Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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:

Buy me a coffee   https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON   https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal   https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute,

OR,

Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

SECRETARY: E. WALTER MAUNDER, F.R.A.S.

VOL. XLVIII.

1916.

580TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.

THE REV. PREBENDARY H. E. FOX, M.A., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the preceding Meeting were read and confirmed.

The CHAIRMAN introduced the Rev. H. J. White, M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, King's College, London, and invited him to deliver his address on " The Connection between the Vulgate Version of the Bible and the Theology of the Western Church."

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE VULGATE VERSION OF THE BIBLE AND THE THEOLOGY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH. By the Rev. H. J. WHITE, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, King's College, London.

I HAVE ventured to speak of the *connection* between these two facts rather than of the *influence* of one upon the other; for it is difficult to say how far the Vulgate has influenced Western theology, and how far Western theology has influenced the Vulgate. Each has influenced the other; each has reacted upon the other; a translation will affect doctrine, and doctrine will affect translators. The main point to which I wish to draw attention is the intimate connection between the two; the fact that some distinctive features of Latin theology are bound up with the Latin version of the Bible, and bound up with texts where that version differs from the original, or at any rate gives but one out of several possible translations.

When we speak of the Vulgate, or of Latin theology, we must bear in mind what a vast realm is embraced by the words. For more than a thousand years the Vulgate was the sole form in which the Bible was known to Western Christendom; it is still the official version of the Roman Church, and is carried by her missionaries over the whole world, and employed by them in teaching; directly or indirectly, it is the parent of all the vernacular versions of Western Europe, the Gothic version of Ulfilas

alone excepted, for Ulfilas translated the Old Testament from the Septuagint, and the New Testament from the Greek.* Its influence was felt on Luther's translation and on our own Authorized Version ; and the Vulgate may claim to have had a larger circulation, and to have been more widely studied, than any other version of the Bible, and even than the original Hebrew and Greek. If, therefore, we are to understand Western theology we must study it with the Vulgate Bible at our sides ; if we are to understand Dante, we must refer constantly to the Vulgate ; even when working at the Latin theologians who wrote before Jerome's time, we shall do well to have our Vulgate at hand, for that version was, in the New Testament, largely an emendation of earlier Latin versions, and many of their distinctive readings passed over into the Vulgate text.

May I remind you very briefly of the main points in the history of Jerome's work ? It was in A.D. 382 that he received the commission from Pope Damasus to make a revised transla- tion of the whole New Testament ; not so much to translate it anew from the Greek as to judge among the numerous exist- ing translations and select throughout that rendering which best represented the Greek.† In the following year, 383, Jerome brought out the first instalment of his work, the Four Gospels. These were succeeded in the next year, 384, by the rest of the New Testament, which was, however, much more hastily done ; indeed, some scholars have doubted whether Jerome ever did revise the rest of the New Testament ; but my study of the Acts and Epistles has made it clear, to me at any rate, that tradition is correct. Somewhere also about this time, though the exact date is not known, he made his first emendation of the Psalter, revising the Old Latin text from the Greek of the LXX ; this is the *Psalterium Romanum*, still in use in S. Peter's at Rome. In 385 Jerome left Rome and, after a short period of travel, settled for the rest of his life at Bethlehem. In or about 387 he revised the *Psalterium Romanum*, using not only the LXX, but the other Greek versions and appending Origen's critical signs ; this is the *Psalterium Gallicanum*, so called from the wide popularity which it attained in Gaul, apparently through the efforts of Gregory of Tours (A.D. 594) ; it ultimately became the current version in the Roman Church, and it is this Psalter

---

* Scrivener-Miller, *Introduction*, II, p. 146.
† See "Vulgate" in Murray's *Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, p. 935 f. ; and the letter of Jerome to Pope Damasus, "Novum Opus facere me cogis ex veteri," printed at the beginning of most Vulgate Bibles.

(not Jerome's later translation direct from the Hebrew) which appears in the modern Vulgate Bible. The Psalter was apparently followed by revised translations of the other books of the Old Testament from the LXX, though very few of these are now extant, and gradually Jerome settled down to his biggest task of all—the translation of the Old Testament direct from the Hebrew—and this occupied him till after 404. The Vulgate Bible is therefore a composite work; in the New Testament it is a revision of existing Latin translations by the aid of the original Greek ; in the Old Testament it is partly a revision of older work by reference to the LXX version, mostly, however, a translation direct from the Hebrew.

In considering any version of any book, we must bear in mind that no version can express its original exactly ; everything loses by translation. That is quite true ; but there is another sense in which it may be said that everything gains by translation ; for every translation is also an interpretation, a commentary ; it puts into the original more than it found there. Two translators, indifferent honest, but holding diametrically opposed opinions, and holding them strongly, would produce very divergent translations of a treatise on the subject about which they differed.

But in translating a book, the translator will be met by words for which he can provide no exact equivalent ; it is not so much his fault as the fault of his language. Or again, the meaning of a word may alter, and what was a fair translation at the time may be a misleading one a thousand years later. Or the original may be ambiguous or vague ; the translator has to select one out of several meanings of a word, or he has to interpret an expression in order to make it intelligible ; sometimes an officious scribe will add a marginal note to a text, and this interprets or amplifies its meaning, and is in time incorporated into the text. Sometimes the translator with strong views goes further ; he is convinced that the phrase he has to translate, *cannot, does* not, represent the author's real mind ; there must be, there *is,* an obvious mistake, and he feels it his bounden duty to rectify this in his translation ; in plain English he deliberately mistranslates in defence of his own theories ; and he puts down not what the author said, but what he would have said had he been in the author's place. There is the case, too, of proper names, plays upon words, etc. ; if these are reproduced literally in a translation they lose their meaning ; but it is difficult to translate them without doing much more, *i.e.,* interpreting them. While finally,

in the case of printed editions, a good deal of alteration may be made by carelessness, or by design, in the use of capital letters, marks of punctuation, etc.

The Vulgate, take it all round, is a very good and honest translation; yet we shall find these imperfections in it, and others as well; and they have had not a little effect upon the theology of the Western Church.

To begin with, we noticed above that Jerome's revision of the Pauline Epistles was very hasty, so hasty that some scholars have doubted whether he revised them at all. Some years ago the late Bishop of Salisbury, Dr. John Wordsworth, complained of the injury done to Western theology by this hurried, super-ficial revision ; he said, that if St. Jerome "had re-translated the New Testament with that power of expression of which he was a great master, he would have done a service to the Church higher than we could easily estimate. He would not say that the Reformation would not have been necessary, but he would say that St. Paul would have been understood by the early Christians in the Western Church, and would have been appreciated and loved and used when, owing to the fact that St. Jerome only used a very imperfect translation of St. Paul's Epistles, and did not properly revise the translation so made, St. Paul was never properly understood in the Western Church until the Reformation. He did not mean to say that there were no great men who understood him; but St. Paul's arguments and ideas did not penetrate into the masses of the people as they might have done."*

This, therefore, brings us to our first cause : when the Pauline Epistles were first translated into Latin the translators were not able to suggest adequate Latin equivalents for the Greek in some quite important cases ; Jerome let much of their imperfect work pass; and Western theology was the loser in con-sequence.

As instances of this, we may note the translation of $\chi \acute{a} \rho \iota \varsigma$ in St. Paul by *gratia* ; we may perhaps be unable to think of any more adequate rendering, but still the fact is clear ; they do not suggest the same things. $X \acute{a} \rho \iota \varsigma$ and the allied words suggest above all things the general idea of God's favour towards us, an atmosphere of kindness and benignity, resulting in an answering feeling of love and confidence on the part of

---

* Speech at Bristol Church Congress, October 16th, 1903 ; quoted in the *Life of Bishop John Wordsworth*, p. 152.

the Christian to God, and so in the free joyous performance of the Christian virtues; χάρις led to the outpouring of χαρίσματα, special gifts of grace, on the Christian. Now *gratia* and the allied words in Latin do not so much suggest this as the idea of a *free gift*, " gratia gratis data," as distinguished from a reward that may be claimed as matter of right; that is, it corresponds to only a part of the idea of χάρις instead of to the whole. Consequently the doctrine of grace in the Western Church is partial, external, hard, compared with the Eastern; atmosphere gives way to a series of acts.

Similarly *Lex* means less than תּוֹרָה, and *Justitia* than צְדָקָה; *Testamentum* is only one half of διαθήκη.*

Again, μετάνοια signifies a change of mind, especially that change of mind by which a man turns from evil to good, abhors the sins which he has committed, and resolves to enter upon a new course of life. Lactantius thought that the best rendering of this into Latin would have been *resipiscentia* (Inst. vi, 24)† = a recovering of oneself as from a fainting fit. The translation *poenitentia*, however, only conveys part of the meaning of μετάνοια, the idea of sorrow for sin. Tertullian (c. Marc. ii, 24, quoted by McNeile on Matthew iii, 2) noted the same thing: " In Graeco sono poenitentiae nomen non ex delicti confessione sed ex animi demutatione compositum est."

In the Douay English translation of the Vulgate the meaning of the word has been still further narrowed down by μετάνοια being rendered almost always by " penance," and the verb μετανοεῖν by " do penance."‡

Πιστεύειν§ is another case : it implies not merely belief as " an assent to that which is credible, as credible " in Pearson's well-known definition, but also a loyal devotion of the heart ; to put one's trust in a person, to give oneself up to him and to follow him absolutely. But *credere* in Latin suggests mainly the intellectual side of this, the believing that a thing is true. " To

---

* These and other cases of inadequate translation were pointed out in a letter of the Rev. Canon Girdlestone to me, April 26th, 1916.

† " Is enim quem facti sui poenitet, errorem suum pristinum intelligit ; ideque Graeci melius et significantius μετάνοιαν dicunt, quam nos latine possumus *resipiscentiam* dicere." " Resipiscant " is used as a translation of ἀνανήψωσιν in the Vulgate of II Tim. ii, 26.

‡ The exceptions are μετάνοια = " repentance," Acts v, 31 ; xi, 18 ; II Tim. ii, 25 ; Heb. xii, 17 ; μετανοεῖν = " to be penitent," Acts iii, 19 ; = " to repent," Mk. i, 15 ; Luke xvii, 4 ; Rev. ii, 21 (*semel*).

§ Henslow, *The Vulgate the Source of False Doctrines*, p. 128.

believe" therefore must have inevitably meant less in Latin than it did in Greek, and the whole conception of faith got more intellectual, and less emotional, moral and spiritual, as the Latin terminology spread. No doubt the trained theologians endeavoured to rectify this; nothing better, to my mind, can be devised than their distinction between Credere deum (to believe that God existed), Credere deo (to believe that what God said was true), and Credere *in* Deum (to believe on God with all one's heart and mind and strength); but the theologians' careful distinctions are not always appreciated by the populace.

We now come to the question of alteration in meaning which words sometimes undergo; the text Ephesians v, 32, presents us with a case of translation where the Latin has in process of time acquired a specialized meaning; and the specialized meaning is not that of the original Greek. St. Paul, after speaking of the love between husband and wife, adds τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστὶν · ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησιάν. As to the meaning of μυστήριον, few people would dissent from Dr. Hatch's verdict,* that the word in the LXX Old Testament, in the Apocryphal Books, and then in the New Testament, was used (1) of a *state secret*, the *secret purpose* of God, and (2) for the *secret sign or symbol* by which this secret purpose could be conveyed from one to the other of the initiated, without the knowledge of the outer world. Thus in the Apocalypse the *mystery* of the seven stars, the *mystery* of the woman, etc., means the *symbol* of the stars, or of the woman; the woman, the stars, are symbolical representations of certain spiritual facts. Thus in Ephesians v, 32, the *mystery* which is a great one probably means the *symbol*; "this *symbol* of marriage is a great one. I interpret it as referring to Christ and to the Church." Dr. Hatch concludes:—"The meaning of μυστήριον was expressed in early ecclesiastical Latin by *sacramentum*. It has hence resulted that the meaning which came to be attached to *sacramentum*...is the meaning which is proper not to the word itself but to its Greek original, μυστήριον." Certainly Cyprian, and later Augustine, use *sacramentum* in the sense of *symbol*; Augustine says "Sacramentum est signum rei sacrae "; Cyprian speaks of the many *sacraments* contained in the Lord's Prayer, etc.; he says that the Red Sea was a *sacrament* of Baptism. Quite naturally, therefore, Ephesians v, 32, was translated into Latin, "Sacramentum hoc magnum est: ego autem dico in Christo

---

* *Essays in Biblical Greek*, p. 57, ff.

et in ecclesia"; and quite naturally, as *sacramentum* gradually acquired a restricted meaning in ecclesiastical Latin, this text also altered its meaning and was claimed in defence of the position that marriage was a sacrament. Dr. Abbott, in his note on the passage,* says that though this reading undoubtedly led to matrimony being regarded as a sacrament, the best scholars in the Roman Church, Erasmus, Caietan, and Estius, reject the view. On behalf of it he only quotes, and that at second-hand, an Encyclical of 1832. But he might have quoted more. The Council of Trent (Sess. 24 *de sacramento matrimonii*) quotes this text as implying that the grace · which sanctifies the marriage state was brought in by Christ. The *Catechismus Romanus* goes further (Pars ii. c. viii, qu. xv), and says that the Church holds for certain that marriage is a sacrament, on the words of St. Paul—though it goes on to explain that by "sacramentum" is meant "sacrum signum." It also affirms that this is the teaching of the Council of Trent, and that the ancient Fathers so interpreted the passage. Aquinas gives the passage as one that may be quoted on behalf of marriage being a sacrament (Summa : Suppl. III^{ae} partis : qu. xlii, art. i). Perrone clearly thinks that the passage teaches that marriage is a sacrament, though he frankly says that he prefers to be on the safe side and not to go beyond the language of Trent. Gury quotes it unhesitatingly; a Lapide quotes it but explains *sacramentum* as "the most perfect sign of that union once formed" between Christ and His Church.

Our next class is that of variant translations of the same passage in the original. The first instance is of a translation adopted by the Vulgate from the LXX; it cannot, therefore, be included among peculiarly Vulgate readings, nor was the doctrinal use made of the text peculiar to the Western Church; but as an interesting case of a wrong interpretation of Scripture being employed to support doctrine, I venture to put it before you. In Hebrews xi, 21, it is said that Jacob when dying ἔκαστον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσὴφ εὐλόγησε, καὶ προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ. The quotation is from the ˙LXX version of Genesis xlvii, 31, the Hebrew being וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל עַל־רֹאשׁ הַמִּטָּה. When Jerome came to that place in his translation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew, he rendered

---

* "Ephesians," in *Intern. Crit. Comm.*, p. 175.

it "Adoravit Israel Deum conversus ad lectuli caput"; our
own R.V. has "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head."
The LXX translators, according to Driver, wrongly vocalized
the last word as הַמִּטֶּה instead of הַמִּטָּה ("staff" instead of
"bed"); if the word were intended to mean Jacob's staff it
would have to be "*his* staff," מַטֵּהוּ, instead of הַמַּטֶּה. The
original Hebrew means that Jacob turned himself over upon
his bed, and bent himself towards the head of the bed, imitating
actual prostration as far as possible. The LXX, however, as
we have seen, translated it προσεκύνησεν ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς
ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ, where the ἐπί, as always with προσκυνεῖν (πρ.
ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, κ.τ.λ.) must be taken *locally*;
Jacob worshipped, bending over, or leaning upon the head of
his staff. The Vulgate went a step further and translated it
here "adoravit fastigium virgae eius," "he worshipped the top
of his staff"; and consequently in this passage has been found
Scriptural warrant for the worship of images; Jacob, it is said,
worshipped an image which was on the top either of his own
staff or of Joseph's staff. Estius imagined the latter; Jacob
saw in Joseph the type of Christ, and in Joseph's staff (" virgae
ejus," not " virgae *suae*") he acknowledged the royal dignity of
Christ, and consequently worshipped it. A Lapide takes it
much the same way; Jacob worshipped the staff, that is, the
sceptre and power and princely dignity of Joseph; for Joseph
was second in the kingdom only to Pharaoh, and Joseph also
was a type of Christ.

It was, according to a Lapide, on the ground of this text
that the Second Council of Nicæa (A.D. 787) approved the
worship of images. Certainly, Leontius (Bishop of Neapolis in
Cyprus), in his *Sermo contra Judaeos*,* defended himself against
the charge of idolatry in worshipping the Cross, by this example
of Jacob, it being clear that Jacob did not worship the wood,
but Joseph through the wood; as we also worship Christ through
the Cross. Also Pope Hadrian I., in his letter to Constantia
and Irene,† refers in the same way to Jacob, who "summitatem
virgae filii sui Joseph deosculatus est, fidei dilectione hoc agens
. . . non virgae sed tenenti eam honoris ac dilectionis exhi-
buit affectum"; and both of these documents were read at the
Council.

---

* Migne (Patr. Gr., xciii, 1601).
† Migne (Patr. Lat., xcvi, 1225). I owe these references to Dr. Stone,

Amongst passages which have been diversely translated from the very first we must number the κεχαριτωμένη applied by the angel to the Blessed Virgin Mary in Luke i, 28. That the translation there is not absolutely certain is shown by the margins of our own Bible; both the A.V. and the R.V. texts translate it, as I believe rightly, by "thou that art highly favoured"; but the A.V. margin gives as alternatives "thou that art graciously accepted," and "thou that art much graced," while the R.V. margin gives as an alternative "thou that art endued with grace."

The majority of the Old Latin MSS. rendered it "gratia plena" = "thou that art full of grace"; but the MSS. cited as *e* and *q* (representing an early African source) have *gratificata*, a literal translation of the Greek passive participle, and = "thou to whom favour is shewn"; while the famous Codex Bezae paraphrases by using "benedicte," which it has also to employ immediately afterwards for εὐλογημένη. The Vulgate therefore followed the *majority* of the early Latin texts in rendering κεχαριτωμένη "gratia plena"; it was not an innovation on the part of Jerome: he took the reading most current at the time, and he gave it his sanction.* The Jesuit commentator Maldonatus therefore is correct up to a point when he extols the divine inspiration which has led all ancient writers to render κεχαριτωμένη by *gratia plena;* all the Latin *Fathers,* so far as I know, use that term, but not all the Latin *versions.* And later, Erasmus, who can hardly be accused of Protestant prejudices, translated it *gratiosa* (which was also the rendering of the Protestant Zurich version); and in his note added " nec est *gratia plena* sed, ut ad verbum reddam, *gratificata* " (*i.e.,* the reading of *e* and *q*). Here, therefore, is a case where the Vulgate has one out of several possible translations of a Greek word; if anyone wishes to see the effect of this translation on Roman doctrine he need not go further than the commentaries of Maldonatus and a Lapide.

Another case of a variant translation which has affected Western theology is furnished by Romans v, 12. Here St. Paul is arguing that " as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed through unto all men *in that*

---

* Ep. 65 *ad Principiam:* " Nam et sancta Maria, quia conceperat eum, in quo omnis plenitudo divinitatis habitat corporaliter, plent gratia salutatur."

all sinned" ("for that," A.V. and R.V.). The Greek is ἐφ'ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, and the ᾧ is certainly neuter, not masculine; it therefore = "inasmuch as," ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι. Origen, however, took it as masculine, and the Old Latin version, which Jerome followed, rendered it *in quo*. This is a quite possible translation, and I have noted a parallel case in II Cor. v, 4, where St. Paul says, "We that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not *for that* we would be unclothed, but clothed upon," etc.; the Greek there is ἐφ'ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, κ.τ.λ., and the Vulgate renders it *eo quod nolumus expoliari;* but the Old Latin MSS. *d e*, one Vulgate MS. (H) and Hilary and Augustine have *in quo nolumus*, etc. The Vulgate reading in Romans, however, gives a perfectly different doctrinal sense to the passage—"sicut per unum hominem peccatum in hunc mundum intravit et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes homines mors pertransiit *in quo* omnes peccaverunt " asserts the mystical union of the whole human race with Adam, so that when he sinned all men sinned in him. This text was accordingly pressed in this sense by Ambrose, Augustine, and other of the Western Fathers, Augustine using it frequently in his controversy with the Pelagians; and undoubtedly it did much to support in the West the explanation of original sin as being due to the mystical union of the race with its first father.

The famous text of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses" in I John v, 7, is a good instance of the manner in which a marginal gloss may obtain a footing in the text of the Bible. Its presence in our A.V. was due to the Greek text published by Erasmus.* Erasmus published his first edition of the Greek Testament in 1516 without the verse; but in his third edition, published 1522, he inserted it, in accordance with a promise he had given that he would do so if he could find it in a single Greek MS. He did find it in a sixteenth-century MS.—*i.e.*, a MS. not so old as Erasmus himself—the *Codex Montfortianus*, in which the clause is clearly a translation from the Latin. As a matter of fact the text is not found in any Greek MS. at all until we get to the fourteenth or fifteenth century; it is then found in two MSS., having come into them from the Vulgate. None of the Oriental versions has it; and it is not quoted by a single Greek Father, though, *e.g.*, in the Arian controversy, it

---

* Westcott, *Epistles of St. John*, p. 207.

would have been a most convenient text for them.* Nor does it find place in the earliest and best MSS. of the Vulgate, nor is it referred to by the Latin Fathers, such as Hilary, Lucifer Calaritanus, Ambrose, Jerome, Leo, or Gregory the Great; while attempts to find references to it in Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine have proved failures. The first definite reference to it comes in the *Apology* of Priscillian, who was executed for heresy in Spain in A.D. 385. This *Apology*, which was discovered, and edited from a Würzburg MS. of the fifth or sixth century, by Dr. Schepss in 1889, was presented to a Synod of Bishops at Saragossa in the year 380; the Bishops, having demanded of Priscillian and his followers an account of their belief. Priscillian, however, in quoting the verse, places the clause as to the Heavenly witnesses *after* that of the earthly witnesses, and the earliest Vulgate MSS. which contain the clause, and which are nearly all Spanish, have the same order. The earliest MS. which contains the verses in the order familiar to us dates from the eleventh century. This early order, as Dr. Künstle suggests, may explain the origin of the verse; the Heavenly witnesses are really an interpretation of the earthly. " Spirit," " blood," and " water " were referred to the three Persons of the Trinity : " Spirit " to God the Father, for God was a Spirit; " blood " to the Son Who assumed our flesh and blood; " water " to the Holy Spirit Who was given to the believer in the water of Baptism. Then afterwards the inserted clause was found to be useful as containing a clear statement of the full doctrine of the Trinity, and was retained in the text, the Heavenly witnesses being now placed before the earthly.

The instance of the text I John iv, 3, has been pointed out to me by Canon Girdlestone. Dr. Westcott's note on the passage† is so complete that we can do little more than reproduce its main points. All the Greek MSS., the Greek Fathers (with the one exception of Socrates the Church historian), and all the versions except the Latin, read—though with minor variations among themselves—$\pi \hat{a} \nu$ $\pi \nu \epsilon \hat{v} \mu a$ $\hat{o}$ $\mu \grave{\eta}$ $\acute{o} \mu o \lambda o \gamma \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ $\tau \grave{o} \nu$ 'Iησοῦν ($+ K \acute{v} \rho \iota o \nu$ ℵ, $+ X \rho \iota \sigma \tau \acute{o} \nu$ KL, etc.); while ℵ KL add $\grave{\epsilon} \nu$ $\sigma a \rho \kappa \grave{\imath}$ $\grave{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \lambda \upsilon \theta \acute{o} \tau a$; " Every spirit that confesseth not Jesus ($+$ Lord, *or* $+$ Christ) come in the flesh " . . . " is not of God." There can be no doubt that this is the right

---

* See throughout K. Künstle, *Das Comma Ioanneum.* (Freiburg, 1905.)

† *Epistles of St. John*, p. 163.

reading; the manuscript evidence alone is decisive, while the correspondence with the previous clause (πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστιν) absolutely demands it; those simple impressive repetitions are just in St. John's style. The writer is emphasizing the paramount importance for the Christian faith of outwardly confessing that our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared on earth in the flesh, and he states this first affirmatively and then negatively.

The variant reading is πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν, omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum, " Every spirit that dissolveth Jesus "; this is not found in any extant Greek MS., but is mentioned by the Church historian Socrates (fifth century) as being the reading of the "ancient MSS." in his days (H.E. vii, 32). Writing of Nestorius he says that he was ignorant that the πάλαια ἀντίγραφα of this passage in St. John's Epistle read πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔστι; and he also accuses those who desired to separate the deity from the humanity in Christ (i.e., the Nestorians) of removing this thought from their Bibles, and notes that the ancient interpreters were aware of this. Socrates certainly wrote in Greek, but he does not say outright that the reading was found in Greek MSS., and Westcott thinks that he may be referring to some Latin MSS. and Latin commentators. For certainly the Latin evidence for λύει, solvit, is as strong as the Greek evidence is against it. It is found in Irenæus, Tertullian, the Latin translations of Clement of Alexandria, and of Origen, in Priscillian and in Augustine, and is the Vulgate reading. Here, of course, the sense is different; what is asserted is not the broad fact of the Lord Jesus having appeared on earth in the flesh, but the theological truth of the hypostatic union; to " dissolve Jesus " is to assert that He was not both human and Divine at the same time, so that although He be God and man, yet He is not two but One Christ. Westcott himself seems to think that λύει is an early gloss on μὴ ὁμολόγει; but I venture to suggest that it may be simply due to a scribe's error (ΟΛΥΕΙ for ΟΛΟΓΕΙ, the scribe's eye having passed over ΟΜΗΟΜ from the similarity of the letters).

We now come to cases of definite mistranslation, of actual alteration in the text. Here we must be very cautious in bringing charges against the Vulgate, for two reasons. The first is that some of the popular charges are wrong, and the second is that our own A.V. is not entirely guiltless. First,

may I remind you of one or two charges brought against the
Vulgate, of which it is innocent ? There was a popular super-
stition that the Church of Rome in uneasiness at the open
contradiction between the Second Commandment and her own
worship of images, had actually *removed* the Second Command-
ment from the decalogue. There is this amount of truth in it, that
the Second Commandment in the Roman Catholic enumeration
is the prohibition against taking Jehovah's name in vain; but
this is simply due to a difference of arrangement, whereby our
First and Second Commandments are made into one by both
Roman Catholics and Lutherans, and the number Ten obtained
by splitting the last Commandment into two.

Another instance where I think a charge has been brought
against the Vulgate wrongly, is that of the text I Corin-
thians vi, 20. This is a case of a false reading in the Vulgate,
but one which is clearly the result of a scribe's blunder; it has
not been introduced to support a doctrine. St. Paul closes the
chapter with the exhortation, " Glorify God therefore in your
body "—δοξάσατε δὴ τὸν Θεὸν ἐν τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν. The
δοξάσατε δὴ got somehow corrupted into δοξάσατε ἀράγε, and
this into δοξάσατε ἄρατε; this was quite naturally translated
by " Glorificate et portate "—" Glorify God and carry Him
about in your bodies." The best MSS. of the Old Latin do not
have it, nor does Irenæus so quote it, nor Jerome (when he
refers to the passage in his other works); but a large number
of Latin Fathers—Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine (as
a rule)—quote it in the longer form, and it is the undoubted
Vulgate reading. I have heard it said that this additional
clause, " et portate," was claimed by the Roman Church as
referring to the Divine Presence received by the Christian in
the Eucharist; but I have not yet come across any Latin
Father or any Roman Catholic commentator who has employed
the text for that purpose; and Dr. Stone, probably the most
learned divine we have on that subject, also informs me that he
has not come across any instance. We must therefore refrain
from making a charge which we cannot prove.

But I have also said that we must not be too severe upon the
Vulgate, for our own A.V. is not entirely guiltless in the matter.
I need only remind you of the numerous cases in which ἐπιστρέ-
ψωσι, ἐπιστρέψας κ.τ.λ. were translated as passives, " be con-
verted," by the A.V. translators, as their rigid Calvinism would not
allow them to grant to the man himself any share in attaining his
own salvation (see Matthew xiii, 15 ; Mark iv, 12 ; Luke xxii,
32 ; John xii, 40 ; Acts iii, 19, xxviii, 27 ; in all these cases the

L

" be converted " of the A.V. has been rightly changed into " turn again " by the revisers). A still more flagrant case, if I may say so, is the rendering of Hebrews x, 38, ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται · καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ (" my just man shall live by [his] faith ; and if he draw back, my soul hath no pleasure in him "). The A.V. translators again were unwilling to assert that anyone who had once been called "just" or "righteous" in the sight of God could ever fall from grace ; and so they boldly interpolated the words *any man* (" if *any man* draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him "), and made the man who drew back a different person from the righteous man, *i.e.*, they altered the Bible to suit their own views. This has, of course, also been corrected in the R.V.

We now come to some of the cases of deliberate alteration in the Vulgate. The first instance which meets us is that of Genesis iii, 15 ; there the Clementine edition of 1592—still the standard edition for the whole Roman Church—reads : " Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem, et semen tuum et semen illius ; *ipsa* conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius"; "*She* shall bruise thy head." The honour is here distinctly referred, not to the woman's seed, but to the woman herself, and so the passage has been naturally referred by Roman Catholic commentators to the Blessed Virgin Mary. But it is a mistranslation. The reference is to the *seed* of the woman ; it should be *ipse*, not *ipsa*. When the alteration was made we cannot tell. Augustine, Ambrose, and Gregory the Great apparently read *ipsa*, but the Old Latin version had *ipse*, and Vercellone gives a long list of writers who have used the correct word, though some of them have been quoted on the other side.*

Another instance has been brought to our notice since the publication of the R.V. of the Apocrypha in 1895. A striking feature in that revision is the enormous length of the 7th chapter of II Esdras ; it runs to 140 verses. The reason is that more than four columns of print in the R.V. are new to us ; they were not in the A.V. The transition in that version, as Mr. Bensly† pointed out, from the 35th to the 36th verse of

---

* *Variae Lectiones*, I, pp. 12, 13.
† *Missing Fragment of the Fourth Book of Ezra*, p. 1.

that chapter was so abrupt as to strike even the most superficial reader ; 33f. gives an account of the final judgment— " The most high shall be revealed upon the seat of judgment and compassion shall pass away and longsuffering shall be withdrawn: (34) but judgment only shall remain, truth shall stand, and faith shall wax strong ; (35) and the work shall follow, and the reward shall be shewed, and good deeds shall awake." Verse 36 proceeds with a completely irrelevant question of Esdras to the angel : " And I *answered* and said, How do we find now that first Abraham prayed for the people of Sodom, and Moses for the fathers that sinned in the wilderness ? " etc. The reason of this abrupt change is that originally a long discussion occurred between Esdras and the angel, at the end of which Esdras asked the angel whether in the day of judgment (verse 102) the just will be able to intercede for the ungodly or to entreat the Most High for them. The angel returns a very decided negative : " Never shall any one pray for another in that day, neither shall one lay a burden on another, for then shall all bear every one his own righteousness or unrighteousness." Such a statement as this did not prove acceptable to some early theologian, and he got out of the difficulty, not by erasing the verse, but by tearing out the whole page which contained the verse. By a strange fate almost all the Latin copies of the 4th Book of Esdras were derived from this mutilated exemplar, and it was not till R. L. Bensly in 1875 published his *Missing Fragment of the Fourth Book of Ezra* that we realized what we had lost for so many centuries.

Samuel Berger* has shewn by a series of extracts from MSS. of different centuries how the text in II Maccabees xii, 46, with regard to praying for the dead, gradually increased in strength. The first group of MSS. is that of the Old Latin ; these reproduce the LXX (B) text, and simply mention with approval the fact that Judas prayed for the dead : " Holy and godly was the thought. Wherefore he made supplication for them that had died, that they might be released from their sin " (Sancta et salubris excogitatio. Ideoque exorabat pro mortuis illis qui peccaverant, ut a peccato solverentur). The Vulgate MSS. of the oldest type alter this a little ; it becomes : " Sancta et salubris cogitatio pro defunctis exorare ut a peccato solverentur " (" It was a holy and sound thought to pray for the departed,

---

* *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers Siècles du Moyen Age,* p. 23.

that they might be released from sin ") ; but the later Vulgate MSS. and the Clementine text turn it into a general rule of faith, not a pious practice on the part of Judas mentioned with praise ; it is now " Sancta ergo et salubris *est* cogitatio pro defunctis exorare ut a peccato *solvantur* " (" It *is* a holy and sound thought to pray for the dead, that they *may* be released from sin.").

I mentioned above that there would occasionally be a play on the words in the original which it might be next to impossible for a translator to reproduce exactly ; it must be allowed, however, that Jerome here often had that good luck which only comes to very clever people. In Acts viii, 30, the question to the Ethiopian Eunuch (" understandest thou what thou readest ? ") γινώσκεις ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις goes exactly into Latin " intel*legis* quae *legis*," though the similar play in II Corinthians iii, 2, γινωσκομένη καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένη was not reproduced in the Vulgate ; Erasmus proposed that it should be translated " quae intel*legitur* et *legitur* " (instead of " quae scitur et legitur " of the Vulgate). But in the Old Testament, Jerome cleverly translated Exodus xv, 23, " unde et congruum loco nomen imposuit, vocans illum *Mara*, id est, *amaritudinem* " ; *cf.* Ruth i, 20, " Vocate me *Mara*, id est, *Amaram* " ; also Genesis ii, 23, *Virago* quoniam de *viro* sumpta est."

In rendering Hebrew proper names, Jerome shewed greater freedom and common sense than our own translators ; he followed the example of the LXX version, which, in the Book of Genesis, regularly *interpreted* such names. This is quite legitimate, and makes much of the Old Testament more intelligible and living. We may doubt whether the average country congregation is much the wiser for hearing that Abraham called the mountain on which he offered Isaac, " Jehovah-Jireh " (Genesis xxii, 14); but the Vulgate is perfectly intelligible with its " appellavit nomen loci illius, *Dominus videt* ; similarly in Genesis xxxi, 47, the " Jegar-Sahadutha " of the A.V. means nothing to the average layman, while the " tumulum testis " of the Vulgate is quite clear. Elsewhere Jerome made his version more clear to a popular audience by *adding* the interpretation after the proper name, as *e.g.*, Genesis xxxii, 2, " *Mahanaim*, id est castra," and Rev. ix, 11, " *Appolyon*, Latine habens nomen *Exterminans.*"

It may be thought that points of translation like these have little to do with influence on doctrine ; but Jerome's

practice of interpreting in this way had considerable effect in those passages of the Old Testament where the word "Anointed," or "Messiah," comes in ; here, following the LXX, he boldly put "Christus," with the result that many more passages have a Messianic reference in the Vulgate than in our own A.V. Again, it may be asked, "What else could he have done ?" Very likely it was inevitable ; but still the fact, and its influence, remained. Psalm ii, 2, is an obvious instance : " Principes convenerunt in unum adversus Dominum et adversus *Christum* ejus," compare Acts iv, 27, where in the A.V. it is also rendered "against the Lord, and against his Christ," though the R.V. has "against his Anointed." Equally personal is the reference in Habakkuk iii, 18,* where " I will joy in the God of my salvation " appears as " Exsultabo in Deo *Jesu* meo" ; also Lamentations iv, 20, where "The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, was taken in their pits" appears as "Spiritus oris nostri, *Christus* Dominus, captus est in peccatis nostris." In some cases anxiety to find a reference to our Saviour in the Old Testament led Jerome to force the translation of the Hebrew, as in Isaiah xi, 10, where we read of the Root of Jesse that "unto him shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious," but Jerome translated "Ipsum gentes deprecabuntur, et erit *sepulcrum* ejus gloriosum" ; or again, Isaiah xvi, 1, "Send ye the lambs for the ruler of the land from Sela, which is towards the wilderness, unto the mount of the daughter of Sion," becomes in the Vulgate "Emitte *agnum*, Domine, *dominatorem terrae* de petra deserti ad montem filiae Sion" ; again in Genesis xli, 45, it is said that Pharaoh gave to Joseph the name "Zaphenath-Paneah" ; Jerome translated this "Vocavit eum lingua Ægyptiaca, *Salvatorem mundi*," which makes the passage appear distinctly Messianic ; according to Driver,† however, the name means "God (or "the God") spake and he (the bearer of the name) came into life," so that Jerome has strained the interpretation here.

I should like in conclusion to draw your attention to some very small points where, by its *punctuation*, the Clementine Vulgate has altered the sense of the original Greek. Time after time St. Paul in the greetings of his Epistles speaks of "The God and Father of our Lord Jesus

---

* See Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, p. 175 (Mainz, 1868).
† Commentary on Genesis (*Westminster Commentaries*), pp. 344, 345.

Christ"; this phrase is not incompatible with the fullest belief in our Lord's Divinity, and you will remember how the risen Saviour in St. John (xx, 17) said "I ascend unto my Father and your Father, and my God and your God." In some cases (*e.g.*, II Corinthians xi, 31, Ephesians i, 3, *cf.* I Peter i, 3) the phrase has been allowed to stand in the Clementine text; but in Colossians i, 3, a comma has been inserted "Gratias agimus deo, et Patri Domini nostri Iesu Christi," compare Ephesians i, 17, where the "Deus Domini nostri Iesu Christi pater gloriae" has been altered into "Deus, Domini nostri Iesu Christi pater, gloriae," in defiance of the sense; in both these passages the change has apparently been made in order to avoid speaking of "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ"; and in Colossians ii, 2, an "et" has been added after "Patris" with the same motive ("in agnitione mysterii Dei Patris *et* Christi Jesu").

I may perhaps also be allowed to mention two very small cases which shew what a different sense can be given to a sentence by the use, or omission, of capital letters; there is no doctrinal significance here; I just mention them for their interest. In Acts xvii, 6, the Jews at Thessalonica, complaining of St. Paul's preaching, cry out "hi qui orbem concitant et huc venerunt" ("those that have turned the world upside down have come here also"); *orbem* very naturally got corrupted into *urbem* —the city—in a good many MSS., and the Clementine Vulgate adopts this reading; but not contented with that, it prints the word with a capital U, and "Urbem" in a Bible printed at Rome could hardly mean anything but the Eternal City itself.

In Acts xix, 9, exactly the contrary procedure is shewn: "quotidie disputans in schola Tyranni" means that St. Paul held forth daily in the school of a man named Tyrannus; but the Clementine Vulgate prints the word with a small t, and thus makes the word an epithet, not a proper name; St. Paul disputed in the school of a certain tyrant; and this was the interpretation of the passage amongst a good many of the mediæval commentators—De Lyra, Caietan, Vatablus, etc.

I must now close this long paper; long as it is, I cannot claim to have treated the subject exhaustively or even very methodically. I have done little more than jot down and discuss the instances—mainly from the New Testament—which I have gradually collected during my years of work at the Vulgate; that work has been carried on with a different object,

and the instances have been noted by the way.   No doubt a more systematic examination would detect more and more striking cases ; but I trust that I have brought forward enough material to shew how interesting the study is, and to prepare the way for a fuller and more satisfactory treatment.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN could confirm from his own experience one of the points of the lecture.   Several years ago he had been brought into connection with a Roman Catholic, an Italian priest who was seeking the light.   They were unable to converse, but they read the Vulgate together, and in one verse which Professor White had alluded to, the priest took a different view of the meaning of the word *poenitentia* from that which he (the Chairman) did.   The priest thought that he must suffer something in order to receive the grace of God.   But when the Greek word, μετάνοια, was pointed out to him, it gave him an entirely new thought.   He asked, "Have I nothing to pay for it ?"   It was the moment of a change in his life ; he understood then that eternal life is the *gift* of God.   He is now a faithful missionary of the Church Missionary Society in India.

Mr. MAURICE GREGORY was reminded by the last word of the Chairman that he was recently present at a funeral of a poor Belgian refugee.   The poor people attending the funeral were astonished to find that there was " nothing to pay " for the burial service.

He would like to ask concerning the word ἐπιούσιος in Matthew vi, 11, and Luke xi, 3 : " Give us this day our *daily* bread."   Is there any justification for translating it "daily"? ought it not to be rather " supersubstantial," thus making the petition in our Lord's Prayer wholly spiritual ?

Mr. M. L. ROUSE said the Lecturer had reminded us that the Lutheran Church, equally with the Roman Catholic, so divides the Commandments as to make " Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife" the ninth, and a tenth out of all the other prohibitions against coveting.   But the Lutheran Reformers may simply have retained this division as a remnant of unreformed tradition deeply engrained by custom.   Valid evidence as to the original form could be obtained by referring to the other branches of the historic Catholic Church—

Greek, Coptic, Abyssinian, Armenian and Nestorian, which were in accord on this point with the Anglican and Calvinistic Churches.

Mr. GRAHAM desired to express his great gratitude to the Lecturer. He had shown how much we could learn from the Roman Catholics, and how much, on the other hand, they could learn from us. A little over two years ago the Rev. T. H. Darlow, Literary Superintendent of the Bible Society, in the lecture which he gave the Institute on Versions of the Bible, showed how the spiritual power of Holy Scripture came out in languages which previously had possessed no equivalent in words for the ideas which had to be conveyed. This was present to his mind while Professor White was delivering his lecture. The inspired Word could take care of itself, and it was well for us to make ourselves acquainted with the differences which exist between the different versions, and to learn from them.

The CHAIRMAN called upon the Meeting to return their sincere thanks to the Lecturer for his most interesting and instructive paper, and the LECTURER, in acknowledging the vote, said that it was not quite certain to this day how Jerome wished to translate the word ἐπιούσιος, since he was not quite consistent in his usage. Probably he intended to use the word "supersubstantial" in St. Matthew. In the Vulgate, as we have it now, we get both renderings; ἐπι is frequently translated by "super" in the Vulgate.

The Lecturer further added, with regard to the second Commandment and to prayers for the dead, that he had restricted his paper to the Vulgate itself, and had not included in it developments which might have arisen out of the Vulgate.

The Meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.