Dennis Brown, Saint Jerome as a Biblical Exegete

Questions from, or allusions to, the works of the Church Fathers are sometimes found in introductions to commentaries on biblical books. But, in the same way that recent critical research has stressed that biblical quotations cannot be properly understood without reference to the theological, social and cultural context from which they come, it is beginning to be realised that quotations from the Church Fathers cannot be lifted arbitrarily from the pages of Migné or the Corpus Christianorum , but must be placed in their proper context. It is the purpose of this paper to set out, in a systematic form, the background and principles of exegesis used by St. Jerome, the greatest biblical scholar of the 4th century. /1

Two facets of the personality of Jerome are of vital importance to a proper understanding of his exegesis - his love of knowledge and his search for the holy life. Jerome's education was the best that could be had. Instead of sending him for his secondary education to a grammar school in or near Stridon, his wealthy parents /2 sent him to Rome, the capital of the Empire, to be trained by one of the most famous teachers of his day, Aelius Donatus. /3 Under his tutelage Jerome became immersed in classical studies, and developed a real flair for rhetoric. In his later works, Jerome quotes from the classical authors on almost every page, and rhetorical flourishes are often seen, especially in his polemical works.

Jerome's search for the holy life started at about the time his schooldays finished (c365 AD, aged about 20). Shortly after he left Rome, he joined an ascetic community in the desert of Chalcis, near Antioch, where he supported himself "by the daily labour of my hands and of my own sweat." /4 Jerome left this community after about two years, but he never lost his desire to become as close to God as possible through the ascetic life. When Jerome returned to Rome in

382AD, he was able to work out a programme of asceticism, /5 which was to be put into practice later at Bethlehem. /6 Jerome's theology of asceticism was both christological and eschatological. It was christological in that Christ, the true Son of God, is the model for the ascetic life. It was eschatological in that the perfect life is the life of heaven, and therefore the ascetic life is one which will be perfected only after the parousia of the lord of history. These two thrusts are manifested in a life of renunciation and virginity. /7

These two facets of Jerome's personality, his love of knowledge and his search for the holy life, found their fulfilment in the study of the bible. The bible was God's book and was therefore holy, and could give directions as to how to live a holy, ascetic life. It also contained many mysteries and "hard sayings", so that it required constant and untiring study in order to understand it properly. It is Jerome's methods of studying the bible to which we must now turn.

Before one could interpret the text of the bible aright, one had to know exactly what that text said. This meant that one had to have a good knowledge of the languages of the bible, Greek and Hebrew, and also a knowledge of the science of textual criticism. As far as the NT was concerned, Jerome encountered no problems, for he had learnt Greek at school, and had attended the Greek lectures of Gregory of Nazianzus in Constantinople. /8 But for the text of the OT, Jerome was faced with considerable difficulties for, apart from Origen in the 3rd century, no other Christian scholar had known any Hebrew.

The reason for this is not difficult to find. When Christianity arose out of Judaism, it inherited the biblical text which the Jews had used, the Septuagint. This Greek version had become hallowed by three centuries of Christian usage, and no need was felt to go beyond this text to the Hebrew original. Indeed from the second century onwards Christians began to base their use of the LXX on the argument from apostolicity. Jesus and the disciples, it was argued, when they quoted scripture, had used the LXX and not the Hebrew text. This argument lent

the LXX a high degree of authority, and from this stemmed a belief in the inspiration of the LXX equal (if not superior) to that of the Hebrew original. So Origen believed that the LXX was divinely inspired. /9 Although Origen, as a scholar, knew that the Hebrew text was the original one, he never moved away from the accepted position of the Church that the LXX was the Christian OT. Origen did study the Hebrew text, but his primary purpose in doing so was as a polemical tool since, with the knowledge this study gave him, he would be better equipped to combat the arguments of the Jews. /10

For Jerome, however, there was another reason for studying Hebrew. He took his first Hebrew lessons from a Jewish convert to Christianity while he was in the desert of Chalcia, and says:

> When I was a young man, walled in by the loneliness of the desert, I was unable to resist the temptations of vice and the hot passions of my nature. Although I tried to crush them with repeated fasting my mind was in a turmoil with sinful thoughts. To bring it under control, I ....set myself to learn an alphabet and strove to pronounce hissing, breath-taking words. /11

This rhetorical piece, however, is written with the benefit of hindsight, (it was composed in 411) and it is likely that Jerome's natural intellectual curiosity and his perception of the place of Hebrew in exegesis played just as large a part in his decision to learn Hebrew as did his ascetic motives.

It is clear from Jerome's account that he found Hebrew a difficult language to learn. This is evident when we remember that the structure of Hebrew was very different from that of Latin or Greek, and that no grammars, concordances or dictionaries existed to assist Jerome in his studies. He says of his Hebrew studies:

> What labour I spent on this task, what difficulties I went through, how often

> I despaired and how often I gave up and
> in my eagerness to learn, started again.
> /12

The question of just how extensive was Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew is very difficult to answer. The modern scholarly consensus seems to point to the conclusion that, when Jerome is compared with other Hebrew scholars who came before him like Origen and Philo, Jerome is seen to have a very much more profound grasp of the Hebrew language. If Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew is compared with our modern knowledge of Hebrew, then many faults show up in Jerome's work, but this method of working, used by some early 20th century scholars, is anachronistic and any judgments based on it are worthless. Jerome must always be studied in his own context and must not be viewed through twentieth century eyes.

One way in which Jerome's good working knowledge of Hebrew is shown is in the fact that he undertook to translate the OT from the Hebrew. Even bearing in mind the previous Greek translations of Theodotion, Symmachus and especially Aquila, which would have helped him considerably, Jerome's own translation was a remarkable achievement, especially when it is noted that it is generally a good and faithful rendering.

Another indication that Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew was far superior to that of any of his predecessors is that he was able to recognize various features of Hebrew style, especially assonance. One example of this is at the call of Jeremiah, where Jerome explains the play on words between שָׁקֵד (shaqed; Latin nux, "nut-tree") and שֹׁקֵד (shoqed; Latin vigilia, "watch"), obvious in Hebrew, but not apparent in translation. The attention to detail is characteristic of Jerome's approach to Hebrew and to the matter of translation on the whole.

Once Jerome had acquired the ability to read the bible in its original languages, his next task was to decide which was the most accurate text. With numerous variant readings in many manuscripts, this was a very

difficult task. /13 But here Jerome could count on the work of his predecessor, Origen, who has in his Hexapla taken over from classical times a number of critical sigla, to indicate where the LXX text differed from that of the Hebrew, and had made some observations on text criticism. Jerome voiced the desire of every text critic when he said that he wished to remove the transmissional errors in the biblical text and establish a trustworthy text. /14

Jerome's commentaries are a treasure-store of comments on various principles of textual criticism. /15 He refers frequently, for instance, to the effect of punctuation on the understanding of a passage. /16 In these cases, he often comments on the given interpretation if it is familiar to his readers, and then goes on to show what he thinks is the correct punctuation, commenting on it. Jerome often mentions that similar letters can easily be confused. In Hebrew, for example, the letters resh (cf English letter "r") and daleth (cf English letter "d") are, Jerome says, only distinguished by a small apex, /17 and the letters waw (cf English "w") and yod (cf English "y") only differ in size. /18 Examples like these suggest that Jerome was well aware of the causes and kinds of error which could appear in a biblical manuscript and, by and large, the criteria he uses to make a judgment between two variants are those which are employed by modern textual critics, viz, the antiquity of the manuscripts, /19 intrinsic probability /20 , and transcriptional probability /21. Jerome's excellence as a textual critic was unmatched in the early Church, even by Origen.

Only after Jerome had thus established the biblical text by translating it from the original languages and by exercizing the principles of textual criticism, could he move on to the more important task of interpreting the biblical words for his readers. The major part of Jerome's literary output is in commentary form, and he spent most of his life composing major commentaries on most of the books of the OT (and especially the prophets) and on some of the NT books. It is to the exegetical methods he used in these commentaries that we now turn.

The aim of a commentary, for Jerome, was "to discuss what is obscure, to touch on the obvious, to dwell at length on what is doubtful." /22 Scripture, to Jerome, was full of obscurities /23 and a reliable guide is needed. A commentary ought always to

> Repeat the opinions of the many...so that the judicious reader, when he has perused the different explanations.....may judge which is the best, and, like a good banker, reject the money from a spurious mint.
>
> /24

In most of his commentaries, Jerome acknowledges the previous authors from whom he has borrowed, and it could almost be said that Jerome's commentaries are nothing but a compendium of portions culled from the works of others.

In the fourth century Church, there were two predominant exegetical schools, those at Antioch and Alexandria. The Antiochene school was founded as a reaction against the allegorising interpretation of Alexandria, and emphasized the literal meaning of the biblical text. It can be shown that Jerome borrowed some of the principles of both schools in the formulation of his own exegetical method.

One of the foremost exponents of the Antiochene school was Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose nickname "the interpreter" suggests the motivating force of his life - interpretation of the bible. He set down what he saw as the exegete's task: "I judge the exegete's task to be to explain words that most people find difficult... he must give the meaning and do it concisely." Sometimes though precision may not be possible, especially when he must deal with passages "which have been corrupted by the wiles of heretics." /25 This is very similar to Jerome's statement which was quoted above, and, like Jerome, Theodore's method is to comment on a book verse by verse, only pausing on difficult passages, or where a theological point is at issue. His most interesting exegetical work is the Commentary on Psalms, in which

considerable attention is paid to textual criticism, and, although Theodore did not know Hebrew himself, he was convinced that a knowledge of "the language the prophet actually spoke" was essential. Generally, he relied on the LXX but, realizing that no one translation was adequate to convey the meaning of the original, he also used other Greek versions, notably that of Symmachus.

Jerome gave a real value to the literal sense of scripture. Even in his very first piece of exegesis on the call of Isaiah Jerome begins with a strictly historical exposition of "who this Uzziah was, how many years he had reigned and who among the other kings were his contemporaries" /27 as well as the dating of the passage. Only after this does Jerome move on to the spiritual interpretation of the passage.

Again in the Commentary on Ephesians, composed in 388, Jerome interprets

> Therefore it is said,
> "Awake, O sleeper, and arise from
> the dead,
> and Christ shall give you light"
> (5.14)

by explaining that the words were spoken to Adam who was buried at Calvary where Christ was crucified. The place was called Calvary because the head of some ancient man had been buried there and because, when Christ was crucified, he was hanging directly above the place where it was buried. /28 G. GrUtzmacher, Jerome's biographer, argued plausibly that in this commentary Jerome was mainly dependent on the work of Apollinarius of Laodicea. /29

In the Commentary on Malachi, written in 406, Jerome criticizes Origen's almost complete neglect of the literal sense;

> He does not pay any attention to the historia but spends all his time on the allegorical interpretation.
> /30

In Jerome's last unfinished commentary on Jeremiah, his

criticisms of Origen's interpretations are more severe than ever before (he refers to Origen as "the mad allegorist" /31), while his own interpretation is mainly historical.

However, while Jerome followed the Antiochene school of exegesis in believing that the plain words of the text had great value, he realized that Christians must go beyond the literal meaning for behind them lay the fuller, deeper meaning of the passage. One could understand this deeper or hidden meaning with the aid of the spiritual or allegorical method.

The allegorical method had had a long history of development in Alexandria, culminating in the interpretative method of Philo. This was adapted for Christianity and further refined by Clement, who was the first Christian scholar to formulate the doctrine that the text of scripture contains a hidden meaning everywhere. Mysteries have been hidden in the bible for the benefit of intellectual Christians and to disguise some doctrines which would prove disturbing for simple Christians. /32 Clement's pupil and successor, Origen, is the most famous exponent of the allegorical method, and his influence on the exegesis of the following centuries was enormous.

When we study Jerome's use of the allegorical method we see an interesting phenomenon. Many of Jerome's specific allegorical interpretations are taken directly from Origen, even to the extent of verbal borrowing, But the meaning attached to the technical terminology Jerome uses to describe the spiritual or allegorical sense is not usually that of the Alexandrian school. The terms typus and aenigma show this clearly.

Typus only occurs rarely in the writings of Clement and Origen, and, when it does, it usually has no specific exegetical significance. /33 Among the Antiochene Fathers however it has more importance. Theodore of Mopsuestia with whose works Jerome may have been familiar developed a "theology of typology" in his Commentary on Jonah. A type has three characteristics:

First, it bears a resemblance to the object of which it is the image; second, the persons involved derive profit from it, and this is an indication of the benefits in the future promises; third, it contains the firm belief that the future reality will be of greater importance than the present image. /34 Theodore finds examples of this in OT incidents like the smearing of blood on the doorposts at the Exodus from Egypt, which was a type of Christian liberation from sin and death by Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. Jerome discusses types at various places in his commentaries, but especially at Galatians 4. 22-24. He mentions Paul's use of the figures of mounts Sinai and Sion as types of Sarah and Hagar. Jerome then says that Isaac is a type of Christ, and Leah and Rachel are types of the Church and Synagogue respectively. He continues:

> For what the type shows is only a part. If indeed the whole meaning is given in the earlier type, it is no longer then a type but should be described as the truth of history. (The Latin runs: Typus enim partem indicat, quod si totum praecedat in typo iam non est typus, sed historiae veritas appellanda est)
>
> /35

This is very similar to Theodore's stress on the need for a type to have a clear object or anti-type.

The term aenigma was compared by Origen with parabola. What they both have in common is that both describe things as having happened which did not happen. They differ in that what is described in a parable is capable of historical realisation whereas what is described in an enigma is not, for an enigma is a deep saying, signifying something hidden and inexpressible. /36 A different view is seen in the Antiochene exegete, Diodore of Tarsus, who distinguishes between an enigma and an allegory. For Diodore, enigmas are real entities which belong to the order of visible things and which contain hidden meanings. /37

In Jerome's writings, aenigma is frequently

associated with parabola. Both are obscure and both use figurative language. /38 Elsewhere, however, Jerome, while implying that parables give an obscure clue to the truth, classifies them with similies as the rhetoricians do. /39 So it is implied, if never explicitly stated, that parables and enigmas are not synonymous terms. So far this sounds rather like the meaning of enigma in Origen. But another passage shows us how Jerome really thought of aenigma. In a long section dealing with the legitimacy of the works of Pythagoras, Plato, Empedocles and other classical authors and their use by Christians, Jerome quotes from the enigmas to which Aristotle referred:

> There are enigmas which Aristotle has very diligently collated in his works /40

From this, and the examples of the enigma he quotes from Aristotle, we may infer that Jerome, trained as a classicist, understood and used the term aenigma in his works from the standpoint of a grammarian. He is not concerned with the philosophic question of whether an enigma has any inherent reality. Here Jerome shows a certain independence from the two exegetical schools and, for once, does not follow either the Alexandrians or the Antiochenes.

As we mentioned earlier, many of Jerome's specific allegorical interpretations are taken over from Origen's commentaries. This is the case before the Origenist controversy in which Jerome played a leading part (393-402) and, after it, when Jerome had renounced Origen's theology as heretical. The influence of Origen whom Jerome had at one time proudly called "my master" can be seen on almost every page of Jerome's works. We have time here for only two examples.

The Commentary on Galatians, written in 388, provides a good example of Jerome's exegetical dependence on Origen. Jerome could not believe that Peter and Paul, the two key apostles, could have quarrelled and that Peter could have reverted to Judaism (Gal 2: 11-21). So he explains the passage by arguing that Paul only

reproached Peter for the sake of the Judaizers and Gentiles and that the disagreement was only a piece of play-acting; Peter and Paul remained friends. /41 Later, in a letter to Augustine, he recalls that this interpretation was taken from the tenth book of the Stromateis of Origen, also mentioning that John Chrysostom had adopted the same interpretation. /42

The second example is very interesting for we can compare it directly with Origen's Commentary on Matthew, large portions of which are still extant. Jerome wrote his Commentary on Matthew in the space of fourteen days, in order to provide his friend Eusebius of Cremona with reading material for a sea voyage. /43 In his interpretation of the parable of the hidden treasure (Matthew 13: 44ff) Jerome has clearly followed Origen. The main points of their respective interpretations are set out below:

Jerome	Origen
	This is not a parable but a similitude. The field equals the scripture.
The treasure is the Word of God which appears to be hidden in the body of Christ, or the holy scriptures in which rests the knowledge of the Saviour. When the treasure is discovered, one must give up all the emolumenta in order to possess it	The treasure equals the mysteries lying within the scripture, and finding the treasure a man hides it, thinking it dangerous to reveal to all and sundry the secrets of scripture.
	He goes, sells all his possessions, and works until he can buy the field, in order that he may possess the great treasure.

Jerome's interpretation appears clearly to have links with Origen in addition to the similarities that are inevitable with the same parable being interpreted. Yet his interpretation is simpler and more direct in its application of the meaning of the parable.

Jerome is not interested in Origen's distinction between a parable and a similitude, the latter being a generic term, the former a particular form of similitude. We should note that Jerome sets down two different interpretations of the treasure - it is either the word of God hidden in the body of Christ, or it is the knowledge of the Saviour hidden in scripture. His first interpretation does not come from Origen. It is evident that such a parable suits Jerome's characteristic ascetic interest.

It is not only specific passages of spiritual interpretation which Jerome borrows from Origen's commentary on Matthew, but also certain themes of the commentary. One of these, very important for Origen, was the goodness of God which he used to combat the Gnosticism of his day. This theme is seen in Jerome's Commentary on Matthew several times. /44

Toward the end of his life, after the trauma of the Origenist controversy, it is interesting to note that Jerome was more critical of some of Origen's contentious exegetical interpretations. This trend is seen most clearly of all in the Commentary on Jeremiah where Origen is denounced as "that allegorist", his unorthodox views are fiercely attacked, and Jerome relies less than in any other commentary on Origen's allegorical interpretations.

We have now seen that Jerome was familiar with both the major schools of Christian exegesis at Alexandria and Antioch, and indeed he borrowed from both of them. We have also seen that he was the only fourth century Church Father to have learnt Hebrew. To do this he took lessons from learned Jews. It is interesting to inquire whether he borrowed any Jewish exegesis from these Jews to incorporate into his own commentaries. In fact, Jerome knew a good deal about Jews and Judaism, and it can be shown that he incorporates many hundreds of Jewish traditions into his own exegesis. It remains in this paper to give one or two examples of this.

Jerome was a man of his time in that he displays

anti-Jewish tendencies. Several times, for instance, he refers to Jewish learning as "belching and nausea." /45 But when these comments of Jerome are set alongside the anti-Jewish statements of other contemporary writers, and indeed the polemical outbursts directed against other Christians by Jerome, then his comments against the Jews are more understandable if not excusable.

Jerome believed, however, that Jewish traditions of exegesis were of great importance for Christians in their interpretation of the OT, as long as they were consistent with the teaching of scripture;

> I once proposed to make available to Latin readers the secrets of Hebrew learning and the recondite teachings of the masters of the synagogue, so long as the latter is in keeping with the holy scriptures."
>
> /46

One of the best-known rabbinic traditions used by Jerome is that Daniel and the three young men with him were eunuchs. Jerome's comment on Daniel 1.3 is as follows:

> From this passage the Hebrews think that Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah were eunuchs, thus fulfilling that prophecy which is spoken by the prophet Isaiah to Hezekiah (Isaiah 39: 7).

Isaiah 39: 7 reads, "And some of your own sons, who are born to you, shall be taken away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon." Because of the explicit statement in Daniel 1:4 that these men had "no blemish", some of the rabbinic traditions attempted to argue that they had been eunuchs but were healed when they passed through the fiery furnace. /48 But the dominant opinion among the Rabbis was that Daniel and the young men were eunuchs.

Again, in his Commentary on Daniel (5.2) Jerome records the following Jewish tradition concerning Belshazzar:

> The Hebrews hand down a story of this sort: Belshazzar, thinking that God's promise had

> remained without effect until the 70th year, by which Jeremiah had said that the captivity of the Jewish people would have to be ended (cf Jeremiah 25:12; 29:10ff) - a matter of which Zechariah also speaks in the first part of his book (cf Zechariah 1: 12ff) - and turning the occasion of the failed promise into a celebration, gave a great banquet by way of mocking the expectation of the Jews and the vessels of the Temple of God.

Jeremiah had promised Israel that their exile would be temporary. After 70 years they would return to their land and glory while their oppressors, the Babylonians, would be destroyed e.g. "Then after seventy years are completed, I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation, the land of the Chaldeans, for their iniquity, says the Lord, making the land an everlasting waste." (Jeremiah 25:12; cf also 29:10ff; Zechariah 1: 12ff; Daniel 9:2). The chronological problem is to determine which year begins the seventy year period. In Megillah 11b it is explained that Belshazzar began his count with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (605 BC). This rabbinic source explicitly says that Belshazzar was mistaken in his calculations, a point which is implied by Jerome. The seventy year period should have begun from the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign and not the first (cf 2 Kings 24:1). Jerome is the only early Church Father to mention this tradition.

Scholars studying Jerome's use of rabbinic traditions have usually assumed that Jerome has taken traditions direct from Jewish sources. But there are a few instances where it is apparent that he must have copied out the Jewish material from the commentaries of Origen, who also made use of Jewish exegesis. These instances are quite rare in Jerome's works but are worth noticing. We have space to give only one example here.

In his Letters - Epistulae 18A,15 , written in 381-2 - dealing with the subject of the two Seraphim in Isaiah 6:6-9, Jerome makes a comparison of Isaiah with Moses and Jeremiah. He says that he discussed this with some Jews,

and reassures his reader that this tradition comes from an excellent (Jewish) source and should be accepted. Jerome gives the impression that he has gleaned this tradition from direct conversation and study with Jews. But, in fact, he borrowed it from Origen who had reported it in his sixth Homily on Isaiah, saying that both Isaiah and Moses had refused God's command at first, on the basis of their unworthiness, but had subsequently accepted.

We come now to the point where we must conclude this short study of the Biblical exegesis of St. Jerome. We have found that Jerome was essentially an eclectic scholar, borrowing principles of textual criticism, and specific interpretations of scripture from other scholars, both Christian and Jewish. We should not criticize him too much for plagiarising thus, as he stated this as his purpose in writing commentaries - to explain what others had already said. Jerome wrote very quickly, and one of the reasons he borrowed so much from previous writers may have been because he did not have time to think out his own answers. He would have found Donne's aphorism, "No man is an island", particularly apt.

Jerome was not primarily a creative thinker although his works are not devoid of novelty. He was a man driven by his education and asceticism to delve into the riches of the bible and especially the prophets, for he believed that the bible contained everything that was necessary to know and love God. His joy was to "meditate on the law of the Lord day and night."

Notes

1. The details of Jerome's life are easily accessible in Cambridge History of the Bible Vol I (CUP 1970), pp510-540, and J.N.D. Kelly, Jerome, (London 1975)
2. That Jerome's family was wealthy, see Epistulae 82.2; 66.14 where Jerome instructs his brother Paulinian to go back to Stridon and sell up the family estates; cf also 3.5 where Jerome recalls running through the slave quarters at home in his childhood.

3. Jerome mentions him with pride at several places, e.g. Commentary on Ecclesiastes 1.9f; Apologia contra Rufinus1.16. The two grammars of Donatus are extant in H. Keil, Grammatici Latini (Leipzig 1865).

4. Epistulae 17.2

5. Ibid.22

6. For the founding of the two monasteries at Bethlehem, see Epistulae 108 and Kelly, op.cit. pp118-140.

7. See E.P. Burke, " St. Jerome as a Spiritual Director" in A Monument to Saint Jerome ed. F.X. Murphy (NYork 1952) pp145-160; D.Dumm, The Theological Basis of Virginity According to St. Jerome (Latrobe, Pa.1961)

8. See his church history of biographies in De Viris illustribus ("On famous men"), 117; Epistulae 50.1; 52.8; Apologia contra Rufinum 1.13; Kelly, op.cit., p70, and D. Winslow, The Dynamics of Salvation: A Study in Gregory of Nazianzus (Cambridge, Mass. 1979)

9. He even believed that its mistakes were divinely inspired! See, for example, his homilies on Leviticus (Hom.in Lev.) 12.5

10. See Ep.ad. Afric.5; On Prayer 14.

11. Epistulae, 125.12

12. Ibid

13. See Jerome's comments at Pref.in Lib.Paralip; Pref.in Quat.Evang., where he says there are as many variants as there are manuscripts.

14. Epistulae 27.1

15. Studies of these are to be found in K.K.Hulley: "The Principles of Textual Criticism known to St Jerome" in Harvard Studies in Classical Philology LV (1933) pp87-111, and more recently in B.M. Metzger, "St Jerome's Explicit References to Variant Readings in Manuscripts of the NT."

in New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional and Patristic (Leiden 1980), pp199; p210

16. E.G. Commentary on Micah, 1; Epistulae 104.6

17. Commentary on Isaiah 12 and often elsewhere

18. Quest.Heb.in Gen.and passim

19. See Contra Pelagium 2.7; Epistulae 127.6

20. See Commentary on Matthew 1] 19; Commentary on Galatians 2.5

21. See Tract. in Ps.77; Comm.Matt.13,35

22. Commentary on Galatians 4.6

23. Epistulae 105.5

24. Apologia contra Rufinum 1.16

25 Commentary on John: Introduction

26. The original Greek of much of this commentary was recovered by R. Devreèsse: Le Commentaire de Théodore de Mopsuèste sur les Psaumes (1-80) (Studi e Testi 93) Rome 1939

27. Ep.18A,1

28. Commentary on Ephesians 5.14

29. G. GrÜtzmacher: Hieronymus (Leipzig 1901), Vol 2, p40; cf also A. Souter, The Earliest Latin Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul (Oxford 1927), p110

30. Commentary on Malachi, Prol

31. Comm.Hier.24.1-10; 27.9-11; 28.12-14

32. Strom 6.15,129

33. See, for example, Clement, Strom. 4.25; Origen, Commentary on John 10.35

34. Commentary on Jonah, Prol.

35. Commentary on Galatians 4.22f

36. Frag.in Prov.1.6

37. Cf L. Maries, Extraits du Commentaire de Diodore de Tarse sur les Psaumes in R.S.R.9 (1919), pp94ff

38. Comm. Ezek17.1ff; cf Comm.Isa 16.1; Comm.Amos 9.1

39. Epistulae 121.6

40. Apologia contra Rufinum 3.39

41. Commentary on Galatians 2.11ff

42. Epistulae 112.6

43. Commentary on Matthew: Prol

44. E.g. 5.1; 10.1; 10.40; 11.30; 13.1-2; 17.7

45. Preface to Lib.Heb.Nom.

46. Commentary on Zechariah 6.9-15

47. Commentary on Daniel 1.3

48. See Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbat 6.9

The Manse
First Comber Presbyterian Church
Co. Down Dennis Brown

Mr Brown holds the degrees of B.D. (Edinburgh) and of S.T.M (Union Theological Seminary, NYork) and is at present doing research on Jerome in connection with a D. Phil degree at Oxford University.