

ARTICLE VI.

CRITICAL NOTES.

AN INQUIRY AS TO THE NATURE AND REALITY
OF HELL FIRE.

Luke xii. 49: "I have come to send fire throughout the earth, and what do I desire except that it be kindled" (Douay Version); "I came to cast fire upon the earth, and what will I, if it is already kindled" (Rev. Ver.); "And what will I? Would that it were already kindled" (Lange, Meyer).

ARCHBISHOP TRENCH expresses surprise that any interpreters should fail to explain the fire here mentioned as the fire promised by the Baptist: "He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost and with fire."

While Olshausen, Alford, Calvin, Stier, and others concur with the Archbishop that the primary reference here is to the fire of the Spirit, there is, they agree, not excluded a secondary reference, to divisions, disquietudes, revolutions, persecutions, wars,—"fire and sword,"—which this holy fire must, in the natural course of things, necessitate in destroying all that is opposed to it.

It is important here to notice that before our Lord "became flesh" and cast this spiritual fire on the earth, he had been wont all along the ages to cast, as its symbol, material fire. Scholars have claimed that, as a mark of his presence and approval, Jehovah cast from heaven the fire that consumed Abel's sacrifice, a form of approval repeated afterward we know not how many times in private and public worship—signal instances of which are given, in inaugurating the covenant with Abraham when the flaming torch passed between parts of the sacrificial offerings (Gen. xv. 17, 18), and in dedicating the tabernacle in the wilderness (Lev. ix. 24), and the temple on Mount Zion (2 Chron. vii. 1), and in the

descent of fire on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii. 38). Similar is Judg. xiii. 19, 20. Many interpret "accept" in Ps. xx. 3 as meaning "approve by setting on fire."

And now what have we found? This: taking Abraham's faith as our point of departure, and under its illumination, we have been marching down the patriarchal and prophetic ages not more guided on earth as by a pillar of cloud, than, under the heavens led, by the casting of fire down from the date of Abel's sacrifice to that point in time when our Lord exclaimed: I am come not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill the prophetic symbol — to cast spiritual fire on the earth; and what will I, if I see it already kindled in the hearts of my disciples? The claim is here made that this transition from one form of fire to another broke upon the vision of the world as naturally as the sunburst came in response to the original fiat, "Let there be light" (Gen. i. 14).

That the human mind redeemed was susceptible to this spiritual illumination was made apparent in the walk to Emmaus on the day of our Lord's resurrection, when, as the result of his intercourse with the two disciples, they were led afterwards to exclaim, "Was not our heart burning within us, while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the scriptures?" (Luke xxiv. 32). This glow of religious emotion was an advance upon previous experience; but it was not equal to what came to them and the other disciples soon after, when, abiding at Jerusalem in the ten days' prayer meeting, the power from on high, according to the promise, came upon them. This illumination of the infant church as the body of Christ was the natural effect of the Epiphany of the Godhead in the Incarnation. "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." He who commanded the light to shine out of darkness hath shined in all believing hearts, to give them "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

We account it true that this light of knowledge is inseparable from, because the product of, the fire which Christ came to cast on the earth. This fire is not more illuminating

than it is purifying. And this in fulfillment of prophecy: "The messenger of the covenant, whom ye desire, behold, he cometh, saith Jehovah of hosts. But who can abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' soap: and he will sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and he will purify the sons of Levi, and refine them as gold and silver; and they shall offer unto Jehovah offerings in righteousness" (Mal. iii. 1-3). If believers are the light of the world, a city set on a hill, it is because each believer, filled with the Spirit, is holding forth not only in his tongue but in his personal character the word of life. This makes the Ecclesia of the living God the pillar and ground of the truth, a realization of its symbol set forth in Moses' burning bush (Ex. iii. 2), forever on fire, forever in a process of purification, forever the light of the world, and forever shining more and more unto the perfect day.

But let it be kept in mind that this baptismal fire, such as came by the laying on of the apostles' hands, and which Timothy was required to stir into a flame, was sometimes counterfeited by a false material fire, an offense so criminal in Nadab and Abihu as to call down upon them the instant vengeance of heaven (Lev. x. 1). They did what Elijah would have done had he, on Mount Carmel, by some subterfuge employed common ("strange") fire wherewith to burn his sacrifice. Was it to defend himself against such a possible charge that the prophet flooded his altar so extravagantly with water? It may be a startling question to ask, but one sufficiently needed: May there not be in the services of the sanctuary in our day a form of eloquence that partakes more of the "strange fire" used by Nadab and Abihu than of that fire which our Lord came to cast, and may not the Divine displeasure against this form of "strange fire"—mock eloquence—be as much more intense as the Christian ministry is to be, in spirituality, in advance of the Levitical?

The discrimination was very exacting: "And Moses said unto Aaron, Take thy censer, and put fire therein *from off the*

altar" (Num. xvi. 46). This injunction forbade the use of fire that had not been kindled by a divine gift. Only the heaven-descended fire stands in the Scriptures as the appropriate symbol of the Holy Spirit. At his baptism our Lord was designated the Prince of Peace by the descent upon him of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove; but elsewhere in the Scripture, with remarkable uniformity, purifying fire of the Redeemer's blood and the Spirit's influences is symbolized by fire. "Is not my word as a fire?" "Except as he is a fire, the Holy Spirit cannot be quenched." By him "each man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is." "Know ye not," says St. Paul to the church at Corinth, "that ye are a sanctuary of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" He, the everlasting Shekinah, the love of God shed abroad in every believing heart, a fire on its altar never to go out, though often requiring to be stirred into a flame, — every true church an Ecclesia of the living God, a Burning Bush?

It is out of such a flaming disclosure of himself that God is still speaking to the nations. All forms of missionary sacrifices and labor, in filling up "that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ . . . for his body's sake, which is the church," are accomplished with tongues aflame with fire from the altar of the Cross. He who came in the spirit and power of Elijah has reannounced the old conviction: "The God that answereth by fire, let him be God," and, saying this, began at once, in his own name, to cast fire on earth in the hearts of men, and it is only as he, "beginning from Moses and from the prophets," has interpreted to the people in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself, that he has opened heaven and put his kingdom on earth into vital contact and intercourse with its counterpart in heaven; Christ, in his own human and divine person, the realization of Jacob's vision, the angels of God ascending and descending upon the son of man. Thus, in coming from heaven in his incarnation, our Lord followed the fire which for ages he had been casting

upon the earth; but he came to impart a different fire, one that could burn in human hearts and create a kingdom—itsself a light out of heaven above the brightness of the sun.

It was in perfect accord with this manifestation that our Lord appeared on the mount transfigured—in garments glistening, exceeding white, so as no fuller on earth can white them; and there, in this radiance, in an interview with Moses and Elijah, representatives of the patriarchal and prophetic epochs, spoke of the deace which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem. In connection with this entrancing disclosure of the Redeemer's person, let us keep in mind the statement, that, when our Lord came to us from heaven, he laid aside the glory that he had with the Father, attempering himself in his incarnation, as Moses did with his veil, to our human vision. More than this, let us not forget the assurance given us that when our Lord comes in second and final advent, he will come, not divested of, but in the glory of his Father with his holy angels, and sit upon the throne of his glory. If his coming in this tempered radiance of a spiritual dispensation was like a refiner's fire and fuller's soap, what must be the effect of this effulgence of glory when it breaks upon the vision of an assembled race, full-orbed. The apostle speaks of the far more exceeding and eternal *weight* of glory that will come to the redeemed as their heavenly inheritance; and may not this weight of glory, to the unsaved, be the fire that is never quenched, and extort the cry to the rocks and mountains to fall on them and hide them from the face of him that sitteth upon the throne?

Professor Shedd's startling exclamation to a Boston audience many years ago, to the effect that the Bible is blood-red with the doctrine of the atonement, is no truer than that the Bible is all ablaze with fire. It is needless to cite instances, beyond what we have, to show this. But it is required that we discriminate, and mark the difference in the kinds of fire that come from heaven. The fire that consumed Elijah's sacrifice may have been other than the fire of Jehovah that burnt among the murmurers against Moses and Aaron, and "de-

voured in the uttermost part of the camp" (Num. xi. 1); and totally unlike these forms of fire must be the fire which our Lord came to cast on the earth and which he rejoiced to see already kindled. When Sinai says that God is a consuming fire (Deut. iv. 24), and Calvary repeats the affirmation (Heb. xii. 29), we must infer that these forms of fire are God's investiture, and, at his command, are employed as instruments of his fatherly discipline of his children. "God is love"; and, because he is love, and love is not a fraction but the sum total of his being, he is a fire that consumes what he cannot warm into spiritual life.

Science tells us that the buds which the sunbeams in the spring cannot unfold into leaf and beauty, are killed by them. As only those buds that receive the warmth unfold in natural order, so only "upon them that fear the Lord shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in its beams." They who will not receive these "beams," and be enlightened and purified and made fruitful by them, convert them into flames that are never quenched. The fire which the incarnate Lord came to cast on the earth suffers a varied fortune; but to as many as receive it, to them does he give the right to become the children of God, even to them that believe on his name.

The nature of this fire is made apparent by the figure St. Paul uses in Rom. xii. 20: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head." The misconstruction placed often upon the parable of Lazarus and Dives as teaching the doctrine of an abyss of literal material fire, is appalling. Does the figurative language there employed convey a more real or distressing truth than would have been expressed had the rich man been represented as put to torture under heaps of St. Paul's coals of fire? The claim is made that the fire which burns in the apostle's coals is the same as that which our Lord came to cast on the earth, fire which he saw already kindled in the hearts of his disciples, that burst into flame on the day of Pentecost, and that makes the Ecclesia of the liv-

ing God a burning bush. Is it not as absurd to say that Dives was in flames of literal fire as to claim that St. Paul by his figure meant that shovelfuls of coals, blazing hot, should actually be cast in heaps upon the heads of the offenders? In the ancient church no experience in the sphere of religion was more blessed than the consciousness of being in, and inclosed by, "the light of God's countenance." That retreat and security brought them into all the heaven they could ask for in this world. But where did the light of God's countenance come from save as it was emitted from him as a "consuming fire"?

Here we must pause to inquire: Why is God revealed to us under such imagery except as it is the best he could use to express his opposition to, and purpose to destroy, all that is hostile to or out of harmony with him? What other element in nature could he employ to express his double purpose to purify, and, if not susceptible of purification, to destroy? As the great Spurgeon is still teaching in one of his sermons, "Melt or Burn," so is Coleridge's alternative accorded to every man, to wit: "Retain your conscience as your guardian angel or your avenging fiend." Why not listen to truth that resounds from the depths of the Apocalypse, radiant in its light, and emphasized by its thunder? To the hundred and forty-four thousand redeemed from the earth and who sing the new song, the light of God's countenance is still their heaven; but what hear we from those who rejected the great salvation?—"Fall on us, and *hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.*" Can it be true that that face that is the bliss of heaven is the woe of hell?

Professor Shedd expressed his surprise yet admiration that one of the great sermons in modern times should come from the author of "The Vicarious Sacrifice." Doctor Bushnell's celebrated sermon on the "Wrath of the Lamb" only puts us into the immediate radiance that pours in flood tides from the face of infinite love. These are the tides that wrap the disobedient unsaved about in sheets of living flame.

God's love in Christ rejected is the fire, and the only fire, that burns to the lowest hell. When men pass from this life into the next and find themselves in their ultimate state, they who are unrighteous and filthy to continue as they are except as they grow worse and worse, they will be overtaken with a new view of things. Facing awful realities they will agree that they are wonderfully and fearfully made. In the light that dawns upon them they will discover the true nature of sin, its criminality, turpitude, malignity, baseness; and, in remorseful agony, inquire: Why, in a world of probationary privilege, did we insist upon eating of the fruit of our own ways and of being filled with our own devices? Knowing that we had in us the powers of an endless life, why, when God called did we refuse? Why, when he stretched out his hand, did we not regard it? Why, when the Redeemer had borne our sins in his own body on the tree and tasted death for every one of us, and cried, Come unto me, why did we not come? If reflections like these are to command the attention and stir the conscience of the finally impenitent forever, is the Biblical imagery of the worm that never dies, and the flames that are never quenched, excessive?

C. B. HULBERT.

TO THE EDITOR, BIBLIOTHECA SACRA:—

1. In your April issue [1917], I asked Mr. Buchanan: "To explain the complete loss of the Old Syriac text, excepting only the Gospels and patristic citations, is there any need to say that, after the revision by Rabbula, 411-435 A.D., all Old Syriac MSS. were burned?" Mr. Buchanan replied with an extract from Theodoret, in which the Bishop of Cyrhus speaks of finding more than two hundred copies of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in use by his churches, and adds: "These I have every one COLLECTED AND DESTROYED, and submitted the Gospels of the Four Evangelists [containing the Genealogies in agreement with the Vulgate]." ¹

¹ The capitalizing in these quotations is Mr. Buchanan's.

Reply: *First*, it would have been more scientific, had Mr. Buchanan given some reference,—at least by naming the work of Theodoret he was quoting. *Secondly*, my question had to do with the *orthodox* Old Syriac MSS., not with the *heretical* Tatian's *Diatessaron*. Theodoret is here summarizing the errors of this heretic;¹ and gives, *in words omitted by Mr. Buchanan*, the reason for *setting aside* Tatian. This reason is not the omission of "the Genealogies in agreement with the Vulgate,"—*words that are not in Theodoret at all*,—but the fact that the faithful "did not recognize the fraud of the composition, and in all simplicity used it as a compendium of the Bible." To preserve the text pure, Theodoret "set aside" the fraud of Tatian, and "submitted the gospels of the four evangelists,"—most likely the Old Syriac text. *Thirdly*, Theodoret does not say that he "destroyed" the copies of Tatian. Here are his words: "Gathering together all these I *set them aside* (*ἀπεθέμην*), and substituted in their stead the gospels of the four evangelists." It is clear, then, that this single witness, Theodoret, and his *setting aside* of the text of the *heretical* Tatian does not explain the loss of the *orthodox* Old Syriac MSS. any more than Mr. Buchanan explains the loss of Old Latin MSS. by the wild assertion: "If they could say Vulgate, they were saved; if not, they were cast into the fire."

2. I asked Mr. Buchanan to prove his rather hysterical statement that in "382 A.D. . . . the Church of Rome began its policy of enforcing the Vulgate of St. Jerome *upon the whole of Christendom*." He replied with two witnesses.

I. The first of these witnesses is the Council of Trent, session iv, whose anathema Mr. Buchanan thus translates:

"If any man does not receive the entire books with all their parts, as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church, AND AS THEY ARE EXHIBITED IN THE ANCIENT VULGATE, as sacred and canonical; and knowingly and of set purpose sets aside the above declarations, LET HIM BE ANATHEMA."

¹"A Compendium of Haeretical Fabrications," Book I, section 20, Migne, P. G. 83, 372.

Reply: *First*, this translation contains two bad mistakes, — one unwittingly ludicrous, the other seemingly intentional, — together with a very patent misinterpretation.

The *ludicrous mistake* is in the last clause. Trent, in this decree, deals with the divine origin of Scripture and of *tradition*. In regard to *tradition*, the text runs: “Si quis . . . *traditiones* prae dictas sciens et prudens contempserit, anathema sit,” — “If any one . . . knowingly and deliberately contemns the aforesaid *traditions*, let him be anathema.” In view of the pose of Mr. Buchanan as an expert in the Latinity of the Vulgate, it is highly amusing to find him translating *traditiones* by “declarations.” Why, the Vulgate uses the word *traditio* fourteen times, and always in the sense of “tradition,” either Jewish or Christian!

The *seemingly intentional mistake* is in the clause, “as they *are accustomed* to be read in the Catholic Church.” There is no question in Trent of the custom *merely at the time of the decree*. The decree reads: “prout in ecclesia Catholica legi *consueverunt*,” — “as they *have been wont* to be read in the Catholic Church.” There is question of a *custom of the past* which is still in force, — *consueverunt*. Trent here proposes two prerequisites to canonicity; if a part of Holy Writ *has been wont* to be read as Scripture in the Catholic Church, — i.e. in the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and all other rites, — and is in the ancient Latin Vulgate, then it must be admitted as canonical.

The *very patent misinterpretation* of Trent by Mr. Buchanan is seen in his capitalizing the clause, “and as they are exhibited in the ancient Vulgate.” He infers that mere presence of a part in the Vulgate implies canonicity. That is not the sense of the Tridentine decree. Canonicity according to Trent, is determined by two facts, taken conjunctively, — use of a part as Scripture down the centuries by the universal Church, and the presence of that part in the Vulgate.

Secondly, the Council of Trent, when declaring the Vulgate to be authoritative, says nothing at all about “enforcing the Vulgate of St. Jerome *upon the whole of Christendom*”; it

merely chooses the Vulgate "from among all Latin editions that are now in use." As I have said before, these rejected Latin editions were not the Old Latin,—long obsolete,—but the translations of Erasmus, Beza, etc. Trent enforced the Vulgate *upon the Latin rite*; just as authoritative use enforced the Peshitta on the Syriac rite, and each other rite had its own authoritative translation sanctioned by use. It is simply flying in the face of most evident facts to say that Trent or the Church of Rome had any "policy of enforcing the Vulgate *upon the whole of Christendom*."

II. The second witness by whom Mr. Buchanan would prove that the Church of Rome imposed the Vulgate *upon the whole of Christendom*, is the Bull of Clement viii, 1592 (*not 1562, as Mr. Buchanan dates it*), in regard to the printing of the Vulgate. The chief elements of Mr. Buchanan's translation of the Bull are these:

Let no man within ten years on this side of the Mountains or beyond the Mountains, or anywhere else, print any Bible except in our own Vatican Printing House. . . . If any Printer . . . WITHIN the specified ten years, or AFTER the specified ten years, print, sell, or have on sale, or otherwise put forth or make known any copy of the Sacred Scriptures other than according to this Standard Copy (the Clementine Vulgate) . . . let him by that act incur the sentence of major excommunication, etc. .

Reply: The entire Bull has to do *only with editions of the Vulgate*,—not at all with editions of the Old Latin, the Peshitta, and other recensions. As we cannot surmise Mr. Buchanan to be ignorant of Latin, we are forced to charge him with the garbling of the text of Clement VIII., in order to bolster up the false statement that the Church of Rome imposed the Vulgate *upon the whole of Christendom*. The text of Clement reads:

"Since the text of the Vulgate edition of the Holy Bible . . . is being issued by our Vatican Press, we, desiring to make timely provision that that same text may in future be preserved incorrupt, as is becoming, strictly prohibit . . . that, within ten years from these present, it be printed by any one . . . elsewhere than in our Vatican Press. And we command that, after the lapse of said ten years, care be taken that no one presume to print this edition

of Sacred Scriptures unless he first get the exemplar printed in the Vatican Press. . . . If any printer . . . dare to print . . . this very same edition of the Sacred Scriptures other than according to an exemplar of this kind, let him by that act incur the sentence of major excommunication," etc.¹

In the name of all that is honest, we ask how a textual critic of Mr. Buchanan's pretensions can dare so to garble this text as to read "any Bible" instead of "the text of the Vulgate edition of the Holy Bible," and "any copy of the Sacred Scriptures" instead of "this edition of Sacred Scriptures"?

3. Another question put by me was: "What scientific proof is there that since 382 A.D., 'There has been a systematic destruction of all Western MSS.' by Rome"? Mr. Buchanan replied by the witness of Bede, and once again garbled the text to suit his purpose. We give his translation, and then ours, of a passage from *Retractationes in Act. Apost.*, cited by Mr. Buchanan without scientific reference; and we print in black letter the instances of garbling:

"We have seen things in the Greek (from which St. Jerome made the Vulgate) which are altered, or added, or wanting (from our own Latin Text). Whether these things happened by the negligence of the translator who omitted them, or changed them; or whether they were depraved or rejected by the carelessness of copyists I have not been able to discover. It would be an implety to suspect that the Greek copy (of the original scripture) had been falsified previously. So I advise the (British) reader to read the Vulgate only for the sake of erudition and not to make his copy of the Bible agree with it, unless he finds the Vulgate sup-

¹Cum sacrorum Bibliorum Vulgatæ editionis . . . ex Nostra typographia Vaticana in lucem prodeat, Nos, ut in posterum idem textus incorruptus, ut decet, conservetur, opportune providere volentes . . . districtus inhihemus, ne intra decem annos, a data presentium numerandos, . . . alibi quam in nostra Vaticana typographia a quoquam imprimatur. Elapso autem præfato decennio, eam cautionem adhiberi præcipimus, ut nemo hanc sanctarum Scripturarum editionem typis mandare præsumat, nisi habito prius exemplari in typographia Vaticana excuso. . . . Si quis vero typographus . . . hanc eandem sacrarum Scripturarum editionem . . . aliter quam juxta hujusmodi exemplar . . . imprimere . . . præsumpserit, etc.

ported by the earlier Latin translation that he has in his own edition."

As will appear from our translation, and the text of Bede, the English Father is here merely explaining his use of the Greek text of Acts in the commentary to follow. He warns the reader not to change the Latin Vulgate text, but to interpret it according to the erudition Bede derives from the Greek. Mr. Buchanan gratuitously misinterprets, when by the parentheses he makes Bede (d. 735 A.D.) to speak of the Greek text, "from which St. Jerome," during the latter part of the fourth century, "made the Vulgate"; and when he twice foists upon the text of Bede the word *Vulgate*, so as completely to change Bede's meaning. Bede's antithesis is between the Latin Vulgate text of *Super Act. Apost. Expositio* and the Greek readings that will occur in the *Liber Retractionis*; it is lacking in the scientific poise of a textual critic deliberately to change this antithesis into one that suits Mr. Buchanan's special pleading. Here is what Bede really wrote:

"In this book, we have also taken care briefly to note a few things that we have observed to be set down in the Greek text either in another, or a longer, or a shorter form. Whether these things were either omitted or changed by the neglect of the translator, or were either garbled or overlooked by the recklessness of copyists, we have not yet been able to make out. For I would not make bold to suspect that the Greek exemplar had been garbled. Hence I urge the reader, wherever I have noted these things, to read them for the sake of erudition, but not to insert them in his Bible, as if to correct it, unless perchance he find them so translated of old in a Latin codex of his edition. For Jerome himself gives many readings of the ancient text, as the Hebrew truth has them; and yet, in our codices, he did not wish either himself so to translate or us so to correct the same."¹

¹ "In quo etiam quaedam quae in Graeco, sive aliter, seu plus aut minus posita vidimus, breviter commemorare curavimus. Quae utrum negligentia interpretis omissa, vel aliter dicta, an incuria librariorum sint depravata, sive relicta, nondum scire potuimus. Namque Graecum exemplar fuisse falsatum, suspicari non audeo; unde lectorem admoneo, ut haec ubicunque fecerimus, gratia eruditionis legat, non in suo tamen volumine velut emendaturus interserat, nisi forte ea in Latino Codice suae Editionis antiquitus sic interpretata repererit. Nam et Hieronymus pleraque testimonia

Mr. Buchanan is absolutely wrong, when he writes: "In this and other passages of his works, Bede testifies that in 735 A.D. the Church of Britain had a radically different Bible text from that of the Vulgate." No one, as conversant with Latin as the Old Latin text scholar should be, has any right to draw such a conclusion. Quite the contrary, the end of the passage, *cleverly omitted by Mr. Buchanan*, points to the fact that Bede's text of the Bible is that of the Vulgate. He urges the reader not to change the Latin text of the Bible by Bede's readings from the Greek, unless "he find them so translated of old in a Latin codex of his edition. For Jerome himself, etc." Why this juxtaposition of the authority of Jerome immediately next to the words, "his edition"? Because "his edition" is that of Jerome! "His edition," the edition used by Bede and English readers, is the edition spoken of as contained in "our codices." And the edition of "our codices," — of Bede, — is undoubtedly the translation made by Jerome. For Bede urges the reader not to change "his edition"; and assigns, as a reason for the urging, the fact that Jerome himself, though calling attention to variations in that edition from the Hebrew, had no mind to change "our codices." No other meaning is possible, when Bede says: "For Jerome himself gives many readings of the ancient text, as the Hebrew truth has them; and yet, *in our codices*, he did not wish either himself so to translate or us so to correct the same."

Mr. Buchanan may object that the Latin text of Bede differs from that of the Clementine Vulgate. We reply, *not radically!* The accidental differences between these two texts prove two things, — first, that the Benedictine Vulgate Commission has much work before it; secondly, that the text of Bede may have preserved some of the Old Latin readings. *veteris Instrumenti, ut Hebraica veritas habet, edocet; nec tamen haec ita in nostris Codicibus aut ipse interpretari, aut nos emendare voluit.*"

"*Liber Retractionis in Actus Apostolorum.*" *Praefatio.* (Migne, P. L. 92, 995).

And this infiltration of Old Latin readings into the Vulgate Latin text shows how absurd is Mr. Buchanan's statement that the Church of Rome deliberately enforced the Vulgate *upon the whole of Christendom*.

To show that the Latin Church was not so drastic in enforcing the Vulgate, as Mr. Buchanan thinks, we called attention to the fact that the *Psalterium Romanum*, intended by Jerome to be part of the Vulgate, was ousted from its place by the *Psalterium Gallicanum* of Jerome; and is to-day recited only in the office of the Vatican and the Milan cathedral. In reply, Mr. Buchanan garbles my statement; makes me say that the *Psalterium Romanum* "has been 'ousted' in the Vatican and in the Milan Cathedral" by the *Psalterium Gallicanum*,—whereas I said that the Roman Psalter is used only in the office of these two Churches; and remarks that "to replace the Quarto Editions of Shakespeare by the Folio Edition of Shakespeare cannot be called 'ousting'; for the result is still Shakespeare."

That smart remark is just what I object to in Mr. Buchanan's work,—it is slipshod, reckless, and unscientific. To compare the first two Psalters of Jerome to the quarto and folio editions of Shakespeare, is to proclaim either a crass ignorance, or a reckless disregard, of the terms of comparison. The *Psalterium Romanum* of Jerome was a revision of the Old Latin text, done in 383 A.D.; the *Psalterium Gallicanum* was Jerome's translation from the Hexapla of Origen, done nearly ten years later,—containing parts of the Hebrew text, omitted by the LXX and borrowed from Theodotion. We priests, who read the Gallican Psalter in our breviary once a week, and at times find parts of the Roman Psalter in the Introit and Gradual of our Roman Missal, would never identify the two translations. For Mr. Buchanan's further information, I can only refer him to Migne's edition of the two Psalters in parallel columns.¹

WALTER DRUM, S. J.

Woodstock, Maryland.

¹ P. L. 29, 123 ff.

[Mr. Buchanan's Reply.]

THE question originally put to me by my Jesuit critic was: "What documents . . . of the Migne *Patrology* . . . prove that in '382 A.D. . . . the Church of Rome began its policy of enforcing . . . the Vulgate . . . upon the whole of Christendom'?"

1. From Theodoret's works I extracted a statement to show that the good bishop destroyed in 423 A.D. MORE THAN TWO HUNDRED COPIES of the Gospel-Compendium of Tatian, although, as he admits, they were "HELD IN HIGH ESTEEM IN THE CHURCHES WHERE THEY BELONGED." The only reason the bishop gives for their condemnation is that these copies had — I quote his very words — "cut away the Genealogies and all verses proving that our Lord after the flesh was a descendant of David." But the question here arises, Did Tatian cut these verses out, or did the Judaizers of Alexander insert them?

The bishop used a Syriac text that was in agreement with the Vulgate; and, having been instructed by St. Jerome that the Vulgate contained the very words of Christ "according to the Greek truth," he perforce condemned Tatian's Syriac Gospels as the work of a heretic. Yet the Freer Gospels in Greek — our oldest extant Greek Gospels — support Tatian IN OMITTING ALTOGETHER the Genealogy in St. Luke. So does the older of the two Arabic copies of the Diatessaron now preserved in the Vatican. So does the Latin List of Contents of the Codex Fuldensis which I collated at Fulda in Germany. So do some copies of the Irish Latin Gospels. So does the Huntington Palimpsest. So, indirectly, does Codex Bezae; for it inserts in Luke A GENEALOGY OF ITS OWN by reversing that of St. Matthew. Tatian, therefore, was quite possibly right, and the bishop wrong, — unless episcopal infallibility be accepted as an article of religion. To call a man "heretic" does not dispense us from hearing his evidence, nor does it justify us in pronouncing his work a "fraud." We may ask in this context, What is heresy?

Further, I am taken to task for translating ἀπεθέμην by

“destroyed,” instead of “set them aside.” This is the merest quibbling. The bishop is using a polite metaphor to signify to the faithful that he burned them, as being the work of a heretic.

2. In my translation of the anathema of the Council of Trent, my critic has pounced on “two mistakes” — one he calls “ludicrous,” and the other, “intentional.” My ludicrous mistake is to translate *traditiones* by “declarations,” instead of by “traditions.” But is it not true that the Church’s declarations of to-day become her traditions of to-morrow? I maintain that the Church’s declarations as to what Books constitute the Canon ARE the Church’s traditions; and that in the context “declarations” was as good a translation as “traditions.” So much for my “ludicrous” mistake.

My “intentional” mistake is that I translate *prout in ecclesia Catholica legi consueverunt* by “as they are accustomed to be read in the Catholic Church.” Here my critic spies in my idiomatic translation a deep-laid plot on my part to shift the Catholic doctrine of Canonicity from its proper basis. To prove me mistaken in my translation he proposes a new twofold basis for Canonicity, viz. if a part of Scripture has been wont to be read in the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian and all other rites; and if it is in the ancient Latin Vulgate. Therefore any part whatever of the ancient Latin Vulgate text not read as Scripture in the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian and ALL OTHER RITES is (according to my critic) wanting in canonicity. I fear he will not find much support from his coreligionists in his new and expansive definition of Canonicity. *Quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* is not the Council of Trent’s test of canonicity — far from it. The Council of Trent stringently declared and decreed that the only sacred and canonical form of Scripture was that exhibited in the ancient Latin Vulgate *edition* of St. Jerome. The obvious implication of this decree is that all other editions that differ from the Latin Vulgate are false. And whoever denies the sacredness and canonicity of the Vulgate, him the Council of Trent anathematizes. Is not this tantamount to enforcing the Vul-

gate on the whole of Christendom? If not, I should like to know what is?

3. The next charge against me is that of "garbling." My critic admits that the Bull of Clement VIII. (1592) proclaimed a "close" season of ten years for the standardized Vulgate, which was to be multiplied in the Vatican printing house, while all other editions were "set aside." No wonder Vulgates abounded from this time onwards, and that the few surviving non-Vulgate readings in the Scriptures and in the Fathers were eliminated! But my translation of parts of the Bull is objected to, and here my critic again quibbles. He says it was a question in the Bull of different *editions of the Vulgate* of St. Jerome, and not a question of different *copies of the Bible*. In other words, he maintains that the Bull of Clement VIII. sought only to secure a pure form of St. Jerome's edition, and was not directed against other editions of Scripture. If this had been so, the Bull would have permitted of Beza's edition and translation of the New Testament, and even of Luther's, being printed in the Vatican printing house! But my critic forgets that he has *already informed us* that the Council of Trent, thirty years before the Bull of Clement appeared, had sought to suppress the Scripture editions of Erasmus and Beza. At Trent in 1563 the Bible editions of Erasmus and Beza were not only "set aside," but their upholders were also anathematized. Yet in 1592 these editions were (according to my critic) not included in the prohibited editions of Scripture. Clement VIII., we are asked to believe, was more liberal than the Council of Trent! But who does not know that in the sixteenth century **THE VULGATE TEXT WAS THE PARENT BIBLE** of Christendom, and *new editions of the Vulgate were therefore new editions of the Bible?* This quibbling distinction between the Vulgate and the Bible is only another successful attempt to twist plain statements from their obvious meaning and befog the issue.

4. It would seem that my worst offense is to have "garbled" Bede in my endeavor to prove that Bede used a copy of the Bible different from the Vulgate of St. Jerome.

My critic would have us believe that the Bible Bede used was the Vulgate, and that Bede in the passage I cited was comparing Latin with Greek — not Old-Latin with Vulgate. One single word of Bede's disproves this baseless theory. Bede speaks of the Greek "exemplar" as the source and equivalent (not rival) of the new Latin Vulgate that he opposed, and, as all the world knows, St. Jerome openly professes in his edition of the Vulgate to have equated his text with that of this Greek exemplar. There could be no contrast in text between the Greek exemplar and its Latin translation.

Every Old-Latin scholar knows that *the printed form* of Bede's work on the Acts largely agrees with the Laudian Old-Latin MS. (*e*) at Oxford, and not with St. Jerome's Vulgate. It is lost labor, therefore, to try and foist St. Jerome's Vulgate on Bede. My critic argues that, because Bede mentions St. Jerome directly after the passage I have cited, therefore he was thinking, not of the (British) Old-Latin, but of St. Jerome's Vulgate edition of the Acts. But surely a man may mention God's name at the end of a sworn statement without the proving that God was in his thoughts in all that he said before. A codicil appended to a will at a later date with a new name added does not by mere implication disinherit the first heirs of all their claims to consideration.

We are none of us infallible, and in proof of this maxim my opponent's Latin fails him in translating the end of the passage "cleverly omitted by Mr. Buchanan." My only "cleverness" in omitting these words was that it induced my critic to give us a taste of *his* quality as a translator. Here is the Latin: *Nam et Hieronymus pleraque testimonia Veteris Instrumenti, ut Hebraica Veritas habet, edocet.* Here is my critic's twice-repeated translation: "For Jerome himself gives many readings of *the ancient text*, as the Hebrew truth has them." To translate *Vetus Instrumentum* as the "ancient text" is a sad lapse in Latinity — especially for one who will not allow me a hair's breadth of liberty in *my* translations. What Bede is saying is this: Jerome did not allow, in the *Old Testament*, "the Hebrew truth" to displace the Old-

Latin Version; and neither shall we in Britain, in the *New Testament*, allow "the [so-called] Greek truth"—translated into the Vulgate—to displace our time-honored Old-Latin text.

The final charge of "garbling" against me is that I quoted my critic as saying that the Roman Psalter had been "ousted" in the Vatican and in Milan Cathedral by the Gallican, when I should have said that the Roman Psalter had been the "ouster,"—not the ousted. This was not intentional, but was due to my not perfectly apprehending a statement of my critic. I would not willfully misrepresent my opponent's least word, nor intentionally garble any translation, to gain any end whatever.

Finally, I may say that in the last twenty years of incessant textual study, in which I have by God's grace collated and published more Latin MSS. of the Scriptures than any other living man, I have seen with my own eyes in more than fifty Latin MSS. of the New Testament scattered all over Europe more than fifty thousand alterations of the text—alterations extending from soon after 382 A.D. until the invention of printing; and *every one of these alterations*—involving much more than "accidental differences"—*has been in the direction of the Vulgate of St. Jerome*. This fact alone—even if the testimony of Theodoret and Bede had not come down to us—proves to my mind up to the hilt that ever since the days of Bishop Damasus the Church of Rome has enforced the fourth-century Vulgate of St. Jerome upon the whole of Christendom as the one and only authentic copy of the Holy Scriptures.

E. S. BUCHANAN.

New York City.