

# The Journal of Theological Studies

APRIL, 1910

## THE INFLUENCE OF ST JEROME ON THE CANON OF THE WESTERN CHURCH. II.

IN the previous paper I ventured to point out how completely and fundamentally Jerome changed his views on the subject of the Canon during his long and tempestuous career; and how, in addition to the mischief he did by his ungoverned rhetoric in his quarrels with other theologians, he did a much greater mischief by giving the sanction of his great fame as a scholar to a theory of the Canon which, whatever its merits, was not that of the primitive Church. What I ventured to say was, for the most part, of common and elementary knowledge; but it needs to be continually emphasized in view of the still prevailing theories about the Canon in many high quarters.

Before continuing and extending the remarks already made, it will be well to recall what Jerome's work on the Bible really comprised.

First as to the New Testament. As we saw he visited Rome at the invitation of Damasus, and stayed there three years, from 382 to 385. During his stay he translated the Gospels. We have no evidence that *at this time* he translated any more of the New Testament.

In regard to the Old Testament, we know that while at Rome he also revised the Psalter afresh from the Greek. On *a priori* grounds it is probable that the Greek text which he used in translating the Psalter was the *textus receptus* then current at Constantinople, which was apparently Lucian's version. This is confirmed by certain facts pointed out by Hody, the father of modern English scientific theology, who is much too little consulted in these days. Hody<sup>1</sup> recalls the fact that Heddius, in his

<sup>1</sup> H. Hody *De Bibhorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata*, Oxford, 1705, p. 284.

life of St Wilfrid (634-709) written at the beginning of the eighth century, tells us that when Wilfrid visited the king of Kent 'Psalms, quos prius secundum Hieronymi emendationem legerat, more Romanorum *iuxta quintam editionem* memorialiter transmutasse'. William of Malmesbury enlarges the story and reports Wilfrid's visit to Erconbert, king of Kent, at the instance of Queen Eanfleda; and he continues: 'Ita Wilfridus Cantiam adveniens Romanas consuetudines, quae Scottorum scientiam vincebant, gnarus addidit. Psalterium denique quod a Scottis *iuxta translationem beati Hieronymi* acceperat, pro Romano more *iuxta quintam editionem* lecitavit et tenuit' (Wil. Malmes. *de Gest. Pont.* iii § 100).

Hody argues very reasonably from these passages that the first edition of Jerome's Psalter was not translated from the Septuagint, but from the *Quinta* of Origen's Hexapla, which was probably followed by Lucian. This is an interesting conclusion if it is sustained, for it affords us a valuable and early and independent means of securing a complete copy of a book in one of Origen's texts otherwise very scantily represented. It also shews that Jerome's first edition of the Psalter was the one generally in use in the Irish Church, which was the mother of that of Northumbria, in Wilfrid's time. It was also probably used in Spain in early times and continued to be used in the diocese of Toledo and is found in the Mozarabic rite. Pius V restricted its use in Italy to the Vatican Basilica, the Church of St Mark at Venice, and the Diocese of Milan (which preserves the Ambrosian rite). It is quoted by St Augustine, by Cassiodorus, and by Gregory the Great.

Jerome's translations on his first visit to Rome were therefore limited to the books most used in the services of the Church, namely the Gospels and the Psalter.

The notable event in his life at this time, however, was that he took part in the Council of 382. He was then acting as secretary to Damasus, and was no doubt completely in sympathy with the pronouncement on the Canon made by that Council, and was probably its author.

This pronouncement, as we have seen, does not profess to enunciate any new views on the matter, but merely to declare what the Universal Church accepted as Divine Scripture: 'de

scripturis divinis . . . quid universalis catholica recipiat ecclesia et quid vitare debeat.'

While this was the first corporate statement made by the Western Church on the question of the Canon, it is not the first list of biblical books that occurs in the West. An earlier one was in fact published by St Hilary of Poitiers. St Hilary was born at Poitiers in the latter part of the third century and became bishop there in 353. A great many centuries later, in 1851, he was proclaimed *Universae Ecclesiae doctor* by Pius IX. His chief claims as a theologian are of course based on the part he took in the West as the champion of orthodoxy against the Arians. On this subject he wrote a good deal and fought a long and fierce battle. His later days were less tempestuous, and it was in the latter part of his life which closed on January 13, 368 (when St Jerome was about twenty-one years old) that he wrote a memorable work on the Psalms entitled *Tractatus super Psalmos*. This work was not an original treatise. It was, no doubt, very largely based on Origen's famous commentary on the Psalter, and was steeped in Origen's views which were then very largely dominant. Origen's views on the Canon were by no means very logical, nor was he always consistent in regard to them. The great purpose of his Hexaplaric edition of the Bible was to confront the Greek Bible with the Hebrew, and he gave the latter a very prominent place in his Hexapla. He accordingly treats the question of the Canon in an ambiguous way, and is found sometimes leaning on the Canon recognized by the Church, and at other times on the Hebrew Canon. The latter was the case apparently in his work on the Psalms, of which, unfortunately, only fragments remain. In one of these Origen makes the number of the Canonical books in the Old Testament twenty-two, being the well-known number in the Hebrew Canon, and in this statement he is directly followed by Hilary, and it is virtually certain that the latter derived his list of Old Testament Canonical books directly from Origen.

In the prologue to the *Tractatus super Psalmos*, cap. 15, Hilary says:—

'Et ea causa est, ut in viginti duos libros lex Testamenti Veteris deputetur: ut cum litterarum numero convenirent. Qui ita secundum

traditiones veterum deputantur, ut Moysi sint libri quinque, Iesu Nave sextus, Iudicum et Ruth septimus, primus et secundus Regnorum octavus, tertius et quartus in nonum, Paralipomenon duo in decimum sint, sermones dierum Esdrae in undecimum,<sup>1</sup> liber Psalmorum duodecimus sit, Salomonis Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Canticum canticorum in tertium decimum et quartum decimum et quintum decimum, duodecim autem Prophetae in sextum decimum, Esaias deinde et Hieremias cum lamentatione et epistola, sed et Daniel, et Ezechiel et Iob et Hester viginti et duum librorum numerum consumment. Quibusdam autem visum est, additis Tobia et Iudith viginti quatuor libros secundum numerum graecarum litterarum connumerare, Romana quoque lingua media inter Hebraeos Graecosque collecta; quia his maxime tribus linguis sacramentum voluntatis Dei et beati regni expectatio praedicatur: ex quo illud Pilati fuit, ut his tribus linguis regem Iudaeorum dominum Iesum Christum esse praescriberet.'

It is very probable that this statement was in a large measure directly transferred from Origen. The only marked difference is that, while Origen makes up the number twenty-four from twenty-two by the addition of the two books of Maccabees, Hilary does so by adding those of Tobias and Judith.

The list given by Hilary, however, must not be taken as enumerating all the books he thought Canonical, or as in any way representing the voice of the Western Church at this moment. It was simply and naturally taken over, with other parts of the Commentary, from Origen, whose work Hilary was largely paraphrasing, and represents the views of Origen rather than those of Hilary. Hilary's own views as to what constituted a legitimate Scripture book may (as the editor of Hilary in Migne's edition says) be collected from his quotations. Thus he quotes Judith as 'ex lege' in his note in *Psalm.* cxxv n. 5. Tobias is also quoted in *Psalm.* cxviii lit. 2 n. 6 and cxxix n. 7. The Wisdom of Solomon is quoted in *Psalm.* cxviii lit. 2 n. 8, cxxvii n. 6, cxxxv n. 11, and *de Trinitate* i 7. Ecclesiasticus, which he assigns to Solomon, is quoted in *Psalm.* lxvi n. 9 and cxl n. 4. Lastly Baruch is cited under the name of Jeremiah in *Psalm.* lxviii n. 19 and *de Trinitate* iv 42; and Susanna in *de Trin.* iv 8. The Epistle to the Hebrews is assigned to St Paul, in *Psalm.* xiv n. 5,

<sup>1</sup> Hilary has here made a double mistake; he has transferred the phrase of Origen *λόγοι ἡμερῶν*, by which he translated the Hebrew heading of Chronicles, from that book to Esdras, and has enumerated only one book of Esdras.

liii n. 12, while in *Psalm*. cxviii lit. 8 n. 16 it is assigned to an Apostle. The Apocalypse is attributed to 'beatus Ioannes' in the prologue to the *Tract. super Psalmos*; and lastly, in *de Trinitate* i 18 he says 'beatus apostolus Petrus in Epistola sua altera ait'. It is plain, therefore, that it would be misleading to quote Hilary as being a champion of the Jewish Canon in the West. It would be singular and incomprehensible, in fact, if within a few years of the death of such an influential champion of orthodoxy the Roman Council should have proclaimed the voice of the Church in the West in terms so different from his.

Let us now revert to Jerome. As we have seen, in 385 he took up his definite and final residence at Bethlehem and there devoted himself to translating the Bible and commenting upon it. A few words first about his work on the New Testament. It has been disputed, as I have said, whether Jerome in fact ever translated any more of the New Testament than the four Gospels which he accomplished at Rome. It is curious that, while we have a preface to the Gospels from his hand, we have no similar introductions to the other books of the New Testament; and it will be remembered how, among others, one of the fathers of the Reformation, Jacques Lefevre of Étampes, justified his own work on the Vulgate of St Paul's Epistles by the argument that he was not revising the work of the great Doctor of the Church, Jerome, since the latter had not revised that portion of the Bible; but that he was only doing for it what Jerome had done for the Gospels, namely, revising the Old Latin version. Jerome's own statements seem, however, inconsistent with this view; thus in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical writings, written, as he tells us, in the fourteenth year of Theodosius, i. e. in 392 or 393 A. D., he says: 'Novum Testamentum Graecae fidei reddidi: Vetus iuxta Hebraicum transtuli.' Similarly in his letter to Lucinius (*Ep.* lxxi 5) he tells us, 'Novum Testamentum Graecae reddidi auctoritati.' These phrases seem consistent only with his having translated the New Testament as a whole.

Again, inasmuch as he claims on more than one occasion (see *J.T.S.* vol. x p. 487) to have followed the text of Adamantius, i. e. of Origen, in the Gospel of St Matthew, and in the Epistle to the Galatians, we can hardly doubt that he did considerable work

on the New Testament, and probably revised the whole of it after his settlement in Palestine, when the great works of Origen became accessible to him.

Whatever was the case in regard to the New Testament, there can be no doubt that Jerome's chief work during the early years of his sojourn at Bethlehem was the revision of the Old Testament text from the Greek. In regard to this translation there seems to me to have been some misunderstanding, and my own language in the previous paper is not free from ambiguity. It seems clear, when Jerome's various statements are compared, that what he means, when he says that his earlier version of the Old Testament was taken from the Septuagint, is not that it was taken from the *Koinḗ* or primitive Septuagint, but from Origen's syncretic Greek text, which, while based on the Septuagint, incorporated the variants of other editions, duly marked with asterisks and obeli, and Jerome more than once says that his own original Latin translation was similarly marked. Hence it follows that this, his first Latin version, was not strictly a translation from the Septuagint, but was the first known rendering into another language of Origen's hexaplaric and syncretic Greek version. To this important conclusion I shall return presently. Meanwhile I shall refer to Jerome's first version as his 'hexaplaric' Latin edition. Unfortunately, of this edition the greater part is lost. There was clearly no room for it when its own author virtually renounced it in favour of his second translation which was derived directly and entirely from the Hebrew. The portions that remain are nevertheless of great interest and importance for the criticism of the hexaplaric Greek text. First among them is the Psalter. As we have seen, Jerome had already issued an edition of the Psalter when at Rome, and I have detailed its later history. Of his Latin *hexaplaric* Psalter, Lefevre of Étamples long ago called attention to a copy as still existing, marked with its asterisks and obeli. It is printed, from two ancient MSS, Vat. Reg. 24 and Vat. Pal. 39, among Jerome's works in Vallarsi's edition (x 105-430) with the hexaplaric marks duly added. The edition became very popular, and in copies meant for general use it was natural that the marks in question should be omitted. From the fact that it was so widely diffused in Gaul it became known as the 'Gallican Psalter'. Its

introduction into Gaul was attributed by more than one mediaeval writer to the personal initiative of Damasus himself, who died, however, some years before it was made. Thus Sigebert of Gembloux after describing it in detail (sub an. 382) says:—

‘Hoc Psalterium Damasus P. rogatu Hieronymi in Gallicanis Ecclesiis cantari instituit et propter hoc Gallicanum vocatur : Romanis Psalterium secundum LXX retinentibus sibi, propter quod Romanum vocatur’ (ap. Hody *op. cit.* p. 382).

The same statement is made by Martinus Polonus in his Chronicle. Similarly Berno Augiensis, in a letter cited by Mabillon written to Megenfrid and Benno, says:—

‘Inter caetera ex emendata LXX Interpretum translatione Psalterium ex Graeco in Latinum vertit [Hieronymus] illudque cantandum omnibus Galliae ac quibusdam Germaniae Ecclesiis tradidit. Et ob hoc Gallicanum Psalterium appellavit, Romanis adhuc ex corrupta vulgata editione Psalterium canentibus : ex qua Romani cantum composuerunt, nobisque usum cantandi contradiderunt. Unde accidit quod verba, quae in diurnis vel nocturnis officiis canendi more modulantur, intermiscantur, et confuse nostris Psalmis inserantur, ut a minus peritis haud facile possit discerni, quid nostrae vel Romanae conveniat editioni’ (*ib.*).

This wrong assignment of the second edition of Jerome’s Psalter to the initiative of Damasus himself is apparently based on a misunderstanding. Martinus Polonus in his Chronicle says ‘Damasus P. instituit rogatu Hieronymi, ut diceretur in fine Psalmorum in Ecclesia Gloria Patri’. Hody tells us that:—

‘Inter diversa diversorum in Psalmos praeambula Remigii Expositioni praefixa, habetur sub Hieronymi nomine, sed supposititia, ad Damasum P. Epistola quaedam, de canendo in fine Psalmi cuiuslibet *Gloria Patri* etc. ad declarandum Niceni Concilii fidem, deque *Alleluia* semper omnibus Psalmis affigenda, cum aliis rebus quibusdam ad Psalmos spectantibus ; quae ei tanquam primo auctori, at absque ullo auctore idoneo, vulgo adscribuntur’ (*ib.* p. 352).

The real introducer of the Gallican psalter into Gaul was clearly Gregory of Tours, as Walafrid Strabo, who died in 849 A.D., tells us (*de reb. eccl.* xxv). Gregory was appointed bishop of Tours in 553 and died in 595. Walafrid expressly says that Jerome’s second Psalter which was in use in Gaul and Germany was introduced by Bishop Gregory of Tours, of whom he says ‘in Galliarum dicitur Ecclesias transtulisse’. Mabillon argued

that it was in fact introduced later by St Boniface, who became archbishop of Mainz. The latter perhaps introduced it into Germany, but it was clearly used in Gaul in the time of Gregory of Tours, who in all his quotations from the Psalter uses the Gallicanum. Hody especially notes the quotation of Psalm lxxii 18 and 19 in the *Historia Francorum* v 14 and of Psalm xcv 9 in vi 5 of the same work, in both of which cases the language is that of the Gallican and not of the Roman Psalter. The Gallican version, he says, was also used by St Germanus of Paris in the middle of the sixth century and by Venantius Fortunatus, who flourished in the middle of the same century, in his hymn *de Cruce*. Besides Gaul and Germany the Gallican Psalter was also used in Britain in later times, in a large part of Spain, and also in some provincial districts of Italy.

Bruno, who was Abbot of Monte Cassino and afterwards Bishop of Segni and died in 1125, in the introduction to his commentary on the Psalms says:—

‘Cum adhuc adolescentulus essem, exposui Psalterium secundum aliam translationem; quae viz. translatio pluribus in locis tantum differt ab hac, qua utitur Romana Ecclesia, ut nullo modo secundum illius expositionem haec translatio intelligi possit. Et illa quidem multos habet expositores: hanc autem si aliquis exposuerit nescio’ (Hody *op. cit.* p. 383).

This makes it very probable that in certain parts of Italy the Gallican Psalter was displaced by the Roman sometime during Bruno’s life. It was also used by some of the Religious Orders. Thus Cardinal Bona reports that Alexander IV commanded the General Prior of the Augustinians to recite the Office according to the *Roman* use, except in regard to the Psalter. Thus again St Francis in his Rule prescribed, ‘Clerici faciant divinum officium secundum ordinem sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, excepto Psalterio’. In each of these cases the prescribed Psalter is clearly the Gallican.

The same Gallican Psalter, as is well known, forms the basis of the version in the Book of Common Prayer.

The Psalter is not the only Old Testament book of Jerome’s hexaplaric translation which has survived. Hody tells us that in a Latin MS in the Bodleian ‘NE. F. 6. 7. 8’, which he calls ‘antiquus et perpulcher’, he had found two translations of Job by

Jerome with separate prefaces, one of which was the hexaplaric text of the book. In a note in the margin of another Latin Bible, among the Laud MSS (D 43), we read, 'In libro veteri, quem vidi, et fuit de coenobio Fontinella, fuit translatio Ieronymi super Iob, qua non utimur'. Hody adds that the same exemplar containing obeli and asterisks had been seen, or perhaps discovered, by Lefevre of Étapes. Other copies have occurred. The text with its hexaplaric marks was edited by Lagarde, *Mittheilungen* ii, and from this edition Dr. Swete extracts some samples (*Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* p. 10).

In the preface to his translation of Job from the Hebrew (x 1097, 1101) Jerome refers to his earlier translation of the book from the Greek in the words:—

'Utraque editio et LXX iuxta Graecos, et mea iuxta Hebraeos, in Latinum meo labore translata est.'

Again he says:—

'Ceterum apud Latinos ante eam translationem, quam sub asteriscis et obelis nuper edidimus, septingenti ferme aut octingenti versus desunt; ut decurtatus et laceratus corrosusque liber foeditatem sui publice legentibus praebeat.'

In the corresponding preface to the hexaplaric version (x 47) he says:—

'Beatum Iob, qui adhuc apud Latinos iacebat in stercore, et vermibus scatebat errorum, integrum immaculatumque gaudete. Quomodo enim probatione atque victoria dupliciter universa ei sunt reddita; ita ego in lingua nostra (audacter loquor), feci eum habere quae amiserat. Igitur et vos et unumquemque lectorem solita praefatione commoneo, et in principiis librorum eadem semper annectens rogo, ut ubicumque praecedentes virgulas videritis, sciatis ea quae subiecta sunt in Hebraeis voluminibus non haberi. Porro ubi stellae imago fulserit, ex Hebraeo in nostro sermone addita. Necnon et illa quae habere videbamus et ita corrupta erant, ut sensum legentibus tollerent, orantibus vobis magno labore correxi: magis utile quid ex otio meo Christi ecclesiis eventurum ratus, quam ex aliorum negotio.'

Again, in his letter to Pammachius (*Ep.* xlix 4), he says:—

'Transtuli nuper Iob in linguam nostram: cuius exemplar a sancta Marcella, consobrina tua, poteris mutuari. Lege eundem Graecum et Latinum, et veterem editionem nostrae translationi compara: et liquido pervidebis quantum distet inter veritatem et mendacium.'

Again, in his answer to Rufinus, ii 29 (Vallarsi, ii 524), he says:—

‘Transibo ad librum Iob, quem post LXX Interpretum editionem, quam Origenes obelis asteriscisque distinxit, ante annos plurimos Latino sermoni datum, cum rursum iuxta ipsum Hebraicum verterem,’ etc.

Lastly, in a letter to Jerome Augustine, *Ep.* civ 3 (Vallarsi, i 630), thus refers to this edition of Job:—

‘Hoc addo, quod postea didicimus, ex Hebraeo Iob a te interpretatum, cum iam quandam haberemus interpretationem tuam eiusdem Prophetæ ex Graeco eloquio versam in Latinum, ubi tamen asteriscis notasti quæ in Hebraeo sunt et in Graeco desunt, obeliscis autem quæ in Graeco inveniuntur et in Hebraeo non sunt, tam mirabili diligentia, ut quibusdam in locis ad singula verba singulas stellas videamus, significantes eadem verba esse in Hebraeo, in Graeco autem non esse. Porro in hac posteriore interpretatione, quæ versa est ex Hebraeo, non eadem verborum fides occurrit. Nec parum turbat cogitantem, vel cur in illa prima tanta diligentia figantur asterisci, ut minimas etiam particulas orationis indicent deesse codicibus Graecis, quæ sunt in Hebraeis: vel cur in hac altera, quæ ex Hebraeis est, negligentius hoc curatum sit, ut non eadem particulae locis suis invenirentur.’

So far as we know, the only books of the Bible in the hexaplaric Latin version of Jerome which survive are the Psalter and Job, as above described. It may be that other portions of the translation occur in some undiscovered or uncollated MS of the Vulgate, but of this we know nothing. They were all apparently intact in the time of Cassiodorus. As is well known, however, in the case of some other books, while the texts have disappeared, the prefaces written for them by Jerome remain; namely, those affixed to the books of Chronicles and to those of Solomon. In the preface to his hexaplaric edition of Chronicles addressed to Domnion and Rogatianus he says (Vallarsi, x 431):—

‘Denique cum a me nuper literis flagitassetis, ut vobis librum Paralipomenon Latino sermone transferrem, de Tiberiade legis quondam Doctorem, qui apud Hebraeos admirationi habebatur, assumpsi: et contuli cum eo a vertice (ut aiunt) usque ad extremum unguem: et sic confirmatus ausus sum facere quod iubebatis. . . . Si quis in hac interpretatione voluerit aliquid reprehendere, interroget Hebraeos, suam conscientiam recolat, videat ordinem textumque sermonis; et tunc nostro labori, si potuerit, detrahat. Ubicumque ergo asteriscos, id est

stellas, radiare in hoc volumine videritis, ibi sciatis de Hebraeo additum quod in Latinis codicibus non habetur. Ubi vero obelus, transversa scilicet virga praeposita est, illic signatur quid LXX Interpretes addiderint.'

In regard to his translations of the Salomonic books from the Greek he says in the preface to the version of the same books from the Hebrew (Vallarsi, ix 1295) 'Si cui sane Septuaginta interpretum magis editio placet, habet eam a nobis olim emendatam'.

Again, in regard to the Prophets, while neither the texts nor the prefaces remain, a considerable amount of their contents, according to this version, can be recovered from Jerome's elaborate commentaries on the Prophetical books which still survive. In regard to this, Vallarsi long ago said, 'possunt instaurari ex versione illa, sive emendatione, quam in Commentariis S. Pater suae ex Hebraeo versioni statim subnectit iuxta Septuaginta' (*Vita Hieronymi* xx 5: Vallarsi, xi 101).

Hody has collected some typical passages from this Commentary in which references to the Latin Hexaplar version are made thus on Isaiah xl:—

'*Ad Es. 40.* Hoc quod asteriscis notatur: Quia spiritus etc. ex Hebraico et Theodotionis editione additum est. *Ad cap. 5.* Nomen Hierusalem, quod hic a LXX additum est, nec in Hebraeo habetur, nec ullus trium Interpretum posuit: unde obelo praenotandum est. *Ibid.* Illud autem quod supra dicitur, Et non occidet etc. de Theodotionis editione ex Hebraico additum est. *Ad cap. 52.* In hoc loco nomen Sion a LXX additum est; et idcirco iugulatum veru. *Ad cap. 55.* Quodque sequitur, Et obnoxii tui erunt in ea, obelo praenotavimus. *In Ier. 2.* Hoc in LXX non habetur, sed sub asteriscis de Theodotionis editione additum est; *Ibid.* Pro imagine mortis (*quod Hebraicum habet*) de Theodotione additum est, umbra mortis. *Cap. 31.* Ridicule Latini Codices in hoc loco, ambiguitate verbi Graeci, pro calido lupinos interpretati sunt etc. *Versio tamen Latina, qua ibi utitur Hieronymus, habet calidum.* *In Ezech. 7.* Haec in LXX non habentur, sed in editione eorum de translatione Theod. sub asteriscis addita sunt. *Rursus:* Locus difficilis, et inter Heb. et LXX multum discrepans, quibus pleraque de Theodotionis editione addita sunt, ut aliquam habere consequentiam viderentur' (*op. cit.* pp. 354 sq.).

As we saw in the previous paper, Jerome, in writing to Augustine, speaks of having lost a large part of his first translation by a fraud ('pleraque enim prioris laboris ob fraudem cuiusdam

amisimus'). As we also saw, the lost books were recovered by Cassiodorus, and we shall return to the matter again when we come to deal with the work of Cassiodorus upon the Canon.

An important question in regard to Jerome's hexaplaric version remains to be discussed, namely, that of his treatment of the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament in that edition.

This question involves another, namely, what did Origen's hexaplar text really contain? The prime object of the Hexapla was to put the Hebrew text in juxtaposition with the Greek translations; and the Hebrew text, first in Hebrew characters, and secondly transliterated into Greek characters, occupied its two first columns, being thus placed in the most prominent position.

Now it must be remembered that the deuterocanonical books were not contained in the Hebrew Bible, nor yet in the two Greek translations, that of Aquila and that of Symmachus, which were professedly translations of the Hebrew Bible. So that they were not contained in four out of the six texts which composed the Hexapla, and it seems to me almost certain that they were not contained in the hexaplar edition at all.

Further, it seems to me that the existence of the Tetrapla, which would otherwise have been a quite useless replica of the four Greek columns of the Hexapla, is evidence of this. The Tetrapla in all probability did contain the deuterocanonical books, since it would seem to have placed Origen's syncretic edition of the *Kouñ* or Septuagint in the place of honour which in the Hexapla was occupied by the Hebrew text.

Jerome's translation, however, was (as he expressly says on more than one occasion) taken from the Hexapla. Hence it would follow that his translation of the Old Testament from the Greek, like his similar translation from the Hebrew, was based not on the Greek Canon, but on the Hebrew Canon, and did not contain any of the deuterocanonical books. So far as I know this suggestion has not been made before, at all events on these grounds; but it seems to be inevitable, and it is remarkably confirmed by the fact that so far as we know no traces of any translation by Jerome of any of the deuterocanonical books *from the Greek* remain, nor does he mention their existence anywhere.

It would seem, therefore, that in regard to the question of the

Canon Jerome changed his views before he undertook his final translation which was from the Hebrew, and that in both his great translations he adopted the Hebrew Canon. All that he did in *his second translation* was to abandon *the Hexaplaric Greek text* in favour of the Hebrew text. In regard to his adoption of the latter in his second edition, the excuse he made to the world for his change of front on such a critical question was plausible. It was founded on the great variations in the texts of the Greek Bible as contrasted with the uniformity of the Hebrew text. In the preface to his translation of Chronicles from the latter he says (Vallarsi, ix 1405):—

‘Si LXX Interpretum pura, et ut ab eis in Graecum versa est, editio permaneret, superflue me, mi Chromati . . . impelleres ut Hebraea volumina Latino sermone transferrem. Quod enim semel aures hominum occupaverat, et nascentis Ecclesiae roboraverat fidem, iustum erat etiam nostro silentio comprobari. Nunc vero cum pro varietate regionum diversa ferantur exemplaria, et germana illa antiquaque translatio corrupta sit atque violata; nostri arbitrii putas, aut e pluribus iudicare quid verum sit aut novum opus in veteri opere cadere, illudentibusque Iudaeis cornicum (ut dicitur) oculos configere.’

Jerome here clearly sets out what was his theory when he discarded the Septuagint for the Hebrew text as the ultimate verity. He presently goes on to claim that in effect he is only doing what Origen had done before him when he confronted the various Greek editions with one another, and then corrected the whole by a comparison with the Hebrew. He further claims to be only doing what the authors of the Septuagint themselves had done with smaller available means, and what had been approved by the Apostles since they had used the Septuagint. Thus he says (*ib.* 1407):—

‘Si igitur aliis licuit non tenere quod semel susceperant, et post LXX cellulas, quae vulgo sine auctore iactantur, singulas cellulas aperuere, hocque in Ecclesiis legitur, quod LXX nescierunt; cur me non suscipiant Latini mei, qui inviolata editione veteri ita novam condidi, ut laborem meum Hebraeis et (quod his maius est) Apostolis auctoribus probem?’

In his preface to Job he goes further and claims that his method is more rational than that of Origen, whose results were obtained by collating a number of contradictory texts and even by interpolation, instead of going, as he had done, to the

fountain-head itself and rigidly abiding by its terms. Nay more; the authors of several of the Greek translations read by Origen were, he urged, not Christians at all, but Jews or Judaizing Ebionites, and were not like himself orthodox Christians, and were therefore likely to sophisticate the sacred book, which he was incapable of doing. Thus he says (*ib.* ix 1099):—

‘Quod si apud Graecos post LXX editionem, iam Christi Evangelio coruscante, Iudaeus Aquila, Symmachus et Theodotio Iudaizantes haeretici, sunt recepti, qui multa mysteria Salvatoris subdola interpretatione celarunt, et tamen in *ἑξαπλοῖς* habentur apud ecclesias, et explanantur ab ecclesiasticis viris: quanto magis ego, Christianus de parentibus Christianis natus, et vexillum crucis in mea fronte portans, cuius studium fuit omissa repetere, depravata corrigere, et sacramenta Ecclesiae puro ac fideli aperire sermone; vel a fastidiosis vel a malignis lectoribus non debeo reprobari?’

This being his justification he proceeded to put in force without flinching the logical conclusion which it compelled, and to appeal directly to the Hebrew text which he variously called ‘Hebraica veritas’, ‘textus authenticus’, or ‘solita praesidia’. He claimed that the unadulterated and infallible text of the Bible was to be found in the Hebrew version and in that alone. ‘Certe confidenter dicam,’ he says, ‘et multos huius operis testes citabo, me nihil, duntaxat scientem, de Hebraica veritate mutasse. Sicubi ergo editio mea a veteribus discrepat, interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum, et liquido pervidebis me ab aemulis frustra lacerari.’

This being his theory he carried it out with great painstaking and skill, and sought help from every available source, and notably from such Jews as were willing to help him, and he became himself a very accomplished Hebrew scholar. His translation of the Hebrew Bible to which the name Vulgate has been most erroneously, and, in fact, ridiculously applied, is consequently a work of the highest importance for the recovery and criticism of the Hebrew Bible. It was made long before the Hebrew text was punctuated. The punctuation of the Hebrew text was the great means by which its much belauded uniformity was secured and then preserved by the Masorets, but it involved a large number of arbitrary meanings being attached to critical words.

While Jerome’s two translations are of considerable value for recovering the unpunctuated Hebrew text, this must not be too

much exaggerated, for it has to compete with older rivals in the Targums, in the Syriac Peshitta, and in such parts as exist of the Greek translations of Aquila and Symmachus, all of which were taken from the mother text of the Masoretic Bible more than two hundred years before Jerome made his translations.

On the other hand, in another direction, the introduction of Jerome's versions had a deplorable effect ; for it led very largely to the disuse and partially to the loss of a much more important and valuable text, namely the original and true Latin Vulgate.

Let us, however, revert to the deutero-canonical books. It is quite plain from many passages in his works that in Jerome's view the books or portions of books of the Old Testament which were not accepted as canonical by the Jews ought not to be accepted as such by Christians, but to be rigidly excepted from the Christian Bible. As is usual with him, however, he finds means partially to evade and avoid his conclusion when it becomes inconvenient and dangerous. These concessions are not too reputable in so great a scholar and so influential a teacher, since they are based on the supposed necessity of conciliating the Church, and not upon a devotion to more ideal motives.

With the Jews the ultimate test of canonicity was professedly the fact that a particular book occurred in Hebrew. Jerome evaded this rule in regard to two books at least, perhaps in regard to three, on the plea that they existed in 'Chaldee', which was very closely akin to Hebrew ; and he accordingly broke through his practice of not translating any Old Testament book which was not in the Hebrew Canon. His excuse for doing so is contained in the prefaces to the books of Tobias and Judith. Writing to Chromatius and Heliodorus about the former he says (Vallarsi, x 1):—

'Exigitis enim ut librum Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad Latinum stylum traham ; librum utique Tobiae, quem Hebraei de catalogo divinarum Scripturarum secantes, his quae hagiographa memorant, manciparunt. Feci satis desiderio vestro, non tamen meo studio. Arguunt enim nos Hebraeorum studia : et imputant nobis, contra suum canonem Latinis auribus ista transferre. Sed melius esse iudicans Pharisaeorum displicere iudicio, et Episcoporum iussionibus deservire, institi ut potui.'

In regard to the book of Judith he says (Vallarsi, x 21):—

‘Apud Hebraeos liber Iudith inter hagiographa legitur: cuius auctoritas ad roboranda illa quae in contentionem veniunt, minus idonea iudicatur. Chaldaeo tamen sermone conscriptus, inter historias computatur. Sed quia hunc librum synodus Nicaena in numero sanctarum Scripturarum legitur computasse, acquievi postulationi vestrae, immo exactioni: et sepositis occupationibus, quibus vehementer arctabar, huic unam lucubratiunculam dedi, magis sensum e sensu, quam ex verbo verbum transferens. Multorum codicum varietatem vitiosissimam amputavi. Sola ea quae intelligentia integra in verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui, Latinis expressi.’

Hody mentions a Bible in the Bodleian ‘NE. F. 6, 7. 8’, containing two Latin editions of Judith, one with the preface above abstracted and thus explaining itself; and the other without a preface, which may be the old Vulgate.

Jerome’s version of Tobit was very generally incorporated in the Latin Bibles.

Besides Judith and Tobit, Jerome apparently also translated the first book of Maccabees, of which he had found a copy in Hebrew, although it was excluded from the Jewish Canon (‘Maccabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum repperi’). Hody says he did not translate this book, nor yet that of Ecclesiasticus; but Dr Swete tells us that the former exists in two versions in Latin, one of which has taken its place in the official Latin Bible, while another is preserved in a St Germain and a Madrid MS. One of these two versions is very probably a translation of the book by Jerome.

As I shewed (vol. x p. 496), Jerome tells us that he had found a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus, but none of Wisdom, which was written in a Greek idiom and according to some was composed by Philo. Neither of these books, he says positively, any more than those of Judith, Tobit, and Maccabees, did the Church receive as canonical. ‘Sicut ergo Iudith et Tobiae et Macchabaeorum libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed inter canonicas Scripturas non recipit; sic et haec duo volumina legit ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam’ (Vallarsi, ix 1293), which is an extraordinary statement in view of the available evidence to the contrary.

In his preface to Jeremiah Jerome says of the book of Baruch,

'Librum autem Baruch notarii eius (i. e. Ieremiae) qui apud Hebraeos nec legitur nec habetur praetermisimus' (Vallarsi, ix 783).

In regard to the Greek fragments of Esther, he speaks thus in certain headlines (*ib.* 1581):—

'Quae habentur in Hebraeo plena fide expressi: haec autem quae sequuntur scripta reperi in editione vulgata, quae Graecorum lingua et literis continetur. Et interim post finem libri hoc capitulum ferebatur, quod iuxta consuetudinem nostram obelo, i. e. veru, praenotavimus.'

Further on he adds several explanatory paragraphs, thus:—

'... Hoc quoque principium erat in editione vulgata quod nec in Hebraeo nec apud ullum fertur interpretum. . . . Quae sequuntur, in eo loco posita erant ubi scriptum est in volumine. . . . Quae in sola vulgata editione reperimus. . . . Quae sequuntur post eum locum scripta reperi ubi legitur. . . . Nec tamen habentur in Hebraico, et apud nullum penitus feruntur Interpretum. . . . Haec quoque addita reperi in editione vulgata. . . . Exemplar Epistolae Regis Artaxerxis . . . quod et ipsum in Hebraico volumine non habetur.'

Then again before the story of Susanna in Daniel (*ib.* 1399), 'Hucusque Daniele in Hebraeo volumine legimus. Caetera quae sequuntur usque ad finem libri de Theodotionis editione translata sunt.' Before the Song of the three children (*ib.* 1873), 'Quae sequuntur in Hebraeis voluminibus non reperi'. At the end of the same song we read, 'Hucusque in Hebraeo non habentur: et quae posuimus, de Theodotionis editione translata sunt'. In regard to Bel and the dragon no comment apparently appears in the text, but in the preface to Daniel we read (*ib.* 1361):—

'Difficultatem vobis Danielis ostenderem qui apud Hebraeos nec Susannae habet historiam, nec hymnum trium Puerorum, nec Belis draconisque fabulas, quas nos, quia in toto orbe dispersae sunt, veru anteposito easque iugulante, subiecimus, ne videremur apud imperitos magnam partem voluminis detruncasse.'

It would seem that in regard to the fragments of Daniel and Esther, while he declined to translate them, he incorporated the old Vulgate in his new edition.

It is perfectly plain, however, that Jerome excluded from his Canon the books of Tobias, Judith, Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, the Prayer of Manasses, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and the fragments of Esther and Daniel. Some of these, he tells us, were

accepted as hagiographa, and read as such by the Jews; others were not used by the Jews, but had been accepted by the Church as containing godly teaching, yet were not to be used for establishing doctrine.

To them he applies in the *Prologus Galeatus* the term 'Apocrypha', not in its modern sense but as it was used by the fathers generally in the sense of extra-canonical, and unauthorized by the Church as a test of doctrine. It was left for the Reformed theologians of the sixteenth century to make a much more opprobrious and unjustifiable use of the term as applied to these books, thus confounding the so-called deutero-canonical books with works actually rejected by the Church as entirely sophistical and false.

Two only of the books hitherto widely received, one of them, so far as we know, universally, did Jerome entirely and scornfully reject, namely the book styled 'Esdras A' in the great Greek Codices which he referred to as Third Esdras, and the apocalyptic book known as Fourth Esdras. Of these he says in his preface to Ezra and Nehemiah (Vallarsi, ix 1523):—

'Nec quemquam moveat quod unus a nobis editus liber est, nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somniis delectetur: quia et apud Hebraeos Ezrae Neemiaeque sermones in unum volumen coarctantur; et quae non habentur apud illos, nec de viginti quatuor senibus sunt, procul abiicienda. . .'

I shall have more to say about them later on.

Jerome's new translation from the Hebrew was no doubt an epoch-making work and created a wide sensation in the Church. A good proof of this is the fact that it was in part retranslated into Greek, in which language several translations already existed.

Among Jerome's friends at Bethlehem was a learned Greek named Sophronios. He became involved in a controversy with a Jew who raised questions about some of his quotations from the Psalms as not being consistent with the Hebrew text. He accordingly asked Jerome to translate that book afresh from the Hebrew, which he did. Afterwards, we are told, Sophronios in turn translated Jerome's later Latin versions of the Psalms and Prophets into Greek, and the result was much appreciated in the East. It is said that no part of this work survives. If it were

recovered it would, of course, be useful in the textual criticism of Jerome's Latin version.

Jerome's tampering in several ways with the received Canon and text of the Bible did not fail to arouse almost immediate opposition. His translations, as we have seen, were made piecemeal. His reputation was so great, however, that they were speedily known, as we shall see later, over a wide area, and notably they were soon known in the African dioceses where his great contemporary Augustine presided, and where they apparently caused great trouble.

This was expressed in more than one letter written by Augustine to Jerome himself, in which he spoke of what he deemed Jerome's dangerous innovations. I will quote some paragraphs from these letters. In one of them he writes (*Ep. civ 4: Vallarsi, i 630*):—

'Ego sane te malle Graecas potius Canonicas nobis interpretari scripturas, quae LXX Interpretum auctoritate perhibentur. Perdurum enim erit, si tua interpretatio per multas Ecclesias frequentius coeperit lectitari, quod a Graecis Ecclesiis Latinae Ecclesiae dissonabunt, maxime quia facile contradictor convincitur, Graeco prolato libro, id est, linguae notissimae. Quisquis autem in eo quod ex Hebraeo translatum est, aliquo insolito permotus fuerit, et falsi crimen intenderit, aut vix aut numquam ad Hebraea testimonia pervenietur, quibus defendatur obiectum. Quod si etiam perventum fuerit, tot Latinas et Graecas auctoritates damnari quis ferat? Huc accedit quia etiam consulti Hebraei possunt aliud respondere; ut tu solus necessarius videaris, qui etiam ipsos possis convincere: sed tamen quo iudice mirum si potueris invenire.'

Again in a second letter he writes (*Ep. lvi 2: ib. 299*):—

'Petimus ergo, et nobiscum petit omnis Africanarum Ecclesiarum studiosa societas, ut in interpretandis eorum libris, qui Graece scripturas nostras quam optime tractaverunt, curam atque operam impendere non graveris. Potes enim efficere, ut nos quoque habeamus illos tales viros, et unum potissimum, quem tu libentius in tuis literis sonas. De vertendis autem in linguam Latinam sanctis literis canonicis laborare te nollem, nisi eo modo quo Iob interpretatus es: ut signis adhibitis, quid inter hanc tuam et LXX, quorum est gravissima auctoritas, interpretationem distet, appareat. Satis autem nequeo mirari, si aliquid adhuc in Hebraicis literis et exemplaribus invenitur, quod tot interpretes illius linguae peritissimos fugerit. Omitto enim LXX, de quorum vel consilii vel maiore spiritus concordia, quam si unus homo esset, non audeo in aliquam partem

certam ferre sententiam, nisi quod eis prae eminentem auctoritatem in hoc munere sine controversia tribuendam existimo. Illi me plus movent, qui cum posteriores interpretarentur, et verborum locutionumque Hebraearum viam atque regulas mordicus (ut fertur) tenerent, non solum inter se non consenserunt, sed etiam reliquerunt multa, quae tanto post eruenda et prodenda remanent. Si enim obscura sunt, te quoque in illis falli potuisse creditur. Si autem manifesta, illos in eis falli potuisse non creditur. Huius igitur rei pro tua caritate expositis causis, certum me facias obsecraverim.'

In another letter he speaks more plainly of the troubles caused in the African Church by the new Bible, as many people deemed it (*Ep. cxvi 35: ib. i 775*).

'Ideo autem desidero interpretationem tuam de LXX, ut et tanta Latinorum interpretum, qui qualescunque hoc ausi sunt, quantum possumus imperitia careamus: et hi, qui me invidere putant utilibus laboribus tuis, tandem aliquando, si fieri potest, intelligant, propterea me nolle tuam ex Hebraeo interpretationem in Ecclesiis legi, ne contra LXX auctoritatem, tanquam novum aliquid proferentes, magno scandalo perturbemus plebes Christi, quarum aures et corda illam interpretationem audire consueverunt, quae etiam ab apostolis approbata est. Unde et illud apud Ionam virgultum, si in Hebraeo nec hedera est nec cucurbita sed nescio quid aliud, quod trunco suo nixum, nullis sustentandum adminiculis erigatur, mallet iam in omnibus Latinis cucurbitam legi. Non enim frustra hoc puto LXX posuisse, nisi quia et huic simile sciebant.'

The result of this strong feeling in the African churches was seen in the pronouncements of those churches on the subject of the Canon, not made once but reiterated at more than one provincial synod, and confirmed by the adherence of the Legate of Rome, in which the Septuagint Canon was affirmed very plainly, while the Hebrew Canon and Jerome's arguments in its favour were ignored. I emphasized this fact in a previous paper (*J. T. S. vii p. 350*). It is notable that the first of these pronouncements was made at the Council of Hippo in 393 at the very time when Jerome was abandoning his old adherence to the Septuagint in favour of his new rabbinical views as to the Old Testament text. It was reaffirmed at the first Council of Carthage in 397, and more authoritatively at the Second in 419, when the Pope was represented by Faustinus bishop of Potentia. These councils, in fact, merely reaffirmed the pronouncement of

the Roman Council of 382, which was held under Damasus, as we have seen, and they are absolutely conclusive as to the voice of the Western Church on the subject of the Canon at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century.

It will be well to put in juxtaposition with the pronouncements of these councils the views of Augustine himself as to the legitimate contents of the Bible; for no one represented the voice of the African branch of the Western Church at this time with more authority. In the *De Doctrina Christiana* ii 8, written about the year 400, he says:—

‘In Canonicis autem Scripturis Ecclesiarum Catholicarum quamplurimum auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illae sunt, quae Apostolicas sedes habere et Epistolas accipere meruerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in Script. Canonicis, ut eas quae ab omnibus accipiuntur Ecclesiis Cathol. praeponat eis quas quaedam non accipiunt; in eis vero quae non accipiuntur ab omnibus, praeponat eas quas plures graviioresque accipiunt eis quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis Ecclesiae tenent. Si autem alias invenerit a pluribus, alias a grandioribus haberi, quanquam hoc facile invenire non possit, aequalis tamen auctoritatis eas habendas puto. Totus autem Canon Scripturarum in quo istam considerationem versandam dicimus, his libris continetur: Quinque Moyseos . . . et uno libro Iesu Nave, uno Iudicum, uno libello qui appellatur Ruth qui magis ad Regnorum principium videtur pertinere, deinde quatuor Regnorum, et duobus Paralipomenon, Iob, Tobias, et Ester, et Iudith, et Machabaeorum libri duo, et Esdrae duo . . . Prophetae in quibus David unus liber Psalmorum, et Salomonis tres, Proverbiorum, Cantica canticorum, et Ecclesiastes. Nam illi duo libri, unus qui Sapientia et alius qui Ecclesiasticus inscribitur de quadam similitudine Salomonis esse dicuntur: nam Iesus filius Sirah eos scripsisse constantissime perhibetur, qui tamen quoniam in auctoritatem recipi meruerunt, inter Propheticos numerandi sunt. Reliqua sunt eorum libri, qui proprie Prophetae appellantur, duodecim Prophetae libri singuli, qui connexi sibimet, quoniam nunquam seiuncti sunt, pro uno habentur. . . . Deinde quatuor Prophetae sunt maiorum voluminum, Isaias, Ieremias, Daniel, Ezechiel. His quadraginta quatuor libris Testamenti veteris terminatur auctoritas. Novi autem, quatuor libris Evangelii . . . quatuordecim Epistolis Pauli Apostoli . . . Petri duabus, tribus Iohannis, una Iudae, et una Iacobi, Actibus Apostolorum libro uno, et Apocalypsi Iohannis libro uno.

It is plain, therefore, that Augustine was completely at one with the African Councils and the Roman Council of 382 as to the legitimate contents of the Canon.

It is a remarkable fact that notwithstanding this very emphatic expression of the opinion of the corporate Western Church on the matter, Jerome, who professed to treat the voice and decision of that Church as dominant and conclusive, should have continued to maintain and disseminate an entirely different view of what constituted the Canon, and that he should have been permitted to do so without any direct official protest and censure, and it shews the personal prominence which he had attained.

His views were not, however, allowed to pass without individual protests from other famous theologians. We have seen how the opinion of the African Church in the matter was voiced by Augustine. That of Italy was expressed by a more aggressive champion, namely Rufinus, one of the most remarkable churchmen of the second half of the fourth century, of whom it is little short of a scandal that no modern critical Life exists, nor a critical edition of his collected works. His reputation has been greatly minimized by the champions of Jerome, who have accepted Jerome's fierce rhetoric and unmeasured abuse as a justification of their own mean opinion of Rufinus as man and as scholar. Tyrannius Rufinus was born probably about 345 at Concordia in North Italy, and baptized at Aquileia about A.D. 371. Having adopted the monastic life, he went to the East, and spent the next twenty-six years of his life in Egypt and Palestine. He died at Messina in Sicily in the year 410 or 411. He was an early friend of Jerome when both were eager students and followers of Origen. When Jerome visited Gaul, Rufinus asked him to secure for him a copy of St Hilary's *Commentarii in Psalmos* and *de Synodis*, thus proving how far the reputation of the great bishop of Poitiers had reached. He and Jerome went together to the East about 371; about 379 he settled at Jerusalem and there he resided for eighteen or twenty years, and there he was ordained. When Jerome himself settled in the East they renewed their intercourse and remained close friends till about the year 393, and Jerome's references to him up to this time are complimentary and friendly. But there ensued a difference between the two which developed into a bitter hostility, and in the controversy which followed Jerome's skill in vituperation was exercised to the full, and no more unedifying spectacle exists in Church history than the language he used in regard to his old

friend of so many years' standing. At this moment Origen's memory was being sharply pursued in many quarters, and both Jerome and Rufinus were suspected, not without justice, of having been his followers. Jerome, who was very nervous when his orthodoxy was in question, clearly saw that the tide was running strongly against his former inspirer and teacher, and abandoned his allegiance. Rufinus remained faithful and even published a translation of the *de Principiis*. In his preface he refers to Jerome's early devotion to their theological father, and to the handsome things Jerome had once said of him. These compliments Jerome now found inconvenient. He called them *fictae laudes* and repudiated them with the energy with which Erasmus, who was in many ways very like Jerome, when in an analogous position, repudiated the compliments of Oecolampadius.

From this time to the end of their lives, with but a short interval, the separation between the two scholars was acute and bitter. Especially was it bitter on the part of Jerome, who has largely secured the ear of the orthodox world from the fact of his having been regarded for so many centuries as the senior Doctor of the Church. But his abuse and misrepresentations ought long ago to have been completely discounted by the simple means of an appeal to the opinions held of the real character and endowments of Rufinus by two such judicial and reputable judges as St Augustine and Gennadius. The golden words of the former may be read in the letter of rebuke he wrote to Jerome when the latter had sent him his abusive attack on Rufinus; while Gennadius speaks of him as follows (*de vir. illust.* 17):—

'Rufinus Aquileiensis presbyter non minima pars fuit doctorum Ecclesiae et in transferendo de Graeco in Latinum elegans ingenium habuit. Denique maximam partem Graecorum bibliothecae Latinis exhibuit . . . Sed et obtrectatori opusculorum suorum respondit duobus voluminibus, arguens et convincens se Dei intuitu et ecclesiae utilitate, auxiliante Domino, ingenium agitasse; illum vero aemulationis stimulo incitatum ad obloquium stylum vertisse.'

Dr Fremantle in his account of Rufinus in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Biography* expresses an opinion worth quoting, when he says, 'His attempt to make peace, and his refusal to reply to Jerome's last invectives, though the tempta-

tion offered by a violent attack in answer to a peaceful letter was great, shews a high power of self-restraint, and a consciousness of holding a secure position' (*op. cit.* iv. 560).

All this should be kept in the memory in judging of the polemics between the two men, nor must we forget the fact that in scholarship they were in their several ways on a par. It is true that Rufinus had little or no pretensions to a knowledge of Hebrew, while he tells us himself: 'Ad latinum sermonem tricennali iam pene incuria torpuisse' (*Apol.* i. 11). In Greek, however, he was a proficient scholar, and no doubt a much better one than Jerome, and it was to him that the Western Church of the fifth century was largely indebted for such translations of the Greek fathers as it possessed.

In addition to their separation on the subject of Origen, Jerome and Rufinus also quarrelled on another subject in which Jerome had turned his back on his early views, namely, on the respective authorities of the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible; or rather, perhaps, on the authority of the Church as the final arbiter of such a question as against the appeal by Jerome to his own private judgement.

Like Hilary, Rufinus was a close student and follower of Origen in his views on the text of the Bible, and like him, no doubt, was embarrassed by the fact that Jews and Christians had two distinct Canons of the Old Testament. And in an early work of his, the *Commentarius in Symbolum Apostolorum* 36 sqq. apparently written in the fervour of his admiration for Origen, published about A.D. 380, and therefore earlier than the Roman Council of 382, we find him writing of the various classes of books for which claims to a place in the Bible had been alleged, as follows:—

'Quae sunt Novi ac Veteris Testamenti volumina, quae secundum maiorum traditionem per ipsum Spiritum sanctum inspirata creduntur, et Ecclesiis Christi tradita, competens videtur hoc in loco evidenti numero, sicut ex Patrum monumentis accepimus, designare.

Itaque veteris Testamenti omnium primo Moysi quinque libri sunt traditi, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium. Post haec Iesus Nave, Iudicum simul cum Ruth. Quatuor post haec Regnorum libri, quos Hebraei duos numerant: Paralipomenon, qui dierum dicitur liber: et Esdrae duo, qui apud illos singuli com-

putantur, et Hester. Prophetarum vero Esaias, Ieremias, Ezechiel et Daniel : praeterea duodecim Prophetarum liber unus. Iob quoque, et Psalmi David singuli sunt libri. Salomon vero tres Ecclesiis tradidit, Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Cantica Canticorum. In his concluderunt numerum librorum Veteris Testamenti. Novi vero quatuor Evangelia, Matthaei, Marci, Lucae et Ioannis ; Actus Apostolorum, quos describit Lucas ; Pauli Apostoli epistolae quatuordecim, Petri Apostoli duae, Iacobi fratris Domini et Apostoli una, Iudae una, Ioannis tres ; Apocalypsis Ioannis. Haec sunt quae Patres intra canonem concluderunt, et ex quibus fidei nostrae assertiones constare voluerunt.

Sciendum tamen est, quod et alii libri sunt qui non Canonici, sed Ecclesiastici a maioribus appellati sunt ; id est, Sapientia quae dicitur Salomonis, et alia Sapientia quae dicitur filii Syrach, qui liber apud Latinos hoc ipso generali vocabulo Ecclesiasticus appellatur, quo vocabulo non auctor libelli, sed scripturae qualitas cognominata est. Eiusdem vero ordinis est libellus Tobiae, et Iudith, et Machabaeorum libri. In Novo vero Testamento libellus qui dicitur Pastoris sive Hermes ; qui appellatur Duae viae vel Iudicium Petri. Quae omnia legi quidem in Ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen proferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam. Caeteras vero scripturas Apocryphas nominarunt, quas in Ecclesiis legi noluerunt. Haec nobis a Patribus tradita sunt, quae (ut dixi) opportunum visum est hoc in loco designare, ad instructionem eorum qui prima sibi Ecclesiae ac fidei elementa suscipiunt, ut sciant ex quibus sibi fontibus verbi Dei haurienda sint pocula.'

This was the view of Rufinus in A. D. 380. It is not impossible that it was the publication of these and similar views by Hilary and himself, and perhaps by other individual scholars who claimed Origen as their master, which led to the authoritative pronouncement on the subject made by the Western Church at the Roman Council of 382.

In his later writings Rufinus seems to have completely acquiesced in this pronouncement of the Church, and he offers a strenuous opposition to Jerome's theories and pretensions on the subject, and to his hebraizing the Rule of Faith by introducing a new Canon, that of the Jews, instead of the Bible which the Christian tradition had sanctioned, and which had been accepted by Christ and the Apostles. I will quote a notable passage on the subject from the second book of his *Invective*.

'An ut divinarum Scripturarum libros, quos ad plenissimum fidei Instrumentum Ecclesiis Christi Apostoli tradiderunt, nova nunc et

a Iudaeis mutuata interpretatione mutares? . . . Ista vero quae nunc tu interpretaris, et per Ecclesias et monasteria, per oppida et castella transmittis, quomodo suscipiemus, tanquam divina, an tanquam humana? Et quid facimus, quod quae Prophetarum vel Legislatorum nominibus titulantur, veriora haec abs te, quam illa quae Apostoli probaverunt, affirmantur? Istud commissum dic quomodo emendabitur, immo nefas quomodo expiabitur? Si enim in explicanda lege aliquid aliter sensisse damnabile apud te ducitur, ipsam legem pervertere in aliud quam Apostoli tradiderunt, quoties damnabile iudicandum est? Cur non magis pro huius ausi temeritate dicamus: Quis ex tot et tantis prudentibus et sanctis viris, qui ante te fuerunt, ad istud opus ausus sit manum mittere? Quis praesumpserit sacras Sancti Spiritus voces et divina volumina temerare? Quis praeter te divino muneri et Apostolorum haereditati manus intulerit? Et quidem cum ingens copia fuisse ex initio in Ecclesiis Dei, et praecipue Ierosolymis, eorum qui ex circumcissione crediderant, referatur, in quibus utique linguae utriusque perfectam fuisse scientiam, et legis peritiam probabilem, administrati pontificatus testatur officium. Quis ergo in ista eruditorum virorum copia ausus est Instrumentum divinum, quod Apostoli Ecclesiis tradiderunt, et depositum Sancti Spiritus compilare? An non est compilare cum quaedam quidem immutantur et error dicitur corrigi? Nam omnis illa historia de Susanna, quae castitatis exemplum praebebat Ecclesiis Dei, ab isto abscissa est et abiecta atque posthabita. Trium puerorum hymnus, qui maxime diebus solemnibus in Ecclesia Dei canitur, ab isto e loco suo penitus erasus est. Et quid per singula commemoro de his quorum comprehendere numerum nequeo? De quo ut omittam illud dicere, quod LXXII virorum per cellulas interpretantium unam et consonam vocem, dubitandum non est, Spiritus Sancti inspiratione prolatam, et maioris id debere esse auctoritatis, quam id quod ab uno homine, sibi Barraba aspirante, translatum est. Ut ergo hoc omittam, vide quid dicimus, verbi causa: Petrus Romanae Ecclesiae per viginti et quatuor annos praefuit, dubitandum non est, quin sicut caetera, quae ad instructionem pertinent, etiam librorum Instrumenta Ecclesiae ipse tradiderit, quae utique iam tunc, ipso sedente et docente, recitabantur. Quid ergo? Decepit Petrus Apostolus Christi Ecclesiam, et libros ei falsos et nihil veritatis continentes tradidit, et cum sciret quod verum est haberi apud Iudaeos, apud Christianos volebat haberi quod falsum est? Sed fortasse dicit, quia sine literis erat Petrus, et sciebat quidem Iudaeorum libros magis esse veros, quam istos qui erant in Ecclesia: sed interpretari non poterat propter sermonis imperitiam. Et quid? Nihil in isto agebat ignea lingua per Spiritum Sanctum caelitus data? Non ergo omnibus linguis loquebantur Apostoli? Sed concedamus, quia non potuerit Petrus Apostolus facere,

quod hic modo fecit : de Paulo quid dicimus ? Num et Paulus sine literis fuit ? Hebraeus ex Hebraeis, secundum legem Pharisaeus, edoctus secus pedes Gamalielis, qui etiam et ipse Romae positus, si quid Petro defuisset, putas non potuit adimplere ? Quomodo ergo isti, qui praecipiebant discipulis ut attenderent lectioni, emendatas eis et veras non dabant lectiones ; et qui praecipunt ne attendamus Iudaicis fabulis et genealogiis, quae questiones magis praestant quam aedificationem ; et iterum cavere nos iubent, et observare maxime eos, qui ex circumcissione sunt, quomodo non praevidebant per Spiritum, quod futurum esset tempus post quadringentos fere annos, quando Ecclesia cognito eo quod ab Apostolis non sibi esse tradita veritas Veteris Instrumenti, legatos mitteret ad istos, quos illi tunc Circumcisionem vocabant, obsecrans et exorans, ut sibi de veritate, quae apud ipsos est, aliquid largirentur ? Per totos istos quadringentos annos errasse se et ignorasse quod verum est fateretur : Adscitam se quidem esse ex gentibus sponsam Christo per Apostolos : sed non ab eis veris monilibus exornatam : putasse se lapides esse pretiosas, nunc autem deprehendisse quod non sunt verae istae gemmae, quas sibi Apostoli Christi imposuerant : erubescere se ad publicum procedere, falsis et non veris lapidibus adornatam, et ideo rogare se ut vel Barrabam illum, quem aliquando ut Christo nuberet, spreverat, mittant ad se qui possit cum uno electo ex suis viro ornamenta sibi vera quae Apostoli non praestiterant reparare.' (*Invectiv.* ii 31-33 : Vallarsi, ii 659 sqq.)

Rufinus then turns upon Jerome, and rends him for claiming to be only following Origen in his appeal to the Hebrew text. Thus he says :—

'Quid tibi ergo Origenis factum in hoc potest praestare solatii, cuius neque opus simile aliquod ostendere potes, et in quo tantum laboras, ut litera occidat consequentem : dum ille e contrario Spiritus vivificantis esse conetur assertor. Tuum igitur, frater, tuum istud est factum, nec quemquam nunc te in hoc comitem vel socium in Ecclesia habuisse certum est : nisi istum solum, quem frequenter commemoras, Barrabam. Quis enim alius auderet ab Apostolis tradita Ecclesiae instrumenta temerare, nisi Iudaicus spiritus ?' (*ib.* 36 sq. : Vallarsi, ii 664 sq.)

We may differ in particular arguments here employed by Rufinus, but we cannot question the fact that, in his constant appeal to the tradition of Christ and the Apostles in regard to the legitimate contents of the Bible against the Hebrew tradition relied upon by Jerome, he was standing on impregnable ground.

H. H. HOWORTH.