Dom Morin needs no introduction to readers of the Expositor. To liturgical students he is known as the editor of Liber Comicus; patristic students owe him a greater debt for the recovery of an early Latin version of the Epistle of St. Clement. His latest work, while dealing with another patristic text, contains materials of special importance for the student of the Old Testament. It is from that point of view that I propose to offer a few remarks upon it here.

The new part of the Anecdota Maredsolana is not, strictly speaking, an anecdotum: the greater part of Jerome’s Notes on the Psalter has long been accessible in the Breviarium in Psalms which appears among his printed works. From a table supplied by the editor of the Anecdota (III. i., p. xii.) it appears that not more than two-fifths of the Commentarioli are actually new. But the Hieronymian matter of the Breviarium is so interlarded with later comments, that hitherto it has been precarious to claim any part of the book as the genuine work of Jerome. Only in the case of a single Psalm (cxxxviii.) has the Breviarium preserved the original text without adulteration. This fact may be taken as the measure of the gain which we derive from the present publication even in regard to those portions of the Notes which are not now printed for the first time. The comments upon some fifty psalms, chiefly in the second half of the Psalter, are absolutely new.

Cardinal Pitra (Analecta Sacra, ii. 395) calls attention to a passage in which Jerome (ep. cxii.) furnishes a text of Greek

and Latin expositors of the Psalms anterior to himself. Of Greek commentators, Jerome counts up six—Origen, Eusebius, Theodore of Heraclea, Asterius, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Didymus; of Latins, three—Hilary of Poictiers, Eusebius of Vercellae, and Ambrose. Origen was not, however, as Pitra points out, the earliest of the Greek expositors; he was preceded by Hippolytus, whose name frequently occurs in the *catenae*. Yet if Origen was not first in the field, his works were certainly the source upon which the Greek expositors who followed him principally drew; and as for the Latins, Jerome fully admits their obligations to the great Alexandrian. Jerome’s Notes plead guilty to the same indictment. He professes himself dissatisfied with the *Enchiridion*, but admits that his book is more or less a compilation from Origen’s larger works upon the Psalms; “ex quae in tomis vel in homiliis ipse disseruit . . . in hunc angustum commentariolum referam.” It would be easy, however, to overestimate Jerome’s indebtedness to Origen. Much in these Notes bears the stamp of the Latin Father’s own mind; his learning shews itself in references to Josephus, Tertullian, Lactantius; more than once he refers to his personal study of the Hexapla, and the criticisms passed upon the text of the LXX., the citations from the other Greek versions, the corrections of the Greek based upon the current Hebrew, are probably due, at least in great part, to Jerome himself.

As we might have expected, the Notes are largely occupied with *allegoria* and *prophetia*, and supporters of the *historia* who neglect the deeper sense are condemned (pp. 10, 39, 42, 75, 78). Many of the Psalms are characterized as Messianic. Psalm i. is to be interpreted, not in reference to Josiah, but as fulfilled in the *adsumptus homo*; a severe censure is passed upon expositors who regard Esther as the speaker in Psalm xxi. (=xxii.); Psalms lxviii. (=lxix.) and lxxi. (=lxxii.) are considered as exclusively
applicable to Christ. Yet an effort is made to determine the occasion of each psalm from its title, and sometimes the historical interpretation is the only one allowed, even when it involves a quaintness which borders on absurdity (cf. e.g. the explanation of Psalm lxxvii. (=lxxviii.) 66 by a reference to 1 Sam. v. 6, 9 (LXX.)). In the same spirit the traditional interpretation of Psalm xcviii. (=xcix.) 5, προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, is, notwithstanding the authority of Athanasius, rejected in favour of a more natural exegesis.

The Notes contain interesting remarks on various topics connected with the Psalter, such as the division of the Psalms into books (pp. 46, 59), and the existence of alphabetical and metrical Psalms (pp. 37, 81, 82, 85, 98). Historical and geographical information is occasionally interspersed; there are references to the age of persecution (p. 23), and to the ancient discipline of the Church (p. 93); we learn (p. 90) that Bethlehem still bore the name of Ephrata; Psalm lxxiii. (=lxxiv.) 4 is explained by a Babylonian custom of fixing trophies over city gates; there is a liturgical note of some importance (p. 76 f.) on the Jewish and Christian use of Alleluia in the recitation of the Psalter. Lastly, several passages possess dogmatic interest, e.g. a condemnation of Traducianism (p. 41); a statement that the wrath of God is purely corrective (pp. 7, 51); references to the doctrine of the "captivity of souls" (pp. 58, 93). Psalm ciiti. (=civ.) 24 is quoted against Marcionite and Manichean error; Psalm cxlv. (=cxlvii.) against Novatianism; Psalm cix. (=cx.) 1 is defended against Arian misinterpretation.

Several of these incidental remarks are attractive, and deserve careful handling. But for the present I must be content merely to direct attention to them, limiting myself to the materials which the Notes supply to the student of the text of the Psalter. These will fall under two heads;
(1) corrections or elucidations of the Greek Psalter from the current Hebrew; (2) contributions to our knowledge of the Hexapla.

(1) Corrections of the LXX. from the Hebrew.

ii. 12. δράξασθε παιδείας. "The Hebrew may be rendered adorate filium." Jerome does not refer to the alternative adorate pure, which he adopts in the "Hebrew" Psalter.

iv. 3. Selah is either a musical note, or, as Aquila's ἄει suggests, a sign of perpetuity. It is not a pause in the music, since in ix. 17 we meet with φίδη διάψάλματος, which implies the opposite.

vii., title. Χουσεὶ νιόθ 'Ιμενει. Not=Χ. ὁ τοῦ ΄Αραχεί (2 Regn. xvii. 5), whose name, Jerome says, is spelt with a ρ. Cush here=Αἰθίοψ, i.e., Saul, who as a Benjamite was a νιόθ 'Ιμενει, and who is called an Ethiopian "propter sanguinarios et tetros et crudeles mores."

vii. 10, 11. The Hebrew punctuates after ΤΗΣ, "The righteous God trieth the hearts and reins." The LXX. wrongly transfers it to the beginning of the next verse (δικαία ἡ βοήθεια μου).

vii. 12 (=11). LXX. μὴ ὅργην ἐπάγων. Aquila's ἐμβρι-μώμενος is truer to the Hebrew (ἕν). As interpreted by the LXX., the clause is read by Jerome interrogatively: numquid irascitur?

xviii. 6 (=xix. 5). LXX. ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκῆνωμα αὐτῶν. The Hebrew suggests τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκ. ἐν αὐτῶν.

xix. (=xx.) 10. LXX. καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν. Hebrew, "Who (i.e. the King) shall hear us."

xx. (=xxi.) 13. LXX. ἐν τοῖς περιλοίποις σου ἐτοιμά-σεις τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν. Jerome wishes to sub-
stitute ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς σου ("pro reliquiis in Hebraeo bonis habet"). He is probably thinking of Aquila's rendering, which Field prints ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς; in the Syriac, however, it is given as ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς. Perhaps the two senses of ἰς led to a confusion. In the "Hebrew" Psalter Jerome translates correctly: funes tuos firmabis.

xxi. 2 (=xxii. 1). There is nothing in the Hebrew to answer to πρόσχες μου, and the Gospels justify the omission (ἐλώι ἐλώι λεμὰ σαβαχθανεί). So Euseb. ad loc., ἀκριβῶς καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν περιλέκειται.

xxiii. (=xxiv.) 7, 9. LXX. ἀρατε πύλας, οἱ ἀρχοντες ύμῶν. Hebrew, "Lift up your heads, ye gates."

xxxvi. (=xxxvii.) 38. LXX. τὰ ἐν καταλίμματα τῶν ἀσεβῶν. Hebrew, "the latter end (今は novissima) of the wicked."

li. (=liti.) title. Jerome, who reads in his text of the LXX., εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ἀχιμέλεχ, remarks that in 1 Samuel xxii. and in the Hebrew of this Psalm the name is spelt Abimelech; the confusion, he adds, arises from the interchange of ב and א. Eusebius (cited by Morin) makes the same statement.

lxxvi. (=lxxvii.), title. LXX. ὑπὲρ Ἰδιθοῦμ. The Hebrew (יהוה ידיתון), according to Jerome, means "by Idithun," i.e., a Psalm of his composition. Jerome goes on to say that the words τῶν Ἀσαφ ψαλμὸς are wanting in veris exemplaribus. They are present in nearly all our MSS. of the LXX., and neither Kennicott nor De Rossi notes their omission by any Hebrew MS.

lxxxvi. (=lxxviii.) 4. The spelling of Rahab here is stated by Jerome to be identical with that of the name in Joshua ii. He seems to have been misled by the LXX., which has Ραᾶβ in both places.
lxxvii. (= lxxxviii.) 11. LXX. ἡ ἰατρὸς ἀναστήσων; Jerome notes that μεγάς, "aut gigantas significat aut medicos."

xciii. (= xciv.) has no title in the Hebrew. The interesting liturgical note in the LXX. (φαλμός . . τετράδι ασβάτων) is consequently dismissed without comment ("unde superfluum est de titulo disputare").

xcix. ( = c.) 3. LXX. καὶ οὐ χὴμεῖς. Hebrew, "and we are His." Jerome does not recognise the reading of the K'thib (אֱלֹהִים).

cxiv. (= cxvi. 9). Hebrew, "I will walk" (יָשָׁב). LXX., εὐαπεστήσω. Cf. Genesis v. 22 (Heb. xi. 6).

cxv. 2 (= cxvi. 11). LXX. πᾶς ἀνθρωπὸς ψεύστης. Hebrew, "falsehood." Jerome follows Symmachus (? Aquila) in taking בות as a noun, yet he represents it by קָוֵה, which is nearer to בות than to בות. Jerome would correct after the Hebrew תַּה רָה קָוֵה תַּה רָה קָוֵה. The correction, which is given in Greek, is probably from Aquila. See Field ad loc.

cxxiii. (= cxxiv.) 5. LXX. τὸ θὸ δῶρ τὸ ἀνυπόστατον. The comment is: "Verbum ἀνυπ. apud Hebraeos ambiguum est et potest sonare 'quod non subsistat' et 'quod intolerabile sit.'" Correct, from the Breviarium, "apud Graecos"; the Hebrew (אֱלֹהִים) presents no such ambiguity.

cxxvi. (= cxxvii.) 4. LXX. οἱ νῦν τῶν ἐκτεταγμένων. Jerome compares 2 Esdr. xiv. 16 (= Neh. iv. 10), where ημιν τῶν ἐκτεταγμένων represents "ἐν τῶν ἐκτεταγμένων; in both places, however, there is a variant (iv. 10, ἐκτεταγμένων ἦν, v. 15 ἐκτεταγμένοι νο).
cxxxvi. (= cxxxvii.) 8. Hebrew, "O daughter of Babylon" ("pro genetivo casu vocativum in Hebraeo habet").

(2) Contributions to knowledge of the Hexapla.

i. 4. ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς: "nec hoc quidem in veteribus habetur exemplaribus," i.e., in the Hexapla and in copies taken from it.

iv. 8. καὶ ἔλατον αὐτῶν: "nec in Hebraeo nec in ceteris editionibus (Aq., Symm., Th., etc.) nec apud ipsos quoque LXX. interpretes (the Hexaplaric recension) repperi."


xxi. (= xxii.) 2. "Quinta et sexta editio verba clamoris mei." Field’s note is Θ. Ε’. οἱ λόγοι τῆς βοήσεως μου.

xxi. (= xxii.) 3. "Aquila ... et non tacebis (καὶ οὐ σωπῆσῃ)." Field quotes from Montfaucon: ’Α. καὶ οὐκ ἔστι συνή, but Jerome’s statement is confirmed by the margin of a Vatican MS. cited by Pitra, Analecta Sacra, iii. 558.

xxi. (= xxii.) 17. "Aq. et Th. venatores interpretati sunt." Field, after Montfaucon, gives ’Α. Σ. θηραταί, Ὡ. κύνες," adding from the same source, "Drusius vero ’Α. Θ. κυνηγέται." He remarks: "Vereor ne utriusque lectiones pendēant a Pseudo-Hier." For
the present it must remain uncertain whether θηράται or εκνηγέται is the true representative of Jerome's venatores; possibly Aq. had θ., and Th. κ.


lxxxvi. (=lxxxvii.) 5. According to Jerome, the true reading of the LXX. is μὴ τῇ Σειών, and ΜΗΘΠ is a scribe's error. Comp. Pitra, Anal. Sacr., iii. 559, τὸ ρῶ κατὰ προσβήκην ἐκείνο εἰς τὴν τῶν ο' ἐν τῷ τετρασελίδῳ ἐν δὲ τῷ ὅκτασελίδῳ ΜΗ ΤΗ Σ.

lxxxvii. (=lxxxviii.) 11. "Symmachus...transtulit aut Rafaim theomachi resurgentes confitebuntur tibi?" (=ἡ 'Ραφαεὶμ θεομάχοι ἀνυστάμενοι ἔξωμολογήσονται σοι). Field, who gives the above rendering without 'Ραφ., suggests that Symm. may have had γίγαντες θεομάχοι.


lxxxix. (xc.) 9. LXX. τα ἐτη ἡμῶν ὡς ἀραχνὴ (ἀράχνην ἙΝ) ἐμελέτων. "Melius Aquila...anni nostri similes loquenti" (=? τὰ ἐτη ἡμῶν ὃμοια φωνοῦντι).


cxv. (=cxvi. 10-19). "Hunc psalmum quinta et sexta editio cum superioribus copulant, Symmachus vero et LXX. interpretes dividunt." Field quotes this, but as from "Pseudo-Jerome."

cxv. 2 (=cxvi. 11). "Symmachus mendacium" (=διά-
Field, following Theodoret, attributes διάψευσμα to Aquila, and διαψεύδεται to Symmachus. cxxiii. (cxxiv.) 5. "Aq. et Symm. et Th. et omnes interpres superbas aquas et adrogantes" (=τὰ ὑδάτα τὰ ἐπερήφανα).

cxxi. (cxxxii.) 15. "Pro vidua, χήρα, et Hebraea volumina et ipsi LXX. θήραν habent... Symmachus et Aquila cibaria interpretata sunt." Θήραν appears to have been the reading of the Hexaplaric Psalter. Theodoret (see Field) vouches for Σ. τὴν σίτησιν, but ἐπισιτισμῶν was the general rendering in Genesis xlv. 21 (Jerome ad l.), and is attributed to Aquila here.

cxxxiii. (=cxxxiv.) 1. The words ἐν αὐλαῖς οἶκον θεοῦ ἡμῶν have no place, according to Jerome, in the true text of the LXX., or in any other Greek version, and have been interpolated from Psalm cxxxiv. (=cxxxv.) 2. In the chief existing MSS. of the LXX. we find two readings (a) οἱ ἐστῶτες ἐν αὐλαῖς οἶκον θεοῦ ἡμῶν (BN*); (b) οἱ ἐστ. ἐν οἶκω Κυρίου ἐν αὐλαῖς οἶκον θεοῦ ἡμῶν (Ntext). Origen, in the surviving fragment of his commentary on this Psalm, deals only with ἐν οἶκῳ Κυρίου, and Hilary writes: "repperi quosdam ambiguos circa hoc in atriis domus Domini fuisse... dicentes hoc a translatoribus primis adicetam esse." On the whole the facts suggest that the pre-Origenic text of the LXX. had the reading of BN* and that Origen prefixed ἐν οἶκῳ Κυρίου, obelizing the rest of the sentence. The reading of Ntext will thus represent the Hexaplaric text with the obelus omitted.

cxxxiv. (=cxxxv.) 4. LXX. Ἰσραήλ εἰς περιονυσίασμὸν αὑτοῦ. Jerome renders Israel in substantiale sibi, adding that Aquila and the quinta translated "similarly." Probably they had περιούσιον; cf. Aq. in Malachi iii. 17.
depopulata atque vastata (= ἐκτεταρθωμένη). Field 
gives ἡ λῃστρὶς, from Syrohex. (Δ.Δ.Δ...Ω).

cxxxviii. (=cxxxix.) 11. “Symm. et nox lux circum me 
(= καὶ νῦξ φῶς περὶ ἐμὲ). Field gives this as the 
Aquila’s rendering, and, following Theodoret, repre- 
sents Symmachus by ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦξ φωτεινὴ περὶ ἐμὲ.

cxliv. (=cxlv.) 14. The words πιστὸς Κύριος...τῶν 
ἐργῶν αὐτοῦ are, according to Jerome, an addition 
made by the LXX. to the Hebrew text with the view 
of assigning a verse to the letter ἰ which the com- 
poser had overlooked in an otherwise alphabetical 
Psalms. The clause was obelized in the Hexapla; 
see the scholion cited by Field.

The Latin version of the Psalms employed in the Com- 
mentarioli is on the whole that of the Roman Psalter. 
There are however a number of readings which belong to 
earlier versions, and some which seem to be direct render- 
ings from the Hebrew; a few of the latter re-appear in the 
Psalterium Hebraicum. The impression left on the mind 
by a careful study is that Jerome had before him his 
earliest revision of the Latin Psalter, and was already 
feeling his way towards the second, and even the third; 
yet while he keeps his eye open to the Hebrew, his aim 
still is to translate from the LXX.—the Hexaplaric LXX., 
which he regards as the purest form of the original work. 
His citations from the rest of the Old Testament are also 
based on the LXX., or derived from the Old Latin; even 
in the Books of Samuel there is no trace of the influence of 
the new Vulgate, although in the passages which he quotes 
from the New Testament I have noticed tokens here and 
there that the revised Latin was in his mind.

These considerations enable us to fix approximately the 
date of the Notes on the Psalter. The learned editor points
out that they must have been written before Jerome's change of feeling with regard to Origen, i.e., before 393. The facts just mentioned point to a date previous to the commencement of the Vulgate O. T. (391) and the publication of the Gallican Psalter (388), but later than the appearance of the Roman Psalter (383), later also than the revision of the New Testament which was begun at Rome in 384. In the interval Jerome had settled in Palestine, consulted the Hexapla at Caesarea, and begun his Hebrew studies at Bethlehem. Dom Morin's new Anecdoton belongs, we may feel fairly sure, to the first years of Jerome's otium Bethleemiticum; it will hardly be rash to assign it provisionally to A.D. 387–8.

H. B. Swete.