

## WHEN DID BARTOL KAŠIĆ COMMENCE AND COMPLETE HIS TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE INTO CROATIAN?

Francis J. THOMSON, Antwerp

The second of the two decrees on Scripture and Tradition adopted at the fourth session of the Council of Trent on 8 April 1546 stated that of all the Latin versions in circulation the Vulgate because of its centuries-old use by the Church in public services, sermons, exegesis and disputations was to be considered the authoritative one and specifically insisted that future editions of the Vulgate should be corrected.<sup>1</sup> In their letter of 26 April to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese (1520-1589) the Council legates reported that the Council had requested that the task of revision be entrusted to the Pope<sup>2</sup> and in his reply the Cardinal very correctly pointed out the difficulties involved and called it *una impresa troppo larga et troppo indeterminata*.<sup>3</sup> It was not until 1569, six years after the work of the Council had finally come to an end with the twenty-fifth and final session on 3-4 December 1563, that the commission to revise the text was formed and in November 1588 the revised text was submitted to Pope Sixtus V (1585-1590), who was so displeased with the result that he reworked it, restoring many of the previous readings. The resultant text published in April 1590 left so much to be desired that on 5 September 1590, nine days after the Pope's death on 27 August, the College of Cardinals forbade all further sales and withdrew as many copies as possible. The task of revision was entrusted to the Congregation of the Index and the resultant text was published in December 1592 by order of Pope Clement VIII (1592-1605). In view of the haste with which the edition had been produced it is not surprising that it contained many misprints but once these had been removed the text remained the same until it was replaced by the *Nova Vulgata* in 1979.

<sup>1</sup> *Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus, ed. CONCILIUM 1911: 91-92. It begins: Insuper eadem sacrosancta synodus considerans, non parum utilitatis accedere posse ecclesiae Dei, si ex omnibus latinis editionibus, quae circumferentur sacrorum librorum, quaenam pro authentica habenda sit, immutescat: statuit et declarat, ut haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot saecularum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur, et quod nemo illam reicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat [...] ut posthac sacra scriptura potissimum vero haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio quam emendatissime imprimatur.*

<sup>2</sup> Ed. CONCILIUM 1916: 470-472, see 471.

<sup>3</sup> Ed. ibid. 506-507, see 507.

During the first period of the Council of Trent (1545-1549) many of the Council fathers had spoken in favour of banning vernacular translations of the Bible and a major factor in the Council's decision on 8 April 1546 not to do so was played by the existence of the Slavo-Latin (Glagolitic) rite in Istria, Carniola and Dalmatia.<sup>4</sup> It is, however, a striking fact that subsequent Catholic vernacular translations were published mainly in countries where Protestant translations were available, e.g. over the period from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century no fewer than 189 Catholic editions of the Bible were published in German translation.<sup>5</sup> In Poland the first Catholic translation of the Vulgate into Polish by Jan Nycz (Leopolita, c. 1523-1572) was published at Cracow in 1571 and went through three editions before being replaced by the translation of the authoritative Sixto-Clementine edition made by Jacob Wujek (1541-1597), which was first published posthumously at Cracow in 1599 after having been revised by a Jesuit commission headed by Stanislas Grodziecki (1541-1613).<sup>6</sup> In Croatia Protestant Biblical translations had been circulating since the mid sixteenth century: the first Croat translation of the New Testament by Anton Dalmatin († 1547) and Stjepan Konzul (1521-after 1568) was published at Tübingen by Hans Ungnad von Weissenwolf, Freiherr von Sonnegg (1493-1546), in two volumes in Glagolitic in 1562-1563 and in Cyrillic in 1563.<sup>7</sup> In 1583 the Slovene translation of the New Testament by Primus Truber (c. 1508-1586) was published at Tübingen in Latin script<sup>8</sup> and the Slovene translation of the complete Bible by Jurij Dalmatin (1547-1589) appeared in Latin script at Wittenberg in 1584.<sup>9</sup> The two New Testaments were translated from the Vulgate, the Bible from the original languages, but all three translations had been influenced by Luther's German translation.

In view of the Protestant vernacular translations of the Bible circulating in the Balkans it was only to be expected that sooner or later the question of a Catholic vernacular translation based upon the Sixto-Clementine text of the Vulgate would arise and when it did, it is hardly surprising that the task was entrusted to the person who was undoubtedly best qualified to make it, the Jesuit Bartol Kašić (1575-1650). In 1599 the *Academia linguae illyricae* was established at the Jesuit College at Rome for Croat students and missionaries to the Balkans and Claudio Aquaviva (1543-1615), the Jesuit General (1581-1615), instructed Kašić to compile a grammar of vernacular Croatian for the use of the students. This he did and the first grammar of Croatian

<sup>4</sup> See THOMSON 2005: 104-117. The same factor played an important role in the debates on the use of the vernacular in the liturgy during the third period of the Council (1562-1563) and the Council's decision of 17 September 1562 merely states that although it is not appropriate for the vernacular to be used everywhere, each local church should retain its own rite, see *ibid.* 127-135.

<sup>5</sup> On these editions see KÖSTER 1995: 357-465.

<sup>6</sup> BIBLIOGRAFIA 1964: 443; 1965: 421-422.

<sup>7</sup> Glagolitic: KRUMMING 1995: no. 24; Cyrillic: BADALIĆ 1966: no. 103. The Glagolitic edition has more Italicisms than the Cyrillic as it was intended for Dalmatia, the latter for Serbia.

<sup>8</sup> BADALIĆ 1966: no. 176.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* no. 180.

appeared at Rome in 1604,<sup>10</sup> which earned for him the title of “Father of Croatian Grammar”.<sup>11</sup> The Society of Jesus had laid down that the grammar should be of the most widespread form of the language<sup>12</sup> and he had been at pains to give the forms which would be understood by all.<sup>13</sup> He thus did not choose his native čakavian but the more widely spoken štokavian in its ikavian variety and in this he was prescient since it was only in the mid nineteenth century that štokavian was finally accepted as the basis for both the Croatian and Serbian languages. From 1607 to 1609 he was confessor to the Croat pilgrims to Rome and in the latter year he was sent to Dubrovnik with the task of establishing a Jesuit house in the city. He remained there until November 1612 when he and a companion, disguised as merchants, undertook a missionary journey in the Ottoman Balkans<sup>14</sup>. They arrived back at Dubrovnik in June 1613 and Kašić went to Rome to report, after which he was appointed confessor to the Croat pilgrims to Loreto from 1614 to 1618, when Muzio Vitelleschi (1563-1645), the Jesuit General (1615-1645), instructed him to return to Dubrovnik to undertake a second missionary journey. Once again disguised as merchants, he and two companions left Dubrovnik on 20 August 1618 and only arrived back in the city on 25 February 1620,<sup>15</sup> where he remained for the next thirteen years.<sup>16</sup> In 1633 after Easter (27 March) he returned to Italy and in late 1634 or early 1635 he replaced Antonio (Antun) Ranzi, who had been Croat confessor at St. Peter’s in Rome from 1628 to 1634.<sup>17</sup> Kašić remained at Rome for most of the rest of his life and died there in 1650.

The question as to when Kašić began to translate the Bible is complicated by the fact that he gave varying accounts of his work on the translation. The sole incontrovertible fact is that his translation of the New Testament had been completed by 12 November 1631, when Archbishop Benedetto Bragadin of Corfu (1618-1658), passing through Dubrovnik on his way to make a *visitatio ad limina Apostolorum*, took Kašić’ translation of the New Testament with him to Rome when he left on that day.<sup>18</sup> Kašić’ earliest account is that in his memorandum sent

<sup>10</sup> *A.M.D.G. Institutionum Linguae Illyricae libri duo*. For a facsimile reprint see OLESCH 1977: 1-191.

<sup>11</sup> OLESCH 1977: XIV.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 4: *Quarè sapienter est a nostrae Societatis Moderatoribus constitutum, ut eius nationis lingua vernacula, quae apud plurimos populos latissime patet, addiscatur ab ijs, qui ad eos erudiendos idonei censeantur.*

<sup>13</sup> See *ibid.* 19.

<sup>14</sup> The principal source for his early life is his autobiography which he began to write in the year of his death (1650) at the age of seventy-six while already in declining health. Unfortunately he died when he had only reached the year 1625, ed. VANINO 1940: 12-140; on the period spent in Dubrovnik see *ibid.* 29-34; for the account of his journey in 1612-1613 see *ibid.* 34-56.

<sup>15</sup> For his account of this journey see *ibid.* 69-110.

<sup>16</sup> See *ibid.* 113.

<sup>17</sup> On Ranzi see WICKI 1986: 30-32. It is usually claimed that Kašić was Croat confessor at Loreto from 1633 to 1634 but his name appears in no list of confessors there or in any other Loreto source at that time, see *ibid.* 33, from which Wicki concludes that he probably remained at Rome after his return from Dubrovnik. That Kašić definitely did not go directly from Dubrovnik to Loreto is known from a note in the archives of the Holy Office to the effect that he was expected in Rome after Easter in 1633, ed. GOLUB 2000: 180. Kašić is the only Croat Jesuit ever to have been appointed confessor at St. Peter’s twice, see WICKI 1986: 28; on his two periods see *ibid.* 29 and 32-34.

<sup>18</sup> See the letter of that date from Archbishop Cellesi of Dubrovnik to the Propaganda, ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 107. The Propaganda acknowledged receipt on 2 January 1632, ed. *ibid.* 108; GOLUB 2000: 177, mistakenly dates the receipt to 8 August 1631.

to Cardinal Desiderio Scaglia (1569-1639), the commissary of the Holy Office in Rome (1616-1639), with a request for permission to have his translation of the New Testament published.<sup>19</sup> The memorandum itself is undated and it has been dated to 1634,<sup>20</sup> but that is impossible since Archbishop Tommaso Cellesi (Celesius, 1628-1633) of Dubrovnik is referred to as being alive, *il presente Monsignore Arcivescovo Tomaso Celesio*, whereas he died in November 1633. Moreover, since it makes no reference to the decision by Pope Urban VIII (1623-1644) at a meeting of the Holy Office on 23 June 1633 that the translation should not be printed until it had received the approval of the Holy Office,<sup>21</sup> it must be dated prior to that. In theory it could date from 1632 but in fact Kašić wrote it in 1633, as his autobiography reveals,<sup>22</sup> probably after his return to Italy, viz. in the period between April and June. In the memorandum to Scaglia Kašić stated that he had been requested twenty-three years previously, viz. in 1610, by Archbishop Fabio Tempestivo of Dubrovnik (1602-1616) and then again ten years previously, viz. in 1623, by Tempestivo's successor, Archbishop Vincenzo Lantero (1616-1628, †1649), to revise the passages of the Old and New Testaments found in missals and breviaries but since the earlier translations in both manuscripts and printed editions had been found defective and erroneous, it had been decided to make a fresh translation of the New Testament on the basis of the Vulgate. He had made the translation and then for six years it had been revised by a commission of theologians at Dubrovnik, who had compared it word for word with the Latin text and the result had then been approved by Lantero's successor, Archbishop Cellesi. Since Cellesi's approval is dated 26 July 1631<sup>23</sup> this implies that the commission met from 1625 to 1631.

The fact that Kašić began his translation of the New Testament in 1623 is confirmed by his autobiography, in which he quotes *in extenso* two letters from the Jesuit General Vitelleschi, dated 24 December 1622 and 8 July 1623 respectively, and it is precisely between these two quotations that he states that it was then that he began work on his translation of the New Testament.<sup>24</sup> The fact that the autobiography reveals that he began the translation in 1623 in turn confirms that his memorandum to Scaglia was written in 1633 and not in 1632. That the

<sup>19</sup> His memorandum ed. GOLUB 2000: 179, and HORVAT 1992-93: 187-188. The latter, *ibid.* 187, considered that the memorandum had been sent to the prefect of the Holy Office, Cardinal Francesco Barberini (1597-1679), but the addressee is specified in the copy in the archives of the Holy Office edited by Golub.

<sup>20</sup> See HORVAT 1992-1993: 187.

<sup>21</sup> The decision ed. GOLUB 2000: 170; on the meeting see *ibid.* 133-135.

<sup>22</sup> On this see below.

<sup>23</sup> There are several copies of Cellesi's approbation which all vary slightly but in no way affect the date, which is the same in all of them: *Datum Ragusii die 20 Iulii 1631*, see the copy in Kašić Bible, ed. ROTHE 1999: 460; that in the Propaganda archives, ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 107; that in the Holy Office archives, ed. GOLUB 2000: 176; for a critical edition see THOMSON 2005: 196.

<sup>24</sup> See his autobiography, ed. VANINO 1940: 122: *Hoc tempore coepit scribere universam sacri Novi Testamenti Scripturam Dalmatico eloquio.*

Propaganda knew that in 1623 he had begun work on this project is clear from the fact that when on 24 December 1623 the Bosnian Franciscan Paolo (Pavao) Papić (1593-after 1643) offered his services for the translation of the Bible he was informed on 10 January 1624 that they were not required as someone else was already engaged upon the task.<sup>25</sup>

In 1625 the Propaganda sent instructions to Kašić via Archbishop Lantero to extend the project to the entire Bible by selecting the texts in early Illyrian codices and revising them on the basis of the Vulgate. Although these instructions have not been traced, the fact that they were sent in 1625 is known from Kašić' petition to Pope Urban VIII in 1644, requesting permission for his translation to be published. In it he states that the Propaganda's instructions had been sent nineteen years previously, viz. in 1625, and that the task had taken him eight years to complete, viz. 1633.<sup>26</sup> Confirmation that the instructions were issued by the Propaganda in 1625 is provided by the title of the sole manuscript with part of Kašić' translation in his own hand.<sup>27</sup> The earliest published evidence that the translation of the entire Bible had been completed is the preface to his Croatian translation of the *Rituale Romanum*, which appeared at Rome in 1640. In the preface, which is dated 15 August 1636, he states that he has translated not only the *Rituale* but also all of the Bible, both the Old and New Testaments:

*Hochiu yosc, datti nà znanye Poctovanim Popovom, i Pastirom od dùscà, dàsam ne sàmo prineslào ù nasc yezik ovim govorom opchëniyim Ritual ovij Rimski, neggo takòyer i sfà Sfeta Pijsma, Stàroga, i Novoga Zakonna: sfe, sctòye ù Biblij upijsano, i potvardyeno od Sfetoga Oça Pape.*<sup>28</sup>

The Bible authorized by the Pope to which he refers is, of course, the Sixto-Clementine Vulgate, not his translation. That the translation had been completed by 1633 is also supported by the evidence of the manuscripts of his Bible. All three MSS with parts of the translation have dates recording when a particular section was finished. Those in the sole manuscript with part of the translation in Kašić' own hand, viz. the first volume of the Zagreb codex, are of 1631, and those in the other two volumes of this codex are of 1632 and 1635-36 respectively,

<sup>25</sup> See von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 1994: 192, n. 6. Papić had gone to Rome to report on the Franciscan mission to Bosnia, see PANDŽIĆ 1965: 211-234.

<sup>26</sup> Ed. STOJKOVIĆ 1919: 205-206; von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 1994: 201, n. 35; EADEM 2000: 118-119, and HORVAT 1992-93: 207.

<sup>27</sup> Viz. the first of the three volumes of *codex R3613* in the Croatian National and University Library at Zagreb with the Pentateuch. The title reads: *Ordo librorum Veteris Testamenti. Genesis. Exodus. Leviticus. Numeri. Deuteronomium. Versio Illyrica Selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag. Fide. Anno 1625*, see BAŠIĆ 2000: 7. The fact that the text of the title from *seu Declaratio* on was added later as the ink is less faded does not diminish its credibility as a source.

<sup>28</sup> *Rituale Romanum Urbani VIII. Pont. Max. iussi editum illyrica lingua. Ritual Rimski istomaccen slovinski po Bartolomeu Kassichiu Popu Bogoslovçu od Druxbae Yesusovae Penitenciru Apostolskomu. Rome 1640*. See the preface in the facsimile reprint ed. HORVAT 1993: ++3\*-++1\*, see ++4\*. The dialect of Croatian to which he refers is the same as that in his grammar of 1604, viz. štokavian in its ikavian form, which contrasts with the dialect of his Biblical translation which is štokavian in its ijekavian form with only a few ikavisms, see the text edited on the basis of the Zagreb codex in ROTHE 1999: 5-681.

while the dates in the Odessa codex are all of 1632 and in the Zadar codex of 1632, 1635 and 1636.<sup>29</sup> It has been claimed that these dates indicate the time of translation,<sup>30</sup> but this is clearly incorrect if only for the reason that the third Zagreb volume with the dates 15 September 1635 (4<sup>v</sup>) and 30 May 1636 (80<sup>v</sup>) has the New Testament, which was sent to Rome in 1631. The codices are obviously fair copies of the translation and not the original manuscripts. That fair copies were indeed made is known from a letter which Archbishop Cellesi sent to the Propaganda on 16 March 1631, in which he referred to the fact that a fair copy of the New Testament was to be made.<sup>31</sup>

The chronology according to the above sources is thus that prior to 1623 Kašić had done some work on comparing the earlier translations of liturgical readings but in that year it had been decided to make a translation of the entire New Testament. In 1625 the Propaganda had issued instructions that the work should include the both the Old and the New Testaments and in the same year a commission had been established to check his rendering of the New Testament. The New Testament had been sent to Rome in 1631 and Kašić had finished his work on the entire Bible in 1633.

It is Kašić' first petition to Pope Urban VIII of early 1634 requesting permission for his translation of the New Testament to be published that causes the chronological problem with regard to when he actually began the translation.<sup>32</sup> In it he states that the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* had been informed that the *Natio Slavonica seu Illyrica* had long had the missal and breviary in the vernacular but that they had not had a faithful Biblical translation and all the versions in circulation not only varied considerably from the authorised Vulgate text but also contained errors, in addition to which heretical Protestant versions were also in circulation. For these reasons the Propaganda had instructed successive archbishops of Dubrovnik to have both the Old and the New Testaments revised and corrected on the basis of the Vulgate. This revision had been entrusted to Kašić, who had taken twelve years to complete it. For six years a commission of theologians mandated by the archbishops had revised the translation of the New Testament and two years previously Archbishop Cellesi had approved it and sent it to Rome, where Archbishop Pietro Massarechi of Bar (1624-1634) on a *visitatio ad limina*

<sup>29</sup> See BAŠIĆ 2000: 8-10. On the other two volumes of the Zagreb codex which are also of the 17th century but were copied by different hands, see *ibid.* 7-9. The second contains in the correct Vulgate order the books Ezra to Ecclesiasticus; the third has the New Testament. The same books as in the second volume are also found in *codex 10/5* of the 17th century in Odessa Central Library, on which see *ibid.* 10. The only other MS traced is *codex 58* in the Chapter Library of St. Anastasia's Cathedral at Zadar, which contains Joshua, Judges, Ruth, parts of 1 and 2 Samuel and 1(3) Kings, Job, part of the Psalms, and the Song of Songs. It was copied by five hands, most of it in 1788; on it see *ibid.* 9.

<sup>30</sup> BAŠIĆ 2000: 13.

<sup>31</sup> See the excerpt, ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 106. In their reply of 17 May the Propaganda refer to the fair copy, see the excerpt, ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 1994: 193, and EADEM 2000: 106.

<sup>32</sup> His petition, ed. VANINO 1942: 69; von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 1994: 195-196; EADEM 2000: 116, and HORVAT 1992-93: 180, 182.

*Apostolorum* had also approved it on 17 March 1633.<sup>33</sup> The petition is undated and the statement that Cellesi had sent the translation to Rome two years previously theoretically dates the petition to late 1633 or early 1634 and that dating has been proposed.<sup>34</sup> However, in mentioning Massarechi's approbation Kašić refers to 1633 as past<sup>35</sup> and the fact that it is of early 1634 is further borne out by a note on the reverse in the hand of Francesco Ingoli (1578-1649), the secretary to the Propaganda, to the effect that the petition had been received from the Holy Office and that the translation had been sent to the cardinal of Cremona, viz. Scaglia, in June or July 1634.<sup>36</sup> Just as in the memorandum to Scaglia, Kašić states that the commission revising his translation of the New Testament met over a six-year period and since Archbishop Cellesi approved it in 1631 this again implies that it met from 1625 to 1631. However, in the memorandum of the commission, which was sent together with the New Testament to Rome on 12 November 1631 and read out at a meeting of the Propaganda on 23 December, the commission stated that they had revised the translation several times over five years.<sup>37</sup> The picture is made even more obscure by the fact that in a memorandum from Archbishop Cellesi read at the meeting of the Propaganda on 22 November 1632 the Archbishop stated that the commission had met over a period of three years.<sup>38</sup> The reason for this discrepancy is unclear but the issue does not affect the dates when Kašić began or finished his translation.

Kašić's reference to a twelve-year period is, however, a more serious discrepancy, the precise meaning of which requires closer examination. In the petition Kašić clearly states that he had taken twelve years to translate the entire Bible after the Propaganda had issued the instructions to do so,<sup>39</sup> which is impossible since that would mean that he finished in 1637, whereas the petition was written in 1634. It is clear that Kašić had infelicitously worded his petition and for this reason the twelve-year period has quite reasonably been interpreted to mean the time which elapsed between the commencement of the translation and the submission of the petition. Since the petition was submitted in 1634 preference has often given to 1622 as the year in which he started work on the translation.<sup>40</sup> In support of this

<sup>33</sup> See the approbation, ed. ROTHE 1999: 460; von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 109, and HORVAT 1992-93: 196.

<sup>34</sup> See VANINO 1942: 69, n. 33, and HORVAT 1992-93: 180.

<sup>35</sup> See his petition, ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 1994: 196; EADEM 2000: 116, and HORVAT 1992-93: 180: *Romae pariter 1633 anno idem opus ut valde necessarium et perutile ab archiepiscopo Antibarensi [...] comprobatum fuit.*

<sup>36</sup> See the note ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 116, and HORVAT 1992-93: 182.

<sup>37</sup> Ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 116.

<sup>38</sup> Ed. HORVAT 1992-93: 177-178, see 177; GOLUB 2000: 180, and von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 109.

<sup>39</sup> See his petition, ed. von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 1994: 195; EADEM 2000: 116, and HORVAT 1992-93: 180, 182: *Ut igitur hisce malis nuper sibi delatis Sacra Congregatio de propaganda fide occurreret, dedit in mandatis Archiepiscopis Ragusinis, ut Vetus et Novum Testamentum Illyricum, hoc est, Biblia Sacra universa recenseri et ad normam latini Vulgati corrigi curarent\*. Praestiterunt hoc illi per P. Bartholomaeum Cassium Dalmatam, theologum ac Societatis Iesu professum, utriusque linguae satis peritum, qui utilem omnino navavit operam per duodennium in opere seligendo, concinnando et perficiendo.* \*Horvat incorrectly gives *curaret*.

<sup>40</sup> For example, DEROSI 1994: 293; von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 1994: 195, n. 19; EADEM 2000: 99, n. 3; KATIČIĆ 2000: 60; STOJKOVIĆ 1919: 198; ŠVELEC 1994: 56.

another piece of evidence has been adduced, viz. the conjecture by the Jesuit Giovanni Maria Mattei (Ivan Maria Matijašević, 1714-1791) that Kašić had made two translations of the New Testament, one between 1622 and 1625 and another later after he had received the instructions from the Propaganda in 1625:

*Dicendo poi il Cassio nei suoi commentarii d'aver tradotto due volte il N. Testamento: "quam P. Cassius Dalmaticam fecit bis", congetturo, che dal 1622 fino al 1625 facesse una traduzione da se stesso nella lingua allora usuale e più commune nella Dalmazia [...]. Che indi ricevuto la commissione della Congregazione di Propaganda circa il 1625 in un col Testamento vecchio traducesse per la seconda volta il nuovo, o per meglio dire, scegliesse dalle antiche traduzioni quel tanto che meglio li sembrava et alla volgare l'accomodasse.*<sup>41</sup>

Mattei clearly based his conjecture upon his acquaintance with Kašić' then unpublished autobiography, in which Kašić wrote:

*Hoc tempore coepit scribere universam sacri Novi Testamenti Scripturam Dalmatico eloquio, quam s. Hieronymus, Dalmata, hortante sancto Damaso Papa latino stilo cum Graeco textu concordem effecit, quamque catholica universalis Romana Ecclesia ut sacram autenticam comprobavit typisque in Vaticano Pontificio palatio editam in lucem universitati fidelium omnibusque nationibus catholicam, emendatissimamque proposuit ac declaravit unam unicamque explosis caeteris quibuscumque ab acatholicis novatoribus confictis, quam P. Cassius Dalmaticam fecit bis.*<sup>42</sup>

However, in this context *bis* is not being used in the sense of "twice" but in that of "for a second time", viz. after St Jerome's Latin translation. Kašić' reasoning is clear: 1. both Jerome and Kašić were Dalmatians; 2. both translated the Bible; 3. both translations were in accordance with Catholic doctrine; 4. both were intended to counter heretical translations which were in circulation. Preference must be given to the evidence of both Kašić' memorandum to Scaglia and his autobiography that he began his translation in the first half of 1623 and the twelve-year period mentioned in his infelicitously worded petition of 1634 is probably the result of the fact that – as the dates in the MSS of his Bible reveal – work was still proceeding on the preparation of fair copies and hence Kašić counted the years from 1623 to 1634 inclusively.<sup>43</sup>

To sum up: Kašić began the translation in 1623 and finished it 1633. He had, however, examined and compared the Biblical readings in Glagolitic missals and

<sup>41</sup> See the excerpt of his unpublished *Annotazioni al precedente Memoriale*, ed. STOJKOVIĆ 1919: 206, and von ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ 2000: 105, n. 35.

<sup>42</sup> See the autobiography ed. VANINO 1940: 122. Already in his petition to the Pope in 1634 Kašić had stated that his translation was justified as heretical translations were circulating, see above. The Hieronymian theory of the origin of the Glagolitic rite had a considerable influence on the debates about the use of the vernacular at the time of the Council of Trent, see THOMSON 2005: 96-97, 106-109, 113, 119, 142-148.

<sup>43</sup> Why HANNICK 2000: 71, asserts that Kašić began his translation of the Bible in 1620 and completed it in 1625 is unclear since it contradicts virtually all of the evidence.



breviaries before he began his translation and continued to have fair copies made after he had finished it. In addition both the Zagreb and Odessa codices at various places have the gloss *prigledah* with the date 1642<sup>44</sup> so that it is reasonable to conclude that he continued to revise his translation from time to time after he had completed it.

#### LITERATURE

- BADALIĆ, J. 1966. *Jugoslavica usque ad annum MDC. Bibliographie der süd-slawischen Frühdrucke*. Baden-Baden: Heitz (Bibliotheca bibliographica Aureliana, 2).
- BAŠIĆ, P. 2000. Die Handschriften. Rothe, H., C. Hannick (Edd.). *Biblia sacra. Versio illyrica selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag: Fide. Anno 1625*, 2 vols. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh (Biblia Slavica. Serie IV: Südslavische Bibeln, 2, I-II), II, 7-57.
- BIBLIOGRAFIA. 1964 and 1965. *Bibliografia literatury polskiej. "Nowy Korbut"*. *Piśmennictwo staropolskie*, ed. R. Pollak, vols. II-III. Warszawa: Państwowy instytut wydawniczy.
- CONCILIUM 1911 and 1916. *Concilium Tridentinum. Diariorum, actorum, epistularum, tractatum nova collectio*, ed. Societas Goerresiana, vols. V and X. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.
- DEROSSO, J. 1994. Salomonova Pjesma nad pjesmama u Kašićevu prijevodu Biblije. (Zadarski rukopis). Kolumbić, N. (Ed.). *Život i djelo Bartola Kašića. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa u povodu 340. obljetnice Kašićeve smrti. Zadar-Pag, 18-21. travnja 1991*. Zadar: Općina Pag i Hrvatsko filološko društvo Zadar (Izdanja Hrvatskoga filološkog društva, 5), 293-317.
- ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ, E. VON 1994. Warum wurde die Bibelübersetzung von Bartol Kašić nicht gedruckt? Zur Ergänzung der Quellenlage. Kolumbić, N. (Ed.). *Život i djelo Bartola Kašića. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa u povodu 340. obljetnice Kašićeve smrti. Zadar-Pag, 18-21. travnja 1991*. Zadar: Općina Pag i Hrvatsko filološko društvo Zadar (Izdanja Hrvatskoga filološkog društva, 5), 191-204.
- ERDMANN-PANDŽIĆ, E. VON 2000. Der gescheiterte Drucklegungsversuch der Kašić Bibel. Eine Dokumentation. Rothe, H., C. Hannick (Edd.). *Biblia*

<sup>44</sup> See BAŠIĆ 2000: 8 and 10.

- sacra. Versio illyrica selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag: Fide. Anno 1625*, 2 vols. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh (Biblia Slavica. Serie IV: Südslavische Bibeln, 2, I-II), II, 99-129.
- GOLUB, I. 2000. Quellen zur Bibel Kašićs im Archiv des heiligen Offiziums. Rothe, H., C. Hannick (Edd.). *Biblia sacra. Versio illyrica selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag: Fide. Anno 1625*, 2 vols. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh (Biblia Slavica. Serie IV: Südslavische Bibeln, 2, I-II), II, 131-196.
- HANNICK, C. 2000. Zur Textgestalt der Bibelübersetzung des Bartol Kašić. Rothe, H., C. Hannick (Edd.). *Biblia sacra. Versio illyrica selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag: Fide. Anno 1625*, 2 vols. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh (Biblia Slavica. Serie IV: Südslavische Bibeln, 2, I-II), II, 71-90.
- HORVAT, V. 1992-93. Bartol Kašić u obranu svoga prijevoda hrvatske Biblije: Apologija hrvatske Biblije, O raznim slavenskim prijevodima Svetoga Pisma, Korolariji, prigovori i odgovori. *Vrela i prinosi 19*: 163-216.
- HORVAT, V. (Ed.) 1993. *Ritual rimski po Bartolomeu Kassichu od Druxbae Yesusovae*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost (Bibliofilska izdanja, 26).
- KATIČIĆ, R. 2000. Über die Sprache der Kašićschen Bibelübersetzung. Rothe, H., C. Hannick (Edd.). *Biblia sacra. Versio illyrica selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag: Fide. Anno 1625*, 2 vols. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh (Biblia Slavica. Serie IV: Südslavische Bibeln, 2, I-II), II, 59-69
- KÖSTER, U. 1995. *Studien zu den katholischen deutschen Bibelübersetzungen im 16., 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Münster: Aschendorff (Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, 134).
- KRUMING, A. 1995. *Svodny katalog staropechatnykh izdaniy glagolicheskogo shrifta 1483-1812 gg*. Moskva: Rossiyskaya gosudarstvennaya biblioteka.
- OLESCH, R. 1977. *Institutiones Linguae Illyricae*. Cologne: Böhlau (Slavistische Forschungen, 21).
- PANDŽIĆ, B. 1965. Relatio de Provincia Bosnae Argentinae O.F.M. an. 1623 S. Congregationi de Propaganda Fide exhibita. *Radovi Hrvatskoga povijesnog*

- instituta u Rimu 1-2: 211-234.*
- ROTHE, H., C. HANNICK (Edd.) 1999-2000. *Biblia sacra. Versio illyrica selecta, seu Declaratio Vulgatae Editionis Latinae. Bartholomaei Cassij Curictensis e Societate Iesu Professi, ac Sacerdotis Theologi. Ex mandato Sacrae Congregationis de propag: Fide. Anno 1625*, 2 vols. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh (Biblia Slavica. Serie IV: Südslavische Bibeln, 2, I-II).
- STOJKOVIĆ, M. 1919. Bartuo Kašić D. I. Pažanin. (1575-1650). Prilog za njegov život i književni rad. *Rad Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti* 220, 170-263.
- ŠVELEC, F. 1994. Pitanja jezika i pisma Propagandinih izdanja u sklopu Kašićevih jezikoslovnih intencija. Kolumbić, N. (Ed.). *Život i djelo Bartola Kašića. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa u povodu 340. obljetnice Kašićeve smrti. Zadar-Pag, 18-21. travnja 1991.* Zadar: Općina Pag i Hrvatsko filološko društvo Zadar (Izdanja Hrvatskoga filološkog društva, 5), 51-60.
- THOMSON, F. J. 2005. The Legacy of SS. Cyril and Methodius in the Counter-Reformation. The Council of Trent and the Question of Scripture and Liturgy in the Vernacular, together with an Account of the Subsequent Consequences for the Slavo-Latin (Glagolitic) Rite and the Bible in Croatian Translation. E. Konstantinou (Hrsg.). *Methodios und Kyrillos in ihrer europäischen Dimension.* Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 2005 (Philhellenische Studien 9), 85-246.
- VANINO, M. 1940. *Autobiografija Bartola Kašića.* Zagreb, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (Gradja za povijest književnosti hrvatske, 15).
- VANINO, M. 1942. Le P. Barthélemy Kašić (1575-1650). Données nouvelles et travaux récents. *Archivum historicum Societatis Jesu* 11: 83-97.
- WICKI, J., M. KORADE 1986. Hrvatski penetencijari u Rimu od 1596. do 1773. *Vrela i prinosi* 16: 23-49.

## S u m m a r y

Kašić began his translation of the Bible into vernacular Croatian in 1623, although he had examined and compared the Biblical readings in Glagolitic missals and breviaries prior to that. He finished his translation ten years later in 1633, although he continued to revise it at least until the early 1640s.

Key words: Bartol Kašić, Bible in Croatian

## S a ž e t a k

### KADA JE BARTOL KAŠIĆ POČEO I ZAVRŠIO SVOJ PRIJEVOD BIBLIJE NA HRVATSKI

Kašić je počeo svoj prijevod Biblije na hrvatski jezik 1623. god., iako je i prije toga provjeravao i uspoređivao biblijska čitanja u glagoljskim misalima i brevijarima. Završio je svoj prijevod nakon deset godina, 1633., ali ga je nastavio revidirati najmanje do ranih 40-ih godina 17. st.

Ključne riječi: Bartol Kašić, Biblija na hrvatskom jeziku

*Izvorni znanstveni članak*

*Autor: Francis J. Thomson,  
professor emeritus, University of Antwerp*