

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

ST JEROME AND THE VULGATE NEW TESTAMENT.

I.

THE question whether St Jerome is the author of the whole Vulgate New Testament, or only of the Gospels, has been much debated, and ought to be settled, if possible, as it is a matter of great practical importance for the editing of the Vulgate, and its elucidation touches a large number of interesting points.

The history of the debate is not worth recording here. Richard Simon's arguments are as good as any which have been put forward since his day.¹ Recently, Wordsworth and White have pronounced in favour of St Jerome as reviser of the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse. So also Mangenot. Lagrange has taken the opposite view, and a very elaborate study by Père Cavallera has claimed to decide the question in the same sense, while Dom De Bruyne has attributed the Vulgate St Paul to Pelagius. This last hypothesis need not be dealt with here. I hope to shew in the *Revue d'Histoire ecclésiastique* that Pelagius was no textual critic, knew no Greek, and commented on an Old-Latin text, which he never attempted to improve. He has no point of contact with the Vulgate. I hold with Wordsworth and White that the whole Vulgate is St Jerome's work.

§ 1. *St Jerome's Ep. 27 ad Marcellam.*

Vallarsi, after doubting whether St Jerome ever revised the New Testament except the Gospels, concluded that he must have done so, because he cites his own revision in Ep. 27. The letter was written in 384, before Jerome left Rome. He says:

'Post priorem epistolam . . . ad me repente perlatum est quosdam homunculos mihi studiose detrahere, cur aduersus auctoritatem ueterum et totius mundi opinionem aliqua *in euangeliiis* emendare temptaverim.'

This sentence seems to make it clear that the saint's detractors referred to a revision of the Gospels alone. This must have been because St Jerome had at that time revised no more. The letter was presumably published soon after the publication of the four Gospels. This can hardly have been long before the death of Damasus in December 384.

¹ Dom De Bruyne (*Revue bibl.* Oct. 1915) enumerates, as the earlier doubters on the subject, Erasmus, Faber Stapulensis, Pithoeus, and Zegers. He has reproduced the arguments of the last of these.

But it is the sequel which convinced Vallarsi; and Mangelot has lately urged the same view; so the rest of the letter must be considered.

After a digression in which Jerome assails with his own inimitable invective the ignorance and the self-indulgent lives of his critics, declaring that they attacked him solely because he had said that a virgin should be more with women than with men (*viz.* in Ep. 22), he turns upon these *bipedes aselli* with the citation of three indefensible O. L. readings in St Paul. Why in St Paul? Vallarsi and others, including Mangelot, supposed that St Jerome is concerned to shew how much better his new revision was than the old. This would have been very much off the point, as it was his revision of the Gospels which was attacked. The real reason is obvious enough: the three passages are ingeniously chosen missiles aimed at his tormentors. They merely happened to be in St Paul. Though he had not had time to revise the Epistles, having only just finished the Gospels, his intention of doing so was sufficiently known.

1. 'Illi legant: *spe gaudentes, tempori seruiantes, nos legamus: spe gaudentes, Domino seruiantes*' (Rom. xii 11). This means: 'They are time-servers and worldly—their reading suits them; I am a religious, serving the Lord.'

2. 'Illi aduersus presbyterum accusationem omnino non¹ putent recipiendum, nos legamus: *aduersus presbyterum accusationem ne receperis, nisi sub duobus aut tribus testibus.*' (1 Tim. v 19)—so they have no right to expect their accusation against me, a Roman presbyter, to be received by any one!

3. 'Illis placeat: *humanus sermo et omni acceptione dignus*; nos cum Graecis, id est cum Apostolo, qui Graece est locutus, erremus: *fidelis sermo et omni acceptione dignus.*' They may think 'the words of a man' to be worthy of acceptance, the words chosen by some unknown translator; for my part I follow the Greek words of the Apostle, 'the words of faith', *fidelis sermo*.

Very clever, indeed, if not very polite! The malicious intention of the Saint was duly perceived by Père Lagrange; but by one of the incalculable aberrations to which the most penetrating minds are liable,

¹ Vallarsi omits *non*, which is in all the MSS quoted by Hilberg, except one, and is necessary to the sense. Similarly, above, Vallarsi reads: '*caenosos riuiolos bibant, et diligentiam, qua auium siluas et concarum gurgites norunt, in Scripturis legendis abiciant,*' where Hilberg has restored *saluas* for the meaningless *siluas*: 'Let them drink their muddy streams, and when they read the Scriptures cast aside the diligence with which they distinguish the flavours of birds and the squirtings of scent-bottles.' The intention is always the same: 'These sensual and ignorant people dare to attack me, a recluse, an ascetic, and a student, devoted to the study of Scripture, as if I was irreverent to the sacred text, of which they know nothing and care less.'

he suggested that St Jerome, for the sake of smiting his adversaries, invented two of the readings which he attributed to them. He doubts whether *humanus* ever figured in a Latin text for πιστός (!), and whether any edition could have suppressed *nisi sub duobus aut tribus testibus* (*Revue Biblique*, 1917, p. 447). How invented readings could have served St Jerome's purpose he does not say.

As a fact St Jerome chose quite common readings, which were sure to be in the Apostolus of his detractors.

1. *Tempori seruientes* is read by *d* g* Ambst., with the Greek D F G. The Vg has *Domino*, of course. Ambst. was told, he says, that the Greek had *Deo seruientes*, and it is possible that Pelagius read *Deo*.

2. The condition *nisi sub duobus aut tribus testibus* is omitted by Cyprian, Ambst. and Pelagius (as his comment shews).

3. In 1 Tim. iii 1 D (Greek) has ἀνθρώπινος λόγος, *d* having *humanus sermo*. Elsewhere this MS has the right reading. Aug. twice quotes 1 Tim. i 15 with *humanus*, and cites Julian of Eclanum for the same reading. Ambst. has *humanus* in 1 Tim. i 15 and iii 1. Pelagius seems to have read *humanus* in 1 Tim. i 15, 2 Tim. ii 11, and 1 Tim. iv 9. I do not know whether *humanus* is ever found in Titus iii 8.

But St Jerome does not say *ego posui*, or anything to that effect, with regard to his own reading. He has each time *nos legamus*, which more naturally implies that he had *not* yet published a revision of St Paul. Dom De Bruyne pointed out that he gives *ne receperis* for no. 1, whereas the Vulgate has *noli recipere*—another indication that St Jerome is not defending a revision he had just published.

§ 2. *The lack of Prefaces to the New Testament by St Jerome.*

St Jerome's letter to Damasus, *Nouum opus*, prefixed to the Gospels, begins by stating that the Pope had forced him to discover which among the innumerable Latin copies agreed best with the Greek. Further down he says: 'I am now speaking of the New Testament.' Later he adds: 'The present preface promises the four Gospels only.' It is implied that he intended to revise the rest in due time.

It is urged that St Jerome never carried out St Damasus's wish and his own intention. The reason which chiefly moved Vallarsi,¹ though it did not ultimately convince him, was that St Jerome wrote no prefaces to the other books of the N. T.

1. Westcott replied² that the omission was probably due to the comparatively pure state in which the rest of the N. T. was preserved.

¹ He doubts in vol. ii (*De viris illustribus* 135, note), but in his preface to vol. x it is certain that St Jerome carried out his plan.

² In Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, art. 'Vulgate' 16.

But Acts, at least, required and received a pretty thorough castigation at the hands of the Vulgate reviser, whoever he was.

2. Though St Jerome did eventually contract an invariable habit of writing prefaces to his translations of the O. T. as he published them, this would scarcely necessitate his prefixing similar letters to a revision which was completed before he contracted the habit. He published no preface with the Roman Psalter. If he wrote one to the Gallican revision, this was because an explanation was really needed. There was no necessity for any preface to the N. T. beyond the *Nouum opus*, which gave all the explanation that was wanted.

3. When St Jerome published several books together, he only put one preface for the whole. If they appeared at intervals, each was provided with a preface. So there is a preface to each book of most of his commentaries; but the Commentary on St Matthew, in four books, has only a single preface. So with his version of the O. T.: one preface suffices for the Pentateuch, one for the three books of Solomon,—and so forth.

4. A more complete reply is forthcoming. It was in 383 that the Pope suggested the revision. The work was a troublesome one, as St Jerome complained. It is incredible that the Gospels should have been completed much before the death of Damasus in December 384. It therefore seems highly improbable that the remainder of the N. T. could have appeared during the lifetime of the Pope, who was its 'onlie begetter'. In fact I hope to prove further on that several years passed before the whole was given to the world. Now a preface by St Jerome is always a letter, always a dedication. No one will suppose that Jerome would dedicate his work to Damasus's successor, with whom he was not on intimate terms, to say the least. He could hardly dedicate to some pious lady the second portion of a work which was already dedicated to the protector who had suggested and ordered it. It remained that he should prefix no letter to the concluding part when it appeared, but let the original epistle serve for the whole, so that all should be dedicated to his regretted patron.

§ 3. *The Pauline Text of St Jerome's Commentaries.*

But there is another difficulty against St Jerome's claim to have revised the whole N. T. In the Vulgate a number of readings which he recommends are conspicuous by their absence. It is in the case of St Paul that this argument is chiefly urged: for Jerome wrote commentaries on Philemon, Gal., Eph., and Titus, and the text on which he comments is not the Vulgate. Besides this, many of the variants which he prefers are not in the Vulgate. It was this

difficulty which recently moved Dom De Bruyne to put forward Pelagius as a probable candidate for the revision of St Paul. But the difficulty is an old one.

The most important work on the subject is Corssen's double edition of Galatians, in which he carefully examines the question so far as that epistle is concerned. His conclusions are quite clear. The text used in the commentary is not the Vulgate, nor is it precisely an O. L. text: it is something between the two. It is too near the Vulgate to be counted as an O. L. text. It represents a revision of the O. L. according to the Greek.

So far is certain, and most important. Corssen went on to conclude that St Jerome did revise the N. T. by Greek MSS, as he professes to have done, but that this revision is preserved only in the commentaries, the Vulgate being a further revision of St Jerome's revision, made by some one else.¹

It is strange that Corssen's irrefragable conclusions have been neglected by recent writers, who have pointed to the divergences between St Jerome and the Vulgate, and have concluded that he can never have revised the Epistles, without adverting to the fact that Corssen had been obliged by the resemblances to infer the opposite.

It has been proved, then, by Corssen that the text of St Jerome's commentaries is a revision which is a stage towards the Vulgate. But there is no reason to suppose that this text ever existed in MSS outside the commentaries.² It follows that whoever composed the Vulgate used St Jerome's text in the commentaries as the basis of his revision.

Who was this worthy? There is no candidate except St Jerome. Corssen tacitly assumed that he could not be the man. Why? He twice revised the Psalms, and then made a new version from the Hebrew. Was his revision of four short epistles necessarily final and irreformable?

But the grave difficulty has been raised, that St Jerome in his commentaries approves and recommends certain readings which do not appear in the Vulgate. In the usual view, that St Jerome's Vulgate

¹ P. Corssen *Ep. ad Galatas*, Berlin, 1885. Corssen suggested that St Jerome's revision may still be latent in a few MSS, and in the Ven. Bede. But, on the contrary, the text of Bede seems to be of his own making. In Acts he reintroduced O. L. readings out of Codex Laudianus (E), the Greek of which he supposed to be a good text. Some of these appear in the Amiatinus, e.g. Acts vi 10—cf. his commentary *in loco*. In St Paul it is perhaps Pelagius's commentary which motivated Bede's alterations, e.g. Amiatinus, Eph. i 6, where *filio suo* is added by the first hand.

² Though Dom De Bruyne found at Vienna (Bibl. Imp. 1163) a twelfth-century MS, wherein the text of Ephesians is extracted from St Jerome's commentary.

of the Epistles was published some years before his commentaries, it might be replied that these recommendations are a further correction of the Vulgate. If, on the contrary, the Vulgate is posterior to the commentaries, as Corssen seems to have shewn, the contradiction is more striking.

The date of the commentaries is certain enough—about 387.¹ I hope to prove further on (§ 14) that St Jerome did not issue his revision of the whole N. T. until 391. Thus there will be four years between the text of the commentaries—which is a stage towards the Vulgate—and the Vulgate itself. It will be necessary in the sections 5 and 6 to examine most of the cases where St Jerome recommends readings in the commentaries.

The text given in Vallarsi's edition of the commentaries cannot always be relied on. Corssen has collated a good number of MSS of the Comm. on Galatians, but they differ a great deal. Yet the general type of text is certain, and the comments help us to determine it. St Jerome continually discusses readings and renderings in his comments, and repeatedly informs us what word is used by the *Latinus interpres* or *Latini codices* or *Vulgata editio*. Sometimes he approves, more often he disapproves. Yet he has frequently retained the reading he finds fault with. This is often because the reading is a fairly good one, and his own suggestion is only meant to explain the real force of the Greek, and not to serve as a tolerable Latin rendering. In many cases he says that the Greek MSS give a different reading: but even in this case he sometimes leaves the old version alone.

§ 4. *St Jerome's Method as a Commentator.*

It would be a mistake to examine St Jerome's commentaries without first familiarizing oneself with his very peculiar views as to the duty of a commentator.

He himself explains that in a commentary 'ubi libertas est disserendi'

¹ The four commentaries on Epistles of St Paul are the earliest works we know St Jerome to have published after his arrival at Bethlehem in 386. He took Philemon first, then Gal., Eph., Titus, and finished them in great haste in a few months. We can gather the date from the list he gives of his own works in *de Viris illu.* 135: for it is certain, from the known dates of some of the writings, that they are enumerated there in strict chronological order. The commentaries come after *ad Eustochium* (Ep. 22), *ad Marcellam epistolarum liber unus* (Epp. 23-9, 32, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, perhaps 43, 44), *Consolatoria ad Paulam* (Ep. 39). These were all published at the end of 384, or in 385 before Jerome left Rome in that year. Next are mentioned the commentaries, then *Quaestiones hebraicae*, *De locis*, *Hebraica nomina*. These all appeared in 389, or partially in 388. The preface to Galatians shews that the commentaries were written in the East. They must belong to 387.

(*adu. Ruf.* i 19), one may cite the contradictory opinions of previous commentators without naming them! 'Ego enim in *commentariis ad Ephesios* sic Origenem et Didymum et Apollinarium secutus sum, qui certe contraria inter se habent dogmata, ut fidei meae non amitterem ueritatem' (*ibid.* i 16). That is to say, he inserts any heresies of Origen or Apollinarius without warning the reader. His own faith is all right all the time; as to the reader's faith, he does not seem afraid of undermining it: 'Commentatoris officium est multorum sententias ponere' (*ibid.* i 22).¹ So we must not assume that St Jerome believes or intends to teach what he sets down in his comments. *Nor are we in a position even to assume that he approves of the text which he adopts or recommends.* He may be approving a reading or a rendering because it suits the comment he is borrowing from his authority. Consequently it is no matter for surprise if we find him condemning a reading in a commentary, yet regularly quoting it on other occasions. There may not be very many instances of this, but there are certainly some.

He gives us an admirable example of his inconsistency as regards the text, when he admits (in 402, *adu. Ruf.* i 19) that in Psalm ii 12, where the Old Latin has *continete disciplinam* (Cypr. *ter.*, &c.) or *apprehendite disciplinam* (Aug., &c.), and his own Roman and Gallican revisions both have *apprehendite disciplinam*, he had given *adore filium* in his *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, whereas in his translation of the Hebrew Psalter he had rendered *adore pure*—yet that the Hebrew really means *deosculamini filium* or *deosculamini pure*. He is positively indignant with Rufinus for finding fault with these amazing variations. 'Quid igitur peccauit', he cries, 'si uerbum ambiguum diuersa interpretatione conuerti?' He would have said the same to Richard Simon or Zegers: 'Why should you expect me to adopt in the Vulgate the renderings which I preferred in the commentary, where, for all you know, I was speaking with the mouth of the great but dangerous Origen, or of blind Didymus, my seer, or of my heresiarch teacher Apollinarius?' Nay, it is to be feared he might have used stronger language, as he did later in 402, against Pelagius who had dared to censure the odd doctrines of the Commentary on Ephesians: 'Ut nuper indoctus calumniator erupit, qui commentarios meos in Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios reprehendendos putat: nec intelligit, *nimia stertens uercordia*, leges commentariorum (!) in quibus multae diuersorum ponuntur opinioniones, uel tacitis (!) uel expressis eorum nominibus, ut lectoris arbitrium sit, quid potissimum eligere debeat, discernere. Quamquam et in primo eiusdem operis libro praefatus sim, me uel

¹ So *ibid.* i 16 'Commentarii quid operis habent? Alterius dicta edisserunt, quae obscure scripta sunt plano sermone manifestant, *multorum sententias* replicant.'

propria uel aliena dicturum, et ipsos Commentarios tam ueterum scriptorum esse quam nostros' (*Praef. in Comm. in Jerem.*).

The Commentary on St Matthew was dictated in a fortnight, and scarcely touches textual questions. Yet its witness is not to be passed over, so far as it goes. Composed in March 398, nearly fourteen years after the revision of the Vulgate Gospels, it has the Vulgate for its text, yet with a large number of differences. The text as given by Vallarsi is not always trustworthy in detail.¹ But a great many O. L. readings are fairly certain, e.g. xix 10 *uxore* where the best Vg. MSS. have *muliere*; viii 20 the well-known O. L. *nidos* for *tabernacula*; *ib.* 25 add *ad eum*; *ib.* 18 add *discipulos*; xv 1 *traditiones*; xxvi 75 *fleuit*; xviii 26 *rogabat*, &c. (I have looked up texts at random). In vi 16 the text has the O. L. *exterminant*, upon which Jerome comments: 'Verbum *exterminant*, quod in ecclesiasticis scripturis uitio interpretum tritum est, aliud multo significat quam uulgo intelligitur. Exterminantur quippe exules qui mittuntur extra terminos. Pro hoc sermone, *demoliuntur* semper accipere debemus, quod Graece dicitur ἀφανίζουσι.' Now in vi 19-20 all Vg. MSS. have *demoliuntur*, and so has the Commentary text. But in v 16, like the Commentary, the Vg. has *exterminant*.²

A good example is x 8: Vallarsi's text has *mortuos suscitare*, but the comment shews that Jerome omitted it, as does the Greek *κωνή*; but it is in all Vg. MSS. So the Commentary appears to introduce a new correction.

In other cases the Commentary agrees with the Vg., as we should expect. On v 22, vi 25, xxiv 36 he mentions additions which he does not adopt either in the Commentary or the Vg. The same is true of the variants he mentions on xi 19 and 23. On the whole the text given in the Commentary is nearer the Vg. than is the text of the Commentaries on St Paul. This was to be expected, for the former is based on the Vg., whereas the latter represent a stage towards it.

§ 5. *Cases in the Commentaries on St Paul where a criticized reading is retained.*

St Jerome in commenting follows the usual method of quoting two or three verses at a time and then explaining them. The following list gives most of his textual criticisms which belong to the present point:—

¹ For example, xiv 1, the text has *iusiurandum*, but the comment has *iuramentum*, with the Vg. The text gives xxiii 14 in full, but there is no comment on it, and it is omitted by the Vg.

² W W read *demoliuntur*, with the Irish MSS and O*, a very poor combination (only one Alcuin MS, K, has followed the Irish, so far as I know), for they regard this as an instance of their principle: 'uera lectio ad finem uictoriam reportat.' But the evidence is weak here, and the witness of the Comm. confirms the best MSS.

1. Gal. i 16: 'Sive ut in Graeco melius habet: *non contuli cum carne et sanguine.*' The wording shews that he retained the O. L. *acquieui* (*Aug. Ambst. &c.*) in his text. So does the Vulgate.

*2. Gal. iv 20: he reads *quoniam confundor in uobis*, but comments: 'Quod quidem Graece magis proprie dicitur. Ἀποροῦμαι enim non tam *confusionem* . . . quam *indigentiam* et *inopiam* sonat. Sensus itaque iste est: Vellem apud uos nunc adesse, et literarum uocem praesens ipse proferre, quia indigeo in uobis.' This is an explanation, not a serious rendering; and in the course of the long comment which follows he adheres to *confundor*: 'compellitur dicere . . . *quoniam confundor in uobis*,' and again: 'laceror, *confundor* atque dilanior,' and again: 'ita et ego, *quia confundor in uobis*,' and again: 'nescio enim . . . quo uos debeam sanare medicamine: *quia confundor in uobis*.' Naturally this O. L. reading *confundor* (*d Aug. Ambst. Celestine I*) is retained in the Vulgate also.

*3. Gal. v 4: 'Κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ non ut in Latino male interpretatum est: *Euacuati estis a Christo*, sed *in Christi opere cessastis* magis intelligitur.' St Jerome has doubtless copied this crudely literal explanation from some commentator or other. He does not mean the words as a tolerable translation, but as a philological note, and he leaves *euacuati* (*d Amb. Ambst. Bede*) in his text. It remains in the Vulgate. St Jerome considers it the right of a commentator to pull a word to pieces and discover its etymological force; but as a translator he is well aware that St Paul is using an energetic expression 'You are abolished from Christ'; and that, though *euacuare* is a strange expression here, it is quite comprehensible; while elsewhere in St Paul it is the correct rendering of *καταργέω*.

4. Gal. v 7: '*Nemini consenseritis*: Sed quia nec in Graecis libris, nec in his qui in Apostolum commentati sunt hoc scriptum inuenimus, praetereundum uidetur.' This comment seems to imply that he has not actually ventured to omit the two words in his text. But Corsen's MSS omit them. They are not in *d Aug. Ambst.*, though they are in *Lucif. Bede Pel. D H g.* I suppose, therefore, St Jerome found they were not in all Old Latin copies, and hence could dare to omit them in the Vulgate, where all good MSS leave them out.

5. Gal. v 13: '*Tantum ne libertatem in occasionem carni* (subauditur *detis*: quod quia in Graeco non habetur, Latinus posuit interpres.)' St Jerome approves, therefore. Of course *detis* has to be retained. (O. L. *carni detis*, *Amb. Ambst. &c.*, Vulgate has more elegantly *detis carnis*.)¹

6. Gal. vi 1: '*Instruite huiusmodi in spiritu mansuetudinis* . . . sive, ut melius habetur in Graeco: *perficiatis in spiritu lenitatis*.' Jerome does not change his text, for *perficiatis* would not be comprehensible. But in the Vulgate, though naturally leaving *instruite*, he has introduced *lenitatis*.

7. Gal. vi 3: 'Φρεναπατῆ, hoc est, *mentem suam decipit*: pro quo

¹ But *d* omits *detis*, to agree with the parallel Greek column (D), whereas conversely *g* and *f* retain *detis* in the Latin, and introduce *δῶτε* in their Greek column (G F).

Latinus posuit interpres, *se ipse seducit.*' This is a comment, not a suggested rendering. The Vulgate has *ipse se seducit.*

8. Eph. i 14: '*Pignus* Latinus interpres pro *arrabone* posuit.' This is not a criticism or disapproval. *Pignus* is retained in the text, and in the Vulgate.

9. Eph. i 14: '*In redemptionem adoptionis*, non habet in Graeco *ὑιοθεσίαν*, sed *περιποίησιν*, quam nos *acquisitionem* siue *possessionem* possumus dicere, nec tamen uim sermonis expressimus.' But he retains the O. L. *adoptionis* here in his text (so *d Vigil.* 1/1). But, as a fact, *acquisitionis* is the commoner O. L. reading (*Aug. Ambst. Pel. Sed. Bede Vigil.* 1/1). So we find *acquisitionis* in the Vulgate.

10. Eph. ii 3: '*Facientes non unam uoluntatem*, sed plures: et non solum uoluntates *carnis*, sed etiam *mentium*, pro quo in Latinis codicibus habetur *cogitationum.*' He has twice quoted the text, the first time with *cogitationum* (according to all Vallarsi's MSS), the second time with *mentium*. In the Vulgate we find *cogitationum*. The Greek *διανοιῶν* might be translated either way. But the singular *carnis* and the plural 'minds' do not go well together. The A. V. and R. V. have substituted the singular 'mind'.

11. Eph. iii 10: '*Multiplex* quippe sapientia Dei, quae sermone Graeco *πολυποικίλος* et, ut ita dicam, *multifaria* appellatur.' But he leaves *multiplex*. In *Lib. ii adu. Iouin.* 23 he paraphrases '*multiplex* et uaria sapientia Dei'. But the more usual O. L. rendering is a perfectly satisfactory one: *multiformis* (*Amb. Vict. Ambst. Aug. Sed. Bede d.*), and St Jerome has discovered and adopted it in the Vulgate.

12. Eph. iii 13: '*Id quod nunc Latinus translator expressit ne deficiatis* potest iuxta Graeci sermonis ambiguitatem et ita legi *ne deficiam* . . . sed magis superior sectandus est sensus.' So he retains *deficiatis* in his text and in the Vulgate.

*13. Eph. iv 19: '*Quod autem ait qui desperantes semetipsos*, id est, *ἀπηληγκότες ἑαυτούς*, multo aliud in Graeco significat quam in Latino . . . Exprimamus si possumus uerbum de uerbo, et dicamus *ἀπηληγκότες indolentes* siue *indolorios*, nam et quidam philosophorum *ἀναλγησίαν*, id est, *indoloriam* praedicaui.' Of course these philological explanations are not meant as serious renderings! St Jerome retains *desperantes* (*Vict. Ambst.*), which is really a translation of the Greek variant *ἀπηληγκότες*: so the Greek DG with dg, and *Iren. Theod. Mopst. (latin) pesh. armen. goth. aethiop.* And *desperantes* remains in Vulg.

*14. Eph. v 22: '*Mulieres uiris suis subditae sint* . . . hoc quod in Latinis exemplaribus additum est *subditae sint*, in Graecis codicibus non habetur: siquidem ad superiora refertur, et subauditur . . . sed hoc magis in Graeco intelligitur quam in Latino.' That is to say, the addition was needed, and of course is retained both in the text of the commentary and in the Vulgate.

15. Titus i 4: '*Scribit autem apostolus Tito carissimo filio*, quod Graece dicitur *γνησίῳ τέκνῳ*, et Latino sermone non potest explicari; *γνήσιος* enim hoc potius sonat quom quis *fidelis* et *proprius* et, ut ita dicam, *legitimus* siue *germanus* absque comparatione alterius appellatur,' &c. He retains *carissimo* in despair of a better. Vulgate has *dilecto*.

16. Titus ii 15: 'Quod uero intulit *exhortare*, id est, παρακάλει, aliud quoddam in Graeco significat quam in Latino; παράκλησις quippe magis *consolationem* quam *exhortationem* sonat,' &c. But he retains *exhortare* in his text, and in the Vulgate.

17. Titus iii 10: 'Legitur in Latinis codicibus (quod uerum Papa quoque Athanasius approbat): *post unam et alteram correptionem*.' So he adopts this reading here and in the Vulgate. As a fact the O. L. for the most part omits *et alteram* (*post primam Tert.*; *post unam Iren. Cypr. Lucif. Amb. Aug. Pel. &c.*).¹

These examples shew us Jerome commenting on a fundamentally Old-Latin text, of which he approves the readings in five cases (5, 8, 12, 14, 17), whereas he is more or less dissatisfied in the twelve other cases (without counting the cases added in the note). But he has apparently made no corrections. A few of the cases, however, have been altered for the better in the Vulgate.

I add another passage, not quite parallel, but very interesting. On Eph. iii 11, 'quam fecit in Christo Domino nostro', St Jerome points out that in the Greek the relative may have for its antecedent either *ecclesia* or *sapientia* or πρόθεσις, 'id est propositio, quam nos genere neutrali in Latino sermone *propositum* habemus expressam'. His text gives *propositum* (with the O. L. *d Aug. Ambst.*), to which *quam* cannot refer. The Vulgate has substituted the feminine word *præfinitionem*, so that the relative can refer to it. The improvement, therefore, suggests Jerome's hand.

Thus St Jerome appears to be extremely cautious in textual corrections, although his passing citations are so free.

¹ In order to be more or less complete, I will give some further instances of readings suggested as alternatives by St Jerome, but not adopted. α. On Gal. iv 28 *nos . . . filii sumus*, he explains how Origen's reading *uos . . . filii estis* can be understood. β. On Gal. v 24 he remarks that, for his own *carnem crucifixerunt*, Origen read *Christi carnem cruc.*, whereas the *Vulgata editio* read *carnem suam cruc.* He also says: 'Ubi Latinus interpres *uitia* posuit, in Graeco παθήματα, id est, *passiones* leguntur.' γ. On Titus ii 2 *νηφάλιοι* means either *sobrii* or *uigilantes*; he preserves *sobrii*. δ. On Titus ii 15 he carefully distinguishes between *περιφρονείτω* and the similar *καταφρονείτω* of 1 Tim. iv 12, but he admits that *contemnat* (Vg.) must serve for both. ε. On Titus iii 10, where *correptio* is read, he remarks that *νοουθεσία* is rather *commonitio* and *doctrina, sine increpatione*. But he is satisfied to leave *correptio* (for in the case of a heretic blame is necessarily implied). ζ. On Titus iii 15 he reads *Gratia Domini nostri cum omnibus uobis*, adding: 'Sciendum quod in Graecis codicibus ita scriptum est: *Gratia cum omnibus uobis*, ut nec *Domini* nec *nostri* in libris feratur authenticis.' η. On Philemon 6 he reads *euidens fiat* (he quotes it twice), but says 'sive ut in Graeco melius habetur, *efficax*'. In all these cases the Vulgate agrees with the text retained in the commentary, except ζ (Tit. iii 15), where the Vulgate rightly omits *Domini* and *nostri*, but has *Dei* instead (with the Greek G).

§ 6. *Cases in the Commentaries on St Paul where St Jerome has changed the O. L. reading of his codex.*

We have been contemplating St Jerome's timidity in altering the O. L. readings. It does not follow that he was using a ready-made O. L. text.¹ On the contrary, we shall now find him pointing out a few passages where he has altered the reading. Corssen's investigation has shewn that, apart from these important changes to which Jerome calls attention, the text has undergone a careful revision. It is improbable that it was a revision of a single O. L. codex. It is likely that St Jerome made up

¹ This inference has recently been made by Père Ferdinand Cavallera, *St Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres, et de l'Apocalypse* (in *Bulletin de Litt. eccl.* of Toulouse, July-Oct. 1920, pp. 269 foll.). He says (p. 281): 'Un premier point indubitable et à nettement affirmer est que St Jérôme, quand il commente, ne fait pas son texte, mais, sauf un petit nombre d'expressions qu'il signale expressément, utilise un texte préexistant. Ainsi pour les prophètes, il commente parallèlement sa propre traduction sur l'Hébreu et l'ancienne version latine des Septante; pour les *Quæstiones hebraicæ* et l'Éclésiaste, la même ancienne latine en la corrigeant dans le commentaire d'après le texte hébreu, pour St Matthieu, sa propre revision des évangiles,' &c. This is not quite accurate. It is quite true that St Jerome in his commentaries on the prophets uses his own 'Vulgate', almost exactly, and in his commentary on St Matthew somewhat less exactly—that is to say, he comments on a text he had already made himself. But it is not true that he subjoins the Old Latin: on the contrary, he invariably describes the second version (which he gives in some, not all, of his prophetic commentaries) as the LXX; it is therefore an O. L. corrected to agree with the LXX, presumably with Origen's Hexaplar text. Whether it is identical with the revision St Jerome had previously made, or whether he revised it from the Greek as he went on, we cannot tell. But I imagine there is no instance of his commenting on a text which he had not previously revised to some extent. With regard to the commentary on the Epistles: 'Ce *latinum exemplar* que St Jérôme transcrit et commente pour les quatre épîtres paulines, il ne le considère à aucun titre comme sien. C'est le point capital de la discussion qu'il faut bien mettre en relief.' Proofs follow that St Jerome refers to it as the *latinum*, as the work of the *latinus interpres*, &c. P. Cavallera insists: 'St Jérôme ne revendique JAMAIS la paternité de cette version qu'il commente,' whereas (he points out) in the commentaries on the Prophets (frequently) and on St Matthew (once, at least) St Jerome does claim it, for he says *pro eo quod nos diximus* or *interpretati sumus* or *posuimus*. This is quite incorrect, for the list given in the present section shews St Jerome correcting the text, and on Eph. iv 29 (below, no. 27) he actually used the expression *pro eo quod nos posuimus*, as opposed to *Latinus interpres posuit*! Cavallera's serious blunder is partly owing to his neglect of Corssen's small but very important contribution to the subject. Cavallera's article appeared after the present study had already been written and rewritten. I was glad to find that there was nothing to be altered or added to in what I had said. But I am sorry I have to disagree with his conclusions, as he had devoted much labour to the question. I note that Père Lagrange (*La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Galates et le texte grec*, in *Rev. Biblique*, 1917, p. 439) says of St Jerome's text in the Comm. on Gal.: 'il ne se croyait pas, au moins à cette date, l'auteur de cette récession'—the same mistake is made by the learned Dominican as by the Jesuit.

his text by comparing two or three at least. But a comparison with the Vulgate suggests that for that final revision he used further O. L. MSS, from which he obtained some improved renderings.

Here is our second list, giving St Jerome's alterations :

18. Gal. ii 5 : 'Itaque aut iuxta Graecos codices est legendum : *quibus neque ad horam cessimus subiectio*, ut consequenter possit intelligi : *ut ueritas euangelii permaneat apud uos* ; aut si Latini exemplaris alicui fides placet, secundum superiorem sensum accipere debemus. . . .' In the text he has introduced *neque* from the Greek (it is omitted by *d Iren. Ambst. Pel.*). The word is, of course, in the Vulgate, but also in *Amb. Aug.*

19. Gal. iii 1 : 'Legitur in quibusdam codicibus : *quis uos fascinauit "non credere ueritati"?* 'Sed quia in exemplaribus Adamantii non habetur omisimus'; and on v 7 he says of the same clause : 'quod quidem nos in uetustis codicibus non haberi in suo loco annotauimus.' The words are also omitted by the best O. L. authorities, *d Tert. Vict. Ambst. Aug.*, so that St Jerome ventures to omit them in his text here and in the Vulgate (D F G).

20. Gal. v 8 : 'In Latinis codicibus ita scriptum reperi : *Persuasio uestra ex Deo est qui uocauit uos . . . melius igitur et uerius sic legitur : Persuasio uestra non est ex eo qui uocauit uos.*' A query added to the former reading will give the same sense as the second (as in *d Lucif.*). But the *non* is found in *Aug. Ambst.*, and St Jerome introduces both *non* and *ex eo* into his text here and into the Vulgate.

*21. Gal. v 9 : 'Male in nostris codicibus habetur : *Modicum fermentum totam massam corrumpit*, et sensum potius Interpres suum quam uerba Apostoli transtulit.' The text has *totam consersionem fermentat*. But in spite of this, in the comments St Jerome has '*totam massam suo uigore corruperit*', 'ne tota domus, *massa*, corpus et pecora, ardeat, *corrumpatur*, putrescat, intreat'. As the Latin translation really makes the sense clearer and avoids the ugly repetition *fermentum fermentat*, it is not surprising that St Jerome drops his own literal rendering when he comments, and that the Vulgate retains *massam corrumpit* both here and 1 Cor. v 6.¹

22. Gal. v 21 : 'In Latinis codicibus *adulterium* quoque et *impudicitia* et *homicidia* in hoc catalogo uitiorum scripta referuntur. Sed sciendum non plus quam quindecim carnis opera nominata, de quibus et disseruimus.' *Adulterium* is the first in *Iren. Cypr. d Lucif. Amb.*, but not in *Sent. Epp. ap. Cypr.*, nor (frequently) in *Aug.* ; it is in the usual Byzantine Greek text, against \aleph A B C P 33. *Homicidia* is just as common an addition, but omitted by *Iren. Ambst.* and \aleph B 33 al. But the omission of $\phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$ after $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$ is so easy an error to make, that a glance at the Greek may have induced St Jerome to change his mind, so that whereas here he gives only fifteen vices, the Vulgate MSS all give *homicidium* as well.²

¹ Possibly St Jerome discovered the alternative Greek reading, $\delta\omicron\lambda\omicron\iota$ for $\zeta\upsilon\mu\omicron\iota$ (in Gal. v 9 D, Marcion, Origen, Basil ; in 1 Cor. v 6 D, Marcion, Basil cod, Irenaeus transl.).

² Besides, we have heard St Jerome appeal to the MSS of Adamantius : in \aleph $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$ has been added by the correctors ' \aleph^o ', who revised the codex at Caesarea

23. Eph. i 6: 'Nec putandum quod in Latinis codicibus habetur scriptum esse *in dilecto filio suo*, sed simpliciter *in dilecto*.' So the best Vulgate MSS A G.

*24. Eph. i 10: 'Pro *recapitulare* in Latinis codicibus scriptum est *restaurare*' (Vallarsi gives *instaurare*, but his note says some MSS have *restaurare*). *Restaurare* is the O. L. reading (*Ambst. Pel. Oros.*). But the translator of Irenaeus and Tertullian give the literal and obvious *recapitulare*, which St Jerome has introduced. But it is a very bad rendering of ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι ('recite over again'), suggesting as it does that all things are summed up in Christ as their last End, whereas St Paul means 'summed up in Him as their new Beginning'. The Vulgate has *instaurare* (with *Aug.*), which gives the better sense.

*25. Eph. ii 16: 'Per *crucem interficiens inimicitiam in ea*, non ut in Latinis codicibus habetur, *in semetipso*, propter Graeci pronomini ambiguitatem.' But *per crucem . . . in ea* is rather a meaningless tautology, and it is hardly surprising that St Jerome later deserts the commentator he is here following, so that *in semetipso* reappears in the Vulgate.

*26. Eph. iii 14: 'Porro quod sequitur, *ad Patrem ex quo omnis paternitas in caelis et in terra nominatur*, non ut in Latinis codicibus additum est *ad Patrem Domini nostri Iesu Christi*, sed simpliciter *ad Patrem* legendum, ut Dei Patris nomen non Domino nostro Iesu Christo, sed omnibus creaturis rationalibus coaptetur.' The Western addition, *D. N. I. C.*, is in *Lucif. Ambst. Aug. dg.*, and in the Latin of Origen (often), *Bas. Chrys. Theod. Mops.*, and the Byzantine Greek text with \aleph , but it is omitted by \aleph A B C P 33. We should perhaps expect that St Jerome would retain this neutral reading; but it is not even clear that he omitted *D. N. I. C.* in the text of the commentary, for Vallarsi found it in the MSS. And the end of his long comment gives up the 'non Christo . . . sed omnibus creaturis', which he has doubtless incautiously taken from some previous author, and arrives at a truer meaning (whichever reading be adopted): 'Potest ergo et hoc dici, ex eo quod Deus *Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi* iuxta substantiam Pater est, et unigenitus non est adoptione filius sed natura, ceterae quoque creaturae paternitatis nomen adoptione meruerunt'; here he must be using a different author, who read *D. N. I. C.* Consequently it is natural to find *D. N. I. C.* preserved in the Vulgate, with Origen and \aleph .

27. Eph. iv 29: 'Pro eo quod nos posuimus *ad aedificationem opportunitatis*, hoc est quod dicitur Graece τῆς χρείας, in Latinis codicibus propter euphoniā mutavit interpretes, et posuit *ad aedificationem fidei*.' Here we have quite distinct assertions '*Latinus interpretes posuit*' and '*nos posuimus*'; St Jerome has made the same correction in the Vulgate (A F^o G H^o).

*28. Titus i 8: 'Sit autem episcopus et *prudicus*, quem Graeci σόφρονα uocant, et Latinus interpret, uerbi ambiguitate deceptus, pro *prudico prudentem* transtulit.' *Ambst.* has in fact *prudentem*. But Jérôme has

according to the text of Pamphilus, whose text presumably represented that of Origen; in fact St Jerome probably refers to the Library of Caesarea when he speaks of *codices Adamanti*. In his comments on Eph. vi 12 and on Titus iii 10-11 he again quotes the 'works of the flesh' without *homicidia*.

here *castum* in his text, not *puclum*. In the same vein in 393 St Jerome insists (*adu. Iovin.* i 27) that $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\sigma\acute{o}\nu\eta$ in 1 Tim. ii 15 means *castitas*, not *sobrietas*, 'ut male habetur in Latinis codicibus'; perhaps he means his own corrected edition, for the Vulgate has *sobrius* in Tit. i 8 and *sobrietas* in 1 Tim. ii 15! St Jerome wanted *castitas* for controversial purposes against Jovinian. But he knew well enough that *sobrius* is really a better rendering of $\sigma\acute{\omega}\phi\rho\omega\upsilon$ than *prudens* or *castus* or *puclus* (see no. 30 below).

29. Titus i 10: Text has *mentium deceptores*: 'Non ut simpliciter Latinus interpres transtulit, *deceptores*, sed *mentium deceptores*.' This awkward expression (so *Lucif.*) is avoided in the Vulgate by the other O. L. reading *seductores* (so *d Hil. Ambst.*), which St Jerome himself quotes later in his commentaries on Aggaeus and Isaias.

30. Titus ii 6, 7: 'Et licet quidam de Latinis ita existiment legendum: *iuuenes similiter hortare ut pudici sint*, et postea inferant, *in omnibus teipsum formam praebens bonorum operum*; tamen sciamus *in omnibus* ad superiora esse referendum, id est, hortare ut pudici sint in omnibus.' The Vulgate has *sobrii*; but the punctuation is uncertain: G has no stop, F agrees with Jerome, A C D have a stop before *omnibus*.

*31. Titus ii 14: Text has *populum egregium*. Jerome explains at length that *egregium* is his own, the result of much research. The Old Latin had *abundantem* (*d Lucif. Aug. Ambst.* and codices known to *Vict. Afer*). But the Vulgate has *acceptabilem*, possibly the result of further research and consideration.

Out of these fourteen corrections St Jerome has dropped five in the Vulgate (21, 22, 25, 26, 28), either because he was uncertain (and he was right in dropping 21, 25, 28) or because he found no O. L. support (I have suggested that he may have left 22 and 26 unaltered on Origen's authority). In five other places (18, 19, 20, 23, 27) he has preserved the correction in the Vulgate. In two places, 24, 29, he has found O. L. authority for a better reading.¹ The punctuation in 28 is an uncertain case. Once he has made a change, but a different one (31).

Thus our former conclusion is singularly reinforced: the author of the Vulgate avoids correcting according to the Greek Neutral (NB) text, unless he has O. L. authority, or the case is extraordinarily clear. He avoids new translations, if he can possibly find an O. L. expression that will serve. He is extremely conservative, extremely cautious. He believes in the NB text, but he is aware that the Origen MSS in Pamphilus's Library frequently support O. L. readings (for we guess many of Pamphilus's 'Western' readings from H and from the correctors of the

¹ It might be suggested that so many cases where the Vulgate has one O. L. reading and St Jerome another ought to imply that the Vulgate is the revision of a different O. L. text. But the Vulgate reading is always the better of the two, and therefore suggests rather St Jerome's method of comparing many O. L. copies. Anyhow, independence of Vulgate from St Jerome's commentaries is impossible, as Corssen has shewn.

Sinaiticus). All this is absolutely in harmony with the letter to Damasus *Nouum opus*, and with the Pope's commands.

It is also entirely in harmony with the hypothesis that the 'Vulgate' revision of St Paul was made by St Jerome some years later than his four commentaries on Pauline epistles.

I do not see how any serious argument can be dug out of these 31 examples to shew that St Jerome is not the author of the Vulgate. Ten of the cases are marked with a * to shew that Dom De Bruyne had borrowed them from R. Simon and Zegers for this purpose. In four of these cases St Jerome did not even introduce the proposed reading into the text of his commentary. In one of them (14) he actually approves the O. L. reading. I have dealt with the other cases.

Dom De Bruyne has added from his authorities four difficulties which do not occur in the commentaries. He has given no references to St Jerome; but for the sake of completeness I will give them here:

a. 1 Cor. xiii 3, discussed by St Jerome on Gal. v 26: 'Scio in Latinis codicibus in eo testimonio quod supra posuimus: *si tradidero corpus meum ut glorier, ardeam* habere pro *glorier*; sed ob similitudinem uerbi, qua apud Graecos *ardeam* et *glorier*, id est, *καυθῆσομαι* et *καυχῆσομαι* una litterae parte distinguitur, apud nostros error inoleuit. Sed et apud ipsos Graecos exemplaria sunt diuersa.' St Jerome is doubtless changing the text to suit a comment he has borrowed, but he allows that the Greek reading is not certain. At a later date, in the Commentary on Isaias lviii, he quotes: '*ut ardeat, siue glorietur*, utrumque enim fertur in exemplaribus.' No instance of *glorier* is quoted from any Latin MS or writer, except that Souter's note *in loco* (Oxford, N. T. *graecae*) gives doubtfully 'Pelag. comm. 1/2'. But the heretic's comment (Ps-Jer. and Ps-Primas. and Sedul. Scot.) clearly gives two ways of giving one's body to be burned without charity, and cannot be an explanation of alternative readings; nor, in fact, is any choice of readings suggested. The Vulgate retains *ardeam*, of course.

b. 1 Cor. vii 35: *adu. Iouin.* i 13: '*Sed ad id quod honestum est, et intente facit seruire Domino absque ulla distractione.* Proprietatem Graecam Latinus sermo non explicat: quibus enim uerbis quis possit edicere: *πρὸς τὸ εὐσχημον καὶ ἐνπρόσεδρον τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως?* Unde et in Latinis codicibus, ob translationis difficultatem, hoc penitus non inuenitur. Utamur igitur eo quod uertimus.' In fact the O. L. (*Amb. Ambst. Pelag.*) had only *ad id quod honestum est*, except that *d* had to fill up the space in the Latin column, and gives the meaningless *et praesente Domino non recedentes!* St Jerome is evidently giving a new version for his immediate purpose: 'utamur ergo,' &c. This is in 393, two years (in my view) after his revision had appeared. He probably

did not remember by heart the exact words he had introduced 'et quod facultatem praebeat sine impedimento Dominum observandi' (so the good MSS). Clearly *facultatem praebeat* is nearer than *intente facit* to ἐπιπροσέδρον, but *sine distractione* is an improvement on *sine impedimento*. Dom De Bruyne is surprised that St Jerome does not quote his own version. It would be much more astonishing if he did!

c. In *Ep.* xviii 21 (otherwise 18 B, 5) St Jerome avers that in 1 Thess. i 1 'uitiose *Siluanus* legitur pro *Sila*', with no MSS to back this gratuitous conjecture, so far as we know to-day. Probably he would have been ashamed of this remark (of 381) if he ever recalled it to mind later.

d. In *Dial. adu. Pelag.* i 21, St Jerome cites Titus i 7: 'Oportet autem episcopum esse sine crimine siue sine accusatione (hoc enim magis ἀνέγκλητος sonat).' In classical Latin *crimen* meant no more than *accusatio*; but in St Jerome's time it had come to mean a crime, that is, a well-founded accusation, so the Doctor explains the true sense. It was odd to quote this, for it occurs in a long citation of Titus i 5-9, none of which is at all like the Vulgate, so that the whole might have been used to shew that St Jerome did not know the Vulgate! But we shall see presently that this kind of argument proves nothing.

I will add a far more telling passage to those of R. Simon and Zegers: in the *Tract. in Ps. lxxviii (Anecdota Maredsolana* iii p. 67) St Jerome quotes Phil. i 23: 'Melius est enim reuerti et esse cum Christo; quia sic habet in graeco; non habet *dissolui* sed *reuerti*.' So he reads in *Comm. in Eph.* iii 1-4: 'nec reuerti et esse cum Christo' (the reference given by Dom Morin is incorrect), and where he quotes this passage of his own in *adu. Ruf.* i 25. Now the Greek has ἀναλῦσαι, which might mean *dissoluere*, but cannot mean *dissolui*; here it means 'weigh anchor', 'depart'. *Reuerti* is a possible translation, but gives a heretical sense, as though St Paul desired to return to Heaven whence he had come—Origenism perhaps, Priscillianism certainly. It is fortunate that St Jerome did not introduce this rendering into the Vulgate. Had he done so (it is in no MSS so far as I know) it would quickly have been expunged. But *dissolui* remains in all Latin copies. This is very astonishing. It would be strange that any revision according to the Greek should allow such a mistranslation to stand. If it was St Jerome who left it, he did so on purpose, because *dissolui* had become so rooted in the minds of Christians, and is so beautiful an expression. But, I repeat, it is more astonishing that any other reviser should have passed it over.¹ The Gospels and the Old Testament afford a number of astonishing readings.

¹ Surely it is much more astonishing that the best Vulgate MSS all give *ipsa* (with *Aug. Ambst.*) in Gen. iii 15 against the Hebrew, as well as against the Greek and the O. L. of Irenaeus, Cyprian, Lucifer. Take for the Gospels the addition of

So far we have been taking St Jerome's proposed or adopted corrections quite seriously. But he did not treat them so seriously himself. A few odd examples will suffice here. The numbers refer to the preceding lists.

1. Gal. i 16: *Acquieui* disapproved in favour of *contuli* in 387: in 388-389 Jerome quotes *acquieui* (c. *Ioan. Hier.* 28), and he does so again in 398 (*Comm. in Mt.* xvi 17).

On Gal. ii 2 he says: 'Id quod supra (i 16) Latinus interpret *acquieui* dixerat . . . , in praesenti loco *contuli* magis quam *acquieui* interpretatus est. Et ut uerius dicam, sermo Graecus ἀνεθέμην aliud quiddam quam apud nos intelligitur, cum scilicet ea quae nouimus conferimus cum amico . . .' In the text we find *contuli*, and in the Vg. with *Iren.* (*Tert.*) *d*; but in 404 (*Ep.* 112. 8) he substitutes the more usual O. L. *exposui* (*Ambst. Vict. Aug.*).

3. Gal. v 4: he objects to *euacuati estis*, but he retains it in the text and in the Vg., and in 404 (*Ep.* 112. 14) he quotes it.

19. Gal. iii 1: he omits *non credere ueritati* in his text and in the Vg. Yet in 398 (on Mt. ix 17) he quotes 'quis uos fascinauit ueritati non oboedire?'

20. Gal. v 8: on Gal. i 10 he had given *suasio*, though in v 8 he recommends *persuasio uestra*, which he had put in his text, and preserves in the Vg.

It is the same with the Gospels. On Titus ii 11-12 he has 'Unde et illud quod in euangelio secundum Latinos interpretes scriptum est *panem nostrum quotidianum* . . . melius in Graeco habetur *panem nostrum ἐπιούσιον*, id est *praecipuum, egregium, peculiarem*. . . QUIDAM ἐπιούσιον existimant . . . quod super omnes οὐσίας sit, hoc est super uniuersas substantias. Quod si accipitur, non multum ab eo sensu differt quem exposuimus; quicquid enim egregium est, extra omnia est, et super omnia.' Here, in the mention of the *Latini interpretes*, there is nothing to suggest that St Jerome had himself made a revision! He rejects *quotidianum*, so indeed does the Vulgate (except the Irish MSS—which are full of O. L.—and some of the Spanish). But he recommends *praecipuum, egregium, peculiarem*, and only secondarily *super omnes substantias*. Who would guess that in the Vulgate and in his

et in Lk. ii 18, or *erat* in Lk. xxii 55 for the *sedebat* of all the O. L. Or this: on Ezech. xlii 19-20 (Lib. xiv) he writes of John x 16: 'Et alias oues habeo quae non sunt ex hoc atrio . . . et fiet unum atrium et unus pastor'; 'hoc enim Graece αὐλή significat, quod Latina simplicitas in *ouile* transtulit.' In the Vg. he had given *ouile* in both places. Yet every known Greek MS and citation has ποιμήνη in the second place, and the O. L. had *unus grex*. The conjecture that St Jerome knew a Greek codex which had μία αὐλή is a most improbable one; for the assonance μία ποιμήνη, εἰς ποιμήνη would seem to render a variant reading almost impossible.

Comm. on Matthew he had adopted the equivalent (but here not mentioned) word *supersubstantialem*?¹

I therefore repeat that St Jerome did not take his own suggestions very seriously.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

(To be continued.)

THE TEXT AND CONTEXT OF ST JOHN x 29.

WHETHER or not Professor Burney has succeeded in proving that the Fourth Gospel is a translation of an Aramaic original, there is no doubt that his suggestion of Aramaic background sheds welcome light on many dark places. On pp. 101-103 of his *Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* he deals with the problem of the text of x 29 a. Before seeing those pages I had inclined to the view that the reading of A^B &c. represented the original text, namely, ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκεν μοι πάντων μείζον ἐστιν. It seemed to me that this text best explained the other variants. The neuter μείζον would be analogous to the neuter in verse 30, or that found in Matt. xii 6, 41, and 42. The text of B* &c. (ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ δέδωκεν μοι πάντων μείζον ἐστιν), which is adopted by W H, seemed to me to have arisen out of a desire to provide an object for the verb δέδωκεν, the neuter μείζον facilitating the change of ὃς to ὃ. The order of the Greek too appeared to tell strongly against the text of B*, for, as Maldonatus pointed out long ago, 'si voluisset Christus dicere quod sibi Pater dedisset maius omnibus esse, non dixisset: *Pater meus, quod dedit mihi*, sed: *Quod dedit mihi Pater*'.²

Dr Burney's interesting and illuminating suggestion is that the clause originally existed in Aramaic in the form אָבִי דִּיהֵב לִי רֵבָא מְרִכְלָא נְבָרַי . . . ? which אָבִי דִּיהֵב . . . ? may be taken to mean either ὃς . . . μείζον or ὃ . . . μείζον' (p. 102). The further suggestion is made that 'possibly the

¹ Take at random a quotation from the Gospels in the commentaries on St Paul: on Eph. vi 12: 'Ego elegi uos de isto mundo; iam non estis de isto mundo. Si enim essetis de mundo, mundus quod suum esset amaret' (Jo. xv 19), where the Vulgate has: 'Si de mundo fuissetis, mundus quod suum erat diligeret; quia uero de mundo non estis, sed ego elegi uos de mundo, propterea odit uos mundus.' (The addition of *hoc* or *iste* to *mundus* is characteristic of many O. L. texts against the usual custom of the Vg.) Or again, Lk. xii 35: 'lucernae ardentes in manibus uestris' (on Eph. vi 14), where *in manibus uestris* is carefully omitted in the Vg. (all older MSS, except E) and the O. L. MSS (except the late c), together with *Iren. Cypr. Hil. Ambst. Aug.* Yet this addition, which is found in St Gregory's Homilies and hence in the later Vg. MSS (and *Vg. Clem.*), is again cited by Jerome on Ezek. xvi 10.

² Quoted by Loisy, *Le Quatrième Évangile*, p. 624, note³.