifth Lateran Council, Frith, and Tyndale, see *supra* on pp. 123, 208, and 295, respectively.
376 On Fisher, Rastell, and More, see *supra* on pp. 253, 260, and 259, respectively.
accused Joye of the heresy of the denial of the bodily resurrection. Therefore, Joye, as has been observed, confessed his faith in the bodily resurrection immediately on the title page: “I knowe and beleue that the bodyes of euery dead man shall ryse agayne at domes daye.” Later in the volume, he repeatedly accentuated this point. He emphasized that his earlier works clearly confirmed his faith in the resurrection of the flesh. In particular he pointed to his **Ortulus animæ**, in which he included his version of the translation of the Creed in the chapter entitled *A frutefull & very Christene Instruccion fore childrene*. Joye’s version of the Creed runs as follows:

I Beleve in god the father almyghtye/ maker of heauene & erthe. And in Jesu Christe his only sonne ower lorde. Whiche was conceived by the holy goste/ and borne of Mary ye virgine. He suffred vnder Poncius Pilate/ he was Cru-cifyed/ dede/ and buryed. He descended to thelles/ and rose the thirde daye from dethe. He ascended to the heavens/ and sitteth on the righthande of god the father almyghyt And frome thense shall he come to iuge the quyc and dede. I beleve in ye holygoste. I belive ye holy chirche every were to be companie or the congregation of the holy & faitfull [sic] men. I beleve to have forgevenes of my synnes. And that every man shal ryse ageyne. And I beleve to have lyfe everlastinge. Amen.

In this text, published four years prior to the beginning of the public controversy (and possibly also included in his earlier, now lost Primer published around 1529), Joye unmistakably affirmed both Jesus’ resurrection and the expectation of the bodily resurrection of the faithful. There is another point to be observed in Joye’s translation of the Creed for which this has been quoted here in its entirety, and that is his tendency to include explanations in the text of the translation itself. Joye’s outspoken Protestant ecclesiology is made explicit in the comment about the nature of the Church which he included as part of the text of the Creed.

---

378 “I neuer doubted of but beleue it [the resurrection of the flesh] as constantly as he/ I haue preached & taught is/ & so interpreted it [the Latin word *resurrectio*] where it so signifieth & confess it openly as euery man maye se that read my workis” (Joye, *Apologye*, sigs. A8º-Bt’). In a similar vein: “as euery man maye se me in my bokis constantly wrytinge and affirming the Resurreccion of our bodyes at domes daye which (I thanke god) I neuer doubted of” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. C8º). See also Joye, *Apologye*, sig. Et’.

379 “I englisshe it Resurreccion [. . .] in the article of our Credo” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. Bt’) and “T. & his enformers shuld haue turned fyrst to the article in our credo concerning the resurreccion which I translated” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. D7º).


381 See *infra* on p. 418.
The reader will also remember Tyndale's claim in his second foreword that due to Joye's teachings a number of people were led astray, denied the resurrection of the flesh, and believed that the departed soul is the spiritual body of the resurrection.\textsuperscript{382} Although Tyndale does not explicitly say so, the obvious reading of this text is that these people held these ideas because Joye held such ideas. This is certainly how Joye took Tyndale's words, and he reacted to it very emphatically: “if T. can shew me these wordes to be mine ether in writing, or brynge forthe any man that euer herde me speke them, then let me suffer dethe. For I take god to recorde that I neuer thought them.”\textsuperscript{383} But Joye not only denies the position which is laid in charge against him, he also ridicules it as illogical, unscriptural, and unorthodox, an idiosyncrasy of the Anabaptists. In fact, Joye perceived the very charge Tyndale seemingly put against him (the denial of the bodily resurrection) as a belief that was a direct consequence of the Anabaptists' teaching on soul sleep. And this teaching, advocated by Tyndale, was exactly the motivation for Joye to alter Tyndale's translation.

The position on soul sleep seemed so illogical for Joye because it contradicted his dichotomic metaphysical view of the human person and because it seemed utterly unbiblical to him.\textsuperscript{384} Joye claimed that Tyndale misunderstood or misinterpreted the Scriptures and committed philosophical fallacies when Tyndale regarded the immediate reward or punishment of the soul after death and the bodily resurrection as mutually exclusive ideas and argued for soul sleep in the following way: “If the souls of the faithful were in heuen/ there shulde be no resurrection.”\textsuperscript{385} Based on the principle that the veracity of the resurrection of the flesh is a core doctrine of Christianity and thus cannot be denied, Tyndale concluded, according to Joye, that the premise (that the souls enter Heaven or Hell upon death) must be false. Accordingly, Tyndale “laith them [i.e. the souls] down to slepe out of heuen as do the Anabaptists tyl domes daye.”\textsuperscript{386}

In other words, Joye clarified, Tyndale claimed that the active survival of

\textsuperscript{382} See supra on p. 332 and on p. 357.
\textsuperscript{383} Joye, Apologye, sig. E2r.
\textsuperscript{384} “Sence I red my philosophy, I knew the differe\ nce betwene a bodye & the soule, & was neuer so mad as to call the soule a spirituall bodye, as Tindal sayth I do affrime yt” (Joye, Apologye, sig. E2r).
\textsuperscript{385} Joye, Apologye, sig. A4r. In another place Joye criticized Tyndale’s argumentation with the following wording: “for this is hyse argument, he that putteth the soulis in heuuen before domes daye stealthe away the resurreccion of their bodyes” (Joye, Apologye, sig. C7v).
\textsuperscript{386} Joye, Apologye, sig. A4r.
the soul and the bodily resurrection are logically mutually exclusive. But this is erroneous thinking on Tyndale’s part, Joye continued, because “his antecedence may be true & the consequence false.” Furthermore, Joye suggested, if anyone can be called a heretic because he shares the view of the Anabaptists, it is Tyndale.

Joye was aware of the fact that Tyndale never overtly confessed the idea of the soul sleep. Yet he pointed out that both Tyndale’s An answere vnto Sir Thomas Mores dialoge and his commentary of 1 John leave very little doubt about Tyndale’s true position. Joye called his readers’ attention to Tyndale’s ambiguous attitude: while Tyndale claimed in his Answere that the idea of the immortality of the soul originated from the pagan Greek philosophers and that the Pope inserted this idea into Christ’s teaching (which, according to Joye, would suggest that Tyndale argued for soul sleep), when it comes to revealing his own ideas, Tyndale pleaded ignorance on the question. But in fact, Joye claimed, Tyndale was a materialist and thought that even the soul was of a material substance, a position that Tyndale supposedly admitted to Joye in a conversation: “but T. in deed […] graunted me that the soule of man was also a bodely substance: wherat,” Joye added sarcastically, “a non I perceyued his highe lerning.”

There is no evidence in Tyndale’s own writings to substantiate Joye’s claim, but this could explain Tyndale’s apparently underlying monistic anthropology. While professing ignorance on the subject of the fate of the soul, Tyndale in all likelihood regarded the human being as an indivisible entity. In his eyes, body and soul are but two different aspects of the same human person, a position that most modern exegetes believe to be the earliest biblical view on the human being.

388 Joye is not only concerned about the spread of Anabaptist ideas but is outraged by the fact that Tyndale implicitly charged him with such ideas. As has been pointed out, such an accusation, much more so than the charge of Lutheranism, could easily have cost him his life. See supra on pp. 279 and 338.
389 See supra on pp. 301ff.
390 “Now reade Tinda. wordis in hys answere to M. Moris fourth boke, and loke whether he graunthet not playnly that the souls sleap tyll domes daye, and whether he calleth not the doctrine that they shulde lyue euer: heythen and flesshly doctrine of the Philosophers ioyned with the popis doctrine. And agayn in the .cxvij. leif where vnto he remitted the reader in his table with thys sentence/ Soulis sleap” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B6v). “And yet bothe there in his answers and in his exposition vpon Johns Pystle apon [the text of 1 Jn 2,28] He sayth yt is a depe secrete layd vp in gods tresury” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. B6v–B7v).
391 Joye, Apologye, sig. E2r.
392 Cf. Tyndale’s argument in his posthumously published Brief Declaration of the Sacraments against the Catholic teaching on the transubstantiation, according to which the
But, quite contrary to Tyndale’s opinion, Joye argued, if there is any logical connection between the active survival of the soul after death in Heaven and the bodily resurrection, then it must be one of mutual necessity. That is to say, if the soul leaves the body at the moment of death to enter Heaven, then this does not exclude but rather presupposes that there must be a bodily resurrection at the end of the world when the souls will be reinvested in their glorified bodies. This must be so—and Joye referred here to Col. 1:18—because Christ is the head and the Church is the body, and wherever the head goes so too must the body: “Christe our head is rysen: wherfore yt must nedes folowe that his bodye which is his chirche shall ryse ageyn.”

Furthermore, if Tyndale was right in affirming that the survival of the soul after death would render the bodily resurrection pointless, then, Joye reasoned, there is a theological problem with regard to Jesus’ soul while Jesus’ body lay in the tomb. Because one either (1) has to say that Jesus’ soul survived His death on the cross and therefore conclude that Jesus’ resurrection was pointless, or (2) has to believe that Jesus’ soul did not survive death actively but “slept out of Heaven.” In Joye’s view, both of these positions are erroneous because they contradict the Bible. But the Bible cannot be wrong: “Heuen & erthe shal soner passe away then one iote of goddis worde shal passe unfulfilled” (Mt. 5:18). Therefore, Joye concluded, Tyndale’s argumentation is faulty and the survival of the soul does not render the bodily resurrection pointless.

substances of the bread and the wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. According to Tyndale, such a teaching separates the body, the blood, and the soul of Christ from one another, as well as the persons of the Holy Trinity: “Wher Chrystes bloud is ther is hys body: and wher hys body is ther is hys soul and where hys soul is, ther is the godhead and the trynitye/ the father, the sonne, & the holy gost” (Tyndale, A Briefe declaration of the sacraments, 1548, sig. E4v). Furthermore, Tyndale argued, if Christ could make His body and blood separate and immortal in the Eucharist, why could he not do the same for his physical body and blood when He died on the cross: “yf he were so myghty, why is he not as myghty to make his bloude to be alone and hys body alone? hys blood, body, & soule, were eche alone at hys deathe. & whyle the bodye lay in the sepulcher” (ibid., sig. E7v). In that regard, it is also very interesting to note Tyndale’s remark that the Word of God (being an indivisible unity) has a “body” (an outer, physical aspect) and a “soul” (an inner, spiritual aspect): “The scripture hath a body with out/ and within a soule/ sprite & life.” (Tyndale, The prophete Jonas, A2v). On the alleged monistic anthropology of the Hebrew Bible, see supra on pp. 73ff.

395 “Wherfore ther can no condicionall antecedence of T. nor yet of any angel in heuen make this conclusion false” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A5v).
Yet, Joye argued, Tyndale’s own words contradict his position. After having already staged a vision of an angel in his commentary on 1 Jn. 2:2, Tyndale also presents a lengthy and bizarre imaginary apparition of Paul to the elect of God in the 16th century.\(^{396}\) The purpose of the apparition is to present Paul as a faithful follower of Luther. But Joye pointed out that while Tyndale thought that Paul was asleep until the general resurrection, Tyndale’s Paul ‘confesses’ that he is already enjoying the beatific vision in the presence of other saints and is presented with a clear foresight into the future.\(^{397}\)

Joye thought thus that Tyndale’s position was untenable. But he was not satisfied with only disproving Tyndale. He wanted to discover the true meaning of the passages in question and wanted to understand Christ’s and the Apostle’s message. In his eyes, the eschatological hope of the human being was a core element in the Christian \textit{kerygma} and he was therefore deeply dissatisfied with claiming ignorance on the subject. Therefore he sought exegetical arguments to prove his own position.

2. \textit{The Belief of the Sadducees.} As will be remembered, three quarters of all those places where Joye changed Tyndale’s translation of ‘\textit{resurreccion}’ refer to the belief denied by the Sadducees. Twelve can be found in Jesus’ discussion with the Sadducees in the Synoptics (Mk. 12:18–25 et par.), and four can be found in the account of Acts of the Apostles (23:6–24:21) about Paul setting the Sadducees against the Pharisees in the Council. Both in the Synoptic passages and in the passage in Acts, it is said that the Sadducees denied the belief in the \textit{resurrectio}. It will come as no surprise, then, that Joye’s foremost arguments for his changes come from the exegesis of the texts about the Sadducees.

As the reader will remember, the passage about the Sadducees’ question to entrap Jesus was used by More in his \textit{Dialogue} to disprove (Luther’s

\(^{396}\) Tyndale, \textit{The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon}, sigs. C8r–Dr1. One is very much puzzled reading such apparitions (even if clearly imaginary) from the pen of Tyndale, who reacted so strongly against the apparition accounts of Catholic popular devotion.

\(^{397}\) “He bryngeth in Paule tellynge a longe tale in hys sleap (yf Tin. doctryne be trew) and maketh Paule at laste to confesse that he himself with other sayntis be in heuen/ contrary to hys own saynge” (Joye, \textit{Apologye}, sig. B7r). Cf. Tyndale’s words: “But now my [i.e. Paul’s] loue is without payne. For I se the will and prouidence of God/ and how the ende of al thinges shalbe vnto his glorie & profecte of theлектe. And though I se thelecte shall somtyme fall/ yet I se how they shall arise agayne and how that their fall shalbe vnto the glorie of God and their owne profecte. And we that are in heauen/ loue you al a lyke: nether we loue one moare and a nother lesse” (Tyndale, \textit{The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon}, sig. Dr1).
and) Tyndale’s denial of the saints being in Heaven. The reader will also remember that Tyndale reacted and claimed that More abused the biblical text and “stole away” Jesus’ argument, for the teaching of the immortality of the soul “was not in the world” then. Despite his hatred of More and in spite of his esteem for Tyndale, Joye claimed that it was not More but Tyndale who misinterpreted Jesus’ answer (and the Sadducees’ question) because Tyndale, in Joye’s eyes, did not understand what the problem really was. For the precise dogmatic issue which was at stake in the Sadducees’ enquiry and in Christ’s reply was, according to Joye, not the bodily resurrection but the survival of the soul. That is what the Sadducees denied, not the bodily resurrection.

Even today, very little is known about the Sadducees. The only records are found in the writings of their contemporary opponents: in the NT, in some works from the Jewish-Roman historian Josephus Flavius, and in a few scattered rabbinical texts of varying value. Almost all of this material was available in the 16th century, and Joye exhibited explicit knowledge of it. So, for example, Joye explained to his readers that the Sadducees accepted only the Torah as authoritative. Furthermore, Joye intimated that they believed in the free will of the human person and rejected

---

398 See supra on p. 261.
399 See supra on p. 302.
400 In his book against More (The Subuersion of Moris false foundacion, see supra in n. 84 on p. 22), Joye called More “M. Mok” (sig. B5r) and the “old holy upholder of the papistical Synagoge” (sig. B3v). In a parody of Erasmus’ friendly pun on More’s name, Joye called More a ‘fool’ on the titlepage. He used similar expressions in his The Souper of the Lorde, too, in which Joye ‘incidentally’ refuted More’s book against Frith. For more information on the subject, see: O’SULLIVAN, The Authorship of The Supper of the Lord, pp. 215–19; Rainer PINEAS, George Joye’s Controversy with Thomas More, in Moreana 38 (1973), pp. 27–36.
402 With the debatable exception of the evidence found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. For some scholars maintain that one may search for the roots or the origins of the Qumran community in the Sadducean party. If this hypothesis were true, it means that the Qumranic material represented an important additional source to those already known in the time of Tyndale and Joye. (Lawrence H. SCHIFFMAN, Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philadelphia & Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994, p. 88. See also E. Earle ELLIS, Jesus, the Sadducees and Qumran, in NTS 10 (1964), pp. 274–79; Jeffrey RUBENSTEIN, The Sadducees and the Water-Libation. Methodological Analyses of Qumranic and Rabbinic Texts Regarding the Legitimacy of Oral-Law, JQR 84 (1994), pp. 417–44; James C. VANDERKAM, The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?, in BibRev 7 (1991), pp. 42–47.)
403 “The Saduceis wold apere to kepe no nother observaucions besyde the law of Moses” (Joye, The vnite and Scisme of the olde Chirche, [Antwerp, Catherine van Endhoven] June 1543, fo. v^).
predestination, even the possibility that God could see into the future. He also pointed out the persistent hostility between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. More relevant for our matter is the Sadducees' standpoint vis-à-vis the dead and the hereafter. Here Joye explicitly referred to Josephus' testimony about the Sadducees. Josephus, who was himself a contemporary Jew, Joye explained, never mentioned that the Sadducees would deny the bodily resurrection. What they denied was the immortality of the soul, i.e. the survival of the soul after death: “The Sadduceis/ as wryteth that aunciau historiograph Josephus beinge himself a iew/ in his. xvij. boke the .ij. ca. sayd that the soule of man was mortal and dyed with the bodie.” The reference is exact and the quotation precise: Josephus, indeed, does not mention the bodily resurrection and speaks only about the immortality of the soul.

---

404 The Sadducees, wrote Joye, “gaue nothing to fortune and destynye/ but to the free lybertye thei attributed althings. For thei threw althings subiecte vnder owr own power/ aknowleginge owr own selues to be the authors of good works” (Joye, *The vnite and Scisme*, fo. v*). Joye’s aim is evidently to draw a parallel between his own Catholic opponents and the Sadducees.

405 “Thei [i.e., the Sadducees] [were] estiemed of the pharisais as men most vile and vnpure/and thus was there perpetuall stryfe betwixte them both” (Joye, *The vnite and Scisme*, fo. v*).

406 Only fourteen years after the publication of the Gutenberg Bible, on 28 June and 23 August 1470 Johann Schüssler published the editiones principes of the Latin translations of Josephus’ *De antiquitate Judaica* and *De bello Judaico* in Augsburg. Subsequently, Josephus’ works were regularly republished throughout Europe. In the Library of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven alone, we find copies dating back prior to 1535 from Lucas Brandis’ press in Lübeck (1475–76), G. Leeu’s office in Gouda (1482), and the printing presses of M. Ungut and S. Polonus in Seville (1492), N. Spindeler in Barcelona (1492), A. Verard in Paris (1492?), B. di Libri in Florence (1493), Ioannes Frobens in Basel (1524), and E. Cervicorn in Cologne (1534). The Greek text was not published until 1544 in Basel at the office of H. Froben and N. Episcopius. Several editions of Josephus’ works appeared in most of the modern vernaculars as well.


409 In his *De bello judaico*, Josephus gives details about the belief of the Sadducees in a very similar vein: Σαδδουκαίοι δὲ, τὸ δεύτερον τάγμα, [...] ψυχῆς τε τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ᾽ᾅδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσιν (II,164–65 (14, iii)). “As for the persistence of the soul after death, penalties in the underworld, and rewards, the Sadducees, the second of the orders, will have none of them” (Josephus, *The Jewish War, Books I–III*, vol. 2, (The Loeb Classical Library), ed. H. St. J. Thackeray, London, William Heinemann, Cambridge (MA): Harvard UP, 1967, pp. 386–87; word order in the translation slightly adapted for the quotation). Joye refers to both places as well as to Pliny in his later book: “Plinys boke of the natural storyes ca.xvij. and Josephus in his.xvij. boke of the antiquites ca. ij. and in his boke of the Jewes batail cap.vij.” (Joye, *The vnite and Scisme*, fo. 6*).
This statement by Josephus, Joye argued, concurs with the evidence one finds in the NT. In the episode in the Acts of the Apostles about Paul before the Council, the author of Acts tells us that the Sadducees hold that there is no *resurrectio*; there are neither spirits nor angels, but the Pharisees acknowledge them both: *Sadducaeæ enim dicunt non esse resurrectionem neque angelum neque spiritum Pharisaæi autem utraque confitentur* (23:8).\(^\text{410}\) Now, if the word *resurrectio* (or its Greek original: ἀνάστασις) referred to the bodily resurrection, Joye maintained, and it constituted a separate item in the list denied by the Sadducees, the author could not possibly have said that the Pharisees believed in *both*, but rather in *all three* of them. But the Latin *utraque* (and the Greek τὰ ἀμφότερα), just like the English *both*, refers to two items.\(^\text{411}\) Even Tyndale himself translated it with “both”: “But the phariseies graunt bothe” (T1526). Therefore, Joye argued, the expression “spirits and angels” in 23:8 can only be seen as standing in apposition to the term *resurrectio*. The text could then be paraphrased in Joye’s understanding as follows: the Sadducees say that there is no *life beyond this earthly life*; there are neither spirits (that is, the souls of the departed between their death and the resurrection) nor angels.\(^\text{412}\)

Joye then turned to Christ’s encounter with the Sadducees in the Synoptics. He recapitulated the story put to Jesus about the seven brothers

\(^{410}\) Joye quotes the text from Erasmus’ Latin NT translation, or a critical edition of the Vulgate that uses *utraque*. The widely used, uncritical editions of the Vulgate have *utrumque*.


\(^{412}\) “Paul confirming the same to be their opinion/ addeth that thei said ther were nether spirits nor angels/ so that to saye there is nether spirit/ (spirit properly is the soule departed) nor angel/ is as miche to saye as the soule is mortall/ & no lyfe to be aftir this: and the Saduceis in denying the lyfe aftir this/ denied by the same denye but onely those two: that is/ bothe spirit and angell: for if they had denyed by that worde Resurrectio the generall Resurrection to in that place/ so had thei denied thre distincte thingis: but Paule addyng/ Pharisei autem vtraquæ confitentur/ but the pharises grant them bothe two/ declareth manifestly that thei denyed but onely two thingis that is to saye bothe spirit & angell: for aftir this present lyfe tyl domes daye there is no lyfe of eny creature but of these two creatures spirits and anguels. And if by this worde Resurrectio Paul had vnderstonden as T. doth the resurrection of the flesshe/ he wolde not haue sayd/ the pharyses grant them bothe/ but all thre. For this word vtraqæ as euery latyne man knoweth/ is spoken but of two thingis only: but as for this mynyde I leaue it vnto the iugement of the lerned” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. A6v–A7r).
who died one after the other, each leaving his wife to the next brother without an heir. In his answer, Jesus tells the Sadducees that they are wrong because they do not know “the power of God.” Joye understood this to be the power to give life (even to the dead), and in a marginal note he refers to Jn. 5, Jn. 12, and 1 Jn. 5 to corroborate his argument.  

It is God, the Father, and the Son who are the “vere lyfe” and the origin of all life, and it is therefore in their power to give life to the dead and keep the souls of the departed alive. It is this lifegiving power of God of which the Sadducees are ignorant when they doubt the survival of the soul. Jesus then explains, Joye argued, that in the resurrectio (Matthew: ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει), when the dead resuscitantur (Mark: ὅταν ἀναστῶσιν Joye: “are reuiued or resuscited”), they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like angels (Matthew, Mark: angeli, ἄγγελοι) in Heaven and are sons of God (Luke). Joye points out that Jesus formulates his answer in the present tense: “christe in describing their present state/ saith in the present tence. Thei mary not nor ar maryed/ but ar lyke au  

angels.” Furthermore, Joye asked, when are the deceased more like angels: (1) when they are still bodiless, incorporeal, purely intellectual souls, or (2) after the resurrection, when they will have already joined their bodies? Undoubtedly, he said, they are much more like angels in their bodiless state, i.e. in the intermediate state, because angels do not have bodies. Tyndale

---

413 John 5 is the story of the healing of the lame on a Sabbath at the pool of Bethsaida. Joye had probably vv. 21–29 in particular in mind. The last verse of this passage (v. 29) also bears witness to Joye’s editorial work. He quotes 5:24 verbatim on sig. B6v. John 12 recounts Jesus’ last actions after having raised Lazarus but prior to the Last Supper. Joye probably refers to vv. 24–26 and 48–50. In 1 Jn. 5 vv. 11–12 are probably the ones Joye refers to: “And this is that recorde, how that god hath geue n  

unto vs eternall lyfe, and this lyfe is in hys sonne. He that hath the sonne hath lyfe, and he that hath not the sonne of god hath not lyfe” (J1534).


415 “Thei erred being ignorant of the scriptures and also of the power of god/ whiche powr christe declareth to consist in the preseruing the dead a lyue” (Joye, Apologye, sig. A6v–v).


417 Joye, Apologye, sig. A6v. He recapitulates this argument on sig. A8v–v: “But as touching the dead/ that thei ar resuscited or they ar all redy alyue (he saith not that they shalbe alyue or shall ryse agayne as T. in hys diligent last correccon turneth the presentence into the future: and the verbe passiue into a neuter to stablissh his errour . . .).”

418 “I aske hym [i.e. Tyndale] whether that the children of that lyfe & worthy that worlde (as Luke calleth them) be not now more lyke angels then they shalbe aftar the resurreccion of their bodies? me thinketh that in thys poyn/ that they nether marye nor
is therefore wrong to translate the present passive *resuscitantur* with the future tense “shal rise agen” in Mk. 12:26.419

Jesus then, to prove the veracity of the *resurrectio*, quotes Ex. 3:6.15f: “I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob” and adds “He is God not of the dead but of the living.”420 What is surprising here, Joye explained, is that this argument is totally pointless if the question is about the general resurrection at the end of the world. For Jesus’ addition (“He is God not of the dead but the living”) refers to the present relationship of the patriarchs with God: they are not dead figures of the past but are alive and present.421 Furthermore, if the dead slept in an indifferent, insensible, and unconscious state until the general resurrection at the end of the world, as Tyndale maintained, then God could not possibly be called “God of the living,” but “God of the sleeping who will be living.”

That there was a logical problem in Jesus’ answer was already noticed by the Fathers. The reader will remember how Jerome, in his Commentary on Matthew, argued that Jesus proved the immortality of the soul on the basis of a citation from Exodus, and from the immortality of the soul the bodily resurrection should follow.422 Calvin, too, will find a similar solution

are maryed: aungels and the spirits be now bothe a lyke: and the chyldren of the lyfe or the worlde where now the blessed lyue with Christe/ are now more lyke aungels then they shalbe aftir the resurrection of their bodyes/ for now they ar substances incorpo-ral/ immortall/ & intellectuall/ and so be aungels: but then they shalbe bodely substances hauyng very flesshe and bones which the aungels neuer had nor neuer shall haue" (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. A7v).

419 Joye, *Apologye*, sig. A7r. Joye used Erasmus’ Latin translation (E). For the Greek περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν ὅτι ἐγείρονται, the Vulgate reads *de mortuis autem quod resurgant*. Erasmus appears to have been discontent with the translation of the passive present indicative of the intransitive ἐγείρονται by the verb resurgant in the active present subjunctive. He uses instead the passive present indicative of another verb, resuscitantur, in order to set it in contrast with the verb ἀναστῶσιν (E, Vg: *resurrexerint*) of the previous verse. To improve the style, Matthew changes the clause into a nominal construction: περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν (E: *de resurrectione vero* (Vg: *autem mortuorum*). Luke also changes Mark’s somewhat awkward construction but keeps the verb in the passive present indicative: δὲ ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροὶ. Here, however, Erasmus keeps the Vulgate’s reading: *quia* (E: *quod*) *vero resurgant mortui*. Tyndale translates the sentence both in Mark and in Luke with the future tense: “that the deed shall ryse agayne.”

420 “De resurrectione vero mortuorum/ non legisits quod vobis dictum est a deo/ qui ait. Ego sum deus Abraham &c. That is to saye. As concernyng the lyfe of them that be dead haue ye not red what is tolde you of god saying: I am the God of Abraham/ the god of Isaac/ and the god of Jacob: God is not the God of the deade/ but of the lyuinge” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. A7r).

421 Cf. supra on pp. 189 and 195.

422 See supra on p. 93.
to the problem: “Quum vero tradit Scriptura, ex spe resurrectionis pendere spiritualem vitam, et animas a corporibus solutas illuc respicere, quisquis resurrectionem convellit, animas quoque immortalitate spoliat.”

In other words, the immortality of the soul and the resurrection necessarily presuppose each other. Therefore, proving immortality proves resurrection at the same time.

Joye also recognized the difficulty with Jesus’ answer. But for him this second step in the argumentation (namely, that the immortality of the soul presupposes the bodily resurrection) is unnecessary because the word *resurrectio* itself refers to the intermediate state. This is the question at stake for the Sadducees. By proving the immortality of the soul, Jesus already answered the question of the Sadducees:

> By this argument: god is the god of the lying & not of the dead: God is the god of Abraham Isaac & Jacob ergo Abraham Isaac and Jacob are a lyue: christe concludeth planely/ nothing els but that there is a lyfe aftir this wheryn the soulis departed lyue/ whiche conclusion sith it is directly made ageynst the Saduces opinion/ it must nedis folow that thei denied in this place that thinge which christe proved.

In other words, if Jesus proved the immortality of the soul, then this must have been the assertion that was called into question by the Sadducees at this point. “If the Saduces here had denyed cheifely [sic] & principally/ by that worde Resurrectio the generall resurrection,” Joye argued, then Christ would have proven the general resurrection with applicable scriptural quotes and arguments. Instead, he proved the immortality of soul, and with that he silenced the Sadducees. Therefore, the Sadducees’ question must have been about the immortality of the soul, otherwise they would not have been silenced by Jesus’ answer: “or els they [i.e. the Sadducees] myght haue well obiected saying: Syr what is this answere to our question? we aske the whose wyfe shall she be at the general resurreccion of their bodyes? and thou answereth vs nothyng els nor prouest vs any thing els with this scripture but that there is a lyf after this wheryn the soulis departed nowe lyue.”

---


424 “For thoughge this place proueth not directly the resurreccion of the bodies yet are there many places moo that proue it” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. B1v).


Joye saw an additional reinforcement of his argument in the final clause of Jesus’ answer, found only in the Gospel of Luke: *omnes enim illi vivunt* (πάντες γὰρ αὐτῷ ζῶσιν). Joye interpreted the present tense of the verb (and do not sleep) “in him” or “by him.” This means that the departed just persons are alive (Joye calls attention again to the fact that the verb is in the present tense). Therefore, it cannot refer to the general resurrection at the end of time.

Joye summed up his argumentation with the conclusion: “the latyn worde [Resurrectio]/ besides that it signifieth in other places the Resurreccion of the bodye/ yet in these it sygnifieth the lyfe of the spirits or soulis departed as christis answere vnto the Saduceis/ and John declare.” Despite Joye’s at times quite sharp style, on the whole he comes across as quite convincing in presenting his arguments on the belief of the Sadducees. His exegetical and historical arguments, supported with a manifest knowledge of the available sources, appear much more persuasive than Tyndale’s more private arguments based on his personal “feeling faith.”

3. Private Judgement and the Interim State of the Soul. In his *Apologye* Joye argued that the interim state of the soul after this life is the meaning of the Latin word *Resurrectio* in three other passages (four occurrences) where he had altered Tyndale’s translation. These occurrences do not refer to the belief of the Sadducees, but rather—at least in Joye’s understanding—in one way or another to the individual judgement passed immediately after the death of the person. One of them can be found in Lk. 14:14, two in Jn. 5:29, and one in Heb. 11:35. In his *Apologye*, Joye clarified his motives for changing the translation in the latter two passages. Lk. 14:14 is not explained by Joye himself, but it will be apparent why he regarded this text as referring to an interim state.

Heb. 11:35 will be considered here first, since Joye regards his argument about this text as one of his best scores against Tyndale’s views. In Heb. 11 the author lists a long line of examples of biblical figures who distinguished

---

428 Joye, *Apologye*, sig. A8v. This is again the text of Erasmus’ Latin NT translation; the Vulgate reads *omnes enim vivunt ei*.


430 “I do here snare & hold him faste, tyl he be able to loose himselfe” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. B4v).
themselves by their steadfastness in faith, even during tribulations and torture. Later, in chapter 12, the author of Hebrews contrasts the exemplary behaviour of the biblical OT 'saints' and martyrs with that of his readers, who “have not yet resisted unto bloudsheddyng” in their “stryvynge agaynst sinne.” (Heb. 12:5 T1526) Part of this list of illustrious saints and sufferers is found in 11:35, which in Erasmus’ NT reads: ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν· ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν. This was put into English by Tyndale in his Worms edition with: “The wemen receaved their deed to lyfe agayne. Wother were racked/ & wolde nott be delivered/ thatt they myght receave a better resurreccion.” Joye was glad to discover that by rendering ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν with “their deed to lyfe agayne,” Tyndale gave a somewhat loose translation of the first part of verse 35. The clause refers to a/some case(s) of resuscitation (possibly to Elijah’s story in 1 Kgs. 17:17–24 and/or his successor Elisha raising the son of the Shunammite woman in 2 Kgs. 4), and for that purpose Tyndale might have thought that his translation would leave no ambiguity. Joye, however, chose to change the last clause of the verse by replacing Tyndale’s ‘resurreccion’ there with ‘lyfe.’ He also inserted the adverb ‘rather’ (to render the comparative) and changed Tyndale’s indefinite article into a definite article: “that they myght receave rather the better lyfe.”

In Tyndale’s understanding the first sentence of the verse clearly refers to a resuscitation rather than to a resurrection in the proper theological sense of the word. To avoid any ambiguity, and as a reaction to his dispute with Joye on the issue, Tyndale inserted the word ‘raised’ in his 1535 revision so the first clause read: “And the wemen receaued their deed raysed to lyfe agayne.” It is worth noting that Tyndale’s rendering does

---

431 Tyndale supplied an indefinite article in English. The absence of an article in the Greek text does not necessarily support this: Greek can also use nouns (especially abstract nouns) without any article in sentences where the definite article would be used in English (cf. Maximilian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek Illustrated By Examples*, § 171, 176ff and BDF, §258). Joye was translating from Latin, which has no articles at all.

432 Joye also changed Tyndale’s somewhat awkward and repetitious “wother” (appearing also at the beginning of v. 36) into the more smoothly reading “some.” He kept the structural division between the two sentences of the verse and started a new paragraph at the beginning of the second sentence of v. 35, just as Tyndale did.

433 Joye commented on Tyndale’s change with the following remark: “But yet in his last newe testament so diligently corrected & compared wyth the greke, because he woulde varie & swarue fro my englysshing (ye from the trueth of the worde) he goyth aboute per ambages with a large circumlocution, saying raysed from dethe to lyfe agen […] he had leuer thus play bo peep with .ij. wordis […] then to say the trueth with me. Here may
not answer the question of what had happened with the body and/or the souls of those who were resuscitated or where they returned from. The second clause of the verse in T1526 undoubtedly refers to the general (and, in Tyndale’s understanding, only) judgement at the end of the world: that the Maccabean martyr brothers (2 Macc. 7:1–29), to whom the text probably refers, might receive a better judgement at the general resurrection. We have seen that this is Frith’s reading of the story in 2 Maccabees. J1534, however, interprets the verse differently. Joye believed in the immediate private judgement after death; hence, he took the second sentence as referring to this individual judgement and to the condition of the soul—that the martyrs’ souls might receive a “better lyfe” immediately their death. Over the course of their controversy, Joye went even further in J1535, and by—congruously—changing the preposition ‘to’ to ‘from,’ he makes it correspond to the Latin de (and the Greek ἐξ) of his Vorlage. In J1535, therefore, the first clause reads: “The wemen receaued their deed from lyfe agayne.” Thus, this clause in Joye’s understanding refers to a return from another life, namely, the intermediate state. Therefore, ‘lyfe’ in this sentence means the life of the soul after death. Hence, Joye’s translation could be paraphrased in modern English as: the women received their dead from the intermediate state.

Joye’s move is neither unmotivated nor illogical. Joye argued that it is rather Tyndale’s version that is illogical and absurd if Tyndale understands the resurrection of the body under the English term ‘resurrection.’ If Tyndale uses the term a ‘better resurrection,’ it presupposes that there must be a ‘worse resurrection,’ too, which is clearly absurd. In Joye’s eyes the comparison can only be with this life, in which “these men so streched & racked hauing experie[n]ce of the worse […] despysed the delyuera[n]ce to obtayne [a] better [life after death].”

ye se what shiftes this man maketh to discrode fro me: ye rather fro m the trueth” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B5v).

434 See supra on p. 269.
435 Cf. supra on p. 196.
436 “Tyndale] englissheth a beter resurreccio: where it is playn that he englissheth it falsely, for sith he taketh here Resurreccio for the resurreccio of the fleshe: & this comparison is here betwene two resurreccions only, it must nedis folow that aftir T. there shuld be two resurreccions of our bodyes, of the which one is beter then the tother” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B3v).
437 Joye, Apologye, sigs. B3r–B4v. Cf: “for the comparison consisteth betwene this lyfe, of which thei were werie, and the tother beter lyfe after this whiche thei so feriously desiered that they refused to be delyuered from their paynes” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B4v–v).
Furthermore, by translating Heb. 11:35 the way he did, Tyndale rendered a Greek clause that had three substantives (γυναῖκες, ἀνάστασις, and νεκροί) with an English clause that also had three substantives (‘women,’ ‘life,’ and ‘dead’).438 Moreover, in the Greek (and in the Latin), just like in Tyndale’s rendering, γυναῖκες (mulieres, women) is the subject of the sentence, and νεκροί (mortui, dead) is the direct object. Accordingly, Joye supposed, the third substantive (ἀνάστασις, resurrectio, life), being the determiner of a prepositional phrase in each language, should correspond in Greek/Latin and English; thus, Joye concluded, Tyndale himself translated resurrectio (ἀνάστασις) with ‘life’ in Heb. 11:35. Accordingly, Joye could declare: “For in so englysshyng the worde I do nomore abhorre the name of the resurrection then do your selfe in the.xj.cap.to the hebrews where youre selfe call yt lyfe also: and haue graunted it me that yt so signifyeth.”439

The Latin preposition de (as the Greek ἐξ) is primarily used to designate a source or origin. In this meaning, Joye argued, the preposition is usually translated by the English prepositions ‘from’ or ‘of,’ or the phrase ‘out of.’ The relationship that the English preposition ‘to’ expresses, on the other hand, is usually expressed by the Latin preposition ad. To translate de resurrectione with “to life” is therefore “playing bo peep,” Joye notes, throwing Tyndale’s own words back at him.440 Once ἀνάστασις/resurrectio is translated by “life,” it is logical, Joye maintained, that the same word appearing in the same verse for the second time with no apparent reason to the contrary should be translated by the same English word.

Joye believed that the broader context of the passage also reinforces his interpretation. He was convinced that in Heb. 12:18–24 the author gives a “playne description of the state where vnto the soulis departed in cristhe ar receyued.”441 The text reads in Joye’s rendering as follows:

ye ar not come vnto the hill Sinai which none might touche: but ye are come vnto the mounte zion the cite of the luying god, the heuene Jerusalem, & vnto the innumerable company of aungels vnto the congregacion of our former first begoten fathers writen togither in heuen, & to god, the igure of al men, & vnto the sprites of the pure iuste and vnto Jesus criste the mediatour of the newe covenante eu en vnto the bespreigned bloude.442

438 The Vulgate has also three substantives (mulieres, resurrectio, and mortui): acceperunt mulieres de resurrectione mortuos suos.
439 Joye, Apologue, sig. D3v. Cf. “Lo here resurrectio aftir T. signifethy lyfe/ & not the generall resurreccion: ergo T. abhorreth this worde resurreccion & denyeth the resurreccion of the flesshe/ these be his arguments against me” (Joye, Apologue, sig. B4v).
441 Joye, Apologue, sig. C1v.
The text mentions spirits in this passage, so it is "playne," Joye argued, “that in this heuenly Jerusalem ar now the congregacion of our former fathers & the spirites of the iuste men, for aftir the generall resurrection, this congregacion shalbe no spiritis, but the company of very men hauyng flesshe and bone.”

To prove that the text cannot refer to the future state after the bodily resurrection, Joye quoted the words of the risen Jesus to his disciples in which Jesus contrasts his corporeal state after the resurrection with the acorporality of a ghost: “a spyrit hath nether flesshe nor bones,” (Lk. 24:39).

Joye also elucidated his motives for altering the second passage (Jn. 5:29) in the Apologye. As has been observed, Joye already made a cursory reference to Jn. 5 in the discussion about the belief of the Sadducees. But he also gave a more detailed reading of chapter 5 of the Fourth Gospel. In that chapter Jesus is confronted by the Jews for healing a lame man at the pool of Bethesda on the Sabbath. Jesus, in justification of His deed, points to the Father who raises the dead and gives them life, and claims that the Son also gives life to whomever He wishes (v. 21) because the Father has allowed the Son to have life in Himself (v. 26). Accordingly, Jesus promised that “the tyme shall come, and nowe ys, when the deed shall heare the voyce off the sonne of god. And they that heare, shall live.” (v. 25 T1526). Jesus also promised that “who so here my worde & beleue in hym that hath sent me/ hath lyfe eueralinge & shall not come into con-dempnacion/ but is passed ouer from dethe to lyfe” (v. 24). This promise is understood by Joye as a clear reference to the individual judgement and to the survival of the soul: the believer will be judged at death and will not be condemned but admitted to life everlasting. Consequently, Joye believed that vv. 28–29 should also be interpreted as referring to the individual judgement and the interim state of the soul: “Maruayle not at thys/ that the houre shall come in the whych all that are in the graues/ shall heare hys voice/ and shall come forthe/ they that haue done goode

---

443 Joye, Apologye, sig. Cr*.  
444 Joye, Apologye, sig. Cr*.  
445 See supra on p. 376.  
446 Joye, Apologye, sig. B6*.  
447 Joye, Apologye, sig. E6v–w. This text, in the eyes of Joye, served also as a refutation of Tyndale’s argument that the survival of the soul was not held by the Jews or the early Christians because Paul did not console the Thessalonians with this idea (see supra on p. 302). In Joye’s understanding, Jn. 5:24 proves that the soul has “eueralinge life” and at death it “passes over from death to life.” While Paul did not refer to this text, Joye argued, it does not prove that he was ignorant of this just because he chose to use another teaching to console the Thessalonians. At any rate, Joye maintained, an argument from silence is always week and dangerous (Joye, Apologye, sig. B6v–w).
into the very life. And they that haue done euyl/ in to the lyfe off damp-
nacion." (J1534). In fact, the three promises refer to the same thing: Jesus is
trying to drive home the point.448 Repetition is a common figure of speech
in the Bible, Joye argued, and John is champion of this, especially in the
explanatory usage of the conjunction ’and.’449 He does so in Jn. 6:35 and
11:35, where Jesus significantly claimed that “I am the resurreccion and
lyfe.”450 Here, “lyfe” explains the meaning of “resurreccion.”451 Therefore,
resurrectio

448 “For where he sayd before/ the dead shal here his voice/ now he sayth for the same/
all that ar in graues shall here his voyce/ and where he sayd in the first same sentence/ ar
passed frome dethe to lyfe & haue everlasting life/ in the seconde sentence he sayth/ shal
lyue/ and in the thirde & last of all he saythe/ shal come forth in to that very and perfit
lyfe/ & where he sayd before/ condempnacion/ here at last he calleth the same the lyfe of
condempnacion or damnable lyfe” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. E6v–E7r).

449 “Yt is the como phrase of scripture to saye spiritus sanctificationis/ pro spiritu
sancto & sanctitas veritatis pro vera sanctitate with many siche lyke/ Also yt is to be noted
that there is none of theuangelistis nor apostles so plentuouse in expowning himselfe with
so many wordis & so ofte repeting one thing as is Iohn/ vsyng thys particle (Et) in englyssh
as myche to saye as (And) expositiue: that is to expowne the sentence or worde before”
(Joye, Apologye, sig. E7r).

450 Joye, Apologye, sig. E7r.

451 “There thys worde (and) expowneth what resurreccion sygnifyeth/ euen very lyfe”
(Joye, Apologye, sig. E7r–v).

452 See supra on p. 339.

453 “I wolde know of Tinda. whether when a mannis bodye is dead & layd in graue/ yt
be his dead bodye or hys soule that hereth cristis voyce/ I am suer T. is not so farre besydis
his comon sencis as to saye the dead bodye hereth cristis voyce/ ergo yt is the soule that
hereth yt/ and then why dothe T. despys my sence or rather the trw sence of the scripture
calling it a mocking out of the text and a false glose?” (Joye, Apologye, sig. E5r).

454 Joye, Apologye, sig. E7r.

As the reader will remember, Tyndale referred to Jn. 5:28 in his second
foreword as a possible example where someone following Joye’s ‘folly’
could make even further changes in the text.452 There, Tyndale ‘suggested’
that instead of those “yat are in ye sepulchres, shall heare his voyce,” one
could substitute “the soules of them that are in the sepulchres shall heare
his voyce,” which, according to Tyndale, is clearly an absurd rendering.
But for Joye, the change ‘suggested’ by Tyndale is in fact logical, because
it is not the dead body that will hear Christ’s voice but the soul.453 In fact,
this is the “trewe & catholyk sence” of the verse, and not even Tyndale
can “make it false.”454

The last passage under consideration is Lk. 14:13–14. Tyndale translated
the Greek text of these two verses as follows: “Butt when thou makest
a feast, call the povre, the maymed, the lame, and the blinde, and thou
shall be happy: For they cannot recompence the. Butt thou shalt be recompensed at the resurreccion of the iuste men.” (T1526). Joye, however, changed the last clause to “But thou shalt be recompensed at the lyfe of the iuste men.” Although Joye did not explain his motivation to change Tyndale’s translation of this text, there can be no doubt that in Joye’s reading, this sentence also refers to the judgement of the individual at the moment of death: the ‘reward’ for the good deeds on earth shall be given to the individual upon his or her death. This interpretation of the text is consistent with his anthropological view and with his belief that the souls of the dead receive their reward or punishment immediately upon their death. Interpreting resurrectio in this sentence as referring to the bodily resurrection would have contradicted his dualistic anthropology or, at least in Joye’s understanding, would have promoted the Anabaptists’ (and Luther’s and Tyndale’s) position on soul sleep.

As has been demonstrated, the three passages where Joye altered Tyndale’s translation that do not refer to the belief of the Sadducees were all understood as referring to the individual judgement and the immediate retribution or reward of the separated human soul after the physical death of the body. Joye’s exegetical arguments are consistent with his view of the human person and with his conviction that the soul is indestructible and survives the death of the body.

4. Bodily Resurrection (1 Cor. 15, Rev. 20). Although on the basis of Tyndale’s criticism and Joye’s later critiques one gets the impression that Joye altered Tyndale’s translation in all, or at least most, of the places where the word resurrectio appears in the Latin text, Joye left Tyndale’s translation of this word unaltered in most cases. As has been pointed out, Joye emphasized that he never denied that bodily resurrection was the first and foremost meaning of the Latin word (and its Greek equivalents). But Tyndale’s question is justified and unavoidable vis-à-vis such a position: what is the function or usefulness or purpose of the bodily resurrection, if one enjoys heavenly bliss immediately upon death?

In his Apologye, Joye pointed to biblical texts where the Latin text contains resurrectio or one of its cognates and where the term, according to him, does mean the bodily resurrection, and his exegesis of these texts reveals the answer to Tyndale’s question. The most prominent of these is 1 Cor. 15. This passage is left unaltered in Joye’s edition, for he,

455 See supra on p. 368.
unlike Melanchthon, Zwingli, and Westheimer, was convinced that the bodily resurrection is Paul’s subject in this passage. Nonetheless, he also disagreed with Tyndale’s interpretation of 1 Cor. 15 as Tyndale used this text in his debate with Thomas More, because Joye believed that Tyndale wilfully misrepresented Paul’s argument when he wanted to confute More. For Tyndale, Joye asserted, “haue coupled paulis consequen with an antecedence of his own ymaginacion” when Tyndale summed up Paul’s message in the following way: “If ther be no resurrection, we be of al wretches the most miserablest.” But, Joye argued, this is not what Paul wrote. “For this is Paulis argument. If we haue but in thys lyfe onely our hope fastened in christe, so were we miserablest of al men.” Although Tyndale’s words are probably a fair summary of Paul’s logic in vv. 13–19, Joye is, as usual, exact both in citing Tyndale and in ‘correcting’ him, because 1 Cor. 15:19 indeed reads: εἰ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ ἡλπικότες ἐσμὲν ἐν Χριστῷ μόνον ἔλεεευντοροι πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐσμέν. Therefore, Joye maintained, Paul’s words do not support Tyndale’s claim: “for so myght his antecede nce be true & his consequen false.” Namely, Joye could hypothetically imagine that even if there were no bodily resurrection, one should not despair, because in the afterlife justice for the soul is done at the individual judgement. Therefore, compared to the souls of saints, who are received into heavenly bliss upon their death, those who are on earth together with the damned souls who “be dead & not receyued in to Abrahams bosom but in hel in tormentis be mich more misarable.” In other words, Paul’s argument in vv. 13–19 is the following, according to Joye: Christians would be the most miserable if there were no hope at all beyond this earthly life, neither in the form of bodily resurrection nor in the form of immortality of the soul. It has to be recognized that even if

456 For Melanchthon’s, Zwingli’s, and Westheimer’s interpretation of the passage, see supra on pp. 192, 195ff, and 240.
457 “Here may ye se how T. runneth ryot of his own wit falsely belying Paule hauing no respecte vnto his book, ner yet dew reuere vnto holy scriptures alleging them” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B5v). More has argued that the souls of the saints are alive in Heaven. (See: supra on p. 262.)
458 Joye, Apologye, sig. B5v. For Tyndale’s argument, see: supra on p. 301.
460 Joye is again following Erasmus’ Latin translation and not the Vulgate: (E): Si in uita hac spem in Christo tantum fixam habemus, miserabiliros omnis hominibus sumus. (Vg): si in hac vita tantum in Christo sperantes sumus miserabiliros sumus omnibus hominibus. Tyndale had translated this sentence with “Yf in thys lyfe only we beleve on Christ, then are we off all men the miserablest” in T1526, and this was left unaltered by Joye.
Joye obviously misinterpreted Paul's intention here, the formulation of v. 19 leaves space for Joye's hypothetical interpretation according to his own logic.

But this is, of course, merely a theoretical possibility for Joye because Jesus' resurrection proved the veracity of the resurrection beyond any doubt. Furthermore, the souls of the saints in the interim state are not yet in the full glory. At the end of the world, after the general judgement “the soulis shall resume their own bodyes not mortal but immortal/ incorruptible/ spiritual/ and gloriosse for euer” (cf. vv. 42–44). Only after the bodily resurrection shall the joy of the saints be perfect, because then their bodies, which were instrumental in their good works and shared in their hardships, will also participate in the heavenly bliss. This state after the resurrection of the body will be the perfection for which all creatures long; this will be “the deluyerance oute of their seruitute into that gloriosse libertye of the children of god,” and this will be the redemption of the body of which Paul spoke (Rom. 8:19–23). “Thys perfeccion and full state” is what Luke called “the tyme of refrigery and confort of the presence of god and tyme of the restoring of all thyngis” (Acts 3:20–21). And this final state will be that of which Heb. 11:39–40 speaks. At the general resurrection, “vniuersal and intire corps of criste his hole chirche [shall] be made ful & perfite in hir most gloriosse and perfite state & perpetuall fruicio ioyed in ioye euerlasting vnto hir head Iesu criste.”

The other important passage about the bodily resurrection and the eschatological events at the end of the world is Rev. 20, which, according to Joye, reveals more than a few enlightening details. There it is said that an angel descended from Heaven and bound Satan for a thousand years and that the souls of those beheaded for their testimony of Christ

---

464 Joye, _Apology_, sig. F2r–v.
465 “The scriptures […] declare playnely that the glorye and ioye of the soulis is more ful and perfite when they shal haue their bodyes felows & parte takers of their felicite & ioye whom they had once as ministers of their good workis & partakers of their affliccio[n] then when they haue their glory a lone wyth out their bodyes” (Joye, _Apology_, sigs. F2v–F3r).
466 Joye, _Apology_, sig. F2r. Cf. sig. F2v.
467 Joye, _Apology_, sig. F2r.
468 “And Paule expressing this gloriosse perfeccion & perfite glorye of bothe bodyes soulis togethir aftir the general resurreccion/ sayth. All these thorow fayth deseryuyng thys testimony haue not yet receuued the promyse (that is to saye the intire renewing/ redemption/ & resurreccion of their bodies promised them) because that god had prouided this one better thyng for vs/ that is to wete/ that thei without vs shuld not be made ful & perfite or be set faste in their ful glorye of bothe body & soule” (Joye, _Apology_, sigs. F2v–F3r).
469 Joye, _Apology_, sig. F3r.
and the word of God came to life and reigned with Christ for a thousand years (20:1–4). “This is the first resurrection,” says the author of the book of Revelation (v. 5), and he calls blessed those who share in this first resurrection, because “the second death” will have no power over them (v. 6). When the thousand years have ended, Satan will be released from his prison and will go out to deceive the nations (vv. 7–8), but he will ultimately be punished together with those who were deceived by him (vv. 9–10). The dead will be raised up and judged according to their deeds, and anyone who is not written in the Book of Life is going to be cast into a lake of fire (vv. 12–15). “This is the second death,” we read in Rev. 20:14.

Joye mentions this chapter several times in his Apologye (occasionally referring to different verses within the same chapter). The first occurrence can be found in his clarification about the Sadducees’ belief.470 Secondly, Joye refers to the text as one of those he used in his discussion with Tyndale when he tried to convince Tyndale about the biblical foundation of the teachings about the intermediate state of the soul. Joye argued that just like in Rev. 14,471 the author of Revelation (whom Joye equated with the Apostle John and with the author of the Fourth Gospel) describes the state of the souls after their death in vv. 4–5. These souls, according to the description of the biblical author, “were alyue & raigned with crist .M. yere”472 (Rev. 20:4), and their state is designated as ‘first resurrection’ (ἡ ἀνάστασις ἡ πρώτη; Vg: resurrectio prima) in v. 5. It is therefore evident, Joye asserted, that the author here “calleth that lyfe of the soulis, prima resurrectionem,”473 Furthermore, he argued, “here is it playn that this worde Resurrectio is not euery where taken a lyke as T. saith.”474 That the expression ‘first resurrection’ (resurrectio prima) refers to the life of the souls in the intermediate state is further corroborated by the fact that in the following verses John describes the state of the damned after the general judgement (‘second death,’ secunda mors, ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος). For if the expression ‘second death’ correlates to the term ‘first resurrection,’ which is clearly the intent of the author of Revelation, Joye argued, then the ‘first resurrection’ must be taken in the sense of ‘first life.’475 Later, Joye reiterated that John called the ‘first resurrec-
tion’ the “state of the soulis departed” before the general resurrection in Rev. 20:5.476 The expression ‘the second death’ is thus used for the general resurrection.477

Joye’s explanation of both 1 Cor. 15 and Rev. 20 reveals that he understood the interim state of the blessed souls as the first and necessary step in the process of attaining the perfect heavenly bliss. This process is only fulfilled at the end of the world, when the universal Church will be perfected and all souls will be rejoined with their bodies. While Joye hypothetically mentioned the possibility that even if there were no resurrection, the immortality of the soul and the private judgement after death would still safeguard the justice of God, this is clearly a purely hypothetical possibility. According to him, bodily resurrection and the interim state of the soul correlate with each other, as Rev. 20 teaches.

5. The Interim State. As has been mentioned, Joye’s understanding of what happens to the human being after death is essentially based on his inherited dualistic anthropology, which was influenced by the principles of Scholastic philosophy. Nonetheless, Joye consciously sought scriptural texts that could shed light on the issue. The Latin resurrectio can only refer to an intermediate state if such a state exists. He therefore needed arguments to prove that such a state is indeed attested to in the Bible; he needed arguments to support his position. In the Apologye he summarized these proofs (most of which he had used to argue his case with Tyndale prior to the publication of his defence).478

The first text he brought up to convince Tyndale was Lk. 23:43: “when christe answerde the theif hangyng by his crosse saying. This days thou shalt be with me in paradyse.”479 According to Joye:

\[
\text{it is manifest that if christe had that daye commended hys spirit into hys fathers handis in heuen (as he dyd in deed) & promised that the spirit of the theif should be with his spirit (for their bodies were not togither) it must nedys folow that hys spirit was with cristis spirit in heuen. And to expresse the place more playnly christe added saying, In paradyse, which is not els then in heuen.} \]

which is the first lyf, & first dethe, whiche is the seconde dethe & seconde resurreccion* (Joye, Apologye, sig. C\textit{v}).

476 Joye, Apologye, sig. C\textit{v}.
477 Joye, Apologye, sig. D\textit{v}.
478 See supra on p. 354.
479 Joye, Apologye, sig. B\textit{v}.
480 Joye, Apologye, sig. B\textit{v}. 
Obviously, Joye interpreted Jesus’ words in a strict temporal sense. For him, time and temporality are self-evidently indispensable characteristics of human nature (and of the human soul) in which Christ (and His soul) also participated. And the declaration that Christ was going to be in Paradise on that day together with the ‘good thief’ can only refer to His soul, Joye maintained, because Christ’s body was resting in the tomb. This argument alone manifestly proves the survival of the soul according to Joye’s view.481 Tyndale, however, remained apparently unimpressed, although he mentioned this argument in his second foreword.482

Joye’s second proof is Mt. 8:11–12: “I tell you verely that many shal come from the east & west and shal sit down to eat with Abraham Isaac and Iacob in the kyngdome of heue [. . .] but the chyldren of the kyngdome of the deuyl shalbe cast forth into extreme derknesses where shalbe wepinge & gnasshing of tethe.”483 According to Joye this “sitting down at table with Abraham” is the association with patriarchs, being partakers in their present joy and fruition in Heaven, whereas the ‘gnashing of teeth’ means Hell, where the damned souls enter immediately after leaving the body.484 In Joye’s understanding this ‘sitting down at table with Abraham’ is just another term for Abraham’s bosom “into which all that resembled Abraham in faith, aftir their departinge were receyued” and of which Jesus spoke in the parable of the poor Lazarus and the rich (Lk. 16:22).485 Without any doubt Joye understood the intermediate state under the term ‘Abraham’s bosom.’ In fact, he believed that in this parable the precise state and lot of the chosen and of the wicked are described immediately after their death: he held “thelecte to be borne of aungels into Abrahams bosome as was Lazarus/ & the reprobated to be caste into hell into tormentis wyth the ryche gloton.”486

Another text Joye cited during one of his disputes with Tyndale is 2 Cor. 5:1ff: “For we knowe that yf oure erthye tabernacle where in we dwell were destroyed/ yet haue we a perpetual maansion not made with handis/ in heuen.”487 According to Joye, this eternal heavenly mansion,

481 “Whych one autorite albe it, it had bene sufficieent for any mane that wolde haue admytted & receyued the sengle and playn veryte of christis worde” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B7v).
482 See supra on p. 340.
484 Joye, Apologye, sigs. B7v–B8r.
which was prepared by God, who sent the Spirit as a guarantee (cf. 2 Cor. 5:5), is the same mansion Jesus promised to prepare in His farewell speech (Jn. 14:2–3), in which he also promised the sending of the Spirit. Furthermore, Paul affirmed that “to be absent from the bodye, is to be present with god”⁴⁸⁸ (cf. 2 Cor. 5:8). This ‘being absent from the body’ and ‘being with God’ can only refer to “state of soulis now beyng with god/ absent frome theyr bodyes yet a sleape in the erthe tyll thei be awaked & raised yp at the general iugement.”⁴⁸⁹

To prove the biblical basis of the intermediate state, Joye also referred to Phil. 1:21–24. There, Paul affirms that “dethe is to himself more aduantage then here to lyue: & therfore he desired to be losed from his body that he might be with criste his life.”⁴⁹⁰ Joye clearly understood Paul’s words as referring to the intermediate state and says that Paul believed “this state to be miche beter then the lyfe of this worlde.”⁴⁹¹ Here, too, Joye took Paul’s words in Philippians in a temporal sense, for Paul’s wish “to depart” and “to be with Christ” can only be a real alternative to “to remain in the body” for the benefit and joy of the Philippians if Paul’s being with Christ would follow immediately upon his death, and not only after an inactive sleep in a sort of intermediate state.⁴⁹²

Joye’s next proof text is Rev. 14:9–13, where John, according to Joye, describes “the states bothe of the damnd & also of the blessed that dye in the lorde hence forthe.”⁴⁹³ This text, too, can only refer to the intermediate state, Joye argued, because the angel—the angel who promises that they will rest from their labours, for their deeds follow them—calls those who die in the Lord blessed from then on (Rev. 14:13): “which sith they be blessed fro their dethe forth, it must nedis folow that thei be in blysse in heue.” Thus, Joye understood amodo (ἀπ’ ἄρτι) as connected with the predicate beati (μακάριοι) and not as an adverb of the subordinate clause (of the Latin text) governed by moriuntur. But the interim state of the souls is attested to also in Rev. 20:4–6 and in Heb. 12:18–24, as has been pointed out above.⁴⁹⁴

---

⁴⁹² Cf. Calvin’s commentary on the same text: supra in n. 140 on p. 319.
⁴⁹⁴ See supra on pp. 382 and 388.
6. Joye’s Other Exegetical Arguments. Joye’s other exegetical arguments can be grouped around three topics: (1) the idea that what happened to Christ’s soul during the three days between His death and resurrection is decisive and exemplary for all Christians; (2) the biblical usage of the verb ‘to sleep’; and (3) the biblical usage of the verbs ‘to stand up’ (surgere) and ‘to resurrect’ (resurgere).

1. As has been pointed out briefly, Joye thought that his most pertinent proof was concerning the condition of Christ’s soul between His death and resurrection.495 When Joye discussed the matter with Tyndale, Joye had the impression that Tyndale could not refute this argument:

   But at laste I remeber that I made hym thys reason/ sayinge. Syr ye knowe that christe is our head/ & we his members/ & altogether hys bodye/ ye knowe also that {1.cor.15} christe is the firste frutis/ & fore leader of them that sleap/ Then I argewed thus/ The bodye must nedis folow the head/ & whether the head went thither must the bodye folow (for crist optayned of his father {ioan.14.and.17} that wheresoeuer he shuld be/ there shulde his faithful be with him to se his glorie) but christis spirit departed slept not oute of heuen/ but wente into the fathers ha(n)dis in heuen/ wherefore euen so shell ours aftir our dethe/ if we dye his membres and in the lorde.496

Joye’s carefully constructed contention is built up from the following elements:

I. Joye, not uncommonly for his era, combined the various metaphors found in the Pauline corpus: those of the homologoumena—we are one body in Christ, and individually we are members one of another (Rom. 12:4–5); the Christians are the body of Christ, and individually (the body of the) Christians are (is) members of Christ (1 Cor. 6:15; 12:12–27)—with that of the antilegomena: Christ is the head, and the Church is His body (Eph. 4:15; 5:23; Col. 1:18).

II. Joye alludes to 1 Cor. 15:20, where Paul, discussing the veracity of resurrection, states that Christ is raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have ‘fallen asleep.’ (E: νυνὶ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἐγένετο. Vg: nunc autem Christus resurrexit a mortuis primitiae dormientium.)

---

495 See supra on p. 370.
496 Joye, Apologye, sigs. C1v–C2r.
III. Joye exploited the vehicle of the combined Pauline metaphor (body and head), and with a ‘logical’ (common sense) argument he claimed that the body always has to follow the head.

IV. To prove the consistency of this last ‘logical’ argument with regard to the tenor, the subject of the metaphor, Joye referred to Jn. 14:1–4 and Jn. 17:24. In the former text, during His farewell discourse Jesus talks about His departure to His “Father’s house” in order to prepare dwelling places for His followers. According to v. 3 Jesus will come again and will take the apostles to Himself, so that where He is, there His apostles may be also. The latter passage (Jn. 17:24), from the so-called High Priestly Prayer of Jesus (also part of the same farewell discourse), portrays Jesus praying for His disciples and for those who are going to believe in Him upon their words. In v. 24 Jesus expresses His desire that those who were given to Him may also be with Him where He is, in order to see His glory. In Joye’s reading both Johannine texts speak about Jesus preparing a place for the souls of the deceased that they might be with the Father and with Christ to behold the glory of God and of Christ.

V. The next step in Joye’s logical construction is to establish that Jesus’ soul did not “sleap out of Heaven” (a clear allusion to Tyndale’s opinion about the soul of the deceased) but was with God the Father. That Jesus’ soul was not sleeping out of Heaven can be known, Joye argued, because Jesus commended His spirit into His Father’s hands when He died (Lk. 23:46). In Joye’s reading, soul and spirit are synonymous, and he took Jesus’ words not (only) as an act of faith or pronouncement of trust but as a divine revelation about the metaphysics of afterlife, meaning that Jesus’ soul actually went to the Father when it departed from Jesus’ body.497

VI. The last step in his line of reasoning is drawing the following conclusion: from the previous five arguments it is obvious to him that the souls of the faithful Christians also will go directly to Heaven when they depart from the body at the moment of physical death.

That this argument of Joye did make a lasting impression on Tyndale is clear from the fact that he reacted to it in his second foreword.498 Joye quoted Tyndale’s words triumphantly and took them as a sign that

497 Cf. Lefèvre’s and Bullinger’s similar arguments, supra on pp. 157 and 231.
498 See supra on p. 339.
Tyndale accepted Joye’s argument. Nonetheless, it is very unlikely that Tyndale would have assented to Joye’s words, for he clearly expressed his reservations and doubts about the immortality of the soul in the lines following this quote. It is not unlikely that Tyndale thought that Jesus’ human soul, too, “slept out of Heaven”—i.e. was in some kind of unconscious state awaiting the resurrection—as he held that ‘sleeping’ is the only biblical term describing the state of the deceased.

2. Joye readily acknowledged that the Scripture uses the word ‘sleep’ to describe the state of the deceased. This is, however, only meant as a metaphor, Joye asserted, and is spoken only of the body, not of the soul. The metaphor of sleep, he believed, is very appropriate for speaking about the death of the body, and as such it describes “a shuttyng vp of the sencis frome their vse,” but it cannot be applied to the soul. “Sleep is onely appropriated to the bodyes,” Joye argued, which is why Paul can express his longing to be loosened from the body and be with Christ (Phil. 1:23). This is also the reason why Christ can be called “the firste frutis/ & fore leader of them that sleep” (1 Cor. 15:20).

3. As has been pointed out, one of Tyndale’s arguments was that there was no precedent either in Jerome’s works or in any other earlier translators’ version for ‘turning resurrection’ into ‘life after this life.’ In his Apologye Joye ironically remarked that he had never heard of Jerome translating the NT into English. On a more serious note he argued that Jerome’s choice of words is irrelevant for their discussion because Jerome translated from Greek into Latin, and the Latin word resurrectio and its cognates carry the same meanings as the Greek terms that these Latin...
words translate. These meanings in the Latin (and in the Greek), Joye argued, ultimately go back to the usage of the Hebrew verb קום.\textsuperscript{507} Therefore, even if Jerome used the Latin word resurrectio in his translation, in those places he understood “the lyfe of souliis departed [...] and not the generall resurreccion as T. dremeth.”\textsuperscript{508}

That the Hebrew verb had more than one meaning can be seen in the fact, Joye asserted, that Jerome translated the Hebrew verb קום with several different Latin verbs. Sometimes, he argued, it is rendered by maneo,\textsuperscript{509} and other times by sto or consto.\textsuperscript{510} And in other places the same verb can also be translated by verbs such as pono, constituo, excito, facio stare in vita, or servo in vita, as is done in Ex. 9:16.\textsuperscript{511} If the verb has several meanings, Joye argued, then the derived noun, resurrectio (and its original counterparts in the Greek and the Hebrew), should also have several meanings.\textsuperscript{512}

In fact, Joye maintained, it would be an error to translate resurgo (or its original) everywhere with the same English word.\textsuperscript{513} He referred to the

\textsuperscript{507} “S. Jerome knewe full wel that the worde in hebrew had mo significacio\textsuperscript{n}s then the resurreccion of the flesh, & did not euery where translate the hebrew verb into Surgo, as I haue shewed before alleged in Isaye” (Joye, Apologye, sig. D4\textsuperscript{v}).

\textsuperscript{508} Joye, Apologye, sig. D4\textsuperscript{v}.

\textsuperscript{509} Joye referred to Jerome’s rendering of דבר אלהינו קום לעולם (Is. 40:8): “And if Tin. wolde loke beter vpon his booke & folow not so miche his owne witte/ he shulde fynde that the hebrew worde which comonly is tra\textsuperscript{n}slated into this verbe Surgo/ the same some tyme saynt Ierome translated into Maneo/ as in Isaye. Verbum domini manet in eternu/ The worde of the Lorde endureth for euer” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. B1\textsuperscript{v}–B2\textsuperscript{r}). For Joye’s possible source, and on the difference between Joye’s quotation and the common (uncritical) Vulgate reading, see infra on p. 401.

\textsuperscript{510} “Some tyme into theise verbis sto/ or consto/ as Isaye xlvj.” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B2\textsuperscript{r}). The Hebrew דבר אלהינו קום לעולם (Is. 46:10) is rendered in the Vg as consilium meum stabit et omnis voluntas mea fiet. Zwingli (1529) has: consilium meum constat et omne placitum meum perficio. (HZSW XIV, 1959, p. 64). See supra on p. 206. Cf. also Westerburg’s rendering supra on p. 185.

\textsuperscript{511} “And some tyme into theis verbis Pono/ constituo/ excito/ facio stare in vita/ vel seruo in vita as in exo. cap. ix. of Pharao. Et perfecto ideo posui te/ vel excitaui te/ seruauit te in vita/ vel feci te stare/ superstitem te volui esse plagis meis: vt ostendam in te fortitudinem meam &c. that is to saye: Doutlesse or verely for this cause yet haue I set and constitute the or stered the vp/ preserved the alyue to receyue my plages to declare my strength vpon the and to shewe that my name myght be knowne thorowte all the world” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B2\textsuperscript{r}). For a possible explanation for Joye’s misunderstanding (the Hebrew text of Ex. 9:16 uses the verb עמד and not the verb קום), see infra on p. 402.

\textsuperscript{512} “The hebrew worde which comonly is translated into this verbe Surgo [...] of the which verbe there cometh Surrectio & so Resurrectio whose rote & original sith it hath these so many dyuerse significacio\textsuperscript{n}s, it must nedis folow that the nowne diriuyed oute therof haue as many” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. B1\textsuperscript{v}–B2\textsuperscript{r}).

\textsuperscript{513} Cf. Bucer’s similar remark supra on p. 218.
blunder of a certain preacher who translated the verse “Ideo non resurgent impij in iudicio &c” (Ps. 1:5) of the Vulgate into English by “wherfore the vngodly shalnot ryse agayn in the iugement.” According to Joye, this led some people to believe that the “vngodly shulde not ryse agen at the generall iugeme” However, Joye pointed out, the leading scholars of his time, such as Philipp Melanchthon, Martin Bucer, Conrad Pellican, Huldrych Zwingli, and Johannes Campensis, all translated the Hebrew עַל־כֵּן לֹא־יָקֻמוּ רְשָׁעִים בַּמִּשְׁפָּט by the Latin “Ideo non constant non consistunt non durant, or non viuunt impij in iudicio &c. that is to saye the vngodlye abyde not, nor endure, nor lyue in the company of the iust at the iugement.” But it is uncertain, Joye believed, whether the Psalmist

---

514 If Joye’s story is correct (cf. n. 513), the preacher might have been inspired by a Wycliffite version. In the earlier Wycliffe Bible (1384), the verse was rendered as “Therfore eft rijsen not the vnpitouse in dom; ne sinful in the counseil of riȝtwise.” The later Wycliffe Bible (1395) translated the same verse with: “Therfor wickid men risen not aȝen in doom; nethir synneres in the counel of iust men.”


516 Joye, Apologye, sig. B2v. Melanchthon used consistent: “Ideo non consistent impij in iudicio” (Philipp Melanchthon, In psalmos aliquot Davidicos Philippi Melanchthonis Enarrationes doctissimae, Hagenaus: Iohan Sec, 1528, a3v). Bucer translated the Hebrew verb with consistent and stabunt remarked that the same verb can be translated with a number of different Latin verbs (see supra on p. 218). The Alsatian Humanist and Hebrew grammian Conrad Pellican OFM (Kursiner, Kuers(ch)ner, also known as Pellicanus Rubeaquesnis c.1478–1556) gave the following translation of the verse: “Ideo non consistent impij, non stabunt, non servient Deo, non subsistent in conscientia, in iudicio, divino & proprio, nec alios uere iudicabunt, & peccatores in consilio iustorum, nuncquam consistent in coetu fidelium, ex communicati à Deo” (Conrad Pellican (trans.), PSALTERIVM DAVIDIS, AD HEBRAICAM VERITATEM interpretationum cum scholiis breuißimis, Chuonradi Pellicani, nunc primum ab autore recognitum, TIGVRI EXCVDEBAT CHRIstophorus Froschouer, in monasterio Franciscanorum, quarta Iuli. Anno M.D.XXXII, fo. 3v). Zwingli used vivunt in Ps. 1:5 (see supra on p. 205). Johannes Campensis (Jan van Kampen; 1491–1538), Dutch exegete and Hebrew grammarian, rendered the verse with the word “Hinc fit ut neque impij, neque sclerati uiuat in cœtu et cocilio iustorum.” In the parallel column, Campensis’ paraphrase reads: ‘Quare subsistere non poterunt impij illi, sed causa sua cadent, quando ad normam æquitatis uita illorum expendetur, neque transgressores durare poterunt in cœtu iusto-rum’ (Johannes Campensis, ENCHIRIDION PSALMORUM. Eorundem ex ueritate Hebraica versionem, ac Ioannis Campensis e regione paraphrasim, sic ut versus versui respondeat, complectens. Concionem praeterea Salomonis Ecclesiastae, per eundem Campensem ex Hebraico παραφρασικῶς traductam, SEB[astian]. GRYPHIUS EXCUD. LUGD. ANNO 1533, sig. A5v). In his French paraphrase he gave the following rendering: “Pour conclusion/les mauluais ne pourront subsister: ains decheoirrot de leur cause/: quant leur vie sera exam- inee a la reigle dequate: aussy ne pourront durer les transgresseurs en la congregation des iustes.” (Johannes Campensis, ¶Paraphrase/ cest a dire/ Claire translation faicte iouxte la sente[n]ce non pas iouxte la Lettere/ sur tous les Psalomes selon la Verite Hebraique. Faicte par Jehan Campensis lecteur pubiq[u]e des Lettres Hebraiques en Luniuersite de Louuain, ¶ M.D.XXIII, fo. 13v). Cf. also Cardinal Cajetan’s ‘literal’ rendering of the Hebrew text (IVXTA HEBRAEUM), which used the verb premaneo: “Propterea non permanebunt impii
refers to the general judgement at the end of the world, or to the particular judgement at the time of death, “as Rabbi kimhy cyted of Bucere vpon that same verse taketh Iudicium in that place.”517 The list of authorities is completed with the names of Bartholmäus Westheimer and Heinrich Bullinger: “gathering out of the lerned mennis workis/ in hys boke entitled Collectanea communium troporum/ the dyuere significacionis of wordis/ & the comon phrasis in the scripture.”518 Westheimer, Joye pointed out, “declareth in the. iij. c. leif/ in how many places this worde Resurrectio is taken for the ferme permanent lyfe of the soulis now departed.”519 Furthermore, Joye wrote, “Henrichus Bullyngerus/ a man of grete lerning &
greater judgment both in the scriptures & the tongues consenteth with me in the significacion of this worde Resurrectio in these placis.”

To drive home his point, Joye pointed out how the Latin word *benedico* can have opposing meanings (to bless and to curse) in different contexts, and that the Latin word *peccatum* refers sometimes to sin and other times to the sacrificial cow or calf that is offered as atonement for sin. Moreover, Joye argued, the fact that a second translator changes the translation of a word in a certain place does not necessarily mean that the second translator would deny the notion behind the choice of the first translator. In his *Apologye*, he hypothetically suggested several examples that could improve Tyndale’s translations. He suggested, for example, the alliterative term “pleasauent paradise” (for the Latin *paradisum voluptatis*) instead of Tyndale’s ‘Garden of Eden’ (for the Hebrew גַּן-בְּעֵדֶן) in Gen. 2:8; the phrase “Jacob thanked Pharao” (Vg: *qui benedicens illi*) instead of Tyndale’s “Jacob blessed Pharao” in Gen. 47:7 (MT: יִבְרָךְ יַעֲקֹב אֶת־פַּרְעֹה); and the expressions “our owne lyues or our owne selues” (Vg: *animas nostras*) instead of Tyndale’s “our own souls” (τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχὰς) in 1 Thes. 2:8.

But these suggestions, Joye maintained, by no means imply that he would deny the notions of Paradise, blessing, or the soul. An *argumentum e silencio* (a negatiuis, as Joye calls it) is “a naughty argument” because it is the “worste & feblest” of all arguments. Therefore, “if I denye the resurrection for so englysshing it,” Joye claimed, “so do you [i.e. Tyndale] denye hell for englisshing Infernus a graue.”

---

522 Joye, *Apologye*, sig. E4v. Interestingly, the Coverdale Bible (1535) accepted Joye’s suggestion for Gen. 47:7: “And Iacob thanked Pharao” (cf. NAB: “After Jacob had paid his respects to Pharaoh”; and NJB: “Jacob paid his respects to Pharaoh”) and for 1 Thes. 2:8: “but oure lyues also” (Cf. NIV, NIB: “but our lives as well”; NAS, NAU, NKJ: “but also our own lives”; DBY: “but our own lives also”; and BBE: “but even our lives”). Joye’s other suggested solution for 1 Thes. 2:8 is the reading of the NRSV, “but also ourselves,” and of the NJB, “but our very selves as well.” Joye’s suggestion for the translation of Gen. 2:8 seems to have influenced Coverdale—“a garden of pleasure in Eden”—and it concurs with the reading of the Douay-Rheims version: “Paradise of pleasure.”
524 Joye, *Apologye*, sig. D3r. Tyndale had translated Gen. 37:35 (Vg: descendam ad filium meum lugens in infernum) in his 1530 translation with “I will go done in to ye grave vnto my sonne.” Also, in the back matter of T1534, he added the remark: “¶ Infernus and gehenna differ moche in significacion/ though we have none other interpretacion for ether of them/ then this Englyshe worde/ hell. For gehenna signifieth a place of punyshement: but infernus is taken for any maner of place beneth in ye erth/ as a grave sepulchre or cave.”
Before concluding this section on Joye’s theological arguments, attention should be drawn to an important pastoral aspect of the controversy, namely, to Joye’s concern about the peace and unity of the followers of Christ. Joye has been frequently depicted as a quarrelsome person. And indeed, many of his writings were inspired by, were the result of, or contained elements of his various controversies. As has been observed, in that regard he is not exceptional for his time. Nonetheless (or perhaps precisely because of his involvement in many controversies), several of his writings bear witness to his earnest longing for peace and unity. In fact, this seems to be one of his foremost concerns. One the most obvious examples is the motto of his book on *The vnite and Scisme of the olde Chirche*. On the title page he quoted Jesus’ words from the Sermon on the Mount: “Blessed ar the atonmakers studyinge for peace/ for thei ar the children of God.” Both in the *Apologye* and in his short epilogue of 1535 did Joye make his desire for peace and unity explicit.525 In the *Apologye*, he wrote that Tyndale acted “against his owne conscience,” and thus was “hurte mynistred vnto the congregacion of Christe.”526 This division among the brethren serves the “goudye a nd reioyse of our aduersaries.”527 Joye’s concern about the possible negative effects of their quarrel comes across as quite genuine. It is therefore very likely that Joye genuinely believed in the possibility that his rational theological arguments presented in the *Apologye* would indeed satisfy Tyndale.

**Joye’s Scholarship and Sources**

Having presented Joye’s argumentation in his *Apologye*, the question about the quality of Joye’s scholarship arises. The reader will remember the claim of the ‘conservative consensus’ that Joye was an ignorant person, by no means Tyndale’s equal, who had an inadequate amount of learning and lacked the necessary skills for translation: a “week and foolish” person whom “the knowledge rankled.”528 But is this description correct?

Joye’s biographical sketch in the introductory chapter points in a different direction. He received his academic formation at Cambridge University, an outstanding academic institution, where Erasmus was lecturing as Lady Margaret’s Professor of Divinity (1511–13) around the time Joye was

525 Cf. supra on p. 350.
528 Cf. supra on p. 39.
Joye not only obtained three degrees there (despite the fact that he was for some reason hindered in his attendance for a number of semesters), he was also made a fellow (1521), a member of the teaching staff of the university. One of the earliest extant references to Joye’s presence at Cambridge is a letter by the backer of his studies, Sir John St John of Bletsoe, fellow Bedfordshire man and a half-brother to Lady Margaret. Dated 25 April 1522, the letter is addressed to Henry Gold, fellow of St John’s and chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury, on behalf of a certain Robert Smith, whose qualities are praised by comparing them to those of Joye. In short, Joye received a good training, pursued an academic career, and was regarded as a talented person.

But what is the value of his scholarship as we can discern it from his works? Joye’s argumentation clearly shows the sound academic training he received. He applied the scholarly terminology of his age appropriately. He presented his arguments clearly and convincingly. His arguments reveal not only a thorough familiarity with the (Latin) Bible but also a desire to gain insight into the biblical world. His use of the biblical texts certainly differs from the medieval tradition of interpreting Scriptures according to the four senses. His quest for biblical support for matters of faith is not simply looking for seemingly applicable proof texts, but a scholarly exegesis of the text. His methodology, a historical-grammatical study of

529 The first chair at Cambridge University was founded in 1502 by Lady Margaret Beaufort (1443–1509), mother of Henry VII and grandmother of Henry VIII. The first occupant of the chair was John Fisher. As Joye received his B.A. in 1513 or 1514, it is not unlikely that he attended some of Erasmus’ lectures. At any rate, he certainly must have been aware of the presence of such an illustrious, internationally celebrated guest lecturer as the occupant of the chair financed by his own benefactors.


531 “I hand non theyr seth master Jorge Gee was myttyd a scholar ther [i.e. Cambridge] as knowyth you” (L&P III, no. 2198).

532 His correct use of Aristotelian and Scholastic termini technici testifies to Joye’s classical training in philosophy (e.g. Joye, Apologye, sigs. A4v–A5r and B5v). In his A frutefull treatis he explicitly refers to the empiric maxim of the Aristotelian-Scholastic epistemology: “For as the Philosopher saith. There may nothing be conveyed into our vnderstanding/ but it be first apprehended of some of our senses” (Joye, A frutefull treatis, sig. A2v). (Cf. Aristotle, De anima, III.4, the axiom referred to by Joye is in fact a medieval summary of Aristotle’s epistemology and not an exact citation. See: Paul F. Cranefield, On the Origin of the Phrase ‘Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu’, in Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences 25 (1970), pp. 77–80.) Besides the precise terms of logic, he also used the correct nomenclature of grammar and rhetoric.
He believed that the elucidation of obscure passages can be achieved by turning to more obvious passages. In order to avoid circular reasoning, for the clarification of the Latin term *resurrectio* Joye used not only passages that contain this word, but also texts that do not.

However, Joye did not rely exclusively on his own judgement. He had learned in his private debates with Tyndale that when it came to the interpretation of a text, it was often his word against Tyndale’s. Therefore, as has been pointed out, he appealed to a number of authorities, “men of greter knowleg/ higher lerning/ and more excellent iugement in holy scripture/ in the hebrew/ greke & latyne then Tindal is or euer lykely to be.”

Since the ‘conservative consensus’ maintains that Joye’s position was an abstruse and bizarre theological standpoint, the result of “mere ‘curious speculation’ of a stupid and ignorant man,” the question of whether Joye used his sources correctly has to be addressed here.

In this regard the first and most obvious question is the reliability of Joye’s scholarship in light of his lack of adequate knowledge of the biblical languages and the question of the reliability of sources of the biblical texts he used. It has been frequently claimed that Joye followed the Vulgate, and therefore his alterations were corruptions. This is, however, not entirely correct. Since the literal accuracy of the Vulgate had been discredited by the Humanists, Joye—like Luther, Tyndale, and the Reformers in general—preferred to use what he regarded as the ‘original’ texts in Greek and Hebrew. But as Joye was not competent in Hebrew and had probably only a very limited knowledge (if any) of Greek, he had to resort to recent translations from the original languages.

As the reader will remember, Joye translated the Book of Psalms at least three times—once from the Latin translation of Martin Bucer, and then using Huldrych Zwingli’s Latin version and commentary. He also used Zwingli’s text for his other OT translations. In the preface to his translation of Bucer’s Psalter (1530),

---


534 Cf. supra on pp. 100 and 236.


537 According to Bale, Joye was “utraque lingua Latina & Graeca peritus” (Bale, *Illustrium majoris Britanniae scriptorum summarium*, fo. 239r). There is, however, no corroborating evidence to prove it, and Joye acknowledged his own shortcomings.

538 See supra on p. 22.

Joye called upon the reader not to judge his translation on the basis of the Vulgate, but on the basis of the Hebrew verity. As I have pointed out, he used Erasmus’ Latin translation for the NT.

Yet even when Joye used the Vulgate, he was not content to rely on the readily available, commonly used text of Jerome’s translation. As has been pointed out earlier, Joye referred in his *Apologye* to Jerome’s rendering of Is. 40:8: “Verbum domini manet in eternum/ The worde of the Lorde endureth for euer.” But the uncritical Vulgate editions employ the verb *sto* for translating the Hebrew קָוֹם: “verbum autem Dei nostri stabit in aeternum.” Joye, however, probably used a critical edition of Jerome’s translation, which used the verb *maneo*.

Of course, despite Joye’s thoroughness, the lack of knowledge of the biblical languages caused some misunderstandings. One of Joye’s examples for the many different meanings of the Hebrew verb קָוֹם was Ex. 9:16. Here, however, the Hebrew text contains another verb (עָמַד): והואל עבדכי באבריך ואתכחין אתך אלהים שמך מכלברים.

Joye’s mistake probably originated from Zwingli’s note on the use of the hiphil perfect first person singular form קָוֹם of the verb קָוַם in this verse, giving synonyms that could be mistaken for the translation of the verb קָוֹם. The confusion of the two verbs might have been reinforced by Bucer’s...
somewhat confusing commentary on Ps. 107(106):25 and Ps. 107(106):29. While Ps. 107(106):25 uses the hiphil imperfect וַיַּעֲמֵד of the verb עָמַד, v. 29 employs the hiphil imperfect יָקֵם of the verb קוּם. The Vulgate used *stetit* in v. 25 and *statuit* in v. 29, and Cajetan’s ‘literal’ rendering of the Hebrew text translated both verbs with *facio stare: fecit stare ventum tempestatis* (v. 25) and *fecit stare ventum tempestatis* (v. 29). It is therefore not surprising that Joye assumed that the same verb is used in all of these instances.

Joye’s inadequate knowledge of the biblical languages was thus indeed a shortcoming. But he was not the only Bible translator of that era who was not fluent in Greek and Hebrew. Myles Coverdale, too, prepared the famous translation with which he made history exclusively from Latin and German *Vorlagen*. And Joye, as has been pointed out, was conscious of this shortcoming and tried to overcome it by using what he regarded as reliable sources, by consulting exegetical works, and by his translational strategy.

As has been observed, Joye pointed to Jesus’ words in Mt. 22:30, where Jesus used the present indicatives γαμοῦσιν and γαμίζονται. Joye’s attention to the fact that Jesus’ answer was formulated in the present tense is not unlikely to have been directed by a text-critical remark by Erasmus on Mt. 22:30. Already in his original edition in 1516 (A) Erasmus remarked that the rendering in the Vulgate does justice to neither the tense nor the style. To the second edition of his NT in 1519 (B), Erasmus, after having summed up the manuscript attestation, added a note arguing for translation of the text in the present tense, because Jesus’ words indicate that the time of *resurrectio* is already present, as he calls *resurrectio* those who are destined to be risen. Similarly, Joye must have taken an interest in

---

545 See supra on p. 220.
546 Cajetan, *PSALMI DAVIdici ad Hebraicam veritatem castigati*, fo. 207v.
547 For Joye’s translational strategy, see infra on p. 414.
548 See supra on p. 376.
549 *Neque temporis ratio seruata est neque Latinitas* (ASD VI/5, p. 294).
Erasmus’ annotations to Lk. 22:27—where Erasmus wrote that the Sadducees believed that there was no kind of resurrection at all—because the text is about the *resurrectio* of the body *and* of the soul.\(^{551}\) Realizing, however, that Erasmus’ emphasis is on the general resurrection and not the interim state of the soul, and that in Erasmus’ understanding the Sadducees denied (primarily) the bodily resurrection, Joye, as any intellectually honest scholar would do, did not take Erasmus’ arguments out of their context and did not refer to them explicitly.

But he did refer to Erasmus when he thought that Erasmus’ argument and purpose were congruent with his own. For besides Erasmus’ NT translation and his *Annotations*, Joye also used the Dutch scholar’s *Explanatio symboli apostolorum* (1533) and mentioned it as one of his authorities.\(^{552}\) Joye claimed that his motivation to not translate *resurrectio* with resurrection in those places was precisely the error of the Anabaptists, against whom Erasmus inserted his note in his catechism.\(^{553}\) Joye’s argument to prove the bodily resurrection by claiming that the Church, as the body of Christ, must follow Christ, is perhaps also taken over from Erasmus’ *Explanatio*, although here, too, Joye left Erasmus’ name unmentioned.\(^{554}\)

Another source for Joye was Martin Bucer. As Joye used Bucer’s text for his Psalm translation, he also used Bucer’s exegetical works, especially Bucer’s Psalm commentary.\(^{555}\) As has been pointed out, Joye explicitly referred to Bucer’s scattered comments on the translation of the Hebrew verb נָשָׁתָן. But Joye also shows awareness of Bucer’s descriptions of the

---


\(^{552}\) Joye, *Apologye*, sig. Br

\(^{553}\) “Secondary/ because that agenst the Anabaptistis false opinion/ & agenst their error whom Erasmus reproueth in hys expsicioun of the Credo which saye the resurrection of the soules to be this: that is to weet/ when thei shalbe called out of their preuye lurking places/ in whiche they had ben hyd from the tyme of their departyng vnto the resurrection of their bodies/ because (I saye) that agenste these erroneouse opinions/ these places thus truely translated make so myche and so planely/ that at thys worde Resurrectio the lyfe of the spirtis aftir this/ their false opinion falleth & is vtterly condemned” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. Br). For Erasmus’ remark, see *supra* on p. 150.

\(^{554}\) See *supra* on pp. 146 and 370.

\(^{555}\) See *supra* on pp. 21 and 294. On Joye’s use of Bucer, see: Hobbs, *Martin Bucer and the Englishing of the Psalms*. 
Hebrew synonyms for the grave (שְׁאוֹל, בּוֹר, שַׁחַת, קֶבֶר). Furthermore, Bucer constituted Joye’s source for establishing Rabbi Kimhi as an authority. Joye’s intellectual honesty can be seen again in his open acknowledgment by referring to Kimhi as “cyted of Bucere.”

Without any doubt, Joye made the most extensive use of Huldrych Zwingli’s biblical works. Joye’s biographers rightly observed that “Joye seems to have found Zwingli’s point of view congenial, for he makes use of the latter’s works in several of his subsequent publications.” Joye certainly found Zwingli’s views on the post-mortem fate of the human person congenial. He used Zwingli’s comments on Ex. 21:19; Ps. 1:5; and Is 13:6, 26:14, 40:8, and 46:10, where the Swiss Reformer explains the various significations of the noun resurrectio. This kind of familiarity Joye shows with respect to Zwingli’s Isaiah commentary is not surprising, as it constituted the source text for his own translation of Isaiah. But the Apologye also testifies to Joye’s familiarity with Zwingli’s arguments in his In catabaptistarum strophas Elenchus. Yet despite their congeniality, Joye manifestly used Zwingli’s work with the necessary scholarly critique: in spite of the fact that it could have served as an additional attestation in favor of his own case, Joye rejected Zwingli’s interpretation of 1 Cor. 15, which maintained that resurrectio in the first half of the chapter could possibly also refer to the interim state of the soul. While Joye’s interpretation of 1 Cor. 15:19 differentiates between an eschatological hope that is founded exclusively on the immortality of the soul, and the denial of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the flesh altogether (a differentiation that was almost certainly not intended by Paul at this place), Joye clearly affirmed that the resurrection of the body at the general resurrection at the end of the world is Paul’s subject throughout the entire chapter. Joye’s reading of the chapter is thus more in line with the present-day exegetical consensus than Zwingli’s.

Joye also made use of Philipp Melanchthon’s works. Besides Joye’s explicit reference to Melanchthon’s translation of Ps. 1:5, he is most
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556 Cf. Joye, Apologye, sig. D3v. For Bucer’s explanation of these nouns, see supra on p. 220.
557 See supra on p. 397.
558 Joye, Apologye, sig. B3v.
559 BC, George Joye, p. 70.
560 See supra on pp. 203–206 and 394.
561 See supra on pp. 193ff and 394ff.
562 See supra on pp. 195f, 199f, and 384.
563 Cf. supra on p. 84.
likely to have used the latter’s *Annotation to the Gospel of Matthew*. Joye’s exegesis of Jesus’ encounter with the Sadducees in Mt. 22:23–33 shows unmistakable parallels with Melanchthon’s commentary. As it did for Melanchthon, for Joye, too, the question of the Sadducees concerned not the resurrection of the flesh but the immortality of the soul. It is Melanchthon who formulated for the first time that the question is about the life after this life (*vita post hanc vitam*), and Joye only rendered Melanchthon’s Latin phrase with an English equivalent. Similarly, Melanchthon’s formulation that even if Jesus’ words to the Sadducees do not prove the resurrection of the flesh in the strict sense, Christ’s own resurrection is sufficient proof of the bodily resurrection, very much resembles that of Joye.

It has been observed that Joye claimed that his reading of the altered passages was in agreement with the interpretation of Heinrich Bullinger. His claim is indeed correct; Bullinger’s reading of these texts is analogous to Joye’s. But there are further elements in Joye’s *Apologye* that reveal similarities between Bullinger’s argumentation and that of Joye. Joye’s understanding of Lk. 23:43 as a divine revelation about the destination of Jesus’ soul agrees with Bullinger’s reading of the text. And Joye’s claim that ‘sleep’ is only a metaphor echoes Bullinger’s similar assertion.

Joye also explicitly identified Bartholomäus Westheimer’s *Collectanea communium troporum sacrosanctae scripturae* as one of the authorities he used. We have seen how Westheimer’s compendium formed a practical summary and shortlist of biblical topics for Protestant preachers. Joye evidently used this handy synopsis to establish “in how many places this worde Resurrectio is take[n] for the ferme per[man]ente lyfe of the soulis now depart[ed].” But again, he used Westheimer’s guide critically. If we compare Westheimer’s list of places were *resurrectio* is alleged to mean the interim state of the soul, we can see that while Joye agreed with Westheimer on the interpretation of Mt. 22:23–33 *et par.*; Jn 5:29 and 11:24; Heb. 11:35; and Is. 26:14, Joye rejected Westheimer’s claim that the expression

---

564 See *supra* on pp. 189 and 377.
565 See *supra* on p. 190.
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‘on the last day’ would refer to ‘their last day’ in Jn. 6:39–44, and that 1 Thes. 4 would contain a reference to the interim state of the soul.574

Joye also named Conrad Pellican and Johannes Campensis as translators of the Book of Psalms, in whose versions he checked the translation of Ps. 1:5 for the Hebrew קום.575 Joye made no further reference to these two scholars of Hebrew, and apparently his use of them was limited to this instance only. It should be pointed out that his eagerness to check so many different versions contradicts the argument of the ‘conservative consensus’ about Joye’s supposedly easy acceptance of the corrupted text of the Vulgate.576

Besides the references to works by his own contemporaries, Joye also referred to authorities from the past. Flavius Josephus’ Jewish Antiquities is the first such work in his Apologye.577 Although Joye’s reference could have originated from Bullinger’s similar note, his straightforward and exact reference (instead of ‘as cited of’) and his other references to Josephus’ works in his other books leave little doubt about Joye’s direct access to the writings of the Jewish-Roman historian.578

Among Joye’s other sources we find Jerome, Augustine, Aristotle, and possibly Otto Brunfels. In a passing remark Joye explicitly alluded to St Jerome’s treatise De optimo genere interpretandi.579 Further, Joye provided the exact reference to the text where Augustine discussed the advantages of having different translations of the same text in his De doctrina christiana (II,12).580 Finally, it is quite probable that Joye made use of Otto Brunfels’

574 Cf. supra on p. 238.
575 See supra on p. 396.
576 The fact that he checked the translation of this single verse in so many works of leading Hebrew scholars of his time can suggest that he had hoped to find more elucidation on the exact meaning of the verb and that to find some confirmation that the verb can refer to the interim state of the soul.
577 See supra on p. 374.
578 For Bullinger’s remark, see supra on p. 227. Erasmus’ similar annotation to Mt. 22:16—“Huius autem dogmatis autor fuit Iudas quidam Gaulonites, qui Essenis, Saduceis et Pharisaes quartam sectam adiunxit; vide Iosephum libro Antiquitatum 18., cap. 2.”—was added only in the last edition of Erasmus’ NT (E), which appeared in March 1535, a month after the publication of Joye’s Apologye. For Joye’s further references to Josephus in his The vnite and Scisme, see supra n. 409 on p. 374. As a source of information on the various factions in Jewish society, in addition to Josephus Joye also points to Pliny in his later work. There Joye also refers to the Essenes, “whom Plinye paynteth very lyuely in his fyrste boke of the natural storyes ca. xvj.” (Joye, The vnite and Scisme, fo. viiv).
579 See infra on p. 417.
580 See infra on p. 417. Augustine, the ancient author most respected by Protestants, was also quoted in Joye’s other works. E.g. “Ryght well therfore did Austen wryte in his .cxvij. pistle vnto Januarium…” (Joye, A frutefull treatis, sig. A3v).
It has been demonstrated that Brunfels’ collection of biblical prayers was serviceable to Joye when he compiled his *Primers*. Although Joye did not refer to every item on Brunfels’ list of proof texts for the immortality of the soul, and although those passages that Joye did refer to from the list were also used by others, I believe that there is reason to assume that Joye made use of the other bestseller by the ex-Carthusian monk, too. Certainly Joye’s refusal of comments and glosses echoes Brunfels’ depreciation of commentaries.

Before drawing a conclusion about Joye’s scholarship, Joye’s presentation of Tyndale’s position likewise has to be addressed. I have pointed out how Tyndale’s second foreword gave an inadequate picture of Joye’s views and how it has misled generations of readers. But was Joye’s presentation of Tyndale’s position correct? With regard to Tyndale’s views on the post-mortem fate of the human person, the dogmatic and theological issues at hand, and the interpretation of the texts presented, the answer is unequivocally affirmative. Joye adequately presented Tyndale’s point of view. He used exact quotations from three works by Tyndale to argue against them (the infamous second foreword, Tyndale’s *An answere vnto Sir Thomas More*, and Tyndale’s *The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon*). Joye did not take Tyndale’s words out of their context, and he presented Tyndale’s arguments faithfully. The theological standpoints of Tyndale’s own works do confirm the picture Joye drew of him. With regard to their personal relationship and with regard to Tyndale’s character, the answer is not so unambiguous. Joye’s critics rightly remarked that Joye’s heated words should be read in the context of their controversy. In matters of personal subjects, objectivity was not Joye’s strongest suit.

To conclude the study on Joye’s scholarship and sources, a few observations can be pointed out. Joye’s treatment of his sources and his presentation of Tyndale’s arguments reflect the practices of a good scholar and
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581 See *supra* on p. 241.
582 Otto Brunfels, *Precationes Biblicae sanctorum patrum illustrumque virorum & mulierum utriusque testamenti*, Argentorati: Schott, 1528. See: BC, *George Joye*, p. 53. Cf. also pp. 65, 99, and 134. Brunfels’s work was very popular in the Low Countries also and saw several Antwerp editions before 1536: by Merten de Keyser (1529, 1531, 1533, three times in 1535; by Michiel Hillen van Hoochstraten (1530) and by Johannes Grapheus (1533). There was a French edition published in Antwerp: *Les oraisons de la Bible faictes par les preres et femmes fideles*, Marten De Kesyer, 1530; and two Dutch editions, too: *Dat gulden ghebe- denboecxken uut denouden ende nieuwen Testementen vergadert*, Merten De Keyser voor Govaert van der Haeggen, 1531; Adriaen van Berghen: 1535.
583 Cf. *supra* on p. 241 and *infra* on p. 418.
584 Cf. *supra* on pp. 301.
certainly surpass the scholarly standards of his own time. He repeatedly provided accurate page numbers ("lief" and "syde") and sometimes even pointed to the exact line. Characteristic of his meticulous scholarship is the case of a quotation from Augustine that John Frith used in his treatise against the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist. During the Middle Ages, the sentence was often cited in a corrupted version—Corpus domini in quo resurrexit uno loco esse oportet—and Frith, relying on a secondary source, quoted it in this form. While both Frith and Tyndale engaged in debate with Sir Thomas More on the meaning of oportet, Joye pointed out that some of the copies read “Corpus enim Domini in quo resurrexit/ uno loco esse potest [italics mine],” which is precisely the formulation as it is found originally in Augustine—“Corpus enim Domini in quo resurrexitis, uno loco esse potest; uritas euis ubique diffusa est.” Moreover, Joye’s biographical descriptions of the various editions of Tyndale’s testaments are very detailed and precise, and they constitute an important source of information on the history of the various editions of Tyndale’s NT translation.

Detecting such a wealth of (possible) sources behind the arguments of Joye’s Apologye should not be taken to mean that Joye was unoriginal or entirely dependent on his sources. As has been observed, he presented original arguments, arranged the borrowed arguments in an original way, and used his sources critically and responsibly. By concentrating on the question of how Joye used his sources, the unsustainability of the
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585 E.g. pointing to a passage in Tyndale’s The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon, Joye used the following precise description: “read the .xvj. lyne the fyrst syde of the .xij. lief of the exposicyon of that text. And he is the satisfaccio &c.” (Joye, Apologye, sig. B7r).
586 John Frith, A Christian sentence and true judgment of the most honorable Sacrament of Christes body and bloud declared both by auctorite of the holy Scriptures and the auncient Doctores, Richard Wyer, s.l. n.d.
588 “Corpus in quo resurrexit in uno loco esse oporteth” (Frith, A Christian sentence, sig. A4r).
590 Among Joye’s original arguments are e.g. his contention about resurrectio standing in apposition to spirits and angels in Acts 23:8 (see supra on p. 375), his statement that the separated souls in the interim state are more aptly compared with angels than the resurrected humans with their bodies in Mt. 22:30 et par. (see supra on p. 376) and his interpretation of the last clause of Lk. 20:38 as a revelation that the patriarchs are alive (see supra on p. 379).
assertion by the ‘conservative consensus’ that Joye’s position was unparal-
leled and unscholarly became apparent. In fact, Joye’s standpoint regard-
ing the translation of the Latin term ‘resurectio’ in those twenty-two
places, his interpretation of these passages, and his exegetical arguments
were not unique among his contemporaries to any extent.

Joye’s Style

The reader will remember that the authors of the conservative consen-
sus characterized Joye’s style as “idiosyncratic,” “parochial,” “poor,” and
“flimsy,” with “little literary value,” and the Apologye as “long-winded,”
“rambling,” “incorrect,” “unsatisfactory,” “unjustifiable,” and “abusive.”
While the exemplary studies of Orlaith O’Sullivan, Clair Cross, Gordon
Jackson, Helen Parish, and Vivienne Westbrook have sufficiently coun-
tered these arguments in general, the question arises as to whether they
can be applied to Joye’s Apologye.

What one means by “idiosyncratic literary style” and “parochial vocabu-
lary,” is, of course, very much subject to interpretation. In Tyndale’s case,
expressions that look strange to the modern reader, like “noosell” (for
‘nurture’ in the Prologue to Romans), “ixion” (for the Hebrew נְוַיִּי —some
kind of bird of prey—in Dt. 14:12), or the peculiar “a fellowship” (as in
1 Sam. 26:8—“Now therfore let me smyte him a felowshippe with my
spear to the earth”—for the Hebrew emphatic particle נָא, usually trans-
lated as ‘now’ or ‘I pray’), are condoned easily. Admittedly, perhaps
some of Joye’s translations exhibit more of these expressions, but to argue
that Tyndale’s language influenced today’s English to a larger degree than
that of Shakespeare, and then to claim that Tyndale’s vocabulary contains
fewer strange elements than that of Joye, and therefore Tyndale is less
“parochial” or “idiosyncratic,” seems to be circular reasoning. At any rate,
it is baffling that if the styles of these two authors are so distinct, if Tyn-
dale’s style is so much more eloquent and so much more exquisite com-
pared with that of Joye, how it could be that Joye’s The Souper of the Lorde

591 Cf. supra on pp. 36ff.
592 I think it is not by accident that we find so many women scholars among those
who appreciate Joye’s style. With their often more balanced approach and greater sense of
aesthetics, they are more likely to give an impartial judgement than their male colleagues.
For the references of their works, see supra on pp. 63f.
593 Cf. David Daniell, Ivory, Apes and Peacocks, in John Terhune Day, Eric LUND &
Anne M. O’DONNELL (eds.), Word, Church, and State. Tyndale Quincentenary Essays, Wash-
(a large enough corpus with its more than 15,000 words) was ascribed to Tyndale for centuries. Even in the 20th century, Mozley, Butterworth, and Chester, people who were thoroughly familiar with the genuine writings of Tyndale and/or Joye, all made the same attribution.

In fact, Joye’s style is quite agreeable and exhibits clear literary qualities. To serve as an illustration from another work, we can consider a hymn on the *Nunc dimittis* in his *Primer*:

The hymne.
Worshipe we the spirit pureli.
Whiche moued Simeon the sage.
In his armes to take reuerently
Ower sauiour yet tender of age.
When his father and his mother
Presented theyr yonge chylde Iesus.
Simeon emonge all wother
Prayed the lorde sayinge thus.
Nowe letest thou thy seruant departe/ o lorde/
accordinge to thy promyse/ in peace.
For myn eyes haue sene the saviour: sente from the.
Whom thou hast set forthe in the presens of all people.
To be a lyght/ lyghteninge ye gentils
& to be ye glory of thy people Israel. 594

Although this hymn would not satisfy David Daniell, whose main measure for the literary qualities of a translation seems to be the number of monosyllabic words, Joye’s hymn does have literary merits. 595 The tonic-syllabotonic hymn’s rhythm is very expressive, and the alliterations (“worshipe we...which,” “spirit...Simeon the sage”) in combination with masculine, feminine, and imperfect cross rhymes (sage-age, pureli-reuerentli, mother-wother, Jesus-thus) form an efficient mnemotechnical device for those who want to learn their prayers by heart. In that regard, it is interesting to note that even the pseudonyms of his fictitious printers in the colophons of his early works are alliterative: Adam Anonymous, Balthassar Beckenth, and Francis Foxe. 596

596 In his other works, alliterations also are frequently employed: e.g. “adding their own dead dreams & deuilish deuicies” (Joye, *The defence of the Mariage of Preistes*, sig. A7r); “scholasticall sophisters” (Joye, *The Souper of the Lorde*, sig. D5r); “so sliper a serpent of so variable colors of contradictions, corrections” (Joye, *A contrarye*, sig. A4r). Joye’s fondness for alliteration is probably founded in the long tradition of alliteration in late medieval
With regard to Joye’s *Apologye*, its vocabulary and literary style were greatly determined in the first place by the topic of his pamphlet. It was a defence of his orthodoxy to show that his belief in the bodily resurrection was above any question, and to explain why he altered Tyndale’s translation. As such, he used systematic, logical, argumentative language, and a vocabulary that is correct from a scholarly perspective. One finds no “idiosyncratic,” “peculiar,” or “parochial” words (the shibboleth of his style, according to the common consensus), but rather straightforward, common English. Joye’s *Apologye*, too, testifies to his concern about the careful formulation of his message. There, as in his other writings, he uses poetic devices, such as alliteration (“many mennis handis”; “defamed & defiled”; “grete greif”; “nether he nor no man els shall neuer proue”), rhyme (“fame & name”), and hendiadys (“pourke & clere”; “defamed & defiled”; “concorde & peace”; “greif & sorowe”; “fame & name”; “dere & leif”) in order to keep his readers’ attention captivated. He uses graphic and simple similes (“I haue talked wyth some of them [i.e. people misled by Tyndale’s teachings] my selfe so doted in that folye that it were as good to perswade a poste as to plucke that madnes oute of their braynes”) and lively metaphors (“I wyll not be his Phisicion & decerne his water at this tyme”). The *Apologye* also displays elements of the spoken language, even dialogues, when they are applicable.

Yet the question remains: is Joye’s work long-winded, rambling, and repetitious, as it is described by his critics? Again, the answer to this question depends on how these adjectives are understood. Joye does reiterate some of his arguments twice or even three times. Yet this repetition is a direct consequence of the genre and the methodology of the work. According to the customary methodology of polemical writings, refutations, and counter-attacks of his age, Joye cites smaller or larger portions of his opponent’s arguments verbatim and then proves them false. Such a

---

599 “The Saduces […] myght haue well obiected saying: Syr what is this answere to our question? we aske the whose wyfe shall she be at the general resurreccion of their bodyes? and thou answerest vs nothyng els nor prouest vs any thing els with this scripture but that there is a lyf after this wheryn the soulis departed nowe lyue” (Joye, *Apologye*, sigs. A7v–A8r). “Ye must beware (syr) how ye argew a negatiuis/ for siche kynde of argumens be the worste & feblest that ye can make” (sig. B6v). “But at laste I remember that I made hym thys reason/ saynge. Syr ye knowe that christe is our head/ & we his members/ & altogither hys bodye […]” (sig. Crv).
method inevitably entails him to sometimes reuse an argument in order to refute different positions, or develop an argument in several stages, making a strong case only when these parts are seen together (e.g. his arguments concerning the faith of the Sadducees). According to modern scholarly norms, therefore, his work can indeed be tedious to follow and can create the impression that it is repetitious. But judged on the basis of the standards of his own era, Joye’s *Apologye* is not verbose at all. His “repetitiousness” is certainly a far cry from Thomas More’s magisterial writings against Tyndale.

But was Joye abusive? Joye’s genuine concern for the unity of the Protestant community is unquestionable. As has been demonstrated, he did his utmost to avoid public debate with Tyndale and clearly exhibited his detestation of any schism in the ranks of the ‘brethren.’ On account of Tyndale’s anonymous attack in *The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon*, Joye remarks that “at which I winked, yet taking yt not as ment of me because I loued quyetnes not wylling that any man shuld know what hatred he did euer beare me sence I came ouer.”600 Nonetheless, as has been observed, his cynical comments about Tyndale’s character and learning do alienate the modern reader with their disparaging tone. While Tyndale, at least according to Joye, called Joye “fole,” “vnlerned,” and “other obprobriouse names,” Joye described Tyndale as “shrewed,” “corrupt,” and having “the venomouse tethe of vepers.”601 These stinging discords do make Joye appear to his later readers as peevish, vengeful, and puerile. While with these remarks, as also has been pointed out, Joye was completely in line with the kind of remarks made by his contemporaries (in fact, these were the characteristics of the genre), and for that matter, in line with remarks by Tyndale himself, they also testify to Joye’s ambiguous relationship to Tyndale.602 On the one hand, he genuinely admires Tyndale and recognizes Tyndale’s outstanding qualities. On the other hand, Joye resents Tyndale precisely because he felt betrayed by such an

602 Cf. Erasmus’ words about Standish (*supra* p. 141), Luther’s description of Erasmus (*supra* n. 96 on p. 144), Zwingli’s opinion on the Anabaptists (*supra* nn. 382 and 386 on pp. 198 and 199, respectively), the criticism of Capito, Bugenhagen, and Luther about Bucer (*supra* pp. 211–212), the harsh words of Clemens and Jacob about Bucer (*supra* p. 214), or Tyndale’s abuse of Fisher (*supra* n. 666 on p. 253), More (*supra* n. 199, p. 331), Roye (*supra* p. 247), and Joye (*supra* p. 330ff).
intimate friend, a person whom he considered close to himself and whom he admired.  

Thus the vocabulary and the literary style in Joye's *Apologye* were greatly determined by the topic, the genre, the methodology and the occasion of the pamphlet. Yet there is another important element that has played just as important a role in the formation of Joye's works as all of the above. It was his translational strategy.

**Joye’s Translational Strategy**

Joye’s translational strategy is perhaps the most ambiguously assessed aspect of the *Apologye* and Joye’s biblical translation in general. Even authors of the conservative consensus sometimes recognize that Joye formulated in very clear terms what later became the Protestant ideal of Bible translation: the pure text without any notes. On the other hand, not only is Joye’s change of “resurreccion” into “the lyfe after this” condemned, but his many other modifications of Tyndale’s text are denounced as pieces of evidence attesting to Joye’s ignorance or bad taste. However, as will be apparent, these were not necessarily faults, but the results of Joye’s translational strategy, which differed from Tyndale’s.

One of the main differences between the two translators was the way they approached the translatability of the Sacred Text and the question of whether God’s Word has only one meaning. As opposed to Tyndale, whom we chiefly know to have reworked his earlier translations, Joye

---

603 “And yf my hater had thus oppressed me/ I coude have had avoyded hym. But yt was thou my nowne felowe/ my companion in lyke perel and persecucion/ my familiare/ so well knowne/ vtmo whom I committed so louingly my secretis/ with whom gladly I went into the house of god” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. G4r). Of course, the source of Tyndale’s strong resentment vis-à-vis Joye is the same feeling of being betrayed by someone from his own ranks.

604 Some of this section is published in Gergely Juhász, ‘*That the reder might once swimme without a corke.*’ George Joye’s Translation Strategy in his Biblical Translations, in ‘Wading Lambs and Swimming Elephants.’ The Bible for the Laity and Theologians in the Medieval and Early Modern Era, eds. Wim François and August Den Hollander, (BETL), Leuven: UP-Peeters, 2010.

605 The sole exception is The First Letter of Saint John. In The exposition of the fyrste Epistle of seynt Ihon, Tyndale did not make any use of his earlier translation published in the 1526 Worms edition, but gave a fresh rendering of those biblical verses which he cited from the letter, based on Erasmus’ 1522 NT. In 1534 and 1535, however, when Tyndale revised his entire NT, he opted twice for a revision of his first, original, but in many instances markedly poorer, translation of the Johannine letter. According to Millus it was an unfortunate choice because in this way many of the lucky findings of his commentary on the epistle got lost (Donald J. Millus, *An Edition of William Tyndale’s Exposition of the*
often retranslated the same scriptural passage completely anew whenever he deemed it useful for a better or fuller understanding of the Word of God. Joye’s choice for a new translation of the same passages (instead of revising his earlier work) was sometimes necessitated—to a certain degree—by his preference for a different Vorlage. The choice of a new source text did not mean, however, that he would have regarded the previously used source as erroneous or misleading. Rather, it testifies to Joye’s preference for a multiplicity of possible translations of the Scripture. The greatest variation can be observed in his publications of the psalms, some of which exist in three different translations with the possibility of a fourth, different but no longer existing translation. He also published two distinct versions of the prayer of Isaiah (Is. 64:1–4), by which he apparently caused some disturbance among his readers and instigated questions about the meaning of the Scriptures. On the other hand, we see—much less frequently—examples when Joye reworked his earlier translations. In his second edition of the NT, he includes a revised translation of Prov. 31 among the OT epistles.

Joye’s tendency to have variation in the translation can also be observed on the textual level within one translation. In Prov. 30:15, for example, he writes: “These horse leches haue two doughters cryeng/ haue done/ haue done/ bring it hider/ a waye/ a waye.” This pleonastic cry of the daughters of “horse leches” originates from his double Vorlage: he used Melanchthon’s text alongside the Vulgate: he used Melanchthon’s text alongside the Vulgate. The Hebrew text has הַב הַב, twice the qal imperative masculine singular form of the verb יְהַב (give, ascribe, come), which was translated into Latin by Melanchthon as “Age, age” (Do something! or Drive (away)!). The Vulgate renders the same words by “Affer,
In order to convey the fullest possible meaning of the original text, Joye includes all possible meanings in his translation.

Joye’s book, published in 1541 during the course of his controversy with John Foxe on the punishment of adultery, will quote 1 Cor. 6:9b–10 as a motto on its last leaf. There, he renders it with the following wording:

Be not deceyued, for neyther fornicators, nor ymage worshippers, nor whormongers, neither softelings, nor buggerers, nor theues nor gredy couetuose insaciable deceytfull gatherers, nor dronckerds, nor euyll speakers, nor pyllers, and pollers shal inherit the kengedom of God.

Besides his amusing colloquial terms (whormongers, softelings, buggerers), it is noticeable in this long list that Joye renders (perhaps for the sake of filling up the available space on the page) the word πλεονέκται (Vg: avari) with the pleonastic expression “gredy couetuose insaciable deceytfull gatherers,” and ἅρπαγες (Vg: rapaces) with “pyllers and pollers.”

Again, his reason for this is to present his readers with all of the possible meanings of the original text in order to preserve the largest possible range of interpretations.

This fondness for diversity is thus emblematic of Joye. Indubitably, Tyndale also used variations for the same word in his translations. One gets the impression, however, that Tyndale varies for stylistic rather than for philological reasons. Joye, on the other hand, regards it as an aid to the reader for the fuller comprehension of God’s message. In several of his works Joye explicitly argues for the benefit of diversity in the translations. As has already been observed, Joye mentions in his letter to Latimer a previous—now no longer extant—letter. This earlier letter was occasioned precisely by a question concerning the diversity of translations (more specifically Joye’s two translations of the prayer of Isaiah). From his words to Latimer

---

610 The LXX translator obviously misunderstood the Hebrew original deriving הֲבָה הֲבָה from the verb אָהֵב (love), and translated it with ἀγαπήσει ἀγαπώμεναί.


612 To ‘pill’ is to ‘pillage,’ ‘plunder,’ ‘extort’; to ‘poll’ means to ‘fleece,’ ‘despoil by excessive taxation.’ The same expression was used by Sir John Harington in his England men say of late is bankerupt growne at the end of his Tract on the Succession of the Crown dated 18 December 1602: “England (Men say) of late is bankrupt grown: | Th’effect is manifest, the Cause unknown. | Rich Treasurers it hath had, and wary Keepers, | Fat Judges, Counsellors in Gain no-sleepers, | Auditors, & Surveyors, Receivers many, | Pillers, & pollers too, All for the penny. | As for the Church, that must both pray, & pay: | For Solvat Ecclesia, the Courtiers say. | Can Any tell, how to help this Disorder? | Faith, one good STEWARD would putt All in Order.” (IS Early Stuart Libels, A14.)
it is obvious that these distinct versions are not regarded as contradictory but as complementary to each other. This can be true, according to Joye, because having several versions of the same biblical text should not necessarily mean that one of them is incorrect. Even Augustine showed in his *De doctrina christiana*, Joye argued, how the exact sense of the original text and the precise intention of the author can be discovered when two different but legitimate translations of the same text are compared.613

This is why he argued that neither his nor Tyndale’s version represented the final say in the history of Bible translations: there will be followers who will come after them and will correct their translations in many places and make them “miche more perfayt & better for the reader to vnderstande.”614 Tyndale should not “brawll & wryte agenst them,” Joye argued, “but rather thanke them and geue place as Paule teacheth,j.Corinth.xiiiij.”615 And if a version contains mistakes, it can be amended, and therefore he called upon the authorities: “Burne nomore goddis worde: but mende it where it is not truly translated.”616

Joye’s inclination to vary the translations is thus part and parcel of his universal translational strategy, according to which he tries to render the original text in such a way that it does not necessitate any further explanations, remarks, marginal notes, or other reading aids. He expresses this (in his view) ideal methodology of translation in a reaction to an altercation with one of Tyndale’s disciples. This unidentified disciple of Tyndale’s wanted to teach Joye the practice of translation based on St Jerome’s work *De optimo genere interpretandi* (Ep. 57). Notably, Joye explains, “how I shuld translat the scripturis, where I shuld geue worde for worde, & when I shulde make scholias, notis, & gloses in the mergent as himself & hys master doith.”617 In his reaction Joye declares that he prefers to include everything necessary for the understanding of the text in the text itself, and not to put it in the margins. If they are absolutely necessary, the glosses

613 “What profit & goodnes cometh of the diuersite of translacios, rede S. Austen in his seconde boke de doctrina christiana cap.xij. In the chirch of god as there be many & dyuere membres, so haue they many & sondry giftes, & one may se in a nother manis workis that he saw not himselfe” (Joye, *Apologye*, sig. D5v). For Augustine’s position on the advantages of the diversity of translations as presented in his *De doctrina christiana* II,12, see *supra* on p. 100.


should only give further elucidation for an already understandable text. But he is convinced that the text of the Scripture is self-explanatory, and therefore the translation should also be self-evident. An ideal translation of the Bible needs no glosses or marginal notes, in Joye’s opinion: “I wolde the scripture were so puerly & plyanly [sic] translated that it neded nether note, glose nor scholia, so that the reder might once swimme without a corke.” In other words, he wanted to produce a text that enables the reader to perceive the meaning of the original without any additional matter.

This tendency toward producing a self-explanatory and self-evident Bible text can be observed in many of the changes Joye brought about in his revision of Tyndale’s NT translation. Most of these involve the problems of translating the culturally determined realia. In Mt. 16:18, Tyndale’s translation read: “And I saye unto the, that thou arte Peter. And upon this roocke [sic] I wyll bylde my congregacion.” While Joye agreed with Tyndale that the official Roman Catholic Church could not be the church Christ founded or wanted, he was clearly dissatisfied with Tyndale’s “congregacion,” a term that did not carry the same theological connotations as ecclesia had in this passage, according to Joye. Therefore, he rendered ecclesia with “chirche” but dissociated the true Church founded by Christ from that of Peter (and the Pope, as Peter’s successor) by rendering the pun on Πέτρος and πέτρα in the Greek (Vg: Petrus and petra) twice with S/stone in English. At the same time, he also added the adjective qualifier “same” so as to make the text unambiguous for those of his readers who do not know the original text: “And I saye also vnto the, that thou arte Stonne. And apon this same stonne, I wyll bylde my chirche.” He thus changed Tyndale’s “congregacion” into “chirche” to ensure that the reader understands that the text is not referring to any congregation but to the true Church of Christ. This explicitness and avoidance of glosses can also be seen as carried even further in Joye’s translation of the Creed, as cited above. In a similar way, Joye changed Peter’s words to Jesus in Lk. 9:20. While Tyndale’s first translation reads “thou arte the Christ off

---

618 “But in good faiathe as for me I had as lief put the trwthe in the text as in the margin and expecete the glose expowne the text (as many of theirs do not) or where the text is playn ynough. I had as lief leue siche fryuole gloses cleue out” (Joye, Apologye, sigs. C6v–C7r).
619 Joye, Apologye, sig. C7r.
620 Luther’s version had: vnnd ich sage auch dyr, du bist Petrus, vnnd auff disen felf will ich bawen meyne gemeyne.
621 See supra on p. 368.
God,” Joye changed it into “thou art the anointed of God” so that those readers who do not know the meaning of the Greek χριστός would not miss the theological importance of Peter’s profession. Similarly, in Acts 6:9 he modified Tyndale’s “Sinagoge” to “scole or college” in order to avoid the use of a word which would need to be explained to at least some of his English-speaking readers.622

Another good example to illustrate Joye’s translational strategy is his translation of Acts 6:1. Joye is frequently faulted for changing Tyndale’s rendering of this verse, which according to the 1526 version read: “In those dayes, the nombre of the disciples grewe, there arose a grodge amonst the ebrues, because theyr widowses were despysed in the dayly ministration.” Here, Joye replaced “those” with “these,” “widows” with “pore nedy,” “despise” with “neglege,” and “ministration” with “almose dealinge.” Thus, the corrected verse in Joye’s rendering reads: “In these dayes, the nombre of the disciples grewe, there arose a grudge amonst the ebrues, because theyr pore nedy were neglege in the dayly almose dealinge.” According to the representatives of the common consensus, not only are these changes etymologically incorrect, but Joye’s pride in them in the Apology exemplifies both his arrogance and his ignorance.623 Admittedly, αἱ χῆραι means “the[ir] widows,” and the Latinite “ministration” (in the sense of service) is correct for rendering διακονία in Tyndale’s translation. Nonetheless, the feminine plural ταύταις of the demonstrative pronoun is more correctly rendered by Joye’s “these,” pointing to what is recently or last mentioned, than Tyndale’s “those,” which would be the translation of ἐκείναις, denoting what is remote.624 And “were neglege” (i.e. neglected) is unquestionably a better translation of παρεθεωροῦντο, the indicative imperfect passive 3Pl of the verb παραθεωρέω that generally means overlook or neglect, rather than Tyndale’s “were despysed.” So even if one puts the emphasis on the literal or formal equivalency of the terms in the source and target languages, two of Joye’s modifications did bring improvement to Tyndale’s text. But what

---

622 T1526 reads: “Then there arose certayne off the Sinagoge, which are called lebertines…” In J1534 the actual text reads: “Then there arose certayne the scole or college, which are called libertines…” The misprint was corrected in J1535: “Then there arose cer- tayne of the scole or college, which are called libertines…”


really happened here is that Joye thought that Tyndale’s translation did not do justice to the translation of the *realia* as determined by the cultural context. In particular, the words “widows” and “ministration” could not convey the same connotations to an English-speaking reader in the 16th century, Joye believed, as their originals did in the source language to the targeted readers living in the original cultural context of the 1st century ad. A widow in the patriarchal biblical times was indeed “poor” and “needy,” i.e. helpless and in need of financial support from others for her very survival. In 16th-century England, although it was still a male-oriented society, widows were in a less precarious financial position. Therefore, Joye chose to make the point of the biblical writer explicit (which he indeed understood correctly) by opting for a hyperonym. He took a similar approach for translating ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ (Vg: *in ministerio*). In his own translation he substituted Tyndale’s Latinate “ministration” by the ‘service’ these poor and needy widows received, viz. “alms,” applying a hyponymy, a perfectly justifiable translational strategy for translating *realia* for a culturally significantly different readership. Joye’s modification of Acts 6:1 is therefore not only defensible, but can justly be seen as an improvement to achieve a more target language-oriented translation.

Joye’s conviction about the self-explanatory and self-evident character of the biblical text is ultimately rooted in his idea of *sola scriptura*. In his treatise on *The Souper of the Lorde*, in which he “accidentily” (i.e. obliquely) refuted More’s book against John Frith, Joye argued against the “vayne vanites” of “moris unwryten verites.” According to him, Christ’s church is founded and supported solely by the “sufficient scryptures.” The Bible, God’s Word, alone is the true authority for the Christian believer, as God’s Incarnated Word is enough for the justification of the faithful.

By way of summary it can be said that there is a significant difference between Joye and Tyndale with regard to their respective translational strategies. Although Tyndale’s works can be characterized as an unbalanced compromise between source language- and target language-oriented translations in favour of the target language and target culture while containing unmistakable elements of exoticizing and historicizing,

---


Joye’s were unmistakably intended as target language- and target culture-oriented translations with more modernizations and naturalizations. In that sense, Joye’s alterations meant walking the entire way along the path Tyndale had taken before him.

Aftermath

A few months after the publication of Joye’s Apologye, Tyndale was arrested. George Collins, one of the merchant adventurers, is the first to report on what at that time still seemed to him to be only a plan. In a letter dated 1 May 1535, he notified a fellow mercer in London that the Procurator General of Brabant had commissioned the arrest of three English fugitives. His information came from another Antwerp merchant adventurer, a certain Mr Flegge, who in his turn had heard it in the church from the ‘stadholder’ of Barrow. Unfortunately, when he learned that one of the men arrested was Robert Barnes, Collins forgot to ask the names of the other two, but he promised to make further inquiries and supply the other two names at a later date.

---

628 The terms exoticizing, naturalizing, historicizing, and modernizing are applied here as they are used by Holmes in his theory of literary translations: “Each translator of poetry, then, consciously or unconsciously works continually in various dimensions, making choices on each of three planes, the linguistic, the literary, and the socio-cultural, and on the x axis of exoticizing versus naturalizing and the Y axis of historicizing versus modernizing of translation are used” (James S. Holmes, Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies, (Approaches to Translation Studies 7), Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988, p. 48). According to Holmes, there is a diachronic axis (the historical distance between the source text and the metatext), and there is a synchronic axis (the cultural differences regardless of their historical settings). Along the diachronic axis, the translator can opt for preserving the historical element (historicizing) or for adapting it to the times of the metatext (modernizing). Along the synchronic axis, the translator can opt for preserving the foreign element (exoticizing) or for adapting it to the target culture (naturalizing or, better, familiarizing, domesticating). These options are made on a case by case basis.

629 The traditional date for Tyndale’s arrest is 21 May 1535. Although this date is included in a number of works (e.g. BC, George Joye, p. 104, Daniell, William Tyndale, p. 364), nowhere is the source of information indicated. Paul Arblaster has convincingly argued for 15 May being the terminus ad quem for Tyndale’s arrest and has proposed 24 April as a possible date (Arblaster, Cat. 119 in TT, p. 177). This date is seemingly in contradiction with George Collins’ letter (cf. infra n. 629).

630 L&P VIII, no. 862.

631 We can reasonably presuppose that the conversation between the stadholder and Flegge took place on Sunday 25 April at the end of the fair. It is unlikely that Flegge, if he knew at the time of his encounter with Collins that Tyndale had been arrested, would not have told Collins that Tyndale was one of the targeted persons. And again it is unlikely that if Collins knew at the time of writing that Tyndale had been arrested, the merchant
Collins wrote to his colleague to ask him to warn Barnes, who was back in England at that time. While Tyndale was unfortunate and was not warned of the threatening peril, Joye, like Barnes, must have been notified, if not earlier, by the news about Tyndale’s arrest. He fled to Calais, where he stayed with Edward Foxe, a friend from his Cambridge days. Foxe, a clergyman favoured by Henry, was on a mission for the Government to improve the King’s relations with Francis I. In his letter to Cromwell dated 4 June 1535, Foxe sent a few lines of mediation on Joye’s behalf along with his official report. He interceded for leave for Joye to return to England and guaranteed Joye’s orthodoxy, or at least his silence on established religious matters. Foxe’s concern for Joye seems to be genuine and is certainly more than an obligatory good word given for the sake of the common alma mater. Undoubtedly remembering that Joye had been serviceable to him, Cromwell acted upon Edward Foxe’s recommendation, and Joye returned to England. He kept his part of the bargain, for no new book appeared during his stay in his home country except for a small octavo volume of barely twelve leaves, published in would not have mentioned it in his letter. Of course, it is possible that George Collins was not yet aware of Tyndale’s arrest at the time of writing, as he wrote only a week after the suggested date, and much of the week was probably spent with the Antwerp merchants moving back from Bergen-op-Zoom.

632 Foxe was Prolocutor of Convocation when it decided the annulment of Henry’s marriage with Catherine in April 1533. A year later he published his Opus eximium de vera differentia Regiae potestatis et Ecclesiae et quae sit ipsa veritas ac virtus vtrivsque (Londini: In aedibus Thomae Bertheleti regii impressoris excus., Anno. M.D. XXXVII). After his return from Calais in 1535, Foxe was soon to be appointed bishop of Hereford. See Francis Oakley, Edward Foxe, Matthew Paris, and the Royal Potestas Ordinis, in SCJ 18 (1987), pp. 347–54.

633 “It may like you also further to understande that George Joye ever sithe his commyng to Calais hathe been lodged with me in my howse whom I have so enduced that I trust hereafter he woll never say any thing whiche may be contrary to any article of out faite or unto that faithe whiche is already receaved concerning the sacrament of the Altare” (Edward Foxe to Cromwell, PRO, SP 1/93, fo. 20; L&P VIII, no. 823). It is clear from Foxe’s formulation that Joye had spent a considerable amount of time (perhaps weeks) by the time of writing. This would suggest that he must have fled around the time when Collins wrote his letter.

634 “And surely sith to be playne with youe I fynde hym veray conformable in all poynte whiche in my opynion requisit for a christen man to belieue. Upon whiche his good comformyte I have promysed hym to be a meane for hym unto the Kings highnes that it may please the same to be good and graciusse Lorde unto hym and not to cast hym away whiche I besche youe to set forthe unto his highnes if youe shall thinke it so requisit. And of your pleasour therin to advertise me at your convenyent leasour” (Edward Foxe to Cromwell, PRO, SP 1/93, fo. 20).

635 On Joye’s earlier service to Cromwell, see: supra n. 87 on p. 23.
September 1535, which no doubt had been prepared on the Continent.636 This little book was the sole recorded publication by Joye between the summer of 1535 and 1540.

But Joye’s reputation was seriously damaged. His debate with Tyndale, the ‘Apostle of England,’ had already alienated him from Tyndale’s circle, and when Tyndale was captured and Joye disappeared from Antwerp, Tyndale’s friends and some of the merchant adventurers thought that Joye was party to Henry Phillips’ plot against Tyndale. In July 1535, Thomas Theobald, a godson of Cromwell whose task on the Continent was to keep an eye on the activities of Henry Phillips, reported to Archbishop Thomas Cranmer that “George Joye is greatly blamed and abused among merchants and many others, that were his friends, falsely and wrongfully.”637 The accusations against Joye were false and wrong, Theobald reported, because they were flatly denied by Phillips himself. Theobald had acquainted himself with Phillips in Leuven, and the latter boasted that he had left no stone unturned to achieve Tyndale’s arrest and condemnation. Phillips also intimated that it was he who convinced the Procurator General to issue warrants against Barnes and Joye also. When Theobald informed Phillips about the rumours that Joye was an accomplice in Tyndale’s arrest, Phillips claimed that he had never seen Joye, let alone made Joye part of his conspiracy. Joye was, Phillips stipulated, one of his intended victims. “It is hoped,” Joye’s biographers write, “that the testimony of Phillips and Theobald somehow came to the ears of Joye’s countrymen to allay their unfounded suspicions.”638 Yet “the suspicions themselves serve to demonstrate how deep was the anger felt by many in the circle of English Reformers against Joye for what they regarded as his disloyalty to Tyndale.”639 Joye’s later falling-out with John Foxe, the celebrated martyrlogist, reinforced the growing hostility against his person among Protestants and damaged his reputation for centuries.

The debate between Joye and Tyndale thus ended with the imprisonment and eventual execution of Tyndale, and the defamation and flight of Joye. While in prison in Vilvoorde, Tyndale is believed to have worked on his OT translation.640 After four years in England, Joye had to flee once

640 In his prison letter (see supra n. 270 on p. 347), Tyndale asks his addressee to intercede with the lord commissioner to return some of his confiscated goods, *inter alia* his
again to Antwerp, where he was again active at the printing press of the widow van Ruremund, but his later books did not touch upon the topic. Nonetheless the debate among Protestants on the eschatological hope and fate of the human person after death did not come to an end. Calvin’s decisive work on the subject of soul sleep had already been written but not yet published by the time of the Tyndale–Joye debate. The book of the French theologian, which comprised arguments quite comparable to Joye’s, was influential for centuries. A letter by Bonifacius Wolfhart to Martin Frecht dated 2 October 1537 also contained exegetical arguments very similar to those in Joye’s *Apologye*. On the other hand, a position on soul sleep similar to that of Tyndale and Luther was defended by the Hungarian Reformer Mátyás Dévai Biró (c.1500–c.1545), whose *Disputatio de Statu in quo sint Beatorum Animae post hanc vitam* was published only a year or so after the Tyndale–Joye debate. In the spring of 1536 Henry

---

Hebrew Bible, grammar, and dictionary. There is a tradition that Tyndale’s request was granted and that he translated (at least some parts of) the historical books of the Bible from Joshua to Nehemiah in prison. This is quite plausible. Daniell convincingly shows that the historical books of the Matthew Bible (1537) are in Tyndale’s translation, and none of this material was published during Tyndale’s lifetime (Daniell, *William Tyndale*, pp. 333–57). Among Tyndale’s contemporaries the bibliographer John Bale and the chronicler Edward Hall both list translations of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kings, Chronicles, Esdras, and Nehemiah among his works (John Bale, *Scriptorium Illustrium Maioris Brytanniae Catalogus*, vol. 1, Basel, 1557, fols. 658–59; Edward Hall, *The union of the two noble and illustrate families of Lancastre & Yorke*, London: Rychard Grafton, 1550, fol. CXXvii). This tradition, however, discredits the common claim that Tyndale was arrested, kept in prison, and executed for translating the Bible.

---

641 See *supra* on p. 279.


VIII assembled the bishops and some leading theologians to draw up an outline of the key dogmatic issues involved in the Henrician Reformation. The discussions led to the *Ten Articles* and the *Injunctions to the Clergy of 1536*. The *Ten Articles* contained a statement on Purgatory, rejecting its ‘popish’ understanding but asserting the beneficial and pious character of the supplications for the dead. Later, in 1553, a *Fortieth Article* was attached to the *Thirty-Nine Articles* of the Church of England rejecting the Anabaptist ideas of millenarism, universal salvation, and ‘realized resurrection’ (as something that has already taken place, referring only to the soul), as well as that of both kinds of psychopannychism. Seven years later, however, Archbishop Matthew Parker (1504–75) abolished this article, and the final list, adopted in 1662, did not contain any doctrinal teaching on what happens to the human soul after death.

Needless to say, the Reformation debate on the fate of the human person after death had important pastoral and ecclesiastical consequences. Liturgy and sacred music were altered: without Purgatory, there was no longer a pastoral need for a personalized supplicatory ritual, since private prayer and congregational participation were sufficient. For the town of Bristol, Clive Burgess summarized the effects of the Anglican Reforms in the following way:

---


645 “Resurrectio mortuorum nondum est facta. Resurrectio mortuorum non adhuc facta est, quasi tantum ad animum pertineat qui per Christi gratiam a motu peccatorum excitetur, sed extremo die quod omnes qui obierunt, expectanda est; tunc enim vita defunctis (ut Scripturae manifestissime testantur) propria corpora, carnes & ossa restituentur, ut homo integer, prorect vel perdite vixerit, juxta sua opera, sive praemia sive poenas reportet. Defunctorum anae neque cum corporibus intereunt, neque otiose dormiunt. Qui animas defuncrorum praedicant usque ad diem judicii absque omni sensu dormire, aut illas asserunt una cum corporibus mori, & extrema die cum illis excitandas, ab orthodoxa fide, quae nobis in sacris literas traditur, prorsus dissentiunt. Millenarii. Qui Millenariorum fabulam revocare conantur, sacris literis ad versantur, & in Judaica deliramenta sese praecipitant. Non omnes tandem servandi sunt. Hi quoque damnatione digni sunt, qui conantur hodie perniciosam opinionem instaurare, quod omnes, quantumvis impii, servandi sunt tandem, cum definito tempore a justitia divina poenas de admissis flagitiis luerunt” (IS *The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*).


647 HAGGH, *Foundations or Institutions?*, p. 93.
Parish worship was profoundly altered, and not simply as a result of the changes in rite. With belief in and provision for Purgatory prohibited, the financial foundation for auxiliary services, ancillary priests, elaborate music, sumptuous equipment and decoration disappeared; and perhaps most strikingly, throughout England church building ceased. Where, before 1550, many of the laity were intimately involved with financing, regulating and improving the spiritual armoury of their parish church, such participation was now severely reduced. After 1550 the laity were obliged to assume a much more passive role. They might listen to sermons or reform their own behaviour, but with the passing of Purgatory and its works the scope for their contribution was small. As a result, many became increasingly disengaged from their parishes—to the despair of their pastor.648

Burgess also rightly pointed out that the new theologies claiming that salvation depended either on sufficient faith or predestination rather than on good moral conduct and charity caused insecurity, disengagement, and sourness, which, according to Burgess, can explain the widespread antipathy towards the late 16th-century English religious establishment.649

On a more positive note, the debate between William Tyndale and George Joye helped lay the foundations for a new Protestant eschatology. The Christian message was rethought and reformulated for the men and women of the Early Modern era. The debate placed an emphasis on the need for solid scriptural arguments for matters of faith. A new methodology of exegesis emerged in which the historical-grammatical analyses of the text in its context rather than the symbolic-aesthetic and associative character of the sacred text predominated.

649 Burgess, ‘By Quick and by Dead’, p. 858.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

THE INAPPROPRIATENESS OF THE CONSERVATIVE CONSENSUS

Some of the most intriguing questions of humankind have always been those that concerned the end of earthly human life and the fate of the dead. From common experience we know that all people die. But what will happen to me when I die? Is there a life after this life? And if so, what is it going to be like? Over the centuries differing answers have been given to this question in different cultures. In the history of Christianity, people have turned to the Bible and to the repository of faith for finding answers to these questions. This is only appropriate, for the core message of the Christian Bible is the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As such, the Bible is ultimately a promise to every believer about his or her fate beyond this earthly life. And since according to biblical teaching death is intimately connected with sin, His death and resurrection not only promised that death has been defeated, but they also contained a claim about the human condition. Through His death Christ attained salvation for all humankind, but the call to salvation has to be met with a human response. During the Reformation the initial debate was on the nature and content of this human response, whether it only involved faith and trust, or whether human cooperation was needed as well.

As Reformers from various denominations began to ponder this question and to search for an answer in the Scripture, soon other related questions surfaced. Some of these concerned anthropology: whether time and space are inherent constituents of the human person, or whether these are earthly dimensions that have no meaning once one has passed ‘beyond’ death. Martin Luther, followed by William Tyndale and John Frith, seems to have opted for the second position, while other Reformers, like Huldrych Zwingli, Philipp Melanchthon, Martin Bucer, and Heinrich Bullinger, apparently upheld the traditional view and claimed that body and soul are subject to time (if not necessarily to space, in the case of the latter). The question of soul sleep versus the intermediate state of the soul was thus ultimately not on an eschatological timetable of the human person, but on the nature of the human person.
The Tyndale–Joye debate on ‘translating resurrection’ has to be positioned in the context of this broader debate on the fate and nature of the human person. When authors of the ‘conservative consensus’ reduce the debate to an etymological question, whether the Greek ἀνάστασις can rightly be translated as “the life after this,” they, besides revealing considerable naïveté concerning how translations and translators work, do injustice not only to the subject matter of the debate but also to the parties involved, and thus to Tyndale, too, whom they want to defend or exonerate in the first place.

In the course of this study it became evident that no element of the conservative consensus can be retained. Although the approach taken by the authors in the conservative consensus is fully understandable, from a scholarly point of view it is wholly untenable. In this study I have proven that the evaluation of the debate in traditional works is (if present at all) utterly mistaken. I have pointed out how authors of the conservative consensus neglected or misinterpreted the available historical evidence. I have demonstrated that their (implicit or explicit) judgement on Joye’s character, scholarship, knowledge, intelligence, style, translational strategy, and legacy does not hold water. Finally, I have shown how Joye’s Apologye cannot be properly studied without its appropriate historical-theological context.

An Exegetical Debate in Its Context

The appropriate historical-theological context is the quest of the Reformers for a new, Bible-based theology. Disappointed in the seemingly meaningless or inapplicable interpretations of the Bible, and in the dogmatic teachings that in their eyes were not based on the Scripture, Reformers argued for the foundation of a new theology that is based exclusively on the Bible. This required a new interpretative methodology, a breakaway from the T/tradition. Accordingly, dogmatic questions were primarily seen as exegetical questions, and vice versa, exegetical findings and interpretative methodology played a decisive role in defining the content of faith.

On the question of the eschatological hope of the human person, the key biblical texts that served as the basis for the new Reformed theology were the passage about Jesus’ encounter with the Sadducees (Mt. 22:23–32 et par.), Jesus’ words on the cross to the repentant thief (Lk. 23:43), and the Pauline texts 1 Cor. 15, 1 Thes. 4, and 2 Cor. 5. Zwingli, Melanchthon, Bucer, and Bullinger understood these texts as divine revelations about
the immortality of the soul. These authors argued that underneath the Latin *resurrectio* and other forms of the verb *(re)surgo*, as well as the corresponding Greek verbs (ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω) together with their cognates, a Semitic way of thinking is hidden. Accordingly, these words translating various forms of the Hebrew verb קָוָם (and other terms derived from it) carry the same connotations as the ‘original’ in the Hebrew, namely, they, too, can refer to the immortality of the soul.

When Joye thus corrected Tyndale’s English NT in these places, he genuinely thought that he was giving the true meaning of these biblical passages. It was Joye’s pastoral concern, his translational strategy, that moved him to remove the ambiguity and put the exegetical results of the greatest theologians of his age into practice. He wanted to provide the readers of and listeners to ‘his’ NT with a text that needed no further explanation, was plain, and was understandable. The threatening historical context of the Münsterite Anabaptist revolt probably made him extra cautious about leaving anything in the text that could support one of the characteristic tenets of the Anabaptists.

### The Legacy of the Tyndale–Joye Debate

When on that cold winter Saturday of the Lenten Season in the year of Our Lord 1535 Catherine van Ruremund published the book entitled *An Apologye made by George Ioye to satisfye (if it maye be) w. Tindale: to pourge & defende himself ageinst so many sclaunderouse lyes fayned vpon him in Tindals vncheritable a[n]d vnsober Pystle so well worthye to be prefixed for the Reader to induce him into the vnderstaning of hys new Testame dili-gently corrected & printed in the yeare of oure lorde .M. CCCCC. and xxxiiij. in Nouember*, she probably knew that this was not going to be her best-selling publication. And justifiably so, for this lengthy title, loaded with emotionally heavily charged words and sarcasm, correctly describes that high level of emotionality and subjectivity that is prevalent throughout the entire book. These characteristics have been a warning sign to readers past and present not to take the book seriously. While in this present work, I showed that the work is indeed highly subjective and emotional, this does not necessarily mean that the work must be without any scholarly merit.

Although in his own age George Joye, the author of the pamphlet, was a well-known leader of the Reformation, his reputation diminished rapidly, and soon he became neglected by most scholars. In later scholarly
works—in which Joye earned a footnote or two, or sometimes even a couple of pages—he has always been treated with a kind of repugnance and was never taken seriously. If his name is ever mentioned in works on the history of the English Bible or on the early Reformation period, he and his works have until recently always been dismissed with dismay and aversion. Since apologies are seldom as appealing as accusations, his Apologye has often been neglected. Nonetheless, Joye has exercised a profound impact on the shaping of Protestant Britain’s new religious liturgy by compiling the first English printed Primer and the first English Psalter. In the field of Bible translation, he was less influential than Tyndale, but his versions of Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations were the first printed English translations of these biblical books. His pioneering work was used in and to some degree incorporated into the complete Bibles issued by Myles Coverdale (1535) and John Rogers (1537). Some of his renderings were justified by modern versions like the NIV and the NRSV. He has even enriched the English language with a few memorable expressions, even if his influence is not comparable to that of Tyndale.

Yet the Tyndale–Joye debate left the mark of its legacy primarily in a different area. Joye’s Apologye has been used even by the authors of the conservative consensus as a unique treasury of information on the early history of Tyndale’s English NT. Furthermore, Joye’s alterations to Tyndale’s text, whether justified or not, resulted in the fact that we now have a fairly good picture of both Tyndale’s and Joye’s views on the human person, salvation, and the post-mortem fate of the human person. Joye’s anthropology corresponds to that of most of his contemporaries. According to this he regarded the human being as a compound of an immaterial soul and a physical body, which separate from each other at the moment of death, providing for an interim state of the soul between death and bodily resurrection at the end of the world. Tyndale, in contrast, while

---

1 “This was elegantly and wittily written, but did not take so much as the other—or, for such is the ill nature of Mankind, that Satyres are always better received than Apologies, and no Satyres are more acceptable than those against Church-men” (Burnet, The Abridgement of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England, p. 128). Burnet’s comment is about More’s Supplication of the Souls written against Simon Fish’s Supplication of the Beggars.

2 Appropriately, Joye’s biography in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography uses one of the terms that were coined by Joye: “In his Refutation of 1546 Joye would have hard words for Gardiner on his backsliding in the intervening years.” Emphasis on the word ‘backsliding’ added. (art. George Joye in IS ODNB).
claiming ignorance on the subject of the post-mortem fate of the soul, regarded the human being most likely as an inseparable unity or indivisible entity. For him, body and soul are in all probability not two different components but two different aspects of the same human person—a position that most modern exegetes believe to be the most ancient and authentic biblical view on the human being. The difference in their opinions can be thus explained by the difference in their methodology, anthropology, theology, and translational strategy. Because of his theological interest, Joye took an active part in the quest for the foundations of a new Protestant biblical theology. As theologians have always done, he tried to reformulate the original Christian message in terms relevant to his own time. Their debate showed the importance of turning to the Bible in matters of faith. Joye’s *Apologye* reflects much of the achievement of his contemporaries and applied historical-grammatical exegesis. In that sense, his methodology was surprisingly modern.

One final question remains unavoidable. Was Joye in the right to change “resurreccion” to “lyfe after this” in those places? Did he correct or corrupt Tyndale’s text? If Joye had been my student, I would have underlined his “lyfe after this” in red and would have put a big red question mark in the margin. I would also have asked him to explain his choice of words for the translation. We can be grateful that Tyndale’s second foreword in the November 1534 revision put this question mark alongside Joye’s translation and that it provoked Joye’s *Apologye*. Although the available historical evidence suggests otherwise, I would like to believe that Joye’s *Apologye* might have satisfied Tyndale.
1. George Joye to Hugh Latimer (29 April 1533)¹

Mr L. I hartely commend me unto youe/ desiring allmighty god to be present wythe youe with his spirytt of trewythe to <ês> lede youe in to him that said/ I am the <te>trewhye and is all trewhye. Sir, William Tindall receyvyd a letter frome John ffrythe wherein John ffryth is somewhat offendyd for that I wrote secretly a letter to one that askyd me a questione as concernyng why I translatyd the prayer of Esaiie not all alye in the hortulas and in the prophete wherein incidently I shew by the diuersitie of translacions what profytt may come therof/ that the sowles departyd slepe not nor lye ydle tyll domes daye as Martyn luther and the Anabaptystes saye and as me thinkythe ffrythe and William tyndall wolde/ this letter of myne I desyre youe to see/ for it is so paynefull to me to wryte yt I coulde not leve any copye with me/ ye shall haue yt among the bretherne/ I cannot tell his name that askyd me the questione and vnto whome I sent the letter. but I sent itt by one William hill Mr Cosens servaut. I beseche youe gett <ŷ> gett [sic] itt and rede ytt and send me your iudge= ment and mynd in the matter/ for ffrythe wrytythe yt <is> it is lyke to gendre dissensione. but I thynke that our sowles departyd lyve and doubt not but the scriptures so sowne/ bothe in chrystes answer to the saduceys .Marc. 12. et c. 2 cor. 5. philipp. 1. Jo. 23. et c. this berer shall gett yt youe callyd henry smythe. I wolde wryte vnto youe more but this berer goethe hastely hense and may not <tay> tarye me/ god preserve youe and praye for me/ I forgett youe not neyther yo<ur> good mynde toward me/ I was full sory when I hard of that fyer that ye sufferryd wherof Paule spekythe 1 cor. 3. to see your worke burnyd befor your face/ but be of good chere Mr latymer. Paule sufferryd as gret a burnyng as that when he sawe his dull galathans bewychyd and borne backe/ god is myghty ynoughge to bryng them agayne and to gyve youe great glorye and Joye upone your childerne borne and trauelyd/ so for <ês> agayne/ suche is the

¹ "George Joye to Hugh Latimer" and "John Coke to Brother William" were preserved among the State Papers in the Public Record Office (SP 1/75, fo. 210, no. 183). They were originally transcribed by Sylvia L. England. Her transcription was later checked by J.F. Mozley for the publication of Joye’s biography. (BC, George Joye, pp. 95–96.) The transcription in its published form, however, contains a few mistakes, which I corrected here. Excerpts from both letters were published by James Gairdner in the Letters and Papers, vol. VI, nn. 402 and 402. ii. My transcription preserves the original line breaks. Letters inserted between <> and crossed out with a horizontal stroke (ll. 2, 13, 14, 18, 25, 28, 29, and 31) are struck out in the original manuscript.
chaunce and fortune of them that must play the pastures and leaders of
chrystes unrewlye flockes. What sufferyd Moyses of his owne flocke? and yet
god brought all to a good ende/ and was glorified in <his> him and his flocke
to/ Wryte to my lorde of Canterbury and animate <him> him to his offyce.
he is in a perellose place/ but yet in a gloriose place to plant the
gospell. god preserue youe/ the <9> 29 daye of apryll
Yours as he was wont george Joye.
2. John Coke to Brother William (29 April 1533)

1 Brother William I hartely commend me unto youe/ I was not content that ye breake

2 so sodenly awaye and tooke not wythe youe my letters as ye promisid me. Syr I sent

3 a letter as concerning the answer to him that wolde know why the prayer of Esaie

4 so varyed in the primer and the prophete and left my self no copye of whiche letter

5 it is thought that dissensions among the wyse bretherne begynne to growe. I

6 pray youe in any wyse monyshe him unto whom ye delyveryd ytt of this folye/ and

7 byd him in any wyse to send me the letter agayne or els a copie therof/ and

8 byd him as ever I shall do for him to take hede whowe [sic] they expounde and

9 descant upon so playne a matter. and byd him send Mr latymer a copye

10 therof. Remember my woode and my chese &c. god preserue youe.

11 the 29 daye

12 of Apryll.

Your John Coke.
3. The ‘Attached Paper’

1. George Joye to Mr Latimer
2. affirming that soules ly
3. not ydle/ vntill domes daye.

---

2 The paper is no longer attached to the letters but is bound in the volume as a separate item (PRO, SP 1/75, fo. 211, no. 184).
4. Joye’s Address ‘Unto the Reader’ in His Second New Testament

[C.viii]. Unto the Reader.

¶ Thus endeth the new Testament prynted after the copye corrected by George Ioye: wherin for englisshyng thys worde Resurrectio/ the lyfe after this. W.Tindale was so sore offended that he wrote hys vncharitabile pistle agenst me prefixed his newe corrected testament/ prynted. 1534. in Nouember/ entytled. W.T. yet once more to the Christen redere. Which pistle W.T. hath promysed before certayne men & me (orels I wolde my selfe haue defended my name & clered myselfe of those lyes and so sclauders there writen of me) that he wolde calle agene his Py- stle and so correcte yt/ redresse yt/ and re- forme yt accordinge to my mynde that I shulde be there wyth contented/ and vs bothe (as agreed) to salute the readers withe one salutacion in the same refor- med pistle to bet set before this testament now in printing. And that I/ for my par te/ shulde (a rekeninge and reson firste geuen of my translacion of the worde) permyt yt vnto the judgement of the lerned in christis chirche. Which thyn- ge/ verely I do not onely gladly consent there to/ vpon the condicion on his par- te/but desyer them all to iuge/ expende and trye all that euer I haue or shall wryte/ by the scriptures.

[C.vii’] Let yt not therfore in the mean season offende the (good indifferent reder) nor yet auerte thy mynde nether from W. Tindale nor fro me: nor yet from redyng out bokis whiche teche and declare the
very doctrine and Gospel of Christe/ because yt thus chaunceth vs to varye  
and contende for the trewe englisshing of  
this one worde Resurrectio in certayne places of the newe Testament. For I  
doubt not but that God hathe so prouy  
ded yt/ that our stryfe and dyssent shal-be vnto hys chirhce the cause of a per-
fayter concorde & consent in thy mater/  
Nomanto thinke hence forth that the  
soulis departed slepe with out heauen  
feling nether payne nor ioye vntill do-
mes daye as the Anabaptistis dreame  
but to be a lyue in that lyfe after thy  
whithe/ and in Christe in blysse and ioye  
in heuen/ as the scriptures clerely testi-
fye. Whych verite and true doctrine off  
Christe & his apostles/ as yt is a swete  
and present consolacion vnto the pore af-  
fiticte persecuted and troubled in thy  
worlde for Christis sake when they sh-
all dye/ so doeth the tother false opini-
on and erroneouse doctrine/ that is to  
weit/ that they sleap out of heauen ne-
ther feling payn nor ioye/ minyster and  
geue perellous audacite and bolde suer-
nes to the vngodly here to lyue styl and  
[C.viii"]continew in their wickednes/ sith they  
se & be so taught that aftir their depar-
ing there is no punysshment but sleep  
and reste as wel as do the soulis of the  
good and ryghteous tyll domes daye.  
Which daye as some of them beleue it to  
be very longe ere yt come/ so do many  
of them beleue that yt shal neuer come.  
Also to stryue for the knowlege of the  
trowth with a meke ad godly cotenci-
on hathe happened vnto farre perfay-
ter men then we bothe/ Nether haue  
there bene euer any fellowship to fewe
and smal/ but some tyme syche breache
and imperfeccion hath hapened emon
god this shal not contine new longe betwe
ye and that euen emonge the
apostles as betwene Paule & Peter/
and Paule and Bernabas. This thing
(I saye) may fall vpon vs also to lerne
men that all men be but lyers and maye
erre/ and to warne vs that we depende
not wholl vpon any mannis translacion
nor hys doctryne nether to be sworne
nor addicte to any mannis lerning/ make he neuer so holye and deoute pro-
testacions and prologs/ but to mesure
all mannis wrytingis/ workis and wor-
dis wyth the infallible worde off God
to whom be prayse and glory for euer.
Amen.
5. Biblical Texts where Joye Changed ‘resurreccion’ into ‘lyfe after this’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 22:23–32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erasmus’ Greek</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1516 [1522])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Εν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσήλθον ἀυτῷ σαδδουκαίοι, οἱ λέγοντες, μὴ ἐίναι ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ἑπιρώτησαν [ἐπηρώτησαν] ἄντιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 λέγοντες: διδάσκαλε, μωσῆς ἐίπεν.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Words and punctuations marked with the sign ′ are replaced in the later editions (Erasmus’ 1522 edition, T1534 or J1535, respectively) by the words and punctuations that follow them between square brackets. Words in square brackets following unmarked words are insertions in the later editions. Words marked with the sign ′ and not followed by words in square brackets are omitted in the later editions. Groups of words inserted between the signs ′ and ′ are replaced by the expression in square brackets following immediately after the marked words. Verse numbers are supplied according to modern conventions. Differences in spelling of the same word, capitalization of letters, and punctuation are not marked. Marginal notes and cross-references are omitted. Abbreviations in the Greek text are resolved silently, and the letter σ has been replaced everywhere by the letters στ, but inconsistencies with regard to spelling, punctuation, diacritical marks (accents), and iota subscripts are kept as in the original. The Vulgate text follows the 1534 critical edition published by Yolande Bonhomme, widow of Thielmann Kerver (d. 1522) (see PS under Vulgate). (For a possible indication that Joye used this edition of the Vulgate, see supra n. 542 on p. 402.) The text of T1526 follows the edition of the BL, in which abbreviations are resolved silently.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joyce (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἦσαν δὲ παρ᾿ ἡμῖν ἑπτὰ ἀδελφοί. καὶ ὁ πρῶτος γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησεν. καὶ μὴ ἔχων σπέρμα, ἀφῆκεν τὴν γυναίκα ἀυτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἀυτοῦ.</td>
<td>Erant autem apud nos septem frates, &amp; primus uxore ducta defunctus est, ’&amp; [ac] non habens semen, reliquit uxorem suam fratris suo.</td>
<td>There were with us seven brethren/ the fyrste maried and ’dyed [deceased] without ysshewe/ and lefte his wyfe unto his brother.</td>
<td>There were wyth vs seve[n] brethren/ the fyrst after he marryed dyed with out yssewe/ &amp; lefte his wyfe vnto his brother.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ δεύτερος, καὶ ὁ τρίτος, ἕως τῶν ἑπτὰ.</td>
<td>Similiter secundus &amp; tertius vsque ad septimum.</td>
<td>Lykewise the seconde and the thryd/ unto the seventh</td>
<td>Lykewise the seconde and the thryd/ vnto the seventh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὢστερον δὲ πάντων, ἀπέθανεν [καὶ] ἡ γυνή.</td>
<td>Nouissime autem omnium defuncta est &amp; mulier.</td>
<td>Laste of all the woman dyed also.</td>
<td>Laste of all the woman dyed also.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῇ ὀυν ἀναστάσει, τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή; πάντες γὰρ ἔσχον αὐτὴν.</td>
<td>In resurrectione ergo cuius erit uxor? Omnes enim habuerunt eam.</td>
<td>Nowe in the resurreccion whose wyfe shal she be of the .vij? for all had her.</td>
<td>Nowe in the lyfe after this/ whose wyfe shal she be of the .vij? for all had her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ἐιπεν αὐτοῖς. πλανᾶσθε μὴ ἐιδότες τὰς γραφὰς, μὴ δὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ.</td>
<td>Respondens autem Iesus, ait illis. Erratis, nescientes scripturas neque uirtutem dei.</td>
<td>Jesus answered and sayde unto them: ye are deceaved/ &amp; ’knowe [vnderstonde] not ’what the ’scripture [scriptures] ’meaneth/ nor yet the vertye of God:</td>
<td>Jesus answered and sayde vnto them: ye are deceaved/ and knowe not what the scripture meaneth/ nor yet the vertue of God:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matthew 22:23–32 (cont.)
### Matthew 22:18–32 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joyce (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει, ὅπερ γαμοῦσιν ὅπερ γαμίζονται, ὅπερ γαμίζονται, ὅπως ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ὑψωμένω ἑαυτοῦ.</td>
<td>30 In resurrectione enim, neque matrimonium contrahunt, neque nubent: sed sunt sicut angeli dei in caelo.</td>
<td>30 For in the resurrection they neither Mary nor are Maryed: but are as the angels of god in heven.</td>
<td>30 For in the lyfe after thys/ they nether mary/ nor are maryed: but are as the angels of god in heauen.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 περὶ δὲ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῶν νεκρῶν. οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος.</td>
<td>31 De resurrectione uero mortuorum non legistis quod uobis dictum est a deo, qui ait.</td>
<td>31 As touchyng the resurrection off the deed: have ye nott redde what ys sayde unto you off god/ which sayeth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 ἐγώ ἐιμι ὁ θεὸς ἀβραὰμ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἰσαὰκ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἰακὼβ. ὦν ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς, θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζωντων.</td>
<td>32 Ego sum deus Abraham, &amp; deus Isaac, &amp; deus Iacob. Deus non est Deus mortuorum, sed uiuentium.</td>
<td>32 I am Abrahams God/ and Ysaaks God/ and the God of Jacob? God ys nott the god of the deed: but of the lyvinge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ἄγγελοι ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ ἀυτοῦ,</td>
<td>33 Et audientes turbae mirabantur de doctrina eius.</td>
<td>33 And when the people hearde that/ they were astonedy at hys doctrine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mark 12:18–27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joyce (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 καὶ ἔρχονται σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτὸν, διὰ τινὲς λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ ἐναι, καὶ ἐπιρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες.</td>
<td>18 &amp; ueniunt sadducei ad illum qui dicunt non esse resurrectionem, &amp; interrogauerunt eum dicentes.</td>
<td>18 ‘And the saduces cam’ [Then came the Sadduces] unto hym/ which saye/ ther is no resurrection. And they axed hym/ sayinge:</td>
<td>18 And the saduces cam vnto him which saye/ there is no lyfe after thys. And they asked hym/ sayinge:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus' Greek</td>
<td>Erasmus' Latin</td>
<td>Vulgate</td>
<td>Tyndale</td>
<td>Joye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1516 [1522])</td>
<td>(1516 [1522])</td>
<td>(1534)</td>
<td>(1526 [1534])</td>
<td>(1534=1535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Διδάσκαλε, μοσῆς ἔγραψεν Ἱμίν, ὅτι έάν τινος ἀδεδρός ἀποθάνῃ, καὶ καταλίθη γυναίκα, καὶ τέκνα μὴ ἀφῇ, καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ τόν γυναίκα ἄυτοῦ, καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ τόν γυναίκα ἄυτοῦ, καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ τόν γυναίκα ἄυτοῦ.</td>
<td>19 Preceptor, Moses scripsit nobis, si cuius frater moriatur, et [ac] relinquat uxorem, &amp; liberos non relinquat, ut accipiat frater eius uxorem illius &amp; suscitet semen [fratris sui].</td>
<td>19 Magister/ Moses wrote unto us/ yff eny mans brother dye/ and leue his wyf/ and leue no chyldren: that then his brother shulde take his wyfe/ and reyse vppe seed vnto his brother.</td>
<td>19 Master/ Moses wrote vnto vs/ yff eny mans brother dye/ and leue hys wyfe/ behynde hym/ and leue no children/ that then his brother shulde take his wyfe/ and reyse vppe seed vnto his brother.</td>
<td>19 Master/ Moses wrote vnto us/ yff eny mans brother dye/ and leue hys wyfe/ behynde hym/ and leue no children/ that then his brother shulde take his wyfe/ and reyse vppe seed vnto his brother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ἡμῖν, ὅτι τινος ἀδεδρός ἀποθνῄσκων οὐκ ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα.</td>
<td>20 Septem frater erant: et primus accept vxorem/ et mortuus est non reliquit semen.</td>
<td>20 There were seven brethren and the fyrst toke a wyfe/ and when he dyed leefte no seed behinde hym.</td>
<td>20 There were seuen brethren and the fyrst toke a wyfe/ and when he dyed leefte no seade behynde hym.</td>
<td>20 There were seuen brethren and the fyrst toke a wyfe/ and when he dyed leefte no seade behynde hym.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν, καὶ ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα.</td>
<td>21 Et secundus accept illam, ac mortuus est, &amp; nec ipse reliquit semen.</td>
<td>21 And the seconde toke her/ and dyed/ nether leeft eny seede/ and the thyrde lykewyse.</td>
<td>21 And the seconde toke her/ and dyed/ nether leeft eny seade/ and the thyrde lyke wyse.</td>
<td>21 And the seconde toke her/ and dyed/ nether leeft eny seade/ and the thyrde lyke wyse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 καὶ ἠλαβον αὐτὴν, καὶ ἀφῆκεν σπέρμα.</td>
<td>22 Et acceperunt eam septem, nec reliquerunt semen.</td>
<td>Postrema uero omnium mortua est &amp; uxor.</td>
<td>22 And seven had her/ and lefte no seed behynde them. Last of all the wyfe dyed also.</td>
<td>22 And seuen had her/ and lefte no sead behynde them. Last of all the wyfe dyed also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</td>
<td>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</td>
<td>Vulgate (1534)</td>
<td>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</td>
<td>Joyce (1534=1535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 23 ἐν τῇ ὀυν ἀναστάσει διὸ ἐν ἀναστώσει, τίνος ἀυτῶν ἔσται γυνὴ; | In resurrectione igitur cum resurrexerint, cuius illorum erit uxor? Nam septem habuerunt eam uxorem. | In resurrectione ergo cum resurrexerint/ cuius de his erit uxor? septem enim habuerunt eam vxorem. | In the resurrection then/ when they shall  
ryse agayne: whose wyfe  
shall she be of them? For seven had her  
to wyfe. | In the lyf aftyr  
ths/ when they  
are a lyue/ whose wyfe  
shall she be of them? For  
seuen had her to wyfe. |
| 24 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, ἔιπεν αὐτοῖς. ὡς ἐγείρονται, οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ μωσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου, ὡς εἶπεν ἁμαρτοντα | et respondens iesus, dixit eis. An non proptererea erratis, quod nesciatis scripturas, neque virtutem dei? | et respondens iesus/ ait illis. nonne ideo erratis/ non scientes scripturas neque virtute dei? | et respondens iesus answered/ and sayde  
to them: Are ye  
not therfore deceaved  
˹because [and]  
˹ye ˹knowe  
[owntoon]  
not the scriptures? Nether the  
power of God? | Jesus answered/ and sayde unto  
them: Are ye not  
therfore deceaued/  
cause ye  
knowe not  
the scriptures?  
nether the power  
of God? |
| 25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν, ὦτε γαμουσίν, ὦτε γαμίσκονται, ἀλλ᾿ ἐισίν ὡς ἄγγελοι ὁι ἐν τοῖς ὀυρανοῖς, | cum enim a mortuis resurrexerint, neque contrahunt matrimonium, neque nuptum dantur, sed sunt  
eulut angelgi qui in celis sunt. | cum enim a mortuis resurrexerint neque nubentur/ sed sunt sicut angelgi dei in celis. | For when they shall  
be a lyue aftyr  
this dethe/ they  
nether mary/ nor are maried/ but are as the  
aungels whych  
are in heauen. | For when they shall be a lyue  
after this death/ they  
nether marry/ nor are maried/ but are as  
the angels which are in heaven. |
| 26 περὶ δὲ τῶν νεκρῶν, ὦτι ἐγέρονται, ὦκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ μωσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου, ὡς εἶπεν ἁμαρτοντα | Caeterum de mortuis autem quod resuscitantur non legisist in libro Mosi/ de rubo, quomodo locutus sit illi deus, dicens. Ego ille deus Abraham, & deus Isaac, & deus Iacob. | De mortuis autem quod resurgant: non legisist in libro moysi/ super rubum quomodo dixerit illi deus inquiens. Ego sum deus abraham/ et deus isaac/ & deus iacob? | As touchyng the  
deed/ that they shall  
ryse agayne: have ye  
nott redde in the boke off Moses/  
howe in the busshe God spoke unto him sayinge: I am the God of  
Abraham/ and God of Ysaac/ and  
the God of Jacob? | But as  
touchyng the dead/ that they  
are a lyue/ haue ye not redde  
in the boke off Moses/ howe in the  
busshe God spake vnto hym/  
sayinge: I am the God of  
Abraham/ and the God off  
Isaac/ and the God of Iacob? |
### Mark 12:18–27 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus' Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus' Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1534)</th>
<th>Joye (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὥς ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν, ἀλλὰ ζώντων. οὐμεῖς ὑμῖν πολύ πλανάσθε.</td>
<td>Non est deus mortuorum, sed dei uievium. Vos autem [igitur] multum erratis.</td>
<td>Non est deus mortuorum sed eiuiset. Uos ergo multum erratis.</td>
<td>He is not the god of the dead/but the god of the living/ye are therefore greatly deceived.</td>
<td>He is not the God of the dead/but the God of the living/ye are therfore greatly deceaued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Luke 14:13–14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus' Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus' Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1534)</th>
<th>Joye (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἂν ποιής δοχήν, κάλει πτωχοὺς, ἀναπήρους, χωλούς, τυφλούς.</td>
<td>sed cum facis conuiium, voca pauperes, debiles, caecos, &amp; cecos:</td>
<td>sed cum facis conuiium/ voca pauperes/ debiles/ caecos/ &amp; cecos:</td>
<td>But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the lame, the blind,</td>
<td>But when thou makest a feast/ call the poore, the maymed, the lame, and the blinde,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ μακάριος, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνταποδοὖναί σοι.</td>
<td>&amp; beatus eris, quia non habent retribuere tibi: retribuetur enim tibi in resurrectione iustorum.</td>
<td>&amp; beatus eris quia non possunt retribuere tibi: retribuetur enim tibi in resurrectione iustorum.</td>
<td>and thou shalt be happy: For they cannot recompence the. Butt thou shalt be recompensed at the resurreccion of the iuste men.</td>
<td>and thou shalt be happy: For they can not recompence the But thou shalt be recompensed at the lyfe of the iuste men.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Luke 20:27–38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus' Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus' Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1534)</th>
<th>Joye (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>προσελθόντες δέ [τέ] τινες τῶν σαδδουκαίων, ὁι ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν ἀυτὸν</td>
<td>Accesserunt autem quidam sadduceorum, qui negant esse resurrectionem, &amp; interrogauerunt eum</td>
<td>Accesserunt autem quidam sadduceorum qui negant esse resurrectionem/ et interrogauerunt eum</td>
<td>Then cam to hym certayne off the Saduces which denye that there is eny resurreccion. And they axed hym</td>
<td>Then cam to hym certayne of the Saduces which denye that there ys eny lyfe after this. And they asked hym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</td>
<td>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</td>
<td>Vulgate (1534)</td>
<td>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</td>
<td>Joyce (1534=1535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 λέγοντες.</td>
<td>28 dicentes.</td>
<td>28 dicentes.</td>
<td>28 sayinge: Master</td>
<td>28 sayinge Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>didáσκαλε.</td>
<td>Magister, Moses scripsit nobis, si frater alicuius.</td>
<td>Magister moyses scripsit nobis.</td>
<td>Moses wrote unto us/ if eny mannes brother dye havinge a wyfe/</td>
<td>Moses wrote vnto vs/ ye eny mannes brother dye hauinge a wyfe. And the same dye wyth out issue/ that then hys brother shulde take hys wyfe/ and rayse vp seade vnto hys brother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μωσῆς ἔγραψεν</td>
<td>[cuius frater] mortuus fuerit habens uxorem, &amp; hic sinc liberis fuerit/ vt accipiat eam frater eius uxorem: &amp; suscitet semen fratri suo.</td>
<td>[cuius frater] mortuus fuerit habens uxorem, &amp; hic sinc liberis fuerit/ vt accipiat eam frater eius uxorem: &amp; suscitet semen fratri suo.</td>
<td>And the same dye wyth out issue/ that then hys brother shulde take hys wyfe/ and rayse vp seade vnto hys brother.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡμῖν. ἐὰν τίνος άδελφος ʿἀποθάνη [ἀποθάνη] ἤχων γυναῖκα, καὶ ὁυτος ἄτεκνος ʿἀποθάνη [ἀποθάνη], Ἱνα λάβη ὁ άδελφος ἄυτου τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἐξαναστήησι σπέρμα τῷ άδελφῳ ἄυτου.</td>
<td>29 Septem ergo frater erant: et primum accepit illam, &amp; [ac] mortuus est sine liberis.</td>
<td>29 Septem ergo frater erant: et primum accepit illam, &amp; [ac] mortuus est sine filijs.</td>
<td>29 There were seven brethren/ and the first toke a wyfe/ and died without children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ὁυτος ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκνος.</td>
<td>30 Et sequens accepit illam: et ipse mortuus est sine filio.</td>
<td>30 Et sequens accepit illam: et ipse mortuus est sine filio.</td>
<td>30 And the seconde toke the wyfe/ and he dyed chyldlesse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν ἄυτην, ὦσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐπτὰ ὁ ἑπτά μεῖν &amp; οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα, καὶ ἀπέθανεν.</td>
<td>31 Et tertius accepit illam, similiter &amp; coeteri septem: &amp; [non] reliquert semen, &amp; mortui sunt.</td>
<td>31 Et tertius accepit illam/ similitur &amp; omnes septem: &amp; non reliquerunt semen/ &amp; mortui sunt.</td>
<td>31 And the thyrdre toke her/ and in lyke wyse the resydue off the seven/ And leeft noo chyldren behynde them/ and dyed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ύστερον πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνὴ.</td>
<td>32 Nouissime omnium mortua est &amp; mulier.</td>
<td>32 Novissima omnium mortua est &amp; mulier.</td>
<td>32 Last of all the woman dyed also.</td>
<td>32 Last off all the woman dyed also.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joye (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 ἐν τῇ ὀνυ ἀναστάσει τίνος αὐτῶν γίνεται γυνὴ; οἱ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξέχων αὐτὴν γυναῖκα.</td>
<td>In resurrectione ergo cuius eorum erit uxor? Siquidem septem habuerunt eam uxorem.</td>
<td>33 Now at the resurrection whose wyfe of them shall she be? For vij had her to wyfe.</td>
<td>33 Nowe at the lyfe after this whose wyfe of them shall she be? for .vij. had her to wyfe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν άυτοῖς ὁ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ. οἱ γενοῦσι τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτοις ἢμοῦσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν, δύτε γαμοῦσιν, δύτε ἐκγαμίσκονται.</td>
<td>Et [respondens] ait illis Iesus. Filij huius seculi ducent uxores &amp; 'nubunt [nuptum dant],</td>
<td>34 Et ait illis Iesus. Filij huius seculi nubunt et traduntur ad nuptias:</td>
<td>34 Jesus answered and sayde unto them: The children off this worlde mary wyves/ and are maryed/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν, καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν, δύτε γαμοῦσιν, δύτε ἐκγαμίσκονται,</td>
<td>illi uero qui digni habebuntur seculo illo, &amp; resurrectione ex mortuis, neque ducent uxores, neque 'nubunt [nuptum dant],</td>
<td>35 but they which shalbe [made] worthy 'of [to enioye] that worlde/ and 'of the resurrection from deeth/ nether mary wyves/ nor are maried/</td>
<td>35 but they whych shalbe worthy of that worlde/ and of the lyfe after this dethe/ nether mary wyues/ nor are maried/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 δύτε γὰρ ἀποδασανεῖν ἢτι δύνανται, ἱσόγγελοι γὰρ ἐείσιν [εἰσι] καὶ ύοι ἐείσιν [εἰσι] τοῦ θεοῦ, τῆς ἀναστάσεως ύοι ὀντες.</td>
<td>neque [enim] ultra mori possunt. Equales enim angelis sunt, &amp; filij sunt dei, cum sint filij resurrectionis.</td>
<td>36 neque ultra mori poterunt. Equales enim angelis sunt: &amp; filij sunt dei/ cum sint filij resurrectionis.</td>
<td>36 nor yet can dye eny moare. For they are equall unto the angels: and are the sonnes of God/ inasmoche as they are the children off the resurrection.</td>
<td>36 nor yet can dye eny moare. For they are equall vnto the angels/ and are the sonnes of god/ in as moche as they are the children of that lyfe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John 5:24–29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516=1522)</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joye (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὃ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με, ἐξείς ζωήν οὐκ ἔχεις, ἀλλὰ μεταβεβήκειν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν.</td>
<td>24 Amen amen dico vobis, qui vobis sermo credi et crede</td>
<td>Amen amen dico vobis quia qui verbum meum audit et credit ei qui misit me habet vitam eternam, &amp; in iudicium condenmationem non ueniet, sed transiuit a morte in uitam.</td>
<td>Verely verely I saye vnto you: He that heareth my wordes/ And beleveth on hym that sent me/ hath everlastynge lyfe/ and shall not come into damnacion: but is scaped from deth unto lyfe.</td>
<td>Verely verely I saye vnto you: He that heareth my wordes/ and beleueth on him that sent me/ hath everlastynge lyfe/ and shall not come into damnacion: but ys scaped from deth vnto lyfe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John 5:24–29 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516–1522)</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joye (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Αμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἐρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν, ὅτε ὁ νεκρός ἀκούσονται τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται.</td>
<td>25 Amen amen dico vobis quia venit hora &amp; nunc est, quando mortui audient uocem filij dei, &amp; qui audierint viuent.</td>
<td>25 Amen amen dico vobis quia venit hora &amp; nunc est quando mortui audient vocem filij dei: &amp; qui audierint viuent.</td>
<td>25 Verely/ verely I saye unto you: the tyme shall come/ and now ys/ when the deed shall heare the voyce off the sonne of god. And they that heare/ shall live.</td>
<td>25 Uerely/ verely I saye vnto you/ the tyme shall come/ and nowe ys/ when the deed shall heare the voyce off the sonne off god. And they that heare/ shall live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 ὥσπερ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ ἔχει ζωήν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, οὕτως ἐδώκεν καὶ τῷ ὑιοῖς θεοῦ ζωὴν ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτῷ,</td>
<td>26 Sicut enim pater habet uitam in semetipso, sic dedit et filio habere vitam in semetipso,</td>
<td>26 Sicut enim pater habet vitam in semetipso: Quia filius hominis est/</td>
<td>26 For as the father hath life in hym sylfe: soo lykewyse hath he geuen to the sonne to have lyfe in hym sylfe.</td>
<td>26 For as the father hath life in hym sylfe: so lyke wyse hath he geuen to the sonne to haue lyfe in hym sylfe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐδώκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι ὁ ἐν πάσαις ἀνθρώποις ἀκούσας ἐστιν.</td>
<td>27 &amp; potestatem dedit ei ‘iudicium faciendi’ [iudicandi quoque], qua filius hominis est.</td>
<td>27 &amp; potestatem dedit ei iudiciu facere. Quia filius hominis est/</td>
<td>27 And hath geven hym power alsoo to iudge in that he is the sonne off man.</td>
<td>27 And hath geuen him power also to iudge although he be the sonne of man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 μὴ θαυμάζετε τούτο, ὅτι ἐρχεται ὥρα, ἐν ὑπάρξει ὧν ἐναντίων τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνέθεται.</td>
<td>28 Nolite mirari hoc, quia ueniet hora in qua omnes qui in monumentis sunt audient uocem eius,</td>
<td>28 nolite mirari hoc: quia venit hora in qua omnes qui in monumentis sunt/audient/ vocem filij dei.</td>
<td>28 Maruayle not at this/ that the houre shall come/ in the whych all that are in the graves/ shall heare his voice/ and shall come forthe/</td>
<td>28 Maruayle not at thys/ that the houre shall come in the whych all that are in the graues/ shall heare his voice/ and shall come forthe/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 καὶ ἐκπορεύονται οἱ τὰ ἄγαλμα ποιήσαντες, εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες, εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως.</td>
<td>29 &amp; ‘procedent [prodibunt] qui bona feceerunt, in resurreccionem uitate, qui uero mala egerunt, in resurreccionem ‘iudicij [condemnationis].</td>
<td>29 &amp; procedent qui bona fecerunt in resurrectionem vite: qui vero mala egerunt/ in resurrectionem iudicij.</td>
<td>29 they that have done goode unto the resurreccion off life. And they that have done euyll/ vnto the resurreccion of dampnacion.</td>
<td>29 they that haue done goode into the very life. And they that haue done euyll/ in to the lyfe off dampnacion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</td>
<td>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</td>
<td>Vulgate (1534)</td>
<td>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</td>
<td>Joye (1534=1535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 γνοὺς δὲ ὁ παῦλος ὅτι τὸ ἑν μέρος ἐστὶ σαδδουκαίων, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον φαρισαῖων, ἔξαρξεν ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ. Ανδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐγὼ φαρισαῖος εἰμι, ὑιὸς φαρισαίου, περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι.</td>
<td>6 Sciens autem Paulus quod una pars esset Sadduceorum, &amp; altera pharisaorum exclamauit in concilio. Viri fratres, ego pharisaeeus sum, filius pharisaei. De spe &amp; resurrectione mortuorum ego iudicor.</td>
<td>6 When Paul perceaved that the one parte were Saduces/ &amp; the other Pharises: He cryed oute in the counsell. Men &amp; brethren/ I am a pharisaye/ the sonne off the hope/ &amp; of the lyf of the dead I am accused.</td>
<td>6 When Paul perceaved that the one parte were Saduces/ &amp; the other pharises: He cryed oute in the counsell: Men &amp; brethren/ I am a pharisaye/ the sonne off a pharisay. Of hope/ &amp; of the lyf of the dead I am accused.</td>
<td>6 When Paul perceaved that the one parte were Saduces/ &amp; the other pharises: He cryed oute in the counsell: Men &amp; brethren/ I am a pharisaye/ the sonne off a pharisay. Of hope/ &amp; of the lyf of the dead I am accused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 τοῦτο δὲ αὐτοῦ λαλήσαντος, ἐγένετο στάσις τῶν φαρισαίων, καὶ τῶν σαδδουκαίων, καὶ ἐσχίσθη τὸ πλῆθος.</td>
<td>7 Et cum hoc dixisset facta est dissensio inter pharisaeos &amp; [ac] sadduceos, &amp; dissipata est multitudo.</td>
<td>7 And when he had soo sayde/ there arose a debate bitwene the pharisayes &amp; ye saduces/ &amp; the multitude was devided.</td>
<td>7 And when he had soo sayde/ there arose a debate bytwene the pharisayes &amp; the Saduces/ &amp; the multitude was deuided.</td>
<td>7 And when he had so sayde/ there a rose a debate bytwene the pharisayes &amp; ye saduces &amp; the Saduces/ &amp; the multitude was devided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 σαδδουκαίοι μὲν γάρ λέγουν, μὴ εἶναι ἁνάστασιν, μηδὲ ἄγγελον, μήτε πνεῦμα. φαρισαίοι δὲ ὄμολογούσι τά ἀμφότερα.</td>
<td>8 Nam sadducei quidem dicunt non esse resurrectionem, neque angelum neque spiritum, pharisaei autem utraque confitentur.</td>
<td>8 Saducei autem dicunt non esse resurrectionem mortuorum/ neque angelum/ neque spiritum/ pharisei autem utraque confitentur.</td>
<td>8 For ye saduces saye that there is no resurreccion/ nether angell/ nor sprete But the pharisiees graunt bothe.</td>
<td>8 For the saduces saye that there is no lyf after this/ nether angel/ nor spirit. But the pharisayes graunt bothe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acts 23: 6–9 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516 [1522])</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joye (1534=1535)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 ἐγένετο δὲ κραυγὴ μεγάλη, καὶ ἀναστάντες γαμμάτεις τοῦ μέρους τῶν φαρισαίων, διεμάχοντο, λέγοντες: οὐδὲν κακὸν ἑυρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ. εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν ἄυτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος μὴ θεομαχῶμεν;</td>
<td>9 Factus est autem clamor magnus, &amp; cum surrexissent scribæ de factionem phariseorum, depugnabant dicentes. Nihil mali inuenimus in homine isto. Quod si spiritus locutus est ei aut angelus, 'num reponuemus deo ?</td>
<td>9 And there arose a grett crye/ and the scribes which wer 'on [of] the pharisais parte [/ arose &amp;] strove saynge: We fynde none eyyll in this man. Though a sprete/ or an angell hath apered to hym/ lett vs not stryue agaynst God.</td>
<td>9 And there arose a grett crye/ and the scribes which wher on the pharisais parte stroue sayinge: We fynde none eyyll in this man. Though a sprete/ or an angell hath apered to him/ let vs not stryue agaynst god.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hebrews 11:35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Erasmus’ Greek (1516–1522)</th>
<th>Erasmus’ Latin (1516–1522)</th>
<th>Vulgate (1534)</th>
<th>Tyndale (1526 [1534])</th>
<th>Joye (1534 [1535])</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 ἐλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν, ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν.</td>
<td>35 Mulieres acceperunt ex resurrectione mortuos suos. Alij uero distenti sunt, aspernati redemptionem, ut potiorem sortirentur resurrectionem.</td>
<td>35 The women receaved their deed [raysed] to lyfe agayne. Wother were racked/ &amp; wolde nott be delivered/ that they myght receave a better resurrection.</td>
<td>35 The women receaeed their deed ‘to [from] lyfe agayne. Some were racked/ and wolde not be delueryed/ that they myght receave rather the better lyfe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Hilarij, Augustini, una cu[m] Annotationibus, qualectorem doceant, quid qua ratione
mutatum sit. Quisquis igitur amas ueram theologiam, lege, cognosce, ac diende iudica.
Neq[u]e statim offendere, si quid mutatum offendoris, sed expedem, num in melius

——, Novum testamentum omne, multo quam antehac diligentius ab Erasmo Roterodamo
recognitum, emendatum ac translatum, non solum ad Graecam veritatem, verum etiam
ad multorum utriusque linguae codicum, eorumque veterum simul & emendatorum
fidem, postreino ad probatissimorum autorum editionem, editionem & interpre-
tationem, præcipue Origenis, Athanasij, Nazianzeni, Chrysostomi, Cyrilli, Theophylacti,
Hieronymi, Cypriani, Ambrosij, Hilarij, Augustini, una cum Annotationibus recognitis,
ae magna accessione locupletatis, quae lectorem doceant, quid qua ratione mutatum sit.
Des. Erasmi Roterodami in Novum Testamentum ab eodem denuo recognitum, Annota-
tiones, ingenti nuper accessione autore locupletatæ. Addita sunt in singulas Apost-
tolorum epistolæ Argumenta per Erasum Rot., Basel: Johannes Froben, March 1519.

——, Novum testamentum omne tertia iam ac diligentius ab Erasmo Roterodamo re-
ognitum, non solum ad Graecam veritatem, verumetiam ad multorum utriusq, linguae
codicum, eorumq eterum simul & emendatorum fidem, postreino ad probatissimorum
autorum editionem, editionem & interpretationem, unæ cum annotationibus recognitis,
ae magna accessione locupletatis, quae lectorem doceant, quid qua ratione mutatum sit.
Quisquis igitur amas veram theologiam, lege, cognosce, ac deinde iudica. Neque
statim offendere, si quid mutatum offendoris, sed expedem, num in melius
mutatum sit. Nam morbus est, non iudicium, damnare quod non inspexeris. Salvo
ubique et illabefacto Ecclesiae iudicio. Addita sunt in singulas Apostolorum epistolæ,
argumenta per eundem, Basel: I. Froben, 1522.
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<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:1–14</td>
<td>75, 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:44</td>
<td>75, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:88(87) (Prayer of Azariah 1:66)</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30–27</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:13–18</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26–27</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1–3</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:2</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hosea</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1–2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:13</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zephaniah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:7–8</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zechariah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20–23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deuterocanonical Books/Apocrypha</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prayer of Azariah</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:66</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Ezra (2 Esdras)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:34–35</td>
<td>76n10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:78–105</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Maccabees</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:26</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>75, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1–29</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:38–46</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:39–46</td>
<td>265, 269–70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:46</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:11–16</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wisdom of Solomon</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:23</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>159, 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tobit</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Testament</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:18</td>
<td>43, 327n179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21–22</td>
<td>160, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:29–30</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:11</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:11–12</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:29</td>
<td>158n80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:28</td>
<td>94n90, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:3</td>
<td>145n105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:5</td>
<td>326n174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:31</td>
<td>107n140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:32</td>
<td>122, 160, 255, 266, 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:36</td>
<td>256, 266, 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:39–41</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:19</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:21</td>
<td>326n174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:21–23</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:28</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:3</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:24</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:1</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:13–14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:4–51</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:41</td>
<td>198–99, 218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:46</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:27–28</td>
<td>157m69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:32</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:32</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:33</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:63</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:29</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:3</td>
<td>78, 326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:9</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:31</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:42</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:44</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:46</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:34</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:23–25</td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:18</td>
<td>326m73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284, 326, 442–45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>318, 326m73, 364m359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326m73, 364m359, 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160–61, 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326m74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7:49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:13–14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:16–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1639–31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80, 157–158, 160, 161, 162, 163, 169, 170–71, 180–181, 185, 244, 256, 261, 265, 273, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27n100, 327m79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132, 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326m73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>445–48 (see also Mark 12:18–27; Matt. 22:23–33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24:13–43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27n100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326m73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326m73, 376m416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>326m73, 364m359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>379, 409m590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80, 130, 157m72, 185, 191, 193, 228–29, 340, 389–90, 406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157m72, 231, 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>157m72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Biblical References</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 134–35</td>
<td>2:25–31 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:2 348n279</td>
<td>2:27 224, 230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:21 27n99</td>
<td>2:29 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1–6 157</td>
<td>2:30–31 145n105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:18–20 78</td>
<td>2:31 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:15 273</td>
<td>4 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:18 273</td>
<td>42 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21–25 242</td>
<td>433 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21–29 376n413, 383–84</td>
<td>61 419–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:24 204, 206–7, 273, 383n447</td>
<td>7:55–59 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:24–29 448–49</td>
<td>7:59 232, 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25 192, 243</td>
<td>9:8 79n17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:28 384</td>
<td>10:21 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:28–29 339</td>
<td>13:35 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:29 151, 239, 326, 326n73,</td>
<td>13:35–37 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383–84, 406</td>
<td>17:3 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45 271n00, 327n79</td>
<td>17:16–33 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15 325n68</td>
<td>17:18 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:23 27n99</td>
<td>17:28 197n379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:35 384</td>
<td>17:31 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:39–44 238, 407</td>
<td>17:32 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:40 192, 196, 204, 227–28</td>
<td>20:28 289n8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45 348n279</td>
<td>23:6 242, 318, 326n73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:51 172</td>
<td>23:6–9 83, 450–51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:52 225</td>
<td>23:6–24:21 372, 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:3 348n279</td>
<td>23:8 242, 326n73, 375, 409n590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:18 94n90</td>
<td>24:2 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:24 239, 406</td>
<td>24:15 79, 242, 326n73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:24–26 228</td>
<td>24:21 326n73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:25 151, 172, 196, 204, 225</td>
<td>26:23 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:35 384</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:44 269</td>
<td>1:4 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:24–26 376n413</td>
<td>4:25 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:25 27n99</td>
<td>6:5 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:26 228</td>
<td>6:8 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:31 205</td>
<td>6:23 151–52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:35 106n140</td>
<td>7:4 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:48–50 376n413</td>
<td>7:24 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:1–4 393</td>
<td>8:11 79, 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:2–3 233, 391</td>
<td>8:16f 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:3–5 79</td>
<td>8:34 326n74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:3 152, 191</td>
<td>12:4–5 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:24 228, 393</td>
<td>12:13 325n68, 327n79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:30 157n69</td>
<td>1 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:1–29 79</td>
<td>3 256, 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:1–14 79</td>
<td>3:12 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:22 94n89</td>
<td>3:12–13 107n40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>3:13 185, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22 35n28, 326n74</td>
<td>3:13–15 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:24 154–55, 158, 160n91, 265, 70</td>
<td>3:45 175–76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Index Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:16</td>
<td>27(n99, 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2–3</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:9b–10</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:14</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:15</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1</td>
<td>311n120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:24–1055</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>339n236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:12–27</td>
<td>79, 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:4</td>
<td>326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:4–8</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12</td>
<td>242, 326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:12–22</td>
<td>335–336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:13–17</td>
<td>326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:18</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:19</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>326m174, 392, 394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:21</td>
<td>326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:21–22</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:22</td>
<td>335n219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:29</td>
<td>131, 196–97, 205, 240, 326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30–31</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:32</td>
<td>326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:32–33</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:33</td>
<td>324m66, 348n280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:34</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:35</td>
<td>326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:42</td>
<td>326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:44</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:51</td>
<td>85, 133, 134–41, 326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:52</td>
<td>326m174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Corinthians</td>
<td>3:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:10–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:11–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:2</td>
<td>107m40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>4:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>1:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>138b–26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:21–24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:5–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:20–21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>1:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:7–5:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:13–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:13–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Timothy</td>
<td>3:1f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Timothy</td>
<td>2:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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