

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.

III.

§ II. *The Vulgate N.T. is the Work of a Single Author.*

WE have now arrived at two very curious and very important characteristics of St Jerome. It was well known that as a commentator he was free, inconsistent, amassing all sorts of incongruous and even unorthodox material, so that the results are of ever varying value.

I. But we have now seen that he is just as wild in his quotations from Scripture. Sometimes he uses his own versions, exactly or freely; sometimes he quotes from memory, or makes a new translation. While regularly exalting the *Hebraica veritas* above the Greek, he continually quotes from the LXX. He is so inconsequent that one cannot prophesy that a new version from the LXX in one column will not be followed by a new version from the Hebrew in the next, while either may be adulterated by reminiscences of the Vulgate.

II. On the contrary, in correcting the New Testament he keeps, as far as possible, to St Damasus's directions, and introduces new readings only where the Greek obliges him to do so. But he makes a number of small improvements, to which I have not had occasion to draw attention in this paper. I used to suppose that having corrected the Gospels and Acts with great care, St Jerome had slurred over the rest of the New Testament. I see now that this hasty opinion was unfounded. The variety of readings in the Gospel codices was enormous; the 'Western' interpolations in Acts necessitated radical operations; but in the Epistles the variations in the Greek were small, the Old Latin variants were neither numerous nor important. Far less alteration was necessary, and what alterations St Jerome actually made, he made with extreme caution and even timidity. I see no signs of haste or superficiality, only of reverence for a traditional text, of fear of malignant criticism, and (especially) of deference to the wishes of his deceased patron, Pope Damasus.

I am assuming already that St Jerome revised the whole New Testament. It is time to give the proofs. They are of overwhelming strength.

The data are simple enough :

1. The 'Vulgate' New Testament is a revision of the whole New

Testament—Gospels, Acts, St Paul, Catholic Epistles, Apocalypse—which has come down to us in an incomparably vast number of manuscripts. It was, in all these five portions, a revision of versions which existed before it in considerable variety. Its own varieties are due mainly to the infiltration of older readings. It is as definite a text as the Vulgate Old Testament.

2. It is also homogeneous; for in every part it is a revision of the older text according to the Greek, and according to Greek manuscripts of a particular type, viz. the 'Neutral' \aleph B family.

3. It has come down to us in the same streams of traditions, the same great families of codices—only that the MSS of the Gospels are enormously more numerous.

4. It is beyond question all of much the same date.

Consequently, were it proved up to the hilt that Pelagius was all that he was not—a great textual scholar, a Hellenist, an explorer of manuscripts, a student of readings, a critic of Latin renderings—that his commentary (published before 410) was upon a pure Vulgate text—that Prologues, certainly by him, were prefixed to all Vulgate MSS of St Paul—one would still hesitate before admitting that the revision of the Apostle was due to him. For the question would arise: Who revised Acts? Who revised the Catholic Epistles? It would be difficult enough to have accepted Pelagius and St Jerome as authors each of a part. But that three or more authors, working on the same lines, with the same methods, revising according to the same type of Greek MSS,¹ should have produced three or more homogeneous revisions of

¹ This is denied by Dom D. De Bruyne with regard to the Catholic Epistles (in a review of Père Vosté's Commentary on Ephesians, in *Rev. Bénéd.*, Oct. 1921, p. [4]). He refers to Harnack's *Zur Revision der Prinzipien der N. T. Textkritik*, 1916, in *Beiträge z. Einl. in das N. T.* vol. vii, pp. 117-130. Now it is true that Harnack concludes that St Jerome revised only the Latin style of the Catholic Epistles, scarcely, if at all, referring to Greek MSS. But is Harnack right? I take as a test the first chapter of 1 Peter, and I choose two excellent examples:

1 Pet. i 16: estote τ (Freising fragm.) Hier. (c. Jov.) Gildas Spec (sitis Spec θ)
eritis Vulgate

$\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ K P *al pl*, $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ L ^{al²⁵} Theoph Oec syr^{sch} sah cop arm
 $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ \aleph A B C 5 13 36 37 65 66* 133 137 etc. syr^P aeth Clem.

1 Pet. i 22: per spiritum Vigil Gildas Spec.

om per sp. Vulgate

$\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ πνεύματος K L P *al pl* aeth Theoph Oec

om $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ πν. \aleph A B C 13 27 73

Now Harnack is witness that the Latin text usually agrees with K P &c.; in these two cases the O.L. goes with K P, and the Vulgate has been revised according to \aleph A B C. I turn to Harnack's discussion of the readings, and I find that he has not

three or more divisions of the New Testament, and that these three or more portions should have become the homogeneous whole which we know, and should have come down to us in 'one great tradition—this would be so improbable *a priori*, that one would have been inclined to put aside the most convincing proofs about Pelagius until something could be discovered as to the reviser of Acts and the rest, and some hypothesis (at least) could be suggested to account for the union of the parts in one dominant whole, which conquered and utterly destroyed all pre-existing versions.

But Pelagius is fortunately out of the question. There is no other claimant for St Paul; there is no claimant at all for the other portions, —except, of course, St Jerome.

It is admitted that the Gospels are by St Jerome. We are perfectly free to attribute the whole of the homogeneous revision to the same reviser. It is the obvious thing to do. I believe I have removed the only objections that could be raised.

5. Tradition is unanimous. Until the few rather hasty modern critics, not a voice was ever raised to suggest that St Jerome did not revise the whole New Testament. The victorious career of the Vulgate is entirely due to the fact that it was universally believed in early times to be a revision carried out by the most learned of Western Doctors at the bidding of Pope Damasus. It is true that the Old Latin did not immediately expire, and that St Gregory the Great at the very end of the sixth century declared that the Roman Church used the old version

noticed either of these cases! Yet he has discussed the other curious readings in i 22, where the Latin copies have *caritatis*, except St Jerome (*c. Iov.*) and the Luxeuil lectionary, which gives *ueritatis* with the Greek. (Why St Jerome left this blunder in the Vulgate, I cannot explain, as *ἀγάπης* does not appear in any Greek MS.)

Further, Harnack's principal argument is based on a claim, that the Bobbio St James is pre-Hieronymian, and represents the Old Latin text which St Jerome employed for his revision. It is far more probable that the Bobbio codex has an Old Latin text largely contaminated by the Vulgate; and St Jerome's revision did not consist in taking a single MS and revising its grammar, but in choosing the best readings and renderings out of several O.L. MSS. Consequently I am not impressed by the reference to Harnack, for I regard his study of the Catholic Epistles as exceedingly interesting and suggestive, without being on most points either complete or convincing. Our knowledge of the O.L. of the Catholic Epistles is very small, and more knowledge of the Vulgate MSS is needed. The best witnesses to the Vulgate are G and F. It is curious that F, which is half O.L. in St Paul, should be the best MS of the Catholic Epistles. It is the only Latin MS, so far as I know, which omits 'deglutiens mortem, ut uitae aeternae haeredes efficeremur' in 1 Peter iii 22, a passage which is found in no Greek MS. But G has only 'deglutiens mortem ut uitae heres esset', so I presume that its archetype had the words illegibly added in the margin. This is a remarkable case of the best Vulgate MSS agreeing with the Greek, against all other Latin authorities.

as well as the new.¹ In theory, yes. But even from St Jerome's time onwards, pure Old Latin is not often to be found for the N. T. We have Vulgate, impure Vulgate, and mixed Old Latin and Vulgate, but no longer a rival Old Latin. The Vulgate triumphs early, and eventually triumphs completely.

6. And behind this tradition we have absolutely definite and categorical statements by St Jerome himself, that he revised the whole New Testament.

Did he mean what he said? Was he a boaster and a liar? Yes, it is said: he claimed to have translated the Old Testament when he had only completed three-quarters of it. I propose to shew that this notion is founded on a false reading in the MSS of *De uiris illustribus*.

§ 12. *Digression on the Textual Criticism of St Jerome's 'De uiris illustribus'.*

For in Vallarsi's, Bernouilli's and Richardson's editions of *De uiris illustribus* St Jerome is made to say, cap. 135: *Nouum Testamentum Græcæ fidei reddidi; Vetus iuxta Hebraicum transtuli.* (Richardson gives *Hebraicam*, without citing MS authority.)

As in 392 St Jerome had only translated some two-thirds of the Old Testament, Vallarsi could argue that we are not forced to believe he had revised the whole of the New.

It has been generally inferred that St Jerome is here boasting of what he has not performed, and that the claims he makes are to be taken *cum grano salis*, to say the least. This is grossly unfair, so far as other passages about his own works are concerned; for he is everywhere careful to say exactly how much he has written, and even whether he has worked hurriedly or with conscientious care.

It is therefore not astonishing to find that the words *Vetus iuxta Hebraicum transtuli* are omitted by the best MSS, and by Herding in his edition (Teubner 1879). They seem to be quite certainly an interpolation.

As Richardson's edition is generally followed, it is unfortunately necessary to say something shortly about the text of *De uiris illustribus*. Herding followed the (probably) oldest MS, the upper writing of a well-known Vatican palimpsest, and therefore gave a good text. Bernouilli

¹ The victory of the Vulgate O.T. over the O.L. was very doubtful up to St Gregory's time, for the prejudice in favour of the LXX was very strong; but according to the extant evidence, the conquest was practically complete from St Gregory onwards. This almost sudden change may have been due to St Gregory's influence, for his own commentaries are on the Vulgate. The N. T. was on a different footing; it was not a new translation, but merely the last and best of many competing revisions, and it was partially or wholly adopted at an early date.

(1895) gave a fairly similar text, with collations of the four oldest MSS. Richardson describes about a hundred codices, and divides them into families. Having chosen nine for collation (viz. the seven oldest, and two of the tenth century to represent a different strain of text), he gives a selection of their readings in his *apparatus criticus*, and a few more of their readings in his Preface. This regrettable practice of giving only select readings which the editor thinks interesting is, alas, too common.¹ But the discussion in Richardson's Prolegomena is full enough to enable the patient reader to gather that his text is based on wrong conclusions.

Putting aside the tenth-century MSS, C and H, his other seven MSS fall into two groups. He follows 31, *a* and *e*, of which 31 (Montpellier) is eighth–ninth century, *a* is at Munich (ninth century), and *e* is a Bobbio MS of the eighth–ninth century at Vienna. The other group is older. It consists of T (Vatican) sixth–seventh century; close to it in readings is 25 (Verona, early eighth century, but De Rossi thought it by the same hand as another Verona MS dated 517), and close again is 30 (Vercelli, seventh–eighth century). T 25 30 form a group with which A is closely connected (Paris, sixth century, according to Delisle, Bernouilli, p. xviii). The group A T 25 30 comprises the four codices used by Bernouilli. It is well that Richardson should have added the independent witness of *a* 31 *e* and C H. But it is astonishing that he should have arrived at the conclusion not only that Vallarsi was wrong to base his text on 25, and Herding to base his on T, and Bernouilli equally wrong to base his text on T A 25 30, but that where T 25 30, or even A T 25 30 are against the remaining MSS, their reading is always to be rejected, while *a* 31 may be right against all the rest. Surely any one family or sub-family might conceivably contain a right reading against all the rest! Not only can we never know what readings an early codex may have received from some MS with which its writer (or the owner of its archetype) compared it, but we have to realise that *plausible* readings are propagated with extraordinary ease. Further, it would seem that all our oldest MSS are derived from an early archetype which absurdly read *Pertinace* for *Nerua principe* in cap. ix, *Carinum* for *Caricum* in cap. xli, Antionitas (Anthionetas) in lxii, *omnimodam historiam* and *eruditissimos commentarios* in cap. lxxxi (where the nominative is wanted). All the older MSS contain Gennadius's continuation

¹ Hilberg tells us in the Vienna edition of St Jerome's letters (1910, p. vi), of which he has so greatly improved the text: 'Integram lectionum farraginem a me enotatam ut nimis prolixam salubribus lituris macrescere iussit Augustus Engelbrecht, cuius prudenti iudicio debetur, quod hoc uolumen non in maiorem etiam ambitum creuit.' I hope that Herr Hilberg will overlook Engelbrecht's injudicious advice, and consent to print separately the interesting *farrago* which will permit his readers to exercise their own judgement. But he has given a large apparatus as it is, whereas Richardson's is scanty.

as well as Jerome. But while 25 and 30 are closely related in the text of Gennadius as well as of Jerome, and are therefore presumably derived from a parent later than Gennadius (c. 490), on the contrary, T has a different text of Gennadius, so that the archetype of A T 25 30 was very likely pre-Gennadian. Similarly in Gennadius, 31 *e* form a group with T, to which *a* does not belong, for it agrees rather with 30 25. So the archetype of *ae* 31 for St Jerome was probably also pre-Gennadian. Consequently the archetype of all the seven was presumably of the fifth century, and perhaps not much later than St Jerome.

1. A T 25 30 have a certain number of omissions *propter homoeoteleton*:

xi De natura et inuentione liber unus	<i>om.</i> A 25 30
xi De tribus uirtutibus liber unus	<i>om.</i> A T 25
xi De ebrietate duo	<i>om.</i> T 25
lxxx Quatuor, Ad Seuerum epistularum libros duos, Ad Demetrianum auditorem suum epistularum libros	<i>om.</i> A 25 30 (<i>Gk.</i>)
ccxxxv De locis librum unum	<i>om.</i> T 25

and some other careless omissions:

ix et uidimus	<i>om.</i> T 25 30
ix per ordinem	<i>om.</i> T 25 30
xxii usque	<i>om.</i> T 25 30
xliii Caesareae	<i>om.</i> T 25
lxxxvi Constantino et	<i>om.</i> 25 30

also some wrong readings:

xxxv chrismate (<i>for</i> schismate)	A T 25 30
lxv + qui usque hodie extat	25 30 (<i>Gk.</i>)
ccxii ordine (<i>for</i> opere)	T 25 30

These errors establish the close relationship. Notice that 25 is wrong every time. It looks as if the other MSS had been more corrected than 25, and that it preserves the errors of its ancestors with peculiar and admirable faithfulness. By a paradox, its persistence in error makes it our safest guide.

But the same MSS witness to the true reading where the other family, *ae* 31, has received emendation, for they frequently omit words like *liber*, *uolumen*, *epistola*, which have been interpolated by a corrector. I bracket the words omitted:

vi Epistolam . . . quae inter apocrypha(s) [scripturas] legitur (<i>Gk.</i>)	<i>om.</i> T 25 30
vii inter apocryphas [scripturas] computemus (<i>Gk.</i>)	<i>om.</i> T 25 30
viii [librum] super eorum conuersionem scripsit (<i>Gk.</i>)	<i>om.</i> T 25 30
xi et de uita nostrorum [liber] de quo supra diximus (<i>Gk.</i>)	<i>om.</i> T 25 30

xxxviii meminit . . . [uoluminis] Tatiani Adv. Gentes (Gk.)	om. T 25
lxvi scripsit [epistulam] Ad Fabianum (Fabium 31, al) (Gk.)	om. T 25 30
lxxv in xii Proph. xxv ἐξηγήσεων Origenis [uolumina] manu eius exarata repperi (Gk.)	om. A T 25 30
cxxxv haec scripsi: uitam Pauli monachi [epistularum] Ad Diuersos librum unum (Gk.)	om. T 25

These plausible emendations have percolated twice into 30, but never into T 25, whereas A has all but one. It is clear that T 25 (and especially Vallarsi's revered 25) have best preserved the readings of the archetype A T 25 30, whether wrong or right.

Here are some more corrector's emendations which have not contaminated T 25 :

ii Origenes <i>ceteri</i> (Gk) Adamantius	A T 25 30
vii Lucam non solum ab Apostolo [Paulo] didi- cisse (Gk.)	om. T 25 30
xv Apostolus [Paulus] ad Philippenses scribens (Gk.)	om. 25 30
xviii quid Aristion . . . et Iohannes loquebantur <i>multi</i> (Gk.), loquantur A	25 30 C
xix ualde utilem <i>ceteri</i> (Gk.), ualde necessarium	T 25
xxix inflatus eloquentiae tumore <i>ceteri</i> , elatus el. tum.	T 25 C (Gk.)

Paulus is not wanted. *Loquantur* is true to Papias (Euseb. *HE.* iii 39), but the corrector did not understand. *Valde necessarium* looked odd; *elatus tumore* is a mixed metaphor, and clamoured for emendation. Another emendation is in cap. iv 'Iudas, frater Iacobi' (from Jude i 1) for 'Iudas, frater Domini', T 25 30 (Gk.) with Eusebius. The corrector (and Richardson) misunderstood cap. ii, where Jerome explains that he prefers to take *frater Domini* to mean 'cousin' rather than half-brother. I have found in Richardson's sparse apparatus a number of other readings where T 25 are almost certainly right. But in all the cases I have quoted, Richardson has rejected the reading of T 25. It seems to me that, in spite of their obvious mistakes (the other MSS have as many and more) they are far the best MSS, and that Vallarsi, Bernoulli, and Herding were more successful in restoring the true text than Richardson, with all his laborious work.¹

¹ I have added (Gk.) to the readings above, in order to shew that the Greek version of Pseudo-Sophronius is almost invariably with the bulk of the MSS against T 25. (a) It has one of the omissions only (lxxx). (b) It has xxix *usque hodie exstat*, which looks like a marginal note by an editor; and it is in the wrong position in the Latin. (c) For xxix *elatus eloquentiae tumore* it gives τῷ ὀγκῶ τῆς παιδείσεως ἐναρθεῖς. (d) It recognizes the correct *frater Domini* in ii. In every other case the Greek sides against T 25. It was translated from a copy already corrected and interpolated.

Let us turn to cap. cxxxv, where St Jerome enumerates his own works. We have already seen one wrong reading (*om. de locis librum unum, T 25*) by *homoeoteuton*, and a right one (*om. epistularum, T 25*); in both cases it is probable that T 25 have preserved the reading of the archetype of A T 25 30. One reading in this chapter, *Captium monachum*, is actually adopted by Richardson (rightly, without doubt) on the authority, one gathers, of T 25 e.¹ But he reads *In Lucam homilias triginta nouem*, whereas T 25 30 have *Origenis* after *homilias*, against the rest of the MSS and the Greek. Some corrector seems to have struck out *Origenis*.² In 392 St Jerome would certainly not have claimed the homilies as his own, and translation is easily understood, as the preceding item was a translation from Didymus. In the Preface to Jerome's Commentary on Micah, Bk. ii, written in this same year, immediately before the *De uiris ill.*, he is proud of his versions of Origen: 'Nam quod dicunt Origenis me uolumina compilare, et "contaminari non decere" ueterum scripta, eandem "laudem ego maximam duco"'. (The quotations are from Terence). I do not doubt that T 25 have the right reading, for they are almost wholly free from the conjectures of correctors.

Consequently, the omission by T 25 of 'Vetus iuxta Hebraicum transtuli' is, on purely textual grounds, almost certain to represent the reading of the archetype of A T 25 30, the other two MSS having been corrected. On the other hand it was natural to insert other books of St Jerome into this list. Cod. 25, so clearly uncorrected in Jerome, has in Gennadius inserted the whole of Possidius's *indiculus* of St Augustine's works into cap. xxxix on that Father. In our chapter, H has added *quaestionum Hebraicarum et traditionum in Genesi*, while C and most cursives and the Greek add *aduersum Iouinianum libros duos, et ad Pam-machium apologeticum et epitaphium*, from St Jerome's preface to his commentary on Jonah. But the translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew was Jerome's most famous work; it was obvious to add it to the list, and the interpolation, once added to an early edition, would be copied into every family; for every corrector would (like Richardson) presume an omission in his text. Consequently Herding was perfectly right to expunge the words.

I note, finally, that those who use Richardson's apparatus in order to quote St Jerome, should beware of the readings of *a*, where that codex

¹ The MSS give several variants. The Greek has τὸν βίον αἰχμαλώτου μοναχοῦ.

² For the tendency to alter or omit heretical names, compare the phenomena in many MSS of Palladius (ed. Butler, vol. ii p. lxxxv), where (amongst other substitutions) the name of Origen, the economist of St Pambo, is regularly changed! In the present case, respect for St Jerome would suggest the omission of *Origenis* as a blunder or a libel.

has been corrected according to Eusebius. Richardson has regularly been deceived by the plausibility of these corrections, just as in the similar cases I have noted above.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO § 12.

This section was written long before the appearance of Fr Feder's article in *Biblica* (i p. 500, Rome 1920): *Zusätze zum Schriftstellerkatalog des hl. Hieronymus*, where information is given about a Bamberg MS of the *de uiris illustribus* of the beginning of the sixth century. Fr Feder considers it to be the oldest extant. I hope he will soon publish some further information, as it will be interesting to know whether it connects itself with the families already known. I am sorry I cannot agree with his suggestion that St Jerome made frequent additions to the last chapter of his catalogue, though the idea is in itself probable, and had naturally occurred to me in connexion with the addition *Vetus . . . transtuli*, a passage of which Fr Feder makes no mention.

He notes that there are two forms of the addition at the end of the last chapter: the first gives only *c. Iouin.* and *Apol. ad Pammach.*, the second adds *et epitaphium*, and omits the introductory words *item post hunc librum dedicatum*. The common view has been that these are two incomplete forms of a single interpolation, borrowed from the Preface to the Comm. on Jonas. But that Preface gives the *de optimo genere interpretandi ad Pammach.* (Ep. 57) as well as the *apologia*, and the *ad Nepotianum* as well as the *epitaphium Nepotiani*. One would therefore conjecture that the original form of the interpolation commenced *item post h. l. d.* and gave all these books. It is interesting therefore to find the *ad Nepotianum* added to this in the Bamberg codex, together with the mention of the commentary on Jonas, and that on Abdias which was published together with it, thus (l. c. p. 505):

(Form iii). *Item post hunc librum dedicatum* in Iona lib. i, in Abdias lib. i *contra Iouinianum haereticum lib. ii et apologeticum ad Pammachium ad Nepotianum lib. i* EPITAFIUM eiusdem Nepotiani prbt lib. i.

The words italicized are identical with Form i; EPITAPHIUM belongs to an excerpt, which we call Form ii: *aduersus Iouinianum libros duos et ad Pammachium apologeticum et Epitaphium*. This short Form ii is actually found in the greater number of the very numerous MSS, e.g. out of seventeen Vatican MSS, I have found it in twelve.

But Form ii very often indeed appears with the addition *sed et epistolam ad Dextrum superscriptam, contuli*, e.g. in five out of twelve Vatican MSS. We may as well call this 'Form iv'. It is not mentioned by Fr Feder until p. 511, as he does not attribute it to St Jerome. Now the oldest MS he quotes for Form ii is of the tenth century, and

reviser the advisability of adding to ch. cxxxv the books here enumerated. This has been the usual explanation of Form ii until now, though Martianay and Vallarsi admitted it to the text.

But Fr Feder suggests that Forms i, ii, and iii are additions made by St Jerome himself in 'dedication copies', in the years 393-394, 396-397, and 406 respectively. I do not know what 'dedication copies' may be. 'Presentation copies' one understands; but if a book was once dedicated to Dexter, then *praefectus praetorii*, how could it be 'dedicated' again in successive years to other people?

As to Form iii, that of the Bamberg MS, it adds after the *epitaphium Nepotiano presb. lib. i* (omitting the letter to Dexter) a list of twenty-four more works of St Jerome, the latest of which is of 406. But it seems quite impossible to attribute this catalogue to St Jerome himself.

1. Because St Jerome is most careful to give his writings in chronological order, whereas the list is all higgledy-piggledy. The dates of the writings are: 395, 395, 392, 392, 394, 396, c. 398, 396, before 402, 395, 395, 382 (!), 396, 395, after 400, 392, 401, 398, 392, after 386, after 389, before 406, 406, 392, 399, 401, 399, 397, 402, 406.

2. Because the list is incomplete. St Jerome might in 406 have left out his translations of Origen's homilies on Isaias and of the rule of St Pachomius, but he would hardly have omitted his version of *de Principiis* (398), still less his laboriously polished renderings of the letters of Theophilus, or their dedicatory epistles (396, 398, 404), or even the letter of St Epiphanius (Ep. 51, 394). The list does not contain such important works as *ad Fabiolam de xii mansionibus* (Ep. 78, 399), and *ad Eustochium de morte Paulae* (Ep. 108, 404). If Fr Feder is right in identifying no. 17, *item ad Pammachium* with Ep. 84, and no. 23 *ad Vigilantium pbtm.* with Ep. 61, then the short but not unimportant books c. *Ioann. Hierosol. ad Pammachium* (398-399) and c. *Vigilantium* (406) are not in the list.

3. Because No. 20 *ad Marcellam ex nomine Paulae, de sanctis locis* would hardly have been counted by St Jerome amongst his own works, though he certainly wrote it himself.

4. Because the lists probably overlap that of *de viris illustribus*. No. 12, *ad Damasum episc. Romanum*, is identified by Fr Feder with the Preface to the Gospels *Nouum opus*, but this is extremely unlikely. The only letters to Damasus not actually mentioned in St Jerome's list are 15 and 16, very early letters, which were no doubt included in the book of letters *ad diuersos*, and have therefore already been mentioned. If we suppose that a lost letter is intended, it is indeed astonishing to find St Jerome adding in 406 to his list of 392 a work composed before the death of Damasus in 384!

5. Because No. 10 *ad Furiam de uirginitate seruanda* is a blunder due

he adds three of the fourteenth and fifteenth, whereas for Form iv he gives one of the eighth, one of the ninth, as well as two of the tenth. This might have suggested to him that iv was the original, the unnecessary mention of the dedicatory letter to Dexter having very naturally been omitted by ii.

But a consideration of Form iv shews that it gives the explanation of the strange expression of Form ii-iii: *item post hunc librum dedicatum*. Why *dedicatum*? Why 'after this book was dedicated', and not 'after this book was written'? The answer is evident: the interpolator has taken into account the fact that a dedicatory letter is written after the completion of the book which it accompanies; consequently the next work of St Jerome to be enumerated is the dedicatory letter to Dexter, no doubt the very next thing he wrote after completing the last chapter of the book. Therefore it has to be mentioned before the *ad Iouinianum* and *ad Pammachium*: 'Next, after the dedication of this book, on Jonas one book, on Abdias one book, . . . and the above-mentioned letter to Dexter'.

Consequently I am inclined to look upon the four forms as relics of an addition, which I restore thus, putting parallel with it the passage of St Jerome from which it appears to be taken.

Praef. ad comm. in Ionam.

Triennium circiter fluxit, postquam quinque Prophetas interpretatus sum, Michaeam, Naum, Abacuc, Sophoniam, Aggeum; et alio opere detentus, non poteram implere quod coeperam: scripsi enim Librum DE ILLUSTRIBUS VIRIS, et *aduersum Iouinianum* duo uolumina: *Apologeticum* quoque et *de optimo genere interpretandi ad Pammachium*: et *ad Nepotianum*, uel *de Nepotiano* duos libros, et alia quae enumerare longum est.

de Vir. ill. cxxxv fin.

Scripsi praeterea in Mich. . . . in Soph. . . . in Naum . . . in Abacuc . . . in Aggaeum. Multaque alia de opere prophetali, quae nunc habeo in manibus, et necdum expleta sunt. EXPLICIT. [Item, post hunc librum dedicatum, in *Iona* lib. i, in *Abdia* lib. i, contra *Iouinianum* haeticum lib. ii, et *Apologeticum ad Pammachium* [de optimo genere interpretandi ad Pammachium,] *ad Nepotianum* lib. i, *epitaphium* eiusdem *Nepotiani* prbt. lib. i, sed et epistola ad Dextrum superscripta. CONTULI.]

I assume that *de optimo . . . Pammachium* fell out by *homoeoteleuton*. The only part worth copying was continually copied, viz. Form ii; in *Iona* and in *Abdia* were omitted, because they were included in the *opus prophetale* mentioned by St Jerome. The parallel with the Comm. on Jonas is very close. The mention of the book *de uiris illustribus*, and the remark that after three years St Jerome had not been able to complete the minor prophets, would necessarily suggest to a critical

to a confusion between Ep. 22 (*ad Eustochium de uirginitate seruanda*—so several MSS) and Ep. 54 (*ad Furiam de uiduitate seruanda*), though it must be admitted that the slip *might* be due to a scribe.

The list has apparently been made up by some admirer of St Jerome out of MSS known to him. He did not happen to know the commentaries on the Major Prophets or the books against the Pelagians, so that the list has the air of stopping at 406. But it is so incomplete that such omissions have no significance.

Fr Feder goes on to attribute some other additions to St Jerome himself.

The only one of these which has any appearance of probability in its favour is in ch. lxxxi: *Contra Porphyrium, qui eodem tempore scribebat in Sicilia, ut quidam putant, libri uiginti quinque*. Here some MSS read for *libri uiginti quinque* the words *libri triginta, de quibus ad me tantum uiginti peruenerunt*. A few years later (between 399 and 403) St Jerome wrote (Ep. 70, 3): 'Eusebius et Apollinaris uiginti quinque et triginta uolumina condiderunt' against Porphyry. It seems obvious to conjecture that the true reading is the longer one, and that *libri uiginti quinque* was a correction (possibly in its origin a mere marginal note) made by a scholiast who had noted the *uiginti quinque* in Ep. 70. But some further study of the MSS is needed before one can put forward such a conjecture with confidence. The words are in the Greek translation, but in few MSS.

The other interpolations attributed to St Jerome are wholly improbable. That he should have added *oppidum Italiae* after *Concordiae* in ch. liii, or be answerable for omitting *nunc praefectus praetorio* after *Dexter Paciani* in the table of contents at a date when Dexter had ceased to hold this office, are not likely suggestions. When we are told that St Jerome himself omitted by mistake the words *item Coloni de paenitentia* (ch. lxix) in writing out Eusebius, but added them in a subsequent 'dedication' copy, our credulity is still more seriously tried. For the passage runs thus: *ad Laodicenses de paenitentia, item ad Cononem de paenitentia*, and the omission in many MSS is an ordinary case of *homoeoteleuton*. We should even be astonished did it not occur in some codex or other.

§ 13. *St Jerome is always accurate and sober in enumerating his own Writings.*

St Jerome's works are very numerous. It is generally possible to determine in what order he wrote them, and in what year, from his own statements. We can discover the dates of his translations of various books of the Old Testament. His letters have nearly all been arranged in the order of their composition. When he speaks of his age he is not

always to be trusted, as he is sometimes inclined to exaggerate his years, to speak of himself as an aged man, when we might think him in late middle age; and when looking back to his youth he seems to exaggerate his youthfulness at the date he is recalling. This makes it difficult to determine the date of his birth. But in determining the dates of his writings we do not encounter these difficulties. And he is accurate as to amount. He usually mentions the number of books in each work. He complains of the labour they cost him; he is proud of the care he took in translating the Old Testament; yet he frankly says in his Preface to his version of Tobit: 'unius diei laborem arripui', and in his Preface to Judith 'huic unam lucubratiunculam dedi', for he only gave a few hours to these tasks, to please his friends.¹

I cite, as a good example of Jerome's careful accounts of his work, the last written of his prefaces to his commentaries on the minor prophets. It is addressed to Pammachius (A. D. 406):

'Praepostero ordine atque confuso duodecim prophetarum opus et coepimus, et Christo adiuuante, complebimus. Non enim a primo usque ad nouissimum, iuxta ordinem quo leguntur, sed ut potuimus, et ut rogati sumus, ita eos disseruimus. NAUM, MICHAËAM, SOPHONIAM et AGGAEUM, primo φιλοπονοτάταις Paulae eiusque filiae Eustochio πρωτεφώνησα: secundo in ABACUC duos libros Chromatio Aquileiensi episcopo delegavi: tertio, post longi temporis silentium, ABDIAM et IONAM tibi imperanti edisserui: praesenti anno, qui sexti consulatus Arcadii Augusti et Anitii Probi fastis nomen imposuit (406), Exuperio Tolosanae ecclesiae pontifici ZACHARIAM, et eiusdem urbis Mineruio et Alexandro Monachis MALACHIAM prophetam interpretatus sum. Statimque recurrens ad principium uoluminis, OSEE et IOEL et AMOS tibi negare non potui. Et post grauissimam corporis aegrotationem, dictandi celeritate ostendi temeritatem meam' etc. (*In Amos lib. iii Praef.*)

The first five were published in 392, for in the preface to Jonas (already referred to) he said (in 395):

'Triennium circiter fluxit postquam quinque prophetas interpretatus sum, MICHAËAM, NAUM, ABACUC, SOPHONIAM, AGGAEUM; et alio opere detentus, non potui implere quod coeperam: scripsi enim librum *De illustribus uiris*, et *Aduersum Iouinianum* duo uolumina, *Apologeticum* quoque, et *De optimo genere interpretandi* ad Pammachium: et *Ad Nepotianum* uel *De Nepotiano* duos libros, et alia quae enumerare longum est'.

So in 395 he is careful to explain that he had as yet commented on only five of the minor prophets, just as in 406 he tells us that it was only 'after a long silence' that he started on the sixth. In the Preface *Iungat epistola* to the Vulgate Solomon he explains that illness has pre-

¹ So in the Pref. to his Comm. on Matt., he insists on the hurry with which he had to dictate it.

vented his writing the commentaries on Osee, Amos, Zacharias, and Malachias, which Chromatius and Heliodorus were demanding. These two bishops paid St Jerome's secretaries and scribes (*notarii* and *librarii*). But the writing of *De uiris illustribus* was the first cause of the delay. In the last chapter (cxxxv) of that work he tells us that he had only commented on the five, but meant to get on with the rest. I transcribe the last part of the chapter, restoring the true text :

De Spiritu Sancto Didymi, quem in Latinum transtuli, librum unum,
In Lucam homilias Origenis triginta nouem,
In Psalmos a decimo usque ad sextum decimum tractatus septem,
Captiuum monachum, Vitam beati Hilarionis,
Nouum Testamentum Graecae fidei reddidi,
Epistularum autem ad *Paulam et Eustochium*, quia cottidie scribuntur,
 incertus est numerus.

Scripsi praeterea *In Michaeam* explanationum libros duos, *In Naum*
 librum unum, *In Abacuc* libros duos, *In Sophoniam* librum unum,
In Aggaeum librum unum,

Multique alia de opere prophetali, quae nunc habeo in manibus, et
 necdum expleta sunt.

This is very frank and detailed. He carefully explains that he has written *tractatus* on seven Psalms only, and mentions which. He would give the number of letters to Paula and Eustochium, if he could.

His letter to the Spaniard Lucinus (so Hilberg with MSS, not Lucinius), Ep. 71, written in 398, is still more to the point. Lucinus had sent six scribes to Bethlehem to copy all that Jerome had written from his youth up (Ep. 75. 4); but he wanted copies of some works which were non-existent :

‘Porro Iosephi libros et sanctorum Papiæ et Polycarpi uolumina *falsus ad te rumor pertulit* a me esse translata ; quia nec otii nec uirium est, tantas res eadem in alteram linguam exprimere uenustate. Origenis et Didymi *pauca transtulimus*, uolentes nostris ex parte ostendere, quid Graeca doctrina retineret. Canonem Hebraicae ueritatis, *excepto Octateucho*, quem nunc in manibus habeo, pueris tuis et notariis describendum dedi—septuaginta interpretum editionem et te habere non dubito—et ante annos plurimos diligentissime emendatum, studiosis tradidi. *Nouum Testamentum Graecae reddidi auctoritati*. Ut enim ueterum librorum fides de Hebraeis uoluminibus examinanda est, ita nouorum Graecae sermonis normam desiderat.’ (Ep. 71. 5).

I have italicized a few passages. We see here why St Jerome had to be so meticulously careful in the enumeration of his writings ; it is because so many were ascribed to him which he had not written, and he was worried to give copies of non-existent works.

He does not shew himself a boaster. He does not vaunt that he has published Josephus and Polycarp and Papias in Latin ; he does not claim to have translated a great quantity of Origen ; he is particular in

explaining that he has not finished the Octateuch, though in fact he had already done a portion of it. We cannot doubt that he is sincere when he asserts that he revised the LXX¹ and the N. T., and that he means to be understood of the whole of both.

Were it otherwise, he would have been a liar, and a fool as well as a liar—and he was far from being a fool. *We are asked by the critics to believe that, while he is correcting a false and annoying rumour that he had translated books which he had not translated, with the same pen and on the same paper² he is propagating a false rumour that he has translated other books which he had not translated!* Why, Lucinus's copyists were on the spot; Lucinus was expected shortly at Bethlehem in person; he would be sure to ask for a copy to be made of this new recension of Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse (for if St Jerome is lying, Lucinus cannot have possessed one already),—and how is Jerome to get out of it? Why, the readers all over Christendom of that most popular book, *De uiris illustribus*, would clamour for copies of this (till then unheard of) revision; Bethlehem would be overwhelmed with letters from publishers and booksellers and friends and unknown correspondents, and the recluse would have had to explain and explain that he had only been talking big, and there was nothing to copy.

But in fact the list of writings in the *De uiris illustribus* was just as careful not to say too much. It does not mention the revision of the LXX, for most of it had been destroyed³; it had been a laborious work and St Jerome was proud of it, but he could not mention it, as he would be bored by requests for copies. It does not mention the translation of the O. T., although in the preceding chapter (134) we are told of Sophronius of Bethlehem: 'opuscula mea in Graecum eleganti sermone transtulit: Psalterium quoque et Prophetas quos nos de Hebraeo in Latinum uertimus.' It is only from this passage that we know that St Jerome had translated the Prophets and the Psalms as early as 392. But he seems not to have cared for his translations to be circulated much, except among his friends,⁴ until the whole should be finished, probably

¹ He seems also to mean the whole of the LXX, *adv. Ruf.* i 24. Cp. also Preface to Hebrew Psalter.

² To avoid captious criticism by the unlearned reader, I will note that at this date it was still considered rude to write a letter on parchment. Paper was always used. The pen, however, was probably in the hand of St Jerome's secretary, not in his own.

³ 'Pleraque enim prioris laboris ob fraudem cuiusdam amisimus,' Ep. 112. 19.

⁴ He writes in 393 to Pammachius: 'Libros sedecim Prophetarum, quos in Latinum de Hebraeo sermone uerti, si legeris, et delectari te hoc opere conperero, prouocabis nos etiam cetera clausa armario non tenere. Transtuli nuper Iob in linguam nostram; cuius exemplar a sancta Marcella consobrina tua poteris mutuari. Lege eundem Graecum et Latinum, et ueterem editionem nostrae translationi compara: et liquido peruidebis quantum distet inter ueritatem et mendacium.'

because he wished to reserve to himself the power of still making alterations. Finally, the list does not mention the Roman or the Gallican Psalter.¹

Why then does the list include the revision of the N. T., except because it was published to the world and widely known? Its very position in the list shews that the Gospels alone are not meant. The Gospels appeared in 384, and their place in the list would have been among the works published while St Jerome was at Rome.

§ 14. *St Jerome published his revision of the whole New Testament in 391.*

It is thus certain that St Jerome twice declares that he revised the New Testament, and that on both occasions he makes this declaration in the course of giving a detailed and precise list of writings. The list in the *De uiris illustribus* is strictly chronological. We can therefore quite simply determine the year in which St Jerome published to the world his completed revision. The dates of the preceding and following works are certain enough :

Origen on Luke, translated	389
Lives of St Malchus and St Hilarion	390
NEW TESTAMENT	?
Letters to Paula, still being written	392
Comm. on five minor Prophets	392

Miseram quaedam τῶν ὑπομνημάτων in Prophetas duodecim sancto patri Domnioni, *Samuelem quoque et Malachim*, id est quatuor Regum libros' (Ep. 48 [49]. 4). So St Jerome kept some finished translations in his cupboard. Probably Job was in the cupboard, for it was clearly not on sale, although Marcella had been allowed a copy. Samuel and Kings were apparently the first books to be translated, yet they may have been in the cupboard still, and only communicated to friends. The Prologue to them is a 'helmeted Prologue', it complains of 'barking dogs', and it begs the reader not to pass judgement on the translator till he has first read and studied the version: 'Lege ergo primum Samuel et Malachim meum: meum, inquam, meum,' etc. One may infer, perhaps, that some translations had been carped at already, probably having been communicated in the first place to friends. We must compare the story of St Jerome's translation of Origen's Περὶ Ἀρχῶν (Ep. cxxiv). He sent a copy, the only one made, to Pammachius in 399. The latter shut it in his desk, *reclusit scrinio*, but a friend borrowed it, and lent it to others. St Jerome tells Paulinus (Ep. 85) in 400 to borrow it from Pammachius, 'a supradicto fratre poteris mutuari', the same words he used about Job to Pammachius. In 409 he had a second copy made for Avitus (Ep. 124). MSS of Ep. xlviii (the *Apologia ad Pammachium* of 393) give an interesting glimpse of some scribe at Bethlehem correcting his text from St Jerome's original, '*cursim contulimus Bethlem*' says K (Epinal 68, eighth century), which is repeated in another form: '*emendauit in Bethlehem*' by Π (Reichenau MS at Turin, 49, ninth century).

¹ The date of the Gallican Psalter is not known, but it is commonly placed before 392, and before the translation from the Hebrew.

The lives of the captive monk and Hilarion are placed in 390, on the strength of this list, by Vallarsi, &c. The early part of 392 must have been wholly occupied by the five commentaries and work commenced on other prophets.

Hence it seems that we can hardly be wrong in placing the N. T. in 391, four years after the commentaries on St Paul, and seven years after the appearance of the four Gospels alone.

I fear the reader of this article may think I have argued with an unnecessary amount of detail. But the conclusions at which we have at length arrived are of such great importance for the revision of the Vulgate, that I have tried to make every point as clear as possible. Supposing the revision of the New Testament to have been made by several different authors, or to have been published at various times, or even to have passed through two or three successively corrected editions in the case of St Paul's epistles, or simply to be later than St Jerome's time, the whole question of restoring the text of the revision would be perturbed. If there were several revisers (as Corsen and De Bruyne have thought) we should have to learn the character of text preferred by each. If the parts were published at different dates, the genealogies of families of MSS would need to be treated in a different way. If the Vulgate St Paul was a third edition of Pelagius, it would be from fifty to a hundred years later than 391, and the earliest manuscripts would be far nearer to the original. I believe that the history of the texts makes such hypotheses impossible; and if research proceeded on the basis of such hypotheses, I imagine the whole subject would be involved in an inextricable tangle. The fact that St Jerome revised the whole with one method and published the result together, as a single book with one Preface to the whole, must simplify the history of the text of the N. T., the Gospels apart.

No less important, in my opinion, is the conclusion that St Jerome exercised great care and great restraint in revising St Paul, that he really collected a number of varying Latin texts, and was anxious not to introduce a new translation wherever any old reading would serve. This necessarily throws a light on his method of revising the Gospels.

It was the opinion of Bishop Wordsworth and Mr White when they published St Jerome's text (most judiciously restored) with the text of the *codex Brixianus* (*f*) printed below it, that the latter codex represents the Old Latin text on which St Jerome based his revision. I have always regarded *f* as a semi-Vulgate text. Mr Burkitt argues that it depends on the Gothic version. Prof. Souter has shewn that for the Parable of the Prodigal Son in Ep. xxi (A. D. 383) St Jerome used a codex resembling the Vercellensis (*a*), and he suggests that it is this type of text which lies behind St Jerome's revision.

I venture to disagree. I think St Jerome really did what he professes to have done in his letter *Nouum opus*. When Newman proposed to revise the Douai version of the Bible, he collected a number of editions of the English versions, Protestant and Catholic, and the volumes may be still seen on the shelves of the Edgbaston Oratory. Similarly, St Jerome seems to have collected a number of codices of the Gospels and of the rest of the N. T., and to have 'sat in judgement' upon them, as St Damasus had required. I do not think we can say that *a* or *f* dominates in the result. But many difficulties are explained by St Jerome's shyness in introducing new readings which were not supported by any of his MSS. And possibly the variety of codices on St Jerome's shelves supplies a partial explanation of the startling variety of his quotations in his later writings: he used any volume which came to hand, when he did not simply trust to memory.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Note.—I am sorry that in my article in the number for Oct. 1922, on p. 44 I accused Père Cavallera of having committed a 'serious blunder'. I see that on the following page of his article (p. 284) he admits that St Jerome, in commenting on St Paul, did occasionally correct the Old Latin text which he used as a basis. Consequently there is no difference between his view and mine; we agree that St Jerome corrected, but not very often. This is also the same as Corsen's view! But I do not now understand what Père Cavallera meant on the previous page (p. 282 of *Bulletin de Littér. Ecclés.*, Toulouse) by saying: 'St Jérôme ne revendique JAMAIS la paternité de cette version qu'il commente'; the JAMAIS in small capitals is rather misleading in the context, as it seems to exclude the *nos posuimus* which Père Cavallera actually quotes on p. 284 from the Comm. on Eph. He has not expressed himself clearly; but I am glad that his enormously laborious enquiry has led to the same result as I have reached.