

Theology on *the Web.org.uk*

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbadshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found
here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Volume XXVI

Part II

1907

Notes on St. Jerome's Tractates on the Psalms

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

TO the eminent Benedictine Germain Morin we owe, among other debts, the establishment of a text of certain works of St. Jerome, some of them of a class not previously represented in that author's extensive writings. The so-called *Breviarium in Psalmos*, though included in the complete editions of Jerome, had long been considered as partly, if not chiefly, spurious, yet amid the mass of foreign material some fragments appeared genuine. The attention devoted to these fragments by Morin was rewarded by the discovery of two series of manuscripts, of which the one contains a collection of *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, the other certain sermons on the Psalms, *Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos*. The former are brief annotations, comparable to many of Jerome's other Biblical commentaries; the latter present to us addresses delivered by the saint to his fellow monks at Bethlehem. These two series are published by Morin,¹ with critical apparatus, introductions, and footnotes.

¹ *Anecdota Maredsolana. Vol. III, Pars I. Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri qui deperditi hactenus putabantur Commentarioli in Psalmos. Edidit, commentario critico instruxit, prolegomena et indices adiecit D. Germanus Morin. Maredsoli, apud Editorem . . . 1895. Vol. III, Pars II. Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos, in Marcii evangeliū, aliaque varia argumenta. Partem nuper detexit, partem adulteris mercibus exemit, auctori vindicavit, adiectisque commentarioris criticis primus edidit D. Germanus Morin. Maredsoli. . . . 1897.*

in which are collected abundant and convincing instances of similarity of thought and expression to other passages in the undisputed works of Jerome. For textual details the reader is referred to these notes and to an article published separately by Morin.² But the editor's work was not ended with the publication of these two series. In a note to the reader prefixed to the second series he says, "*Contigit, ut absolute iam volumine novam seriem tractatum in Psalmos, eamque penitus ineditam, inopinato reperirem.*" This new series³ was published in 1903, and with it full indices to it and the part preceding. The authenticity of this work is likewise established beyond doubt by abundant parallelisms of style and subject-matter.

Having thus stated the case to the reader, I desire briefly to discuss some questions in regard to the method and the style of the three series, with the especial purpose of throwing some light upon the nature of the third series. Citations will be made to the parts of Vol. III of the *Anecdota Maredsolana*, i.e.,

I = *Commentarioli in Psalmos.*

II = *Tractatus in Psalmos.*

III = *Tractatus in Psalmos XIV.*

The numbering of pages and lines is that of the *Anecdota*.

The study of Jerome's style has been prosecuted chiefly by C. Paucker and H. Goelzer.⁴ Much material of the highest value to the student has been collected by them, but their work suffers from two important limitations. In

² *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, t. I (1896), pp. 393-434: *Les Monuments de la Prédication de Saint Jérôme par Dom Germain Morin. Macon, 1896.*

³ *Anecdota Maredsolana. Vol. III, Pars III. Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos quatuordecim. Detexit, adiectisque commentarioris critici primus editio D. Germanus Morin. Maredsoli... 1903.*

⁴ *De Latinitate B. Hieronymi observationes ad nominum verborumque usum pertinentes conscripsit C. Paucker. Editio adiecto indice auctior... Berolini apud S. Calvary, MDCCCLXXX. pp. iv + 189. See also many periodical articles by Paucker which are cited in the following work: Étude lexicographique et grammatische de la Latinité de Saint Jérôme par Henri Goelzer. Paris, Hachette et Cie. 1884. pp. xii + 472.*

the first place, we are unable to trace the development of Jerome's style from the early period, when the influence of his Roman life and of his teacher Donatus must have been potent over him, to the later time, when, living at Bethlehem, subjected to many foreign influences, he could write, "*Nec mirum si me et absentem iam diu, et absque usu Latinae linguae, semigraeculum, barbarumque, homo latinissimus et facundissimus superet.*"⁶ In the second place, the fact that the *Tractatus in Psalmos* were still undiscovered gave the student no example of Jerome's *spoken* style as distinct from that of his *written* works. The first of these wants may perhaps yet be met by still more detailed stylistic study; as to the second a few general remarks may here be appropriate.

Jerome's style is always rapid,⁷ but in these sermons it is marked by an unusual swiftness. Short sentences succeed one another with the simplest sorts of connectives; unusual words and long periods are avoided; the enthusiasm of the speaker leads to frequent use of apostrophe, rhetorical question, and repetition. Again, from the simplicity of his language and his explanations of Scripture, it is clear that he is not addressing a learned audience, but one composed in large measure of those to whom he refers as '*simpliciores fratres.*'⁸ As was natural in the presence of such hearers, reproofs of vice and exhortations to virtue are much more frequent than in his purely exegetical works.⁹ These and other differences will appear more clearly in a comparison of the three series in order.

I

This series consists of a short *Prologus* and brief¹⁰ comments on 125 Psalms. The text and footnotes occupy one hundred pages in Morin's edition. In some Psalms several

⁶ *Ep.* 50. 2.

⁷ Goelzer, *Etude*, pp. 85-86; Morin in *Revue Bénédictine*, xix (1902), pp. 126 sqq.

⁸ II. 53. 20: *haereamus terrae propter simpliciores*; 54. 4; 116. 5: *Do exemplum ut simpliciores possint intelligere quod dicitur*; 124. 22; 211. 5; 225. 22.

⁹ A particularly interesting example is that in II. 116. 5 sqq.

¹⁰ Even as short as a single line of text.

lemmata are discussed; in some only one, or even none at all. The series is plainly a written work, for it is addressed to some unknown person who had asked Jerome for information on points in the Psalms neglected or not fully explained in the *Enchiridion* of Origen.¹⁰

The opinions of various writers are several times quoted in this series with no attempt on the part of Jerome to decide between varying views, e.g. I. 3. 4-4. 1: *Quidam dicunt . . . alii . . . aliter . . . denique . . . Aliter . . . Aliter . . . Aliter . . .* The 'simpliciores fratres,' however, of II are ordinarily instructed as to which of several views they are to adopt.¹¹ So, too, the citation of various versions of the Psalms is in I very frequent, e.g. I. 67. 14-17: *Pro 'superbo' in hebraeo RAAB scriptum habet . . . quod Aquila 'impetum,' Symmachus 'adrogantiam,' Theodotion 'superbiam,' sexta 'tumultum' interpretati sunt.*¹² This abundance of variants is to be compared with the paucity in the *Homiliae* (II), of which I shall later speak.

Hebrew words and their interpretations appear frequently, e.g. I. 8. 18-19: *in hebraeo legitur NESCU BAR, quod interpretari potest, Adorate filium.*¹³ And Greek words, explained or unexplained, e.g. I. 8. 7-8: *πλεονασμοῦ esse vitium;* I. 47. 16-17: *Pro quo in hebraeo ita habet: ἐπινίκιον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθῶν.* I. 86. 4: *Pro desolatoriis carbonibus in hebraeo ἀπκενθέντοις habet.*¹⁴ But though Greek words occur in large numbers in the homilies (II and III) addressed to ignorant men, we may explain their presence there by the fact that some of the auditors of those homilies may have been familiar with Greek, living, as they did, in an Eastern community. Moreover, many of the words are ecclesiastical terms, such

¹⁰ I, pp. 1-2.

¹¹ IL 1. 12 *sqq.*; 2. 4 *sqq.*

¹² Cf. I. 4. 20; 11. 11-12; 19. 2-4, 23; 21. 18-21; 24. 5; 25. 13; etc., in all about 40 cases in Series I.

¹³ Cf. I. 10. 15; 11. 10; 17. 21; 19. 14; 21. 1-2, 12, 13; 24. 14; 34. 9, 11; 50. 45; 52. 10; 66. 1; 67. 14; 69. 16; 83. 20; 84. 21; 90. 16; 92. 9; 98. 15; 99. 20, 21.

¹⁴ Cf. I. 2. 11; 5. 16; 12. 8; 15. 7; 21. 3; 25. 15, 22; 41. 8; etc., about forty cases in all in Series I.

as *anastasis*, *ascetes*, etc., which would probably be more or less familiar to churchmen who knew no Greek. See below, p. 114. In Series I, however, the Greek words are introduced chiefly from Jerome's interest in variant readings and textual interpretations, and indicate the author's expectation that this work would be read by educated men who would appreciate such details of scholarship.

With such readers in mind, it is not strange that in this series the hortatory element is rare. Moreover, the mention of various heresies to be avoided is rather infrequent. I have noted only the following instances: I. 13. 9-11: . . . *peribunt omnes haeretici, qui loquuntur contra Deum mendacium*; I. 80. 13-15: *Quod si nobis obponere voluerit haeresis Ariana . . . respondebimus ei . . .*; I. 98. 20 *sqq.*: *Adversum Novatianos hoc psalmo uti possumus*. In I. 7. 18 the Anthropomorphic heresy is censured. With this slight mention we should compare the frequent accusation of heresy in the following series.

If we turn for a moment from the subject-matter to some grammatical questions, — a few selected from many possible ones, — we notice between the various series striking differences. Nowhere are these more evident than in the constructions used in indirect discourse. The use of *dico quod*, *dico quia*, or *dico quoniam*, followed by a finite mood was evidently common in Jerome's time. Though apparently analogous to the Greek λέγω δὲ, this usage is believed really to have arisen from the Latin colloquial speech,¹⁵ a theory certainly not contradicted by what I find to be the case in these three series under discussion. This construction appears through all the work of Jerome, but in his commentaries and written compositions it is only moderately frequent. In Series I, I note only —

<i>indico quod</i>	+ subj.	75. 23.
<i>intellego quod</i>	+ indic.	80. 4.
<i>respondeo quod</i>	+ subj.	83. 2.
<i>scribitur quia</i>	+ subj.	84. 16.

¹⁵ Dräger, *Hist. Syntax*, II.² § 379. Cf. Goelzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 375-6.

Thus rarely do *quia* and *quod* appear, while *quoniam* is here entirely wanting in this construction.¹⁶ And this proportion of *quia* and *quod* agrees pretty well with that in most of Jerome's other writings. But in II and III I shall show the case to be quite different.

The occurrence of a few particular words in all three series may best be treated in this place. *Pulchre dixit*, found in II 15 times (in 315 pages), and in III, pp. 32-93, 12 times, is here absent. It appears then to be a phrase more characteristic of the spoken than of the written style.

The enclitic *-que* in Series I is about as frequent as in Latin of the classical period. In II it is confined to these phrases:

- huc illuque* II. 7. 24 and 8 other cases in II.
- longe lateque* II. 237. 22.
- simulque* II. 78. 2 and 8 other cases in II.

Quippe, a frequent word in the writings of Jerome, I have noted but once in II;¹⁷ in I it appears 15 times. *Verbi causa* (in II 20 times) and *verbi gratia* (in II 12 times) are here wanting. They occur in Jerome's other works, but are by far most common in the homilies. Other words whose less frequent occurrence forbids generalization seem to point toward the same distinction between the written and the spoken style.

II

This series occupies, with footnotes, 315 pages in Morin's text. Fifty-nine Psalms are discussed. Though the notes are often very brief, yet the comment is seldom as short as one page for one Psalm. A few¹⁸ by their brevity suggest some of the Commentarioli, but lack, for the most part, the scholarly point of view of that series. Others are more carefully finished, with more frequent use of Greek words and of rhetorical figures, but all have an audience clearly in

¹⁶ With the periphrastic form *notandum est, sciendum est, observandum est*, *quia* and *quod* are quite as frequent as the infinitive, or rather more so.

¹⁷ II. 306. 14.

¹⁸ Especially on Psalms 100, 101, 103, 104, 110, 135, 139.

view, as one may see from the abundant use of imperatives¹⁹ and other features of spoken style.²⁰ The nature of the average parts of the work may best be shown by an example, II. 307. 20 *sqq.* (an explanation of the lemma *Laudate eum sol et luna*) :

Videte, gentiles; videte, Manichaei. Sol laudat, non laudatur. Laudate eum sol et luna. Vos solem deum dicitis. Ecce post quanta laudat. Laudate de caelis, laudate in excelsis, laudate angelii, laudate omnes virtutes. Deus vester in quinto gradu laudans ponitur. Laudate eum sol et luna. Non dixit, luna et sol; sed, sol et luna. Quod maius in lumine est, prius laudat. Vide et ordinem visibilium. Laudate eum sol; post solem, luna; post lunam, omnes stellae. Omnes stellae; non tantum lucifer, non tantum maiores stellae, sed et minores pariter laudent Dominum. Dicat aliquis: Quomodo sol et luna et stellae laudant Deum? In eo quod a suo officio et servitio non recedunt. Servitium ipsorum laus Dei est.

In these sermons addressed to monks their life and its duties are frequently described, *e.g.* II. 116. 6 *sqq.* :

Si ieris in civitatem monachus solus, et coepiris deambulare, et audieris clamorem in circo, et aliquis tibi dixerit: Veni et specta, circus est; et coepiris ei tu dicere, Non licet, non possum ire: si ille tibi ostenderit infinita hominum milia, et dixerit tibi, Ducentia hominum milia ibi sunt: ergo illi omnes perituri sunt, et tu solus salvis eris? tu debes intellegere, quia symptoma diaboli est; hoc est, scire debes quia plures cadunt.

Or II. 231. 18–20:

Dimisimus possessiones, dimisimus patriam, dimisimus saeculum; et propter calamum rixam facimus in monasterio.²¹

These monks seem to have had little appreciation for the variant readings of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, for of these names, so familiar in Series I, only Theodotion is named, and he but once, and in such a manner as to show

¹⁹ *Vide; vide; audi, haeretice; esto; estote; habeto; habetote;* cf. II. 257. 16; also II. 41. 21–2; 200. 9.

²⁰ Cf. Morin, *Rev. Bénéd.* xix. (1902), pp. 140 *sqq.*, where he mentions various phrases by which Jerome aroused to attention his drowsy auditors. The examples are from III, but are exactly like many in II.

²¹ Cf. 224. 26; 229. 10 *sqq.*; 284. 14; *et passim*.

that Jerome's hearers could have known little about him, II. 293. 25-26: *Denique Theodotion, qui unus est de interpretibus . . . ait . . .* The LXX is here, as elsewhere in Jerome, referred to freely.

In place of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion heretics here receive much attention. I give a list with the number of times each is mentioned: Anthropomorphitæ (1), Apollinaristæ (1), Arrius and Eunomius (9), Arriani (7), Macedoniani (2), Manichæus (10), Marcion (2), Montanus and the Cataphrygæ (1), Novatianus (1), Origen (4), Photinus (1), Tatianus, princeps Encratitarum (1).²³ The Jews are constantly attacked.

Hebrew words are, in proportion to the length of this series, far less numerous than in I.²⁴ Greek words, as I have already said, appear frequently in II and III as well as in I. Many are ecclesiastical terms doubtless already partly or completely Latinized; e.g. *anachorita, anagoge, anastasis, archisynagogus, ascetes, baptista, catachumenus, chameunia, coenobium, diaconus, encaenia, idolatiae, laicus, Pascha, Pentecoste, Scenopegia, tropologia*, etc. These important words would be readily understood by Jerome's hearers, subjected as they no doubt were to considerable Greek influence. Indeed, that these homilies were delivered in Greek and translated by some friend or assistant of Jerome has been suggested by Morin, but the strong objections which led him to abandon this view are certainly valid.²⁵

Indirect discourse is, as I have suggested, a striking criterion of the style of these three series. I have noted in II the following cases of finite moods in indirect discourse. For brevity I shall omit the references, but state the number of occurrences observed. If no number is added, I have noted a single instance only.

²³ This list is that of Morin's index *s.v. haereticus*. To it should be added Porphyrius, whose views are twice censured, II. 60. 4 *sqq.*; 80. 15 *sqq.* This makes a total of 42 references to heresies in this series.

²⁴ II. 19. 18; 20. 7-8; 26. 2; 40. 17; 51. 14; 82. 16; 102. 14; 156. 8; 196. 5; 206. 18, 14, 15, 16; 218. 8; 219. 12, 18, 16-18; 235. 11. Eight of these words are nothing more erudite than names of letters in the Hebrew alphabet.

²⁵ *Rev. d'histoire et de litt. relig.* I. (1898), pp. 427-429.

<i>cogito quoniam</i>	+ indic.
<i>cognosco quoniam</i>	+ indic.
<i>confido quoniam</i>	+ indic.
<i>confiteor quod</i>	+ indic.
<i>considero quia</i>	+ indic. 2. <i>quoniam</i> + indic. 2.
<i>credo quod</i>	+ indic.
<i>quod</i>	+ subj.
<i>dico</i>	(+ <i>infn.</i> 9.)
<i>quod</i>	+ indic. 4.
<i>quod</i>	+ subj. 7.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic. 9.
<i>quia</i>	+ subj. 4.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic. 7.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ subj. 3.
<i>intellego</i>	(+ <i>infn.</i> 4.) (+ <i>pr. ppl.</i> , 241. 12: <i>intellegebat se diabolum retinentem</i> . This seems to = <i>olda</i> + <i>ppl.</i>)
<i>quia</i>	+ indic.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic. 2.
<i>lego</i>	(+ <i>infn.</i>)
<i>quia</i>	+ indic.
<i>quia</i>	+ subj.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic. 4.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ subj. 2.
<i>memini quod</i>	+ subj.
<i>nescio quod</i>	+ indic.
<i>novi quia</i>	+ indic.
<i>nuntio quia</i>	+ subj.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic.
<i>ostendo</i>	(+ <i>infn.</i> 5.)
<i>quod</i>	+ subj.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic.
<i>promitto quia</i>	+ indic.
<i>quia</i>	+ subj.
<i>puto</i>	(+ <i>infn.</i> very frequent; over 20 cases noted.)
<i>quod</i>	+ indic.
<i>quod</i>	+ subj. 5.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic. 2.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ subj. 2.
<i>scio</i>	(+ <i>infn.</i> 3.)
<i>quod</i>	+ subj. 2.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic. 13.

<i>quia</i>	+ subj.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic. 13.
<i>scribo</i>	(+ <i>infin.</i> 2.)
<i>quod</i>	+ subj.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic. 2.
<i>quia</i>	+ subj. 3.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic. 2.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ subj. 2.
<i>video</i>	(+ <i>infin.</i> 9.)
<i>quod</i>	+ indic. 4.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic. 4.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic. 23.

Aio, existimo, indico, invenio, nego, and suspicor I have found only with the infinitive.

No one can fail to be impressed by the frequency of the finite moods in this construction, especially compared with their infrequency in I. Moreover *quia*, which is in I found but once, and *quoniam*, there absent, are here abundant. In this connection it is of interest that Goelzer²⁶ cites but one instance of *quoniam* thus used in the works of Jerome,²⁸ and Dräger,²⁷ stating it to be rare, cites examples only from Lactantius, Cyprian, and Augustine. Is it too much to infer that it too is especially characteristic of the colloquial rather than the carefully written style?

I have attempted to discover the difference between the indicative and the subjunctive in this construction. A few cases might indicate that a distinction existed, e.g. II. 50. 11 *sq.* : *Et certe non est scriptum ibi, quia clamaret Moyses ad Deum: sed quoniam cor eius clamabat.* . . . But in the vast majority of cases the two moods seem to be used interchangeably, and the apparent distinction in the case I have cited may therefore be purely fortuitous. Cf. II. 40. 5 *sqq.* : *Et hos salvasti, qui non credebant quod possibile est Deum habitare in homine.* . . . *Isti qui antea non credebant quod possibile sit Deum habitare in homine.*

The forms of words also show in this series a greater

²⁶ *Etude*, p. 384.

²⁷ *Ep.* 147. 1 with the verb *ignoro*.

²⁸ *Hist. Synt.* II.* pp. 282-3.

tendency to vary from classical usage than is the case in I or in Jerome's other works. A few examples will illustrate this tendency:

eo, fut. iemus, II. 138. 22; cf. *perient*, II. 73. 11²⁹
imperf. exiebant, II. 170. 24, 25.

fugio, infin. fugire, II. 3. 21; 19. 7; cf. II. 74. 19, where Codex L reads *fugierat*.³⁰

ipse, acc. sing. neut. ipsud, II. 156. 8 (so Cⁿ³¹ and G).

iste, nom. sing. neut. istum, II. 301. 19 (so BGC¹).

maximus, comp. maximior, II. 310. 1.

porticus, abl. sing. portico, II. 139. 5 *sqq.*³²

sedeo, fut. ppl. sediturus, II. 74. 26.

Examples of incorrect genders:

caput, masc. or fem. (cf. κεφαλή?) II. 267. 23 (so CSGI; *neut.* B).

flos, neut. II. 108. 21.

gladium, neut. II. 315, 23, 28.³³

vellus, masc. II. 141. 16 (so CG).

vultum, neut. II. 267. 25.

An interesting construction with the comparative, though found elsewhere in Jerome, is especially frequent here. II. 2. 1: *omne autem quod comparatur minus est ab eo cui comparatur*. Cf. II. 29. 13; 44. 17; 151. 27; 278. 4. Goelzer³⁴ cites *Ep.* 21. 41 and *in Dan.* 6 18, to which may be added *in Eph.* 5 22.³⁵ Rönsch³⁶ gives many examples from the Old Testament versions, and believes that the idiom is borrowed from the Hebrew. For the view that it entered Latin by way of Africa, see Wölfflin, *Archiv für lat. Lexicog. u. Grammatik*, vi. 448, vii. 125–129. The origin of this idiom is traced by the editors of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (*s.v. a, ab*) to the separation-idea in the ablative with a

²⁹ Goelzer, *Étude*, p. 287.

³⁰ Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 285, cites many examples of this conjugation.

³¹ Which Morin regards as the best codex in respect of orthography. *Anecd. Mareds.*, vol. iii. pars iii. *praefatio*, p. xii.

³² Cf. Rönsch, p. 261, fn.

³³ So in ante-classical Latin.

³⁴ *Étude*, p. 336.

³⁵ See also examples in Wölfflin, *Archiv*, vii. 127–8.

³⁶ *op. cit.* p. 452.

comparative without *quam*. It may very well be that in the colloquial language this ablative was often reinforced by *a* or *ab*. In II. 165. 26–27 we find another comparative idiom : *serpentem, qui sapientior erat in paradiſo prae omnibus bestiis.* For this see also Wölfflin, *Archiv*, vii. pp. 129–130.

Loose uses of the genitive case, which Goelzer⁸⁶ believes to be often of Hebrew origin, are frequent, e.g. :

tenebris erroris, II. 11. 26.

aura diaboli, II. 7. 27.

sol institiae, II. 11. 26; 37. 8; 43. 9; 166. 11, 15, 22; *al.* Cf. *Ep. 48. 21; 108. 12; in Matt. 17. 16.*

sol iniquitatis, II. 37. 7.

filius doloris mei, II. 20. 4; and many others.

A considerable number of constructions borrowed bodily from the Greek should be noticed.

II. 104. 28–24: *quas interpretati sumus de ecclesia potest intellegi et in anima nostra* (the best Ms. reading), where Morin correctly recognizes the Greek construction of a singular verb with a neuter plural subject. Other examples of this are II. 70. 11 and 133. 11.

In II. 100. 25, if we accept Morin's attractive emendation, we shall read *qui populum eductus fuerat*, suggesting the Greek idiom ὁ τὸν λαὸν ἐξηγοράσμενος. The text is, however, too uncertain for sure argument.

Conditional constructions suggesting the Greek. II. 44. 10–11: *Si enim esset nunc iudex, peccatores non erigebantur et in saeculo obtinebant divitias.* Cf. II. 7. 11–12; 168. 8; 170. 21–23; 233. 15–16: *Esau, cui multo melius fuerat si natus non fuisset;* 270. 17–18. Cf. also II. 47. 14–15: *O si et nos essemus equi Dei, et super nos dignabat Deus ascendere.*

Infinitive of purpose: II. 127. 29: *aquam dare bibere*; cf. II. 230. 14–15; *c. Iovin.* II. 17; *in Ez. 40. 1; in Os. 1. 2; in Matt. 13. 10.* II. 149. 9: *venit ergo iudicare;* cf. II. 171. 2–3; *Ep. 22. 4.* II. 41. 7–8: *submissi a daemonibus negare Salvatorem et blasphemare eum.*⁸⁷ Here may be noted a curious infinitive in II. 61. 1–2: *non habemus ubi requiescere.*

⁸⁶ *Etude*, p. 828.

⁸⁷ Goelzer, *Etude*, p. 870.

Matt. 8. 20 and Luke 9. 58, which this phrase seems to imitate, have the subjunctive: *οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνη*. Perhaps the infinitive here may be a colloquial idiom.

Double negative, II. 2. 24: *qui negat se peccatum non fecisse mentitur*; cf. II. 185. 1-2, though the reading there is not certain.

The preposition *ab* used with the genitive case, II. 198, 19: *a quorundam vocatur*. Rönsch³⁸ cites Luke 24. 27: *et erat incipiens a Moisen et omnium prophetarum*; and Luke 20. 46: *adtendite a scribis . . . amantium salutationes in foro* (*προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων . . . καὶ φιλούντων ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς*). In these two instances the solecism seems to be due to the interposition of other words, but in the example from Jerome the genitive follows directly upon the preposition.

Accusative of anticipation, a colloquial³⁹ and a poetical idiom in Latin, also found in Greek; II. 64. 17-18: *legimus decem tribus quoniam reliquerunt Deum*; cf. 68. 21-22.

A transition from the ablative absolute to the genitive absolute appears in II. 41. 10-11: *videntibus quingentis viris et omnibus apostolis et cherubim et omnium angelorum ascendiisti in caelis*.⁴⁰

Dominor is here found governing the genitive (Greek *ἀρχεῖν τινός*), II. 47. 26-27; 189. 1; 269. 24; *in Is. 54. 4*; also in Appuleius, Lactantius, and Tertullian. For some other unusual constructions with verbs, see II. 14. 12-13; 42. 18, and Morin's notes on these passages. II. 86. 22: *conmutavit divitias regni caelorum*. Here Morin suggests *τι τίνος ἀλλάσσειν*. Parallel to the Greek *λέγειν πρός τινα* we find *dico ad, loquor ad*. II. 9. 6: *Dicit Deus ad Abraham*.⁴¹ II. 24. 9: *serpens qui loquebatur ad Eream*.⁴²

A very free use of prepositions is noteworthy, especially

³⁸ op. cit., p. 442.

³⁹ E.g. Cic. *ad Fam.* 8. 10. 8.

⁴⁰ See Morin's footnote on this passage.

⁴¹ So in II. 11. 4; 38. 13-14; al. And in Jerome's other works, e.g. *Vit. Hilar.* 40; *in Matt.* 18. 2; al.

⁴² Cf. II. 81. 12; al.; Ep. 122. 5; 180. 4; *in Is.* 19. 1; Goelzer, *Etude*, p. 839.

of *in* with the ablative, which expresses a large variety of relationships, e.g., II. 25. 16-17: *Nonus psalmus . . . grandis in versibus, grandis est in mysteriis*; 29. 28: *loquuntur veritatem in labiis sed non in corde*; 51. 2: *in misericordia ipsius delectatus sumus*; 67. 20: *in Adam omnes nos de paradiſo electi sumus*; cf. August. *Conf.* 5. 9: *omnes in Adam morimur*; II. 103. 14-15: *Sion salvetur in homine qui in ea nasceretur*.⁴⁵

Credo in the sense of 'believing upon' is followed by one of three constructions: II. 38. 13: *quae crediderunt in Xpisto*⁴⁶; II. 6. 7-8: *credamus in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum*⁴⁷; the third use, with the dative, is not found in II, but occurs in III. 86. 7: *quoniam non regnat in creditibus Christo?*⁴⁸

If one looks in these homilies for traces of one of the most characteristic Greek traits, the use of *μέν* . . . *δέ*, he will not be entirely disappointed. Those words seem to be here represented by the following:

quidem . . . vero, II. 1. 4-5; 173. 22.

quidem . . . autem, II. 148. 15; 156. 26; 272. 6.

quidem . . . ceterum, II. 181. 3; 290. 27.

quidem . . . sed, II. e.g. 124. 11; 144. 10-11; 161. 16; 174. 22; 177. 22 *et passim*; *Ep.* 54. 8; 121 *praefat.*; *Vir. Ill.* 65.

Some other peculiarities of idiom, not due to Greek influence, may be briefly noted. The use of pronouns is often careless.

ipse = is, II. 73. 10: *Iudei inimici ipsius negabunt eum*; cf. II. 4. 14; 99. 7-8; 101. 14; 138. 5; 175. 23-24; 189. 18; 263. 8; *al.*

⁴⁵ Goelzer, *Etude*, pp. 346-8.

⁴⁶ Cf. II. 62. 16; 101. 5; 103. 8; III. 55. 18; 56. 20; *Ep.* 112. 12; *c. Vig.* 7; *in Tlt.* 8 *et al.*

⁴⁷ II. 22. 17; 24. 24; 48. 5; 47. 22; *al.*; III. 41. 4; 48. 17; *Ep.* 120. 9, 10; 121. 8; *Vit. Hilar.* 2, 14, 16; *c. Iov.* I. 7, 17, 38; II. 29, 32; *in Tlt.* 1 *et 3 et al.*

⁴⁸ Cf. I. 30. 7; 55. 5; *Vit. Hilar.* 25; *in Philem.* 19; *in Is.* 14 *et al.* For all these three constructions, see Goelzer, *Etude*, p. 349. And compare the use of *spero* in II. 185. 30-32: *Altius speravit in imperatore, speravit in principe, in patre, aut in matre: in aliquo negotio subito subtractus est spiritus eius in quem ille speravit*. Cf. I. 47. 8; III. 18. 25; *Ep.* 121. 2; Goelzer, *Etude*, p. 345.

iporum = suus, II. 125. 3-4.

ipse = idem, II. 14. 8: *ipsa est domus quae et templum*; cf. II. 23. 28; 49. 22.⁴⁷

iste = hic, II. *passim*. Often contrasted to *ille*, II. 5. 3: *qui non fecit illa et fecit ista*; II. 6. 4, 16; *al.* Often as the antecedent of a relative. So, too, in I. 30. 14-16.⁴⁸

The use of a positive adjective or adverb instead of a comparative. II. 174. 11-12; 222. 4-5: *Facile ruimus quam concendimus*.

Carelessness in sequence of tenses, II. 19. 7-9, 9-11; 35. 14-15; *al.*

Transitive verbs used intransitively:

adoro, II. 158. 8: *adorare in Deum*.

considero, II. 163. 28: *non possumus istis oculis considerare in abyssum*.

inpingo, II. 97. 19-20: *ubi aequalis via est, ubi ambulare potest, ubi non potest inpingere*.

video, II. 56. 27-28: *Viderunt . . . contra terram reprobationis*.

In II. 157. 5-6 we have a remarkable use of *sum*: *non anteponebam aliquid Domino, neque consentiebam iniquitati; sed totus ad Deum eram*.⁴⁹

Verbs followed by cases with which they are not regularly associated:

indigo + acc. II. 160. 20. (Anteclassical.)

misereor + dat. II. 79. 23; 96. 26; 97. 2 *sqq.*; *c. Pelag.* II. 15; *in Is.* 26 15. (Hyginus.)

noceo + acc. II. 226. 10; 237. 7.⁵⁰

The verbs *amitto*, *contemno*, and *perdo* are followed by the infinitive. II. 113. 1: *perdidimus esse filii Dei*; cf. II. 129. 6; 159. 10-11.⁵¹

⁴⁷ Goelzer, *Etude*, p. 406.

⁴⁸ Paucker, *De Lat. B. Hier.*, p. 82; Goelzer, *Etude*, p. 405.

⁴⁹ Is this perhaps on the analogy of certain constructions in the Greek N. T.? John 1: δούλοις τηρεῖται θεός. *Id.* 1 εἰς: δούλοις κόλαψεν τοῦ πατέρος. Or perhaps Hebrew influence is here to be seen; cf. the use of the preposition *ל*.

⁵⁰ Goelzer, *Etude*, p. 808.

⁵¹ *id.* pp. 808-9.

Prepositional phrases:

de subtus medio + gen. II. 6. 11-12.
de medio + gen. II. 6. 13.

Adverbial phrases:

in contra, II. 6. 13-14.
in semel, II. 178. 5.
in secundo, II. 180. 10.
de foris, II. 6. 29-30; *Ep.* 125. 17; *Reg. Pachom.* 146.
e contrario, II. 7. 8, 17; 9. 5; 20. 4; *al.* I. 95. 19; III. 8. 6; 18,
 20; *Ep.* 48. 2; 54. 9, 18; *al.*
ex secundo, II. 7. 14-15.
de longe, II. 160. 13; cf. *in Matt.* 26 *se: a longe*.
ex tunc, II. 191. 6-7; cf. *ex quando*, III. 78. 26; *ex inde*, etc.
de sursum, II. 312. 29-30; cf. *Ep.* 22. 19. So also *de deorsum*,
 III. 33. 12; *Ep.* 46. 2.

The preposition *in* with the wrong case:

- a) II. 8. 27-28: *Venit Deus . . . in paradiſo*; II. 11. 27;
 41. 11; cf. II. 21. 11; 49. 12; 67. 22; *al.*
 b) II. 66. 15: *mortui sunt et iacent in sepulcra*; ^{**} cf. II. 38. 8.

By these citations, selected from many possible ones, I have endeavored to give an idea of some of the stylistic features of Series II. Though in these instances parallels can sometimes be found in Jerome's written works, yet there is everywhere evident in II a far greater influence from the colloquial style than obtains elsewhere (except in parts of III). As to the method of composition of these sermons, we can perhaps form no certain conclusion. To suppose that Jerome wrote out before delivery all that we have here is to believe that he wrote much that was trivial and self-evident. A view more charitable to the ability of so great a man, and equally compatible with our evidence, is to believe that we have not his notes but the report (shorthand or otherwise) of a hearer, who wrote down, to the best of his ability, all that Jerome said, important or unimportant, but very likely lost entirely many utterances of some value while he was engaged in setting down ideas of inferior importance (a phenomenon familiar in the college lecture-rooms of our

^{**} See Morin's note on the passage. He believes this a Hellenism.

own day). The more careful and scholarly sermons may be due to Jerome's revision (improved by frequent erasure) of the reporter's copy. However committed to paper, Series II contains, in varying degree in its different parts, the strong influence of the spoken language, and stands in contrast in that respect to Jerome's ordinary work and to Series I.

III

This series contains comments on 14 Psalms, occupying, with footnotes, 93 pages in Morin's edition. Four MSS. are the basis of the text:⁶⁸

L.	Medic.	S. XI.
M.	Venet.	S. XII.
O.	Vatic.	S. XVI.
V.	Vatic.	1554.

Of the 14 Psalms 6 are contained in LMOV (82, 84, 87, 88, 89, 92), 3 in MOV (10, 15, 96), and 5 in L alone (83, 90, 91, 93, 95). In Psalms 87 and 88 the text of LMOV is followed in MOV by other short and unimportant notes.

I shall now, for reasons which I trust soon to make evident, divide Series III into two parts:

A (Psalms 10 and 15), pp. 1–31. 24.

B (the other 12 Psalms), pp. 31. 25–93. 23.

Part A finds its parallels in written work, rather than in the homilies. A quotation will best introduce the reader to its style. III. 16. 21 *sqq.*:

Quod quidem et Aquila διατονήματα transferens, secundum morem suum simulacra significat. Nam in hebraeo dicitur ASABOTH, id ipsum verbum quod et ibi ponitur 'Idola gentium argentum et aurum.' Pono in eo quod ait προκισμένων, quod Septuaginta dixerant 'acceleraverunt,' videtur mihi sensum monstrare sublimem; quod apostoli sive gentium populus postquam ad fidem Christi conversi sunt, et Dominus illis sua peccata donavit (hoc est enim προκισμένων, quod προνία, id est, gratuito eis conversa sunt vitia), διατονήματα, hoc est dolores in illis aucti sunt, scientibus in quam magni maris aquis fuerint et a quali barathro liberati sint; secundum illud quod in Ecclesiasti scriptum est 'Qui apponit scientiam apponit dolorem.'

⁶⁸ For a discussion of MSS., see Morin, III, *Praefatio*, pp. xvi–xvii.

A rather hard passage for the '*simpliciores fratres*'! But compare this with any passage in Part B and the contrast is striking, for Part B is in the same style as Series II. The difference between the two parts of this series has not, I think, been sufficiently appreciated by Morin, for he treats the series as a whole, and applies to that whole arguments drawn from Part B.⁵⁴ Let us look more in detail at the evidences that Part A is a written work.

As in I, so here, various opinions are presented and left to the reader's decision. III. 18. 6 *sqq.* : . . . *Sive aliter . . . Alius . . . sic interpretabitur.*⁵⁵ The expressions *videtis*, *vis scire*, and the like are here much less frequent proportionally than in II and III B, and where they occur⁵⁶ may easily refer to readers rather than to hearers. There appears to be in these pages no immediate reference to monks and their life. Such reference is not wanting in III B.⁵⁷

Upon the use of the word *supra* in the following cases I am disposed to lay weight. III. 1. 6 : *supra plenius disputatum est*; III. 7. 4 : *Pauperem : illum, de quo supra dicitur 'Tibi derelictus est pauper.'* Morin in footnotes shows that these references in the comment on Psalm 10 refer to passages treated in that on Psalm 9 (which comment we lack). But *supra* is a word appropriate to the written style, whereas *iam* would be the natural word if the address had been spoken. If in opposition to this it be said that a speaker might, in preparing his notes, say *supra*, and read this expression to his audience, I should like to call attention to what results here, if such a view be adopted. To be at all comprehensible to his hearers, the *supra* in a spoken address should at least refer to something already treated in

⁵⁴ Rev. Bénéd. XIX. (1902), p. 181, speaking of Psalm 82: *Multa sunt quae dicantur, sed hora excludimur: longum est enim per singula currere [III. 34. 20-21]. Ce trait, qui revient à plusieurs reprises dans cette seconde série [III] comme dans la première [II], montre clairement que nous avons bien là des discours improvisés, non des élucubrations de cabinet.*

⁵⁵ Cf. III. 23. 11 *sqq.*; 27. 10 *sqq.*; *al.*

⁵⁶ III. 15. 20; 16. 10; 21. 2; 25. 7; 27. 10.

⁵⁷ E.g. the long passage III. 73. 35-76. 82.

that address. Which would mean here that Psalms 9 and 10 were expounded at the same service. But Psalm 10 occupies about 10 pages of text, and if we assume that Psalm 9 had been treated with corresponding fulness, since it is a longer Psalm, we could scarcely assign less than 20 pages as the length of one day's discourse. Now this makes an extreme length if compared with the other homilies. In Series II the longest⁶⁰ homily has 18 pages; the next longest⁶¹ 11. In Series III B the longest⁶² is 8 pages. Such great length as 20 pages is paralleled in only one case before us, and that is in the case of Psalm 15, the only other Psalm treated in this Part A of Series III. It has the great length of 21 pages, and I believe it to have been, likewise, not verbally delivered, but written. But if *supra* occurs here in *written* work, then it is easily understood, as also in III. 10. 1: *ob supra dictas causas.*

The two Psalms contained in Part A differ in yet another noteworthy respect from those of Part B in that neither closes with an ascription. In B all but one of the homilies close with such words as: *Cui est gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen.* And that one exception⁶³ does not so close because it was to be followed by a homily on the Gospel, as we see from its beginning, III. 86. 20-21: *Antequam de evangelio disputemus, de titulo psalmi videntur nobis pauca dicenda.* In Series II the custom varies. Twenty Psalms close with ascriptions; one⁶⁴ refers to the Gospel which is to follow immediately; 11 end with a more or less effective climax, often hortatory in character,⁶⁵ and 27 lack any formal ending. Of these 27 many are very short and plainly fragmentary. But in III B the usage is constant enough, and the ascription follows so naturally upon the mention of

⁶⁰ Ps. 119.

⁶¹ Ps. 108.

⁶² Ps. 88.

⁶³ Ps. 95.

⁶⁴ II. 27. 6-7.

⁶⁵ II. 86. 5-8: *Hoc igitur, quod apostoli dixerunt in principio, nos dicamus in fine. Deus misereatur nostri et benedictus nos: in lumine vultum suum super nos, et misereatur nostri.* II. 189. 15-18: *Et nos ergo ambulemus in portico Salomonis, protegatur a maiestate eius, ipsius habeamus auxilium, et dicamus illud de Canticō cantorum, quoniam 'Hiems pertransit, et pluvia abiit, abit sibi' in Christo Iesu.*

Christ in the preceding sentence that it seems unlikely that it is the insertion of a copyist. Consequently, its absence in III A is the more significant.

Several Hebrew words are mentioned in III A;⁶⁴ in III B I find but one.⁶⁵ In Greek words and phrases Part A abounds, and almost none are ecclesiastical (more or less Latinized) terms, but rather readings of the different translators. Of these, in 31 pages, Aquila is mentioned 10 times, Symmachus 10 times, Theodotion 6 times, the 'quinta' 4 times, and the 'sexta' once. In III B the Greek words are very scarce,⁶⁶ and these interpreters are not mentioned at all. To heresies I find but four allusions in III A;⁶⁷ in III B there are 17.⁶⁸

Of the explanation of the meanings of Scriptural proper names to those unacquainted with Hebrew there are many examples in Jerome, e.g. II. 84. 24-27: *Oreb interpretatur foramen, in quo coluber ingreditur; Zeb interpretatur lupus*, etc. This is perhaps more common in the spoken works than in those intended for more scholarly readers. So in I there are but 10 instances as opposed to 60 in II. Part B of Series III contains 17 cases, but in Part A there is but 1 instance,⁶⁹ and there the interpretation is merely used as a periphrasis for the person, who is not mentioned by name.

Indirect discourse. In III A (excluding the construction *-ndum est quod*) the following verbs are followed by a finite mood:

considero quod + subj. III. 24. 18; 26. 6.

doceo, III. 14. 18-22: docemur quod . . . debemus: quia . . . non possumus.

lego quod + subj. III. 16. 6.

noto quod + subj. III. 28. 7.

⁶⁴ III. 1. 18; 10. 19, 27; 12. 8; 24. 15; 27. 6; 31. 11.

⁶⁵ III. 68. 4.

⁶⁶ In III A (31 pages) I have noted 24; in III B (62 pages), 8.

⁶⁷ III. 6. 19-20; 22. 2-8; 26. 22-28; 28. 11-12.

⁶⁸ Arrius (1), Basiliades (1), Manichaeus (2), Marcion (2), Montanus (1), Novatus et Maximilla (1), Origen (who is not censured in III A; cf. III. 23. 14 sqq.) (5), Sabellius (1), Valentinus (3).

⁶⁹ III. 20. 19-21.

repperio quod + subj. III. 13. 2.

scio quod + subj. A possible instance in III. 21. 3.

In all 7 possible instances of *quod*, 1 of *quia*, none of *quoniam*.
But compare with this the results of Part B:

<i>aestimo quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 92. 18.
<i>considero quia</i>	+ indic.	III. 92. 19.
<i>credo quod</i>	+ indic.	III. 75. 4.
<i>quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 74. 22.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic.	III. 76. 29.
<i>dico quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 36. 16; 47. 16; 68. 25; 77. 23.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic.	III. 66. 2.
<i>quia</i>	+ subj.	III. 53. 22.
<i>intellego quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 68. 5, 26.
<i>invenio quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 71. 29.
<i>lego quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 69. 18.
<i>nescio quia</i>	+ indic.	III. 75. 1.
<i>novi quia</i>	+ indic.	III. 61. 7.
<i>ostendo quod</i>	+ indic.	III. 87. 30.
<i>quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 71. 24; 89. 9.
<i>promitto quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 60. 19.
<i>relatum est quia</i>	+ subj.	III. 74. 9.
<i>scio quod</i>	+ indic.	III. 75. 14.
<i>quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 74. 19.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic.	III. 46. 15; 75. 24.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic.	III. 62. 2.
<i>scribo quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 49. 12.
<i>video quod</i>	+ indic.	III. 37. 21; 46. 7; 49. 2; 50. 3; 73. 8; 79. 3.
<i>quod</i>	+ subj.	III. 83. 28; 85. 28.
<i>quia</i>	+ indic.	III. 40. 13; 88. 11.
<i>quoniam</i>	+ indic.	III. 43. 7; 68. 19.

In all *quod* 26 times, *quia* 11, *quoniam* 8, or 40 cases as compared with 8 cases in A.

Moreover, in III B we have great carelessness in indirect discourse. III. 67. 16-18: *scire debemus, quod . . . undecim psalmos in hebraeo titulum non habere.* Cf. III. 78. 9-10. (In III. 24. 8-5, where Morin thinks that *ut* introduces an infinitive, I believe that the infinitive really depends on an *acciendi* *sit* supplied from the *acciendi* *sit* in line 8, in the same construction, depending on an *ut* in line 1.)

Solecisms and unusual constructions are not wanting in both III A and III B. I note a very few typical of the various sorts :

- III. 29. 2-3 : *implete illud quod Paulus ait.*¹⁰
- 16. 19 : *cultus* used in plural.
- 42. 18 : *multis salutibus indigemus*; cf. II. 93. 27.
- 20. 7 : *eum = se.*
- 71. 12 : *utor* followed by the *accus.* So III. 50, 1-2, 4-5,
abutor.
- 76. 23 : *adversarium triumphare quaeramus.*
- 83. 20-21 : *Mirantur homines philosophorum ac poetarum di-*
centium . . . Where Morin aptly compares the
Greek *tivōs dýapai.*
- 16. 3-4 : *perago*, intransitively.
- 66. 20-21 : *postea sessus a Domino refrenatur.*
- 24. 2-3 : *renes nunc pro seminum locis accipiendum sit*; cf.
II. 164. 4 : *montes pro sanctis accipiendum est.*
For the same construction in Boethius, cf. A. P.
McKinlay in *Harvard Studies in Classical Phil-*
ology, xviii (1907), p. 127. Cf. also Lucretius,
1. 112. I believe this to be here a Latinization
of the construction of the Greek verbal in *-réov.*

Other examples may be found in Morin's indexes.

I have already stated that of Series III all the tractates are found in Ms. L, except those on Psalms 10, 15 (these two together forming Part A), Psalm 96, and the short notes appended to Psalms 87 and 88. These parts are found in MOV. With the rest of the collection which appears in L they may have nothing to do, but were doubtless added from a separate source to the common source of MOV. And the style of III A, while certainly that of Jerome himself, differs from that of III B so decidedly that I cannot believe the two parts to have been composed under the same conditions. The short notes following Psalms 87 and 88 are not in the style of those homilies, and clearly do not belong where they now are, since in each case, before the notes were added, the homily had already been terminated by an

¹⁰ See Morin's citation of parallels in his footnote.

scription.⁷¹ The homily on Psalm 96 presents no great contrast to the rest of III B, and belongs to Jerome's spoken work.

Returning to III A, let us try to place it more definitely. It is a written work, consisting of treatises on two Psalms (10 and 15) with a reference (the '*supra plenius disputatum*') to a comment on Psalm 9. Our two treatises clearly do not belong to the Commentarioli, for (a) the Ms. tradition is distinct; (b) they are much more extended discussions than are found in the Commentarioli; and (c) we already have a distinct comment in the Commentarioli on each of the Psalms in question. To what, then, does our work belong?

In the final chapter of his work *De Viris Illustribus* Jerome gives a catalogue of his own works. One entry interests us: *in psalmos a decimo usque ad XVII.*⁷² If we try to make III A agree with this last work of Jerome, it is only necessary, as far as the numbering of the Psalms is concerned, to notice that the numbering in the Tractatus (which Morin has followed) is that of the LXX and the versions derived from it, making our two Psalms Nos. 10 and 15; but if Jerome, in referring to this work, is using the numbering of the Hebrew (in which Psalms 9 and 10 were distinct, not combined into one as in the LXX), then these two Psalms will be not 10 and 15, but 11 and 16. And this latter numbering will readily admit of their falling within the limit *a decimo usque ad XVII* (or even *XVI*), and still leave a chance for the Psalm referred to in the words *supra plenius disputatum*, which will now become Psalm 10 (according to the Hebrew numbering).

The theory that the comment on Psalm 15 might be referred to this work of Jerome's occurred to Morin, who says:⁷³

⁷¹ These notes also contain a suspiciously large number of unusual words: *perpetualiter, recuperatio, resuscitatio, saucto* I am unable to find elsewhere in Jerome; *derelector, obliter, profanator* are perhaps first used here.

⁷² Codex Bambergensis (S. XI) here reads *usque ad XVI.*

⁷³ *Bcv. Bénéd.* XIX (1903), p. 130.

L'idée m'était venue un instant, que cette exposition du psaume xv pourrait bien être l'un des sept Tractatus sur les psaumes x-xvi que Jérôme s'attribue à lui-même, au dernier chapitre de son De Viris Illustribus : elle eût été, à ce compte, antérieure à la fin de l'année 392. Mais la considération plus attentive des particularités signalées ci-dessus m'a fait voir qu'il n'y avait pas à songer à pareille identification ; notre Tractatus a été prononcé, comme les autres qui nous restent, une dizaine d'années après la composition du De Viris.

I confess that I am unable to find in the article from which I quote this the '*particularités signalées ci-dessus*' which induced the editor to reject so attractive a theory. And I hope that by the suggestions I have offered above in regard to the differences of style between III A and III B I have shown that there is no intimate connection between them, since one consists of spoken addresses, like the homilies of II, while the other is plainly written work, not dissimilar to Jerome's other written work. If, then, Part A must be separated from Part B, what more natural than to assign it to the Commentary on Psalms 10-17? Our two tractates internally require but one thing — the existence of a comment on the Psalm before Psalm 10 (of Morin's numbering). I have shown how this comment easily falls into the limits required by the numbers 10-17. In short, our work under discussion for which we need a title coincides so strikingly with Jerome's title for which we need a work that the probability of this identification approaches as near to absolute certainty as the nature of the case will allow.

The date of the work, according to this theory, can be roughly set as follows. It was written before 392, because it is cited in the *De Viris Illustribus* of that date. It was also written later than the book of *Hebrew Questions in Genesis*, as we see from III. 31. 11-12: *SABA enim verbum, ut in libro quoque Hebraicarum Quaestionum diximus, quattuor res significat.* This work has been assigned to the year 388, but Schanz, in his *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, will merely date it as prior to the *De Viris Illustribus* and during the saint's life at Bethlehem. G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*, I, p. 101; II. pp. 61 *sqq.*, dates this between 386 and 391.

As to III B, it is hard to determine the date, but from numerous references to the heretical views of Origen it must be after Jerome's revolt from Origenism set in.⁷⁴

I have tried to show briefly the kind of composition which appears in each of these series of tractates. The examples I have selected from many possible ones, often with some doubts as to just how much illustrative material to insert and how much to omit. I have endeavored especially to show the reasons we have for believing that III A is what remains to us of a work of Jerome hitherto supposed to be lost. If I have seemed to give disproportionate attention to Parts II and III B, it is because they furnish us the only criteria for judging of Jerome's spoken work, and it is only by differentiation of the spoken and written work that we can properly appreciate either, or understand the reasons for separating from Series III what I have designated as Part A.

⁷⁴ And see Morin, *Rev. Bénéd.* XIX (1902), p. 181.