

DIVERGENT HEBREW READINGS IN JEROME'S ISAIAH

BENJAMIN KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN

I

The view that the Vulgate has only very little value, if any at all, for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible rests on two assumptions: first, the obvious fact that Jerome did not independently work on, and translate from, a Hebrew original but made extensive use of the earlier Greek versions seemed to suggest that it would be methodically wrong to draw from his Latin version any conclusions as to the Hebrew text underlying it; secondly, the relatively late composition of V appeared to imply that it was based on a Hebrew text which was practically identical with the MT.¹

These two assumptions are somewhat contradictory in themselves. Yet this does not absolve us from examining each on its own merits.

Jerome constantly admits his acquaintance with, and partial dependence on, his Greek predecessors; many of his renderings run parallel to the Septuagint, Aquilas, Theodotion or — to a larger extent — Symmachus. Yet this fact must not obliterate the strong evidence of all the many instances where Jerome in his rendering of the Hebrew text departs, and often explicitly so, from the Greek versions. After all, he intended to base his new version on the "Hebraica veritas". When he did have recourse to the works of his predecessors, and to concomitant interpretations supplied by his Jewish informants, he did this in a fashion in which nowadays one would employ a Biblical con-

1 Cp. the opinions of Eichhorn and Wellhausen as quoted by W. Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die alttestamentliche Textkritik* (Göttingen 1875) 23–24; B. Jacob, "Beiträge zu einer Einleitung in die Psalmen", ZAW 16 (1896) 155–156: "Hieronymus und Targum aber haben nicht den geringsten Wert als Textzeugen... Denn von Aquila ab (ihn eingeschlossen) haben wir schlechterdings nichts mehr zu erwarten, was für die bibl. Textkritik von irgend welchem Belang wäre." Similarly, H. de Saint-Marie *Richesse et Déficiences des Anciens Psautiers Latins* (Collect. Bibl. Lat. XIII, Rome 1959) 151; J.H. Marks, *Der textkritische Wert des Ps. Hieron. juxta Hebraeos* (Winterthur 1956) 144; F. Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel* (Paderborn 1928) 123: "Wo Hieronymus mit der Septuaginta oder den späteren Übersetzern gegen unseren heutigen Masoratest übereinstimmt, scheidet er meines Erachtens überhaupt aus... Bei vorsichtiger Erwägung aller Umstände wird man sagen dürfen, dass Hieronymus einen Text vor sich hatte, der im wesentlichen mit dem übereinstimmt, der uns vorliegt." Cp. M. Noth, *Die Welt des A.T.* (Berlin 1957) 275 and 284; and many others.

cordance or dictionary, *i.e.* as tools for elucidating a difficult word or passage.²

With regard to the underlying Hebrew text, V necessarily reflects much less textual divergence from MT than does G. In the centuries intervening between the Greek and the Latin translations a Hebrew standard text had been constantly gaining ground.³ However, Jerome's version sufficiently antedates the Massoretic schools as to allow for many non-standard readings. It is in subtle details where V is apt to deviate from the text of our printed Bibles, sometimes being the only textual witness, to a divergent reading, in other cases supporting and being supported by other VSS.⁴ Recently, a direct confirmation of many a Vulgate rendering has been obtained from the Qumran Scrolls.⁵

At this point, however, we face the crucial question of a textual criticism which concerns itself with the comparison of an original with its translation: how to distinguish between rendering and reading? One admits that many a Latin wording, not in agreement with MT, can be traced back to one of the Greek versions or perhaps the Vetus Latina; that it may reflect an exegetical tradition, Jewish or Christian; or that it should be attributed to the translator's deliberate choice due to his methods and inclinations. Therefore one readily recognizes the need of submitting the Vulgate variants to a most careful analysis before one is entitled to assume that they mirror a deviant

- 2 Cp. F. Stummer, *op. cit.*, 90-124; J. Ziegler, *Die jüngeren griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlagen der Vulgata in den prophetischen Schriften* (Braunsberg 1943); F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* 1 (Oxford 1875): "in versione Latina a... (Hieronymo) elaborata prae ceteris omnibus interpretibus Symmachum ducem et magistrum sibi proposuit." W.W. Cannon, "Jerome und Symmachus", ZAW 45 (1927) 191-199. Rahmer, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus*, Genesis (Breslau 1861); *id.*, Prophetes (Berlin 1902). F. Stummer, "Spuren jüd. und christl. Einflüsse auf die Übersetzung der grossen Propheten durch Hieronymus", JPOS 8 (1928) 35-48.
- 3 Cp. O. Eissfeldt, *Einführung in das A.T.* (Tübingen 1956) 833-840 (with ample bibliography); H.B. Swete, *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek* (Cambridge 1914) 319-320.
- 4 Cp. W. Nowack, *op. cit.*; H.P. Smith, "The Value of the Vulgate OT for the Textual Criticism", *Presbyt. and Reformed Review* (1891) 216-234. C.M. Cooper, JBL 69 (1950) 233, maintains that "Jerome's Psalter rests on a Hebrew text that is half-way between its early situation as reflected in the LXX and its final fixation in the MT."
- 5 A. Penna, *Biblica* 38 (1957) 381-395 has composed a very useful list of parallel readings in the Vulgate and the Qumran Isaiah Manuscript A (Is-a). The list, however, contains too many instances and omits others: It is very precarious to draw conclusions as to the Hebrew text wherever the Vulgate has an additional "et"; Is. 28:21 V does not concur with Is-a: בעמק ... בהר as it has "sicut in..." (MT: ... בהר כהעמק). On the other hand, Is. 2:20 V: "talpas", Is-a: להפרפרים, as against MT: פרוה להפרפר should be included in any comparative list. (True, there is the difference in gender if we consult Jerome's Com. *ad loc.*, ed. Vallarsi¹ iv, 43 where he transcribes "Pharpha r o t h". But the relationship between the Vulgate and Jerome's Com. deserves, as this paper hopes to prove, special consideration.)

Hebrew text. It is here, in this painstaking investigation, that we wish to benefit from Jerome's own remarks on the Biblical text, the VSS, and his own work.

The information that can be gathered from these remarks is rather impressive. In his commentaries on the Prophets and Ecclesiastes, his *liber quaestionum hebraicarum in Genesim* and *apologia adversus Ruffinum*, and in many of his letters, Jerome frequently imparts to his readers the exact wording of a Biblical phrase, occasionally spelling words or rendering them in transliteration. He enumerates different ways of translation and states his own choice as well as the reasons for it. This, then, seems to be an ideal tool for textual criticism: the translator himself informs us, or so it appears, on the text-form he had before him and the manner of his translating.⁶

But, while checking the Vulgate against Jerome's Commentary we come across some most amazing discrepancies between them. As their number keeps growing we tend to become more cautious in assuming one and the same Hebrew text to underly both Version and Commentary. The situation might have been more complex. The following analysis purports to demonstrate this; its object is the Vulgate of the Book of Isaiah and Jerome's commentary on it. It has been chosen because here the intervening lapse of time between the translation and the writing of the Commentary promises to bring out the discrepancies in full relief. Moreover, for some of the chapters, *viz.* 13–23, Jerome composed two Commentaries at different periods of his life. This enables us to trace changing tendencies in his work. Finally, additional help for this textual study may be derived from the Qumran Scrolls of Isaiah.⁷

II.

Deviating Vocalization

There are many instances where V reflects a vocalization of a Hebrew word which differs from MT. It is not to be assumed that the Latin translator just erred. In any case this would not be the rule. Generally Jerome relies on a deviant reading tradition that more often than not is supported by other VSS.

- 6 F. Stummer, "Hauptprobleme der Erforschung der alttestament. Vulgata", BZAW 66 (1936) 234: "...der Übersetzer unterrichtet uns nämlich... an einer grossen Reihe von Stellen über den Text, den er übersetzt und damit über die Art, wie er seine Übersetzung gewinnt." (Spacing by me, B.K.). The importance of consulting the commentaries for textual criticism was stressed by W. Nowack, *op. cit.*, 2–3.
- 7 In the following textual comparison the Vulgate (V) as well as Jerome's Com. are quoted from Vallarsi's first edition (1734–42) of Jerome's complete works. Volume 9 contains the OT Vulgate, vol. 4 the Com. on Isaiah. (Thus, *e.g.*, iv, 215 stands for volume 4, Jerome's *Commentarius*, column 215.) The other texts and VSS quoted are:

Sometimes even the *scriptio plena* of the Qumran Scroll confirms it. The more remarkable it is, therefore, when in his Commentary Jerome departs from this tradition and comes closer to MT.

Is. 21:7 MT: וראה רֶכֶב צמד פרשים רֶכֶב חמור רֶכֶב גמל

G: καὶ εἶδον ἀναβάτας ἵππεις δύο ἀναβάτην ὄνου καὶ ἀναβάτην καμήλου

T: ויחזי רתך אנש ועמיה זוג פרשין רכיב על חמר רכיב על גמל

S: וחזא רכובא דתרין פרשין דרכיב חמרא ודרכיב גמלא

Is-a: וראה רכב צמד פרשים (ו)רוכב חמור ורוכב גמל

V: et vidit currum duorum equitum ascensorem asini et ascensorem cameli

V does not follow G which has ἀναβάτης (“rider”) three times for רֶכֶב in this verse. The Latin distinguishes (like T, Is-a) between the first appearance of this word on the one hand: “currus” (רֶכֶב) and the second and third on the other: “ascensor” (רֶכֶב). Whether the latter originated from a *plene* writing, i.e., רוכב, is impossible to decide, but it certainly rests on a wide-spread tradition. However, in his Com. (iv, 215) Jerome writes: “...vidit venientem bigam, et aurigam desuper, asinumque et camelum currum trahere.” When, at a later stage, he again comments on this chapter he quotes (iv, 304) “...ascensorem asini et ascensorem cameli...” and it is to this wording that he attaches his theological remarks. But not for long; in a broader rephrasing of the passage he states (iv, 305): “...se vidisse significans, venire Dominum Salvatorem sedentem super bigam, et duobus equis, immo animantibus, asino et camelo unum currum jungentem.” It was, after all, רֶכֶב חמור and רֶכֶב גמל.⁸

Is. 13:20 MT: ורעים לא ירבצו שם

G: οὐδὲ ποιμένες οὐ μὴ ἀναπαύσονται ἐν αὐτῇ

Is-a: ורעים לא ירב(י)צו שם

T: ורעין לא ישרון תמן

S: ורעותא לא נרעון תמן

V: nec pastores resquiescent ibi

MT = Massoretic Text.

Is-a = The Complete Isaiah MS From the First Qumran Cave, ed. M. Burrows (1950).

G = Septuagint, ed. J. Ziegler (Göttingen 1959).

S = Peshitta, ed. of Urmia, reprinted by Trinit. Bible Society (London 1934).

T = Targum, ed. A. Sperber (Leiden 1962).

⁸ Rashi *ad loc.*: הלשון והרקע הלשוני, Cp. Y. Kutscher, הלשון והרקע הלשוני של מגילת ישעיהו (Jerusalem 1959) 245.

V reads, as the other VSS do, **יִרְבְּצוּ** (is this Is-a's **יִרְבּוּצוּ** ?), though not being blindly dependent on G (“ibi” against ἐν αὐτῇ). The Com. explains (iv, 174): “...deserta, ut ne ad pascua quidem armentorum et pecorum utilis sit. ...nec pastores post vestigia gregum fessi labore quiescent”, referring to the flocks in whose track the shepherds take their rest. This seems to echo the conception of MT, and possibly of Is-a: **יִרְבּוּצוּ** (?), as well as the medieval Jewish interpretation (cp. Qimḥi *ad loc.*: **וְאֵפִילוּ רוּעִים לֹא יִרְבּוּצוּ שֵׁם צֶאֱנָם**). The second Com. puts a stress on the same combination (iv, 245): “...nec pastores requiescent ibi, qui mansuetissimum Domini gregem in Jerusalem solent pascere.”

Is. 21:13 MT: **מִשָּׂא בְּעֶרְבַּי בִּיעֵר בְּעֶרְבַי תְּלִינוּ**

G: (Luc.: το ὄραμα το ἐν τη ἀραβία) ἐν τῷ ὄρουμῳ ἐσπέρας
κουμηθήσῃ

S: **מִשְׁקֵלָא דְעֶרְבִיא בְּרִמְשָׁא בְּעַבָּא תְּבוּתוֹן**

T: **יֵת עֶרְבָאֵי בְּחֹרְשָׁא בְּרִמְשָׁא יְבִיתוֹן**

V: onus in arabia in saltu ad vesperam dormietis

The varying rendering of **עֶרַב** parallels that of T and S. The translator (= G) had read **בִּיעֵר בְּעֶרְבַי**. But at a later stage he apparently felt the need to explain why he had not rendered the passage according to what we find in MT. Thus he belittles the importance of the discrepancy, exclaiming almost impatiently (iv, 218): “verbus ARAB, ut saepe iam diximus, et vesper et Arabia, et corvus et planities, et Occidens appellatur”, and (iv, 308): “Arabia in lingua nostra vesperam sonat.” Yet the fact remains that in other instances he does not interchange “vesper/Arabia” freely, and he certainly would not justify the substitution of “corvus”, “planities” *etc.* for “Arabia” or “vesper”. It follows that while translating he had read **עֶרַב ... עֶרְבַי** whereas later he became aware that the two words should be read identically.

Is. 21:14 MT: **בְּלַחְמוֹ קִדְמוֹ נִדְד**

G: ἄρτοις συναντᾶτε τοῖς φεύγουσι

T: **מִמָּא דִּאתוֹן אַכְלִין זְמִינוּ לְמַעֲרִיקָא**

S: **בְּלַחְמִכּוֹן אַרְוְעוּ לְמַדְבְּרָא**

V: cum panibus occurrite fugienti

V, like the other VSS, converted the past tense into an imperative. This is obviously based on the reading **קִדְמוֹ**. Again the relative independence of V from G should be noted: “fugienti” (sing.) against φεύγουσι (plur.). Jerome, however, became acquainted with our present reading **קִדְמוֹ**, and explains (iv, 219): “In quo nos transtulimus: ‘Qui habitatis terram Austri, cum panibus

occurrere fugienti' et quasi ex persona Domini imperativo modo legimus, in Hebraeo sic legi posse affirmant: 'Qui habitant terram Austri, cum panibus occurrerunt fugienti' ". In order to interpret this latter reading, which certainly impressed him as being preferable, he was obliged to introduce another change into his Latin wording: "habitant" instead of "habitatis". But this creates the problem how to explain the form הָתִיּוֹ in the first stichos. He had translated it as an imperative and still did consider this the only correct rendering.⁹ He ingeniously solved the problem by implying that the inhabitants of the country were ordered to carry (imperative!) water to the thirsty, after they had brought (past tense!) only food to them with the cruel intention of increasing their thirst (*ib.*): "ut quum Deus eis dixerit 'occurrentes sitiendi ferte aquam', illi inimica mente panes tulerint absque aquis, ut cibo auferent sitim." In his later Com. on this same verse he relies on his translation, apparently without checking it, and quotes freely (iv, 309): "...occurrere cum aqua et panibus...", and (*ib.*): "...vos autem aquas et panes offerite fugientibus."

Is. 6:10 MT: יבין ושב ורפא לו

G: συνῶσι και ἐπιστρέψωσι και ἰάσονται αὐτοῦς
(cp. Mt. 13:15; Jn. 12:40; Acts 28:27)

Sym.: συνη και επιστραφη και ιαθη

T: יסתכלון ויחובון וישתביק להון

S: ונסתכל בלבה ונתוב ונשתבק לה

V: intelligat et convertatur et sanem eum (*al.*: et sanetur)

As we have seen in the previous example, Jerome feels free to supply any def. grammatical pers. in his rendering of a Heb. participle. As regards finite forms of the Heb. verb he proceeds in a much more careful way. Consequently, it may be assumed that in the present instance he read רָפָא, equating it with the 1st pers.: "sanem". Here the possible influence of G and the NT quotations ought not to be overlooked, but neither should we overestimate it (note the change from plur. into sing. in this clause!). Jerome's explanatory remarks concur with MT (iv, 99): "...et conversi fuerint, et intellexerint, et sanati fuerint... si quis convertatur, eum posse sanari." Previously he had already given an *ad hoc* translation of our verse whose independence from the V rendition is proved by stylistic variations (iv, 97):

9 Cp. Gesenius-Buhl, *Hebr. und Aram. Handwörterbuch* (1915) 78: החי f. החי' הִיפְחִיל *hiph'il imp.*; Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* (revised by Cowley, 1910) § 76d: *hiph'il perf.*

ad hoc translation

ne forte videat oculis suis
 et auribus audiat
 et corde intelligat
 et convertatur
 et sanetur¹⁰

V

ne forte videat oculis suis
 et auribus suis audiat
 et corde suo intelligat
 et convertatur
 et sanem eum

This special translation was then accepted as *lemma* in the Com. (iv, 96) whence it slipped into a few MSS of V. But it seems that the original rendition mirrors a deviating vocalization, which is corrected in the Com. and the translation included therein.

Is. 48:8 MT: ופשע מבטן קרא לך

G: καὶ ἄνομος ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας κληθήσῃ (Sym. εκληθης)

Is-a: ופשע מבטן יקראו לך

T: ומרוד ממעיין יתקרי לך

S: ועולא מן כרסא אתקרית

V: et transgressorem ex utero vocavite

Whereas the other VSS prefer a pass. construction or an impersonal one, V renders the Heb. by means of the 1st pers. sing. One may safely assume an underlying reading קרא, and as in the previous example, the participle was referred to God. In the Com. we read (iv, 556): “Ab initio enim meorum praevaricator es mandatorum; et de ventre transgressorem vocavit te Deus, quando de Aegypto liberatus, quasi meo ventre conceptus es...” In the context all the time the 1st pers. sing. is employed; the sudden switch to the 3rd pers., exactly where the V text would warrant the continued use of the 1st, gives the impression that we are dealing with another correction towards the MT reading קרא or, more probably, towards the reading קרא.¹¹ This impersonal form may underly Is-a and T.

Is. 1:7 MT: זרים אכלים אתה ושממה כמהפכת זרים

G: καὶ ἠρήμωται κατεστραμμένη ὑπὸ λαῶν ἀλλοτριῶν

Is-a: זרים אכלים אתה ושממו עליה כמהפכת זרים

T: עממיא מחסנין יתה ובחוביכון צדיאת מנכון וגו'

S: אכלין לה נוכריא וצדיא איך הפיכתא דנוכריא

V: alieni devorant et desolabitur sicut in vastitate hostili

10 The indef. subj. ורפא is translated as a pass. form. Cp. C. Rabin, “Ancient Versions and Indefinite Subject”, *Textus* 2 (1962) 60–76.

11 In both cases, due to the conversion from pass. into act. or to the indefinite subj. respectively, a suitable subject had to be supplied.

V read a verbal form as did G, but the two VSS differ in many other details in this verse. Also Is-a gives evidence to fluctuations in the Heb. text. We may assume, then, that V read לְשִׁמְמָה . The translation of MT שְׁמָמָה , is found in the Com. *ad loc.* (iv, 16): "...et in tantam redacta est Terra repromissionis solitudinem, ut a leonibus vastaretur ...alieni devorant, et usque ad finem mundi perseverabit vastitas Judaeorum."¹²

- Is. 2:22 MT: $\text{בְּמָה נִחְשַׁב הוּא}$
 Aq.: $\text{εν τινη ελογισθη αυτος}$
 T: וכלמא חשיב הוא
 S: מטל דאיך מנא חשיב
 V: *excelsus reputatus est ipse*

V alone among the VSS, but paralleled by an old *al tigrê* variant, presupposes the reading בְּמָה .¹³ Jerome in his Com. accuses the Jews of tendentiously reading בְּמָה and changing the meaning of the verse, from "The Man (*i.e.*, Jesus) highly is he to be accounted" into "...wherein is he to be accounted". But he admits that linguistically both readings are possible (iv, 43/44): "Ubi nos diximus, 'excelsus reputatus est ipse'; Aquila interpretatus est, 'in quo reputatus est ipse'. Verbum Hebraicum BAMA, vel dicitur, id est, 'excelsum', vel certe 'in quo', et eisdem literis scribitur BETH, MEM, HE: ac pro locorum qualitate, si voluerimus legere 'in quo' dicimus BAMMA; sin autem 'excelsum' vel 'excelsus' legimus BAMA."¹⁴

Different Word Division

The *Vorlage* of V did not use *scriptio continua*. There can be no doubt about this, as Jerome himself testifies to the double form of the five letters כמנפץ which "have to be written differently according to whether they stand at the beginning or in the middle of the word or whether they stand at its end."¹⁵ In a

- 12 שְׁמָמָה is generally rendered by a noun, such as "solitudo", "desolatio", "desertum". Ez. 14:16 "desolabitur" stands for the combination: היה + שממה . Is. 62:4 and 64:10 "desolata (est)" for שְׁמָמָה , but Is-a has in both instances: שוממה .
- 13 Bab. Tal., Berakhot 14a; Sota 4b (אל תקרי במה אלא בְּמָה). The reading רמה is also possible (Ez. 16:31: רמה - "excelsum"), but less probable.
- 14 Another instance of a divergent vocalization, in the *lemma*, but not in the Commentary, corrected according to the MT, is the following: Is. 40:29 $\text{וְלֵאֵין אוֹנים עֲצֻמָה יִרְבֶּה}$
 V: "et his qui non sunt fortitudinem et robut multiplicat". V is based on a reading $\text{וְלֵאֵין אוֹנים (ו)עֲצֻמָה יִרְבֶּה}$ (cp. v, 23); and so is the Com. (iv, 494): "Qui videntur in saeculo esse quasi nihili, virtutem roburque multiplicat." But the *lemma* reads (*ib.*): "his qui non habent fortitudinem, robur multiplicat." (Cp. Sym.: $\text{και τοις αδυνατοις}$).
- 15 Hier. *Prologus Galeatus* (ix, 455-456): "Porro quinque literae duplices apud Hebraeos sunt, CAPH, MEM, NUN, PHE, SADE: aliter enim per has scribunt principia medietaesque verborum, aliter fines."

few cases his *Vorlage* divided words in a manner which differed from MT. The most famous of these is found in Is. 2:20 talpas — לחפרפרות (cp. Is-a) as against MT: לחפר פרות. In two instances in Isaiah the Com. appears to reveal that Jerome had become conscious of the divergent word-division which underlies his translation.

Is. 44:24 MT: [מאתי Q:] מיאתי

G: τίς ἕτερος

Aq.: τις συν εμοι

Is-a: מיא אתי

S: מני ולי

V: et nullus mecum

V's rendering is based on a word-division which underlies also G, Aq. and S, and is found in Is-a and in some Heb. MSS, with the difference that Jerome prefers, as he does quite often, the negative statement to a rhetoric question.¹⁶ In his Com. he feels obliged though, owing to theological considerations, to dwell on these words and reaches a double translation which reflects the older as well as the Massoretic reading (iv, 530): "nullus erat cum Deo, [מי אתי] praeter eum qui erat in eo". [מאתי]

Is. 54:9 MT: כִּי־מִי נח זאת לי אשר נשבעתי מעבר מִי־נח עוד על הארץ

MS. C: כימי ... מי נח

G: ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ ἐπὶ Noe τοῦτο μοί ἐστι καθότι ὄμοσα αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἐκείνῳ τῆ γῆ

Aq.: ως ημεραι νοε... υδατα νοε [Sym., Th.]

Is-a: כימי נח ... מי נח

T: כיומי נח ... מי טופנא דהורו כיומי נח

S: הדא איך יומתא ה' לי דנוח

V: sicut in diebus Noe istud mihi est cui juravi ne inducerem aquas Noe ultra super terram

V concurs with some Heb. MSS, Is-a and the other VSS (with the exception of G which is different altogether). In the Com. we read (iv, 632): "Quomodo universo orbe peccante, postquam corrupit omnis terra viam Domini, inductum est Diluvium: et cum auctoribus cunctis peccatorum, cuncta peccata deleta sunt: et in uno homine Noe humanum servatum est genus: cui juravi nequaquam terris inducendum esse Diluvium." This implies the reading כִּי־מִי נח ... מי נח (twice). That this is no coincidence may be gathered from his

16 E.g. Job 23:13 : מי ישיבנו — "nemo avertere".

further comment (iv, 633): “Quando Dei patientia expectabatur in diebus Noe, Diluuium impiis inferens.” Here, under the influence of a NT quotation (1 Petr. 3:20)¹⁷, he reverts to his earlier reading: **יְמֵי ... מֵי**.

Interchange of Consonants

In the following instances V seems to mirror a Heb. text that differed from MT in the interchange of a consonant or two. The use of a noun determined by a poss. suffix or alternatively of its indefinite form, in some cases may be due to scribal errors and abbreviation techniques, in others to original alternate readings in Heb. texts. This difference sometimes obtains between V and the Com.

- Is. 3:12 MT: מאשריך מתעים [= Is-a]
 G: οἱ μακαρίζοντες ὑμᾶς πλανῶσιν ὑμᾶς
 T: משבחך אטעיוך
 S: מטאבניך אטעיוך
 V: qui te beatum dicunt ipsi te decipiunt

Jerome possibly read מתעיוך (cp. T, S). In the Com. the indefinite plur. is employed (iv, 57): “peccatores in populo... beatos vocantes, et columnas Dei, et caetera quae solent adultores dicere.” However, it should be noted that the pers. suffix perhaps was omitted because of the rendition of the noun by a *nomen agentis* — “adultores”, which often is used to translate a Heb. participle. Thus, e.g., in a similar context V translates literally the Heb. מתעים by “seducetes” whereas the Com. renders it by the *nomen agentis* “seductores”.

- Is. 9:15 MT: מאשרי העם הזה מתעים
 V: qui beatificant populum istum seducentes
 Com.: qui enim beatum dicebant populum, seductores sunt (iv, 139).
 Is. 22:3 MT: כל נמצאך אסרו [= Is-a]
 G: καὶ οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἐν σοὶ
 T: כל דאשתכח בכך
 V: omnes qui inventi sunt vincti sunt

The omission of the pers. suffix may be due to stylistic considerations, but it also may mirror an alternate Heb. reading הנמצאים. The correction contained

¹⁷ “...quando expectabunt Dei patientiam in diebus Noe, cum fabricaretur arca: in qua pauci, id est octo animae saluae factae sunt per aquam.”

in the Com. in fact makes this quite probable (iv, 312): “Quod autem dicit juxta Hebraicum: ‘Omnes qui inventi sunt in te...’”¹⁸

Is. 26:11 MT: קנאת עם (= Is-a)
 G: ζήλος... λαόν
 T: סנאי עמך ... רשיעיא ... פורענות עמא
 V: zelantes populi

Perhaps this is a way of rendering an abstract noun. Thus “nobiles”, “fortes” and “sublimes” render גבורה, כבוד and שאון respectively (Is. 3:25; 5:13, 14). In trying to harmonize the V rendition with MT, Jerome comments (iv, 350): “Cui respondit Dominus: Videant magis et confundantur, vel zelus populi vel zelantes populi...” This correction, as some others, found its way into a few MSS of V.

	MT	G	Is-a	V
Is. 15:2	ודיבון	λεδηβων (λεδημων — and otherwise)	דיבון	Dibon
15:9	מי דימון מי דימון	ρεμμων ρεμμων Sym.: διμων	דיבון דיבון	Dibon Dibon

V has in all three instances “Dibon”. This deviation is often explained as deriving from Jerome’s tendency to render proper names in their prevalent form.¹⁹ This, a precarious generalization in itself, has become altogether unsatisfactory with the discovery of Is-a, which has the same uniform reading דיבון. It stands to reason that Jerome relied on a similar text. By the time he was composing his commentaries he had become acquainted with the divergent reading ‘Dimon’ (iv, 188): “Ne quis scriptoris vitium putet (apparently, the

18 As to the determination by def. art. as against by pers. suff. cp. Is. 1:31, p. 196. The opposite case, *i.e.*, the plur. ending converted into a pers. pron. is found in Is. 16:7 תהגו אך נכאים — “loquimini plagas suas (*al.*: ejus)”. Perhaps this was due to defective writing (נכאם = נכאם). In the Com. the pronoun is avoided (iv, 190): “...et plagas repentinae subversionis ostendit.”

19 W. Nowack (*op. cit.*, 21) says of Jerome: “diejenigen (nomina propria), die in mehreren Formen vorhanden sind, giebt er fast immer in der gebräuchlichsten wieder. Ganz deutlich zeigt sich dies Jes. 15, 9 ‘quia aquae Dibon’, cf. v. 2; im Commentar sagt er dazu: ‘usque hodie indifferenter Dimon et Dibon hoc oppidulum dicitur.’” Similarly, Kutschler, *op. cit.*, 76–77: בעל: שכן הירוגימוס, דימון. שכן הירוגימוס, בעל: אשר לוולגאטה אין כל ספק שגרסה דימון. שכן הירוגימוס, בעל: אשר לוולגאטה אין כל ספק שגרסה דימון. לא נמנע מלקבוע בוולגאטה את צורת הוולגאטה, אומר ברורות בפרושו... אעפ שגרס דימון, לא נמנע מלקבוע בוולגאטה את צורת דיבון — T reads as MT. S in all three instances “Ribon”.

fact that in the *lemma* figures 'Dimon' against V's 'Dibon'), et errore emendare dum vult, faciat, una urbs et per M et per B literam scribitur." Then follows a deft etymological explanation and equalization: "E quibus Dimon, 'silentium' interpretantur; Dibon, 'fluens'. Indito utroque nomine propter latices qui tacite fluant, usque hodie indifferenter et 'Dimon' et 'Dibon' hoc oppidulum dicitur." Also the later Com. explains both names etymologically (iv, 269).

Is. 14:19 MT: יורדי אל אבני בור
 G: εἰς ἄδου
 Aq.; Th.: ἐπι λιθους λακκου
 Sym.: ἐπι θεμελιους λακκου
 Is-a: יורדי אל אבני בור²⁰
 T: לגוב [אבני] בית אבדנא
 V: ad fundamenta laci

Did Jerome read in his Hebrew text *אל אבני בור*? The graphic confusion of ב-ד is well attested. But also an interchange אבני-אדני can be assumed in view of their semantic relationship in Job 38:6: על מה אדניה הטבעו או מי ירה: אבן פתנה. There V renders אדני(ה) "bases (illius)", a synonym of "fundamenta". In the present verse Jerome was influenced by one of his Greek predecessors. But would he have followed him if he had had in his text the simple word אבן? The *lemma* of his Com. brings the correction (iv, 255): "...qui descendunt ad lapides laci." Furtheron this diversity is explained (iv, 256): "Fundamenta autem laci, pro lapidibus laci, interpretatus est Symmachus, ut aliis verbis profundum et tartarum signifaret inferni."

Is. 16:4 MT: כלה שד [= Is-a]
 G: (*aliter*)
 T: אשתיצי כזוא [כזוא]
 S: וסף כזוא
 V: consummatus est miser

"Miser" for שד is very strange indeed. The context by no means suggests such a rendering. The preceding clause מפני שודד is translated "a facie vastatoris"; the following תמו רמס מן הארץ "defecit qui conculcabat terram". In both instances the Lat. terms stand for the oppressor and not for the victim of oppression. This is also the line Jerome takes in his first Com. (iv, 189): "Pro 'misero' in Hebraico legitur SOD, quod potest et 'vastator' intelligi." This time he read שד; the rather loose rendition certainly suits the context. What,

²⁰ Kutscher, *op. cit.*, 438, explains the peculiar writing of the Scrolls as a *lapsus calami*: ירד + בור is a frequent expression, whereas ירד + אבני בור occurs only in the present verse.

then, had induced him to translate “miser” in the first instance? It appears that he found in his *Vorlage* the consonants שדד (שדד reflected in T and S?) and read it as שדד (cp. Jud. 5:27: שדד – “miserabilis”). An ingenious combination of the two readings and their translation is found in the later Com. (iv, 270): “Et consummatus est miser, qui multus fecit miseros.”

Is. 13:17 MT: אשר כסף לא יחשבו וזהב לא יחפצו בו [Is-a: יחשוב]

G: οἱ οὐ λογιζονται ἀργύριον οὐδὲ χρυσίου χρεῖαν ἔχουσι

Aq.: οἱ ἀργύριον οὐ λογιζονται καὶ χρυσίον οὐκ εὐδοκῆσουσι

T: די בכסף לא מטפסין [מטקסין] וזהב לא מתרען ביה

V: qui argentum non quaerant nec aurum velint

It is difficult to explain “quaerant”. Is it that the *Vorlage* read in both stichoi יחפצו? “Quaerere” and “velle” in this case, would constitute a Lat. variation on the same Heb. verb. However, also divergent readings, such as יחפשו, יחשקו or, in accordance with the general use of “quaerere”, יבקשו cannot be ruled out.²¹ For the translation of a verbal form of $\sqrt{\text{חשב}}$ Jerome probably would have employed “reputare”. (Cp. Is. 2:22: נחשב — reputatus est; 33:8 53:3; 2 Chr. 9:20: למאומה... לחשב — pro nihilo reputabatur; and many others.) In fact, we do find a trace of this Latin word in Jerome’s comments on our verse (iv, 173): “Tantum autem scribit Medorum Persarumque saevitiam, ut ardore sanguinis effundendi, aurum argentumque contemnant, et oblatas opes pro luto reputent.”

Jerome testifies to the faulty pronunciation of the gutturals at his time as well as to his own acoustic memory as regards the Hebrew vocabulary when he equalises עפר and אפר (*Quaest. in Gen.*, 3:15: “...quod nos ‘favillam’ possumus dicere et ‘pulverem’ ”); or עורב/קרב and עורב (vi, 710: “quod secundum lectionis diversitatem vel ‘siccitas’, vel ‘gladius’, vel ‘corvus’ accipitur”). Therefore it is almost impossible to decide whether a given diversity is due to a scribal error in his *Vorlage* or to his misreading or mispronouncing a word.²²

Is. 17:10 MT: נטעי נעמנים [=Is-a]

G: φύτευμα ἄπιστον

Aq. Th.: φυτὰ εὐπρεπῆ

Sym.: φυτὰ καλά

T: נצבא בחירא

V: plantationem fidelem

21 As to the possible lack of variation cp. the instances given under the heading “Substitution of Words”, p. 202 f. For the root חשק cp. 1 Ki. 9:5 חשק אשר חפץ — “quod optaverat...et voluerat”.

22 Cp. Is. 17:8: ישעה — “inclinabitur” (based on שוח, שחח, ושחה). In the Com.: “...convertetur...”.

Jerome probably read **נאמנים** though his rendering may be explained as a protest against the Greek negative *ἄπιστος* which obviously had no roots in a Heb. *Vorlage*. In his Com. he feels compelled to defend his translation (iv, 283): "Miretur quispiam, cur pro plantationibus pulchris et bonis, quod Aquila, et Theodotio ac Symmachus interpretati sunt, nos 'fidelem plantationem' dixerimus. Verbum Hebraicum NEEMANIM, si per ALEPH literam scribatur, πιστοὺς id est 'fideles' sonat; si vero per AIN, et dicatur NEAMENIM, pulchram significat." But he does not state explicitly that he had employed a MS "per Aleph" while translating. The question remains if this indeed had been the case.

Is. 56:10 MT: **הזים**

G: ἐντυπιαζόμενοι

Aq.: φανταζόμενοι

Sym., Th.: οραματισταί

Is-a: **חזים**

T: **נימין**

S: **חזין**

V: videntes vana

In V the expression "videre vana" otherwise stands for **חזיה שוא**.²³ In the present instance it may be a translation of the *hap. leg.*, or else a conflation of the alternative readings **חזים, הזים**.²⁴ While writing his Com. Jerome probably had before him a MS which read **חזים** (cp. many MSS and Is-a) and thus was at a loss how to explain the additional word "vana" in V. Therefore he omits it in his remarks (iv, 662): "Sed illi speculatores non erant caeci. Denique appellabantur videntes. Isti autem de quibus Propheta nunc loquitur, non solum speculatores caeci, sed et canes muti appellantur, non valentes latrare."

Interchange of Plural and Singular

Not every conversion of a MT plur. into a Latin sing. points to a divergent reading; a conversion is often conditioned by the different structure of the two languages.²⁵ A comparison with other VSS and a careful analysis of

23 Cp. Ez. 22:28: **חזים שוא** — videntes vana; also *ib.* 13:6, 9.

24 Perhaps also the explanation of *Thopheth* (Is. 30:33) in the Com. as "spatiosa et lata gehenna" rests on the double reading **תפתה** (MT) and **תפתח** (Is-a).

25 Thus "tenebrae" (plur.) stands for **חשך, חשכה, חשך** as well as for **מחשכים** (Ps. 143:3). Is. 42:16 V: "ponam tenebras" neither confirms nor refutes the Massoretic **אשים מחשך** against Is-a: **אשים מחשכים**. Another instance: The plur. form of the Hebrew verb in expressions of reciprocity (e.g. Is. 13:7, 14) is always rendered by a Latin singular.

Jerome's usage often enable us to distinguish between reading and rendering. When a corrective tendency in his Com. can be noted, it seems to prove that Jerome was dissatisfied with the discrepancy between his translation and the Heb. text-form he had before him at that time. His translation should, in this case, not be attributed to his working manner but to a deviant *Vorlage*.

- Is. 8:18 MT: נתן לי ה' לאותות ולמופתים
 G: ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός και ἔσται εἰς σημεῖα και τέρατα
 Aq.: ἔδωκεν μοι κυριος εἰς σημεια και εἰς τερατα [Sym., Th.]
 Is-a: נתן לי ה' לאות ולמופת
 T: דיהב לי ה'... אתין ומופתין
 S: דיהב לי מריא לאתא ולתדמורתא
 V: dedit mihi Dominus in signum et in portentum

Whereas other VSS concur with the plur. nouns of the MT, V has the sing. (cp. S). As against this we should note the usually consistent concurrence of V with MT in the rendition of: אַתּוֹת וּמוֹפְתִים “signa et portenta” (e.g. Jer. 32: 20, 21), against אֹת וּמוֹפֵת “signum et portentum” (e.g. Is. 20:3). Thus V's deviation from MT in the case under review hardly can be explained as merely a loose translation. Moreover, Is-a supports V and suggests what its *Vorlage* may have been like. But in the Com. we read (iv, 125): “Isti autem pueri, id est prophetae, in signa dati sunt et in portenta.” These are plur. forms echoing MT.

- Is. 53:12 MT: והוא חטא רבים נשא
 G: και αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε
 Sym.: αὐτος δε αμαρτιας πολλων ανελαβε
 Is-a(-b): והוא חטאי רבים נשא
 T: והוא על חובין סגיאין יבעי
 S: והו חטהא דסגיאא שקל
 V: et ipse peccata multorum tulit

The plur. of V for the Heb. sing. of the key-word is found in both Qumran Scrolls²⁶ and in all VSS. It is also used by Jerome in his christological remarks (iv, 624): “Peccata enim nostra portavit in corpore suo...” Therefore it is the more interesting that he prefaces those remarks with a paraphrastic rendering of our verse which mirrors the sing. of the MT (*ib.*); “Christus cum iniquis reputatus sit, ut iniquos redimeret a peccato...”

26 In the fragmentary Qumran Scroll of Isaiah (Is-b) it is just the י of the word in question that is preserved: [י רבים נשא]. Cp. ארצר המגילות הגנוזות (Jerusalem 1954) plate x.

Is. 22:18 MT: וְשָׁמָּה מִרְפָּבוֹת כְּבוֹדֶךָ
 G: καὶ θήσει τὸ ἄρμα σου τὸ καλὸν
 T: ולחמן רתיכי יקרך
 V: et ibi erit currus
 Com.: et ibi erunt currus gloriae tuae (iv, 225)

Is. 26:19 MT: טל אורח טלך
 G: (al.)
 T: ארי טל ניהור טלך
 V: ros lucis ros tuus
 Com. lemma: ros luminum ros tuum (iv, 356)
 Com.: ros erit luminum plurimorum quod Hebraice dicitur
 OROTH

In both these cases Jerome had based his translation on the defective spelling in his *Vorlage* which he read as fem. sing. His explanatory remarks reveal acquaintance with our reading and/or *scriptio plena*.

Is. 19:20 MT: מפני לחצים [=Is-a]
 G: διὰ τοὺς θλίβοντας αὐτοῦς
 T: מן קדם דחקהון
 S: מן קדם אלוצא
 V: a facie tribulantis

The Latin translator probably read לַחֲץ (= S). Perhaps the same consonantal combination, pronounced לַחֲץ, is reflected in Jerome's earlier Com. (iv, 208/209): "quum persecutionis tempus ingruerit, implorabunt Domini misericordiam, statimque Salvator adveniet..." In his second exegetical work he combines this reading with that of V (iv, 297): "Quumque persecutio creverit a facie tribulantium nominis Christiani..."²⁷

Is. 3:10 MT: פרי מעלליהם יאכלו [=Is-a]
 G: τὰ γενήματα τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν φάγονται
 Aq.: καρπους επιτηδευματων αυτων φαγονται [Sym., Th.]
 T: ארי פירי עובדיהון ישתלמון
 S: פארי עבדיהון נאכלון
 V: fructum adinventionum suarum comedet

V alone has the verb in the sing. This, indeed, is corrected already in the *lemma* of the Com. which substitutes "comederunt" for it (iv, 56). Jerome there explains first the Heb. then the G text using in both instances the plur. form,

²⁷ Jer. 30:20: לחציו — "qui tribulant" (plur.); Lam. 1:5: לפני צר — ante faciem tribulantis (sing.); 1 Ki. 20:27: לחם לחץ — pane tribulationis.

“comederunt” and “comedent” respectively: “Juxta Hebraicum et caeteros Interpretes hunc sensum habet: Vae illis quia sua scelerat receperunt... impii labores manuum suarum comederunt.” And then: “Juxta LXX autem interpretes... fructus operum suorum comedant.” Where, then, does the sing. “comedet”, to which all MSS of the V testify, come from? The *Vorlage* probably read יֹאכֵל, whether this be a scribal error or a variant based on the Midrashic interpretation: the “just man” would eat (sing.) the fruits of their (plur.), the “wicked ones”, deeds. In the Com. the variant is corrected.

Changes in the Grammatical Person

Many are the fluctuations in MT and VSS as regards the employment of the 1st as against the 3rd pers. sing. It is not our intention here to analyse their causes, whether they are phonetic, graphic or logic. But we shall try to demonstrate how these changes are reflected in V and Jerome's Com.

Is. 48:11 MT: למעני אעשה כי איך יהל

G: ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ ποιήσω σοι ὅτι τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα βεβηλοῦται

Is-a: למעני אעשה כי איך איהל

T: בדיל שמי בדיל מימרי אעביד דלא יתהל [אתהל]

S: מטלתי אעבד דלא אחטוש

V: propter me faciam ut non blasphemem

The Latin translator had before him אהל, 1st pers. sing. (cp. S and one MS of T). This reading may be traced in Is-a if איהל is taken as a conflation of אהל (V, S) with יהל (MT); however, it also could be merely a graphic representation of איהל (as against אהל, active).²⁸ Anyhow, Is-a parallels V, partly or wholly. In his Com. on the other hand, Jerome offers a different, slightly paraphrastic, translation (iv, 556): “Propter me ergo faciam, ne blasphemetur nomen meum in gentibus...”. That this is not just a Latin rendition of G is sufficiently proved by the changed order of words, the explanatory addition “in gentibus”, and last not least, by Jerome's actual translation of G (*ib.*): “...propter me faciam, quia nomen meum polluitur.” The Com. gives the impression that a Heb. text, identical with MT, but different from the one on which V was based, necessitated the new rendering “blasphemetur” (= יהל) which on its part, and in accord with exegetical practice, required the provision of a subject — nomen meum (cp. Qimḥi: איך יהיה מחולל שמי and Rashi: (איך יחולל שמי).

28 Cp. M. Goshen-Gottstein, *Biblica* 35 (1954) 61. Y. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, 182, suggests an interchange of the roots $\sqrt{\text{חל}}-\sqrt{\text{חל}}$, thus איהל = איהל. For אהל *hiph.* cp. Ez. 39:7; for אהל *ib.* 22:26.

- Is. 14:30 MT: והמתי ברעב שרשך ושאריתך יהרג
 G: ἀνελεῖ δὲ λιμῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὸ κατάλειμμα σου ἀνελεῖ
 Is-a: והמתי ברעב שרשך ושאריתך אהרוג
 T: וימות [וימית] בכפנא בנך ושאר עמך יקטיל [יקטול]
 S: ואמית עקרכי בכפנא ודמשחיר מנכי נחקטל
 V: interire faciam in fame radicem tuam et reliquias tuas interficiam

The use of the 1st pers. sing. in the final clause could be viewed as just another case of harmonization of two different verbal forms in the same sentence. Yet the fact that G and T read the 3rd pers. and Is-a the 1st pers. in both instances, poses the question whether it is not MT that reflects a compromise between two consequent text-forms. Jerome's *Vorlage*, then, would have been similar to that of Is-a. Now, in his first Com. we read (iv, 183): "...siccetur radix Philisthiim, et omnes reliquiae consumentur"; in the later one he explains (iv, 263): "famem perpetuam sustinebunt... omnes eorum reliquiae intereant." This conversion to the 3rd pers. ("consumetur" = יהרג, understood as יִהָרַג = S) seems to follow naturally from the employment of indirect speech. But also the reverse can be argued, namely that the employment of indirect speech instead of the frequent opening formula "Dominus dicit...", arises from the use of the 3rd pers. sing., as found in MT. The next example in fact confirms this supposition.

- Is. 51:19 MT: מי ינוד לך השד והשבר והרעב והחרב מי אנהמך
 G: τίς σοι συλλυπηθήσεται... τίς σε παρακαλέσει
 Sym.: τις λυπηθησεται σοι... τις παρηγορησει σε
 Is-a: מי ינוד לך ... מי ינחמך
 T: דינחמניך אלהין אנא
 S: מן נביאכי ...
 V: quis contristabitur super te... consolabitur te

Here all VSS have the 3rd pers. sing. after the interrogative מי, thus avoiding the syntactical difficulty inherent in MT. Is-a proves that also some Heb. MSS preferred this easier reading. We may assume that on such a reading Jerome based his rendition. But in the Com. MT is echoed (iv, 597): "...vastitatem sequitur contritio: famem et gladium interitus... bonum est ei sua sentire supplicia, et audire Dominum dicentem: Quum ira furoris mei transierit, rursum curabo." The opening "Dominus dicens" was introduced so that the verb could be quoted in the same grammatical pers. that is found in MT.

- Is. 7:14 MT: וְקָרְאתָ שְׁמוֹ עִמָּנוּ אֵל
 G: καὶ καλέσεις... [= Aq., Sym., Th.]
 G^{MSS}: καὶ καλέσει... καὶ καλεσουσιν...
 Is-a: וְקָרְא שְׁמוֹ עִמָּנוּ אֵל
 T: וְתִקְרִי שְׁמִיָּה
 S: וְנִתְקַרְא שְׁמָה
 V: et vocabitur nomen ejus Emmanuel [MSS: vocabitis; vocabis]

Of the variants found in MSS of V, “et vocabitur” (= S) obviously is to be preferred. The other two forms intruded from easily traceable sources: “vocabitis” is found in VL; “vocabis” is a correction according to Jerome’s Com.²⁹ Now, “vocabitur” concurs with Is-a, whether וְקָרְא or וְקָרְא (understood either וְקָרְא or וְקָרְא) is read; the Lat. pass. form stands for the Heb. pass. as well as for the imper. form. In the Com. Jerome justifies his preference for the apparently recent form (iv, 110): “Quodque sequitur: ‘Et vocabis nomen ejus Emmanuel, et LXX et tres reliqui similiter transtulerunt, pro quo in Matthaeo scriptum est ‘vocabunt’: quod in Hebraeo non habetur. ...Verbum CARATHI, quod omnes interpretati sunt ‘vocabis’, potest intelligi et ‘vocabit’.”³⁰

- Is. 26:3, 4 MT: כִּי בְּכַף בָּטוּחַ בָּטוּחַ בָּטוּחַ בָּה'
 G: ὅτι ἐπὶ σοὶ [MSS: + ἐλπιδί] ἠέλιον [MSS: ἠέλιον] [MSS: ἠέλιον] [MSS: ἠέλιον]
 Aq.: οτι επ αυτω πεποιθασαι [Th.: + ἐλπιδί]
 Is-a: כִּי בְּכַף בָּטוּחַ בָּה'
 T: אֲרִי בְּמִימְרֵךְ אֲתַרְחִיצוּ אֲתַרְחִיצוּ עַל מִימְרֵךְ דָּה'
 S: מִטַּל דְּבַךְ סִבְרֵן מְרִיא
 V: quia in te speravimus sperastis in Domino

The abundance of variants in the VSS points to an uncertain text transmission. V does not adhere fully to any known Heb. MS nor to any one of the VSS. Moreover, it should be stressed that the context militates against a change from the imper. to the perf. tense. (v. 2 פְּתוּחוּ = aperite, imp.). Thus a guess at the reading which Jerome found in his *Vorlage* may be permitted: He probably read בָּטוּחַ (cp. additions in MSS of G) as the first verb and felt free

²⁹ Cp. G.B. Gray, *Isaiah* (ICC 1912) 127.

³⁰ It is not easy to decide what Hebrew word the transliteration CARATHI stands for. It might represent the 2nd pers. fem., as against CARATHA — masc. (Jer. 3:12). Cp. A. Sperber, “Hebrew Based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations”, *HUCA* 12–13 (1937–38) 124, 156, 256; K. Siegfried, “Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus”, *ZAW* (1884). In his letter to Pammachius (I, 310), written ca. 395, Jerome writes: “Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium, et vocabit nomen eius Emmanuel. ...vocabit, inquit, ipsa quae concipiet, ipsa virgo quae pariet.” —

to supply a person to the inf. absolute, as he often does;³¹ and perhaps had as the second verb **וְהִבְטִחוּ** (v). In the Com. he tried to smooth out the discrepancy (iv, 345): “Post populi verba et responsionem Domini, et rursum vocem populi Propheta loquitur ad credentes: Sperastis vel sperate in Domino, in saeculis sempiternis, et caetera quae sequuntur.”³²

Changes in the Grammatical Structure

Is. 42:2 MT: **וְלֹא יִשְׁמָע בְּחוּץ קוֹלוֹ** [=Is-a]

G: οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνῆ αὐτοῦ

V: nec audietur foris vox ejus

Mt xii, 19: οὐδε ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ

V (*ib.*): neque audiet aliquis in plateis vocem ejus

V differs considerably from the Latin NT quotation (despite the christological connotation of this verse). It is similar, but not wholly dependent on G to Is. (cp. the rendering of the foregoing word **יִשָּׂא** – “accipiet personam”³³, as against ἀνήσει). It appears that the defective writing of **יִשְׁמָע** resulted in the Latin rendition “audietur”. Whether Jerome read **יִשְׁמָע** (*niph'al*) or **יִשְׁמַע** (*qal*, with indefinite subject) cannot be decided; both forms may be rendered by a Latin pass. form. Yet the Com. states (iv, 507): “‘Nec audietur foris vox ejus’, neque enim extra Galilaeam atque Judaeam in aliis gentibus Evangelium praedicavit.” This, undoubtedly, translates the MT **יִשְׁמָע**.³⁴

Is. 26:10 MT: **יִתֵּן רָשַׁע**

G: πέπαιται γὰρ ὁ ἀσεβής

Aq., Th.: ἠλεηθη ασεβης

Sym.: εδωρηθη ασεβης

T: יהבתא להון ארכא לרשיעיא

V: misereamur impio

31 *E.g.* Is. 22:13 **אָכַל בֶּשֶׂר וְשָׁתוּ יַיִן אָכּוּל וְשָׁתוּ כִּי מָחָר נִמּוֹת** – comedere carnes et bibere vinum comedamus et bibamus cras enim moriemur. Yet the additional evidence of some Greek MSS and MT points to a Hebrew **בִּטְחוּ** and permits us to assume the same *Vorlage* for V.

32 Also cp. Is. 59:4 MT: **בִּטְחוּ עַל תְּהוֹ** Is-a-b: **בִּטְחוּ** (cp. G)
V: confidunt

33 Based on an equalization: **יִשָּׂא = פָּנִים**; cp. Deut. 10:17: **לֹא יִשָּׂא פָּנִים** – “qui personam non accipit”. The Com. offers a different equalization: **יִשָּׂא קוֹלוֹ = יִשָּׂא**, explaining (iv, 507): “non accipiet personam in iudicio, sive non levabit, subauditur, in altum vocem suam.”

34 Cp. Is. 52:7 **מְשִׁיעַ שְׁלוֹם** – praedicantis pacem...
מְשִׁיעַ יְשׁוּעָה – praedicantis salutem

For the MT 3rd pers. sing. pass., Jerome found a perfect Latin translation in his Com. (iv, 349): "...magis impius misericordiam consequatur." (Cp. Prov. 28:13 יִרְחֵם – misericordiam consequatur.) We must explain, then, the divergence in V. It stands to reason that Jerome had in his *Vorlage* בָּתַן, which actually stood for בָּתַן (niph'al), a proper equivalent for יָחַן. Yet he read it בָּתַן (*gal*) and translated accordingly.

Is. 44:2 MT: עֲשֵׂךְ וַיִּצְרַךְ מִבֶּטֶן יַעֲזֹרְךָ
 Sym.: εκ κοιλιας ετι βοηθων σοι
 Is-a: עוזרכה
 T: יסעדינך
 V: faciens et formans te ab utero auxiliator tuus

Jerome uses the *nomen agentis* as the translation of a Heb. noun or, very often, of a Heb. participle (cp. Sym.) but not as the equivalent of a definite verbal form. In the present verse one can safely assume that he translated a text parallel to that of Is-a. The Com., on the other hand, echoes the MT verb (iv, 524): "...factor et formator tuus qui ab utero auxiliatus est tui."

Translation of Pronominal Suffixes

In V a certain liberty in the rendition, or even omission of pronouns and pronominal suffixes is to be noted. Especially the same pronoun, or suffix, repeated several times in the Heb. text, is liable to be translated only once.³⁵ Even in this detail the Latin version of Isaiah and the Prophets in general is much more faithful to the original than, e.g., that of the Pentateuch. After a thorough study of Jerome's manner of translating, viewed against the background of other VSS we may reach some conclusions as regards Heb. deviant readings on which V renderings possibly were based.

Is. 1:31 MT: וְהָיָה הַחֶסֶן לְנִעֲרָה וּפְעֵלוֹ לְנִיצוֹץ
 G: και ἔσται ἡ ἰσχυς αὐτῶν... και αἱ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν...
 Is-a: וְהָיָה הַחֲסוֹנִים לְנִעֲרָה וּפְעֵלֵיכֶם לְנִיצוֹץ
 T: וְיִהְיֶה תוֹקְפָהוֹן דְּרִשִׁיעִיא כְּנִעֲוֹרָתָא וְעוֹבְדֵי יְדֵהוֹן כְּנִיצוֹץ נֹרָא
 S: וְנִהוּא עוֹשְׁנֵהוֹן לְסִרְקָתָא וְעַבְדֵי הוֹן לְבַלְצוֹצִיתָא
 V: fortitudo vestra ut favilla stuppae et opus vestrum quasi scintilla

In the passage preceding our verse we find a somewhat harsh transition from the 3rd to the 2nd pers. plur. In MT it occurs in v. 29, but most VSS retroject it into v. 28 or transfer it to v. 30:

³⁵ Cp. Is. 41:12, 16; W. Nowack, *op. cit.*, 19.

v.	MT	G	T	V
28	יכלו (3)	συντελεσθήσονται (3)	ישתיצון (3)	consumentur (3)
29	יבשו (3)	καταισχυνθήσονται (3)	תתבהתון (2)	confundentur (3)
	חמדתם (2)	ἠβούλοντο (3)	חמדתון (2)	sacrificaverunt(3)
	תחפרו (2)	ἐπισχύνθησαν (3)	תתכנעון (2)	erubescetis (2)
	בחרתם (2)	ἐπεθύμησαν (3)	אתון מסתייעין (2)	elegeratis (2)
30	תהיו (2)	ἔσονται (3)	תהון (2)	cum fueritis (2)

This is the background against which must be judged the textual tradition in v. 31. It appears that the Heb. MSS showed some fluctuation in the employment of the suffixed pers. pron., as may be learned from the reading of Is-a. G continues with the 3rd pers. plur., this reading being strengthened by T's switching back from the 2nd (vv. 29–30) to the 3rd pers. plur. (as in v. 28). Also V exhibits the 2nd pers. plur. pron. suffix. Although this is in line with the preceding verse, it is reasonable to assume that the translation mirrors a Heb. *Vorlage* similar to Is-a. The Com. (iv, 29/30) avoids using the pers. pron. which appears in V, but is absent from MT: "Omnis igitur fortitudo et superbia peccatorum et sceleratorum Israel, qui dereliquerunt Dominum et idcirco consumti sunt..." It then continues: "Sequitur enim: 'et opus ejus', id est fortitudinis vestrae, sive idolatriae, in qua erraveratis, parvula scintilla consumet." Thus the reading of MT is declared to mean the same as the translation of V. It appears that this rendering was made anew from a Heb. text, but Jerome omits to state whether this *Vorlage* differed from the one he had before him when he translated the first time. In the case discussed Is-a appears to contain a conflation of two alternative readings: חסון and חסונם. Instances of such a combined reading are found in the MT and tend to prove that determination by means of the def. art. was considered interchangeable with determination by means of a pron. suf.³⁶ With regard to V, the problem is more complex: The Latin translator, who did not have at his disposal a def. art., occasionally used the pers. pron. attached to a Latin noun as an equivalent for a Heb. noun determined by an art. This, at least, is our impression. Yet in such cases, some doubt as to the underlying Heb. text remains, especially when the Com. corrects the text by omitting the pron.

Is. 8:18 MT: הנה אנכי והילדים אשר נתן לי ה'
 G: ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδιά ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός
 οἱ λ': ἰδου εγω και τα παιδια μου α μοι³⁷

³⁶ Cp. S. Talmon, "Double Readings in the MT", *Textus* 1 (1960) 178.

³⁷ According to Eusebius this is the text of οἱ λοιποί. Procopius Gazaetus gives it, omitting the poss. pronoun, as the rendering of Aq., Sym. and Th.

V: ecce ego et pueri mei quos dedit mihi Dominus³⁸
 Com. (iv, 125): non solum ego, sed et pueri quos mihi dedit Dominus

Is. 18:5 MT: וּכְרַת הַזְּלִזִּים בַּמְזֻמְרוֹת
 G: καὶ ἀφελεῖ τὰ βοτρύδια τὰ μικρὰ τοῖς δρέπανοις
 Aq.: και εκκοψει τα εκβρασματα [αυτης]...
 Sym.: και αποκοπησεται τα ευτελη αυτης...
 V: et praecidentur ramusculi ejus falcibus
 Com. (iv, 200): ...quasi rami inutiles falcibus praecidentur
 (iv, 287): Ramusculi autem, qui inutiles sunt, falcibus praecidentur

Is. 40:26 MT: מְרַב אֹנִיּוֹת וְאַמִּיץ כַּח
 G: ἀπὸ πολλῆς δόξης καὶ ἐν κράτει ἰσχύος
 Sym., Th.: πληθους δυναμεως και κρατους ισχυος
 Is-a: מְרַב אֹנִיּוֹת וְאַמִּץ כּוּחוֹ
 T: מסגי גבור ותקיף [ותקרף] חיל
 S: בסוגאא דאיקרה ובעושנא דחילה
 V: prae multitudine fortitudinis et roboris virtutisque ejus

G, S and T apparently had in their *Vorlage* a defec. writing (as in Is-a) which they read as אַמִּץ. So did Jerome, and therefore he renders this and the following word as if in apposition: “roboris virtutisque”. Then he adds a pers. pron. to כַּח which also is found in Is-a. Yet again the exegetical remark (iv, 492): “Magnitudo enim fortitudinis Dei suo facit ordine cuncta servire”, breaks off before the divergence from MT becomes apparent. Instead it supplies in the continuation what appears to be a paraphrase of אַמִּץ כַּח, “Deus”. But now comes a most amazing addition in which he refers to the G rendering (*ib.*): “Sive juxta Septuaginta a multitudine gloriae et potentiae virtutis ejus...” But he had translated G quite differently in the *lemma* (iv, 490): “...a multa gloria et in robore fortitudinis...”, and this translation indeed concurs with the Greek text which we have before us.³⁹ Jerome appears to have attributed his own divergent translation to the influence of G. He never reckons with a possible variant in the Heb. text. His compromise translation harmonizes the V version with the Greek.

38 Some MSS, among them the famous Amiatinus, omit the poss. pron. “mei”. Yet this seems to be an attempt at harmonization with the Com. (or, possibly, with the Heb.).

39 One Greek MS (87 of the Catena) and the Sahidic translation support Jerome’s addition of the poss. pron.

Prefixed Prepositions

V sometimes mirrors a prefixed preposition which differs from the Heb. text. The same may often be observed in other VSS, and occasionally also in Heb. MSS. Our present purpose is to find out whether, and if how, these variants are reflected in Jerome's Com.

- Is. 40:17 MT: כל הגוים כאין נגדו מאפס ותהו נחשבו לו
 G: ...ὧς [εἰς] οὐδέν εἶσι καὶ εἰς [ὧς] οὐθὲν ἐλογίσθησαν
 Is-a: כאין נגדו וכאפס ותהו נחשבו לו...
 T: כלמא עובדיהון גמירא ושיצאה אינון חשיבין קדמוהי...
 S: לא איך לא מדם חשיבין לה לאבדנא ולחרבא חשיבין לה
 V: quasi non sint sic sunt coram eo et quasi nihilum et inane reputatae sunt

The variants in G indicate that the Heb. text was not stable as far as the prefixed prepositions are concerned. Is-a provided definite proof of the existence of divergent Heb. readings. V reflects a Heb. text akin to Is-a. In the Com. we find a quotation which is based on V, and then a wording that is closer to MT (iv, 488): "...ita universa gentium multitudo supernis ministeriis comparata et Angelorum multitudini, pro nihilo ducitur." And further on: "Si autem omnes gentes sic sunt in conspectu illius quasi non sint, et quasi nihil et inane reputantur (in omnibus autem gentibus et Israel est) ergo et ipse sic est quasi non sit et in nihili atque inane reputatur."⁴⁰

- Is. 57:15 MT: מרום וקדוש אשכון
 G: ὑψιστος ἐν ἁγίοις ἀναπαύομενος
 Is-a: במרום ובקדוש ישכון
 T: ברומא שרי וקדישא שכינתיה
 S: מרימא וקדיש משריה
 V: in excelso et in sancto habitans

V reflects a Heb. text similar to Is-a. The Greek rendition which is apparently based on מרום בקדוש ישכון represents an intermediate reading between V, Is-a and MT. So does T. There, however, the preposition is prefixed to the alternate noun (קדישא... ברומא). In the Com. we read (iv, 678/679): "Haec enim dicit Dominus excelsus atque sublimis, qui habitat in excelsis, et Sanctus in Sanctis... excelsus habitat in excelsis, ...sanctus in sanctis." True, here may be felt a strong influence of G which contains in this verse

40 Both "pro" and "in" occasionally render the preposition מן (Is. 28:7: תעו מן השכר - erraverunt in ebrietate; 40:26: מרב אונים - "prae multitudine fortitudinis"). Here they also may reflect, as does S, a prepositional ל.

the elements ὁ ὑψιστος ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς and ἅγιος ἐν ἁγίοις. But Jerome did not base his homiletical remarks on the extremely repetitive Greek text, as might have been supposed. The opening words (“excelsus atque sublimis”) are taken from his V rendering, based on the Heb. Why, then, does he switch to the “sanctus in sanctis” formula of G? We are inclined to assume that he saw in it the harmonizing combination of מרום and במרום; קדוש and בקודש which reconciled MT with his Lat. rendering of a divergent Heb. text. The relative clause “dicit Dominus..., qui habitat etc.” could be an attempt to smooth over the discrepancy ישכון/אשכון.

- Is. 21:3 MT: נעויתי משמע נבהלתי מראות [= Is-a]
 G: ἠδίκησα τὸ μὴ ἀκοῦσαι ἐσπούδασα τὸ μὴ βλέπειν
 T: איטפשו מלמשמע טעו מלמחוי
 S: זעת דלא אשמע ואתדלחת דלא אחזא
 V: corruī cum audirem conturbatus sum cum viderem

The prepositional מ before an infin. constr. is generally translated by the Lat. particle “ne...” (which here would parallel the G and S renderings). The form “cum + subjunctive”, on the other hand, is the standard rendering of the prepositional ב.⁴¹ Thus one is inclined to assume the existence of a variant Heb. reading: בראות... בשמע. Indeed, in his earlier Com. Jerome hints at the reading with the negative particle (iv, 214): “sed conturbatus et trepidus, et in terram corruens, caligantibus oculis nesciat quid loquatur.” In the later Com. he demonstrates how he would have translated the prepositional מ if it is not taken as a negative particle (iv, 303): “Prae auditu et visione durissima...” (cp. Eccl. 1:8; auditu משמע [ולא תמלא און]). A parallel interpretation is found in Qimḥi’s commentary: משמע הפרענות, כל שכן כשאר אנה...

- Is. 48:10 MT: צרפתוך ולא בכסף [= Is-a]
 G: πέπρακά σε οὐχ ἕνεκεν ἀργυρίου
 T: צרפתוך ולא בכסף
 S: צרפתוך ולא בכספא
 V: excoxi te sed non quasi argentum

The *Vorlage* of V probably had כסף. Against this assumption it might be argued that Jerome occasionally inserts words, such as “quasi”, “sicut” or “velut”, if he deems them necessary to bring in relief the sense of a clause.

41 Some isolated exceptions are: Hag. 2:16: ... מהיותם בא אל ערמת עשרים – “cum accederetis...”; Is. 49:6: נקל מהיות – “...ut sis”. As to the prefixed ל of an inf. constr. cp. Is. 1:12, MT: רמס, Is-a: לרמוס, V: “ut ambularetis”, points to the Is-a reading (cp. S, Sym.). In his Com. Jerome bases himself on the Greek πατέiv and translates “calcare”; but this is also closer to MT.

In our verse, at first sight, this seems to be the case (cp. Rashi and Qimḥi: **לא כצרך כסף**). But on closer inspection it becomes clear that it would have been perfectly satisfactory, and in accord with Jerome's practice, to translate, even in this context: **בכסף** "(in) argento". *Psalt. gallic.* has (57:31): "...qui probati sunt argento." The Com. at first paraphrases but then reverts to a Heb. reading **בכסף**, and demonstrates the elegant ease with which this can be interpreted (iv, 556): "'Ecce excoxi te', id est probavi, quomodo conflatur argentum. Sive non in divitiis, sed in fornace paupertatis probare te volui."

Is. 55:13 MT: **והיה לה' לשם לאות עולם**

G: *καὶ ἔσται κυρίῳ [κύριος] εἰς ὄνομα καὶ εἰς σημεῖον αἰώνιον*

Is-a: **והיה לה' לאות ולשם עולם**

T: **ויהי קדם ה' לשום לאת [לאת לשום] עולם**

V: *et erit Dominus nominatus in signum aeternum*

V's use of the nom. "Dominus", (which may parallel G, *vide ed. Ziegler*) as against the dat. of MT, certainly improves the syntactical structure of the sentence. The possibility that this is an attempt on the part of the translator to straighten out a cumbersome reading, must be discussed in conjunction with the rendition of **לשם** by the relatively rare verbal form "nominatus", and with a view to the fact that the third Heb. dat. **לאות** received a different treatment (in contrast to the parallel translation of **לשם** and **לאות** in G). It appears that these two expressions did not share the same preposition in the text which Jerome had before him. He probably read **והיה לה' שם לאות** and rendered it as he thought fit (cp. 2 Sam. 23:18: **ולוי שם בשלושה** – *nominatus inter tres*. Similarly, *ib. v. 22*). In the Com. Jerome does not quote his V translation but rather the Lat. rendering of the Greek as he had given it in the *lemma* (iv, 652): "Sequitur: 'Et erit Dominus in nomen et in signum sempiternum, quod non deficiet'" (iv, 654). He must have felt that this was closer to the Heb. text he was reading at that time. Moreover, in his exegesis he tries to link the two (*ib.*): "His qui de malo commutati fuerint in bonum erit Dominus in nomen et in signum aeternum..."

Is. 14:17 MT: **שם תבל כמדבר** [= Is-a]

G: *ὁ θεὸς τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην ἔρημον*

T: **שוי תבל כמדברא**

V: *qui posuit orbem desertum*

Jerome was aware of the divergence between V and the Heb. text on which he relied while writing his Com. He perhaps considered this divergence to result from the influence of G on the former, stating (iv, 254): "Sequitur: 'Qui

posuit orbem terrarum desertum', sive ut juxta Hebraicum, praeter LXX omnes alii transtulerunt, 'quasi desertum'." However, it is obvious that he did not translate here the Greek text, since he gives no equivalent for ὄλην. Taking into account all the other instances where in contrast to the case under review, כמדבר is pedantically rendered "sicut (or 'velut') desertum" we cannot help assuming that here the V rendition is based on a reading שם תבל מדבר.⁴²

Substitution of Words

The substitution of words is a well known phenomenon in every textual tradition. Sometimes it is the wish to introduce variation, or on the contrary to abstain from it, that may cause a change (cp. 2 Sam. 22:1: מכף כל איביו ומכף (מכף כל איביו ומיד שאול) against Ps. 18:1: שאול). At other times it is some word in the wider context that has influenced the text. This is the case in our first example:

Is. 49:24 MT: אם משבי צדיק ימלט

G: καὶ ἐὰν αἰχμαλωτεύσῃ τις ἀδίκως σωθήσεται

Aq., Th.: καὶ εἰ αἰχμαλωτίζων δικαίον περισωθήσεται

Sym.: ἡ αἰχμαλωσία δικαίου διασωθήσεται

Is-a: אם משבי עריץ ימלט

T: ואם דשבו זכאין ישתיזב

S: אן שביתה דעשינא מתפציא

V: aut quod captum fuerit a robusto salvum esse poterit

Obviously "robustus" stands for עריץ, as it does in v. 25. But it is unlikely that it was transferred from there by the Lat. translator. Other VSS, and now also Is-a, prove that there existed a text-form which had this very reading. In the Com. MT is echoed (iv, 574): "Fortis et gigas diabolus est... Mundus enim in maligno positus est, quem nullus justorum vincere potuit."

Is. 18:4 MT: ביום קציר [= Is-a; MSS: ביום קציר]

G: ἡμέρας ἀμῆτου

T: בשחין חצד

S: ביוםא דחצדא

V: in die messis

42 As to the possible omission of the comparative כ cp. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *op. cit.* § 141d. Jerome's customary faithfulness to the Heb. text of the Prophets as regards this detail can be demonstrated by Is. 27:10; Jer. 19:12; כמדבר— "quasi desertum"; Is. 33:9 כערבה— "sicut desertum"; as against Is. 50:2; Jer. 22:6: מדבר— "in siccum" resp. "solidinem".

It is hardly conceivable that Jerome would have followed G against his own Heb. text, since his rendition differs from theirs in many other details. This argument is strengthened by the direct evidence of some Heb. MSS and of S which support the reading underlying V: **ביום קציר**.⁴³ In Jerome's commentaries, however, **בהם** of MT shines through (iv, 200): "Sicut in toto die nihil est clarius meridie, quando sol de medio caelo rutilat, et omnem orbem pariter illustrat, et sicut in aestu et calore torrente, quando nudus messor excoquitur, et operis magnitudinem anhelitus probat, gratissima est roris temperies etc." The later Com. combines the two readings (iv, 287): "Et quomodo nubes roris in die messis, et in fervente aestate gratissima est...".

Is. 14:9 MT: **כל מלכי גוים ... כל עתודי ארץ** [=Is-a]

G: οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς... πάντας βασιλεῖς ἐθνῶν

Aq., Th.: παντας καιριμους γης...

T: **כל עתירי נכסיא ... כל מלכי עממא**

V: omnes principes terrae... omnes principes nationum

The uniform Lat. translation of two different Heb. words is unusual, especially so, since **מלך** has a standard Lat. equivalent. One cannot help assuming that Jerome's *Vorlage* employed the same word in both members of the parallelism — **עתודי || עתודי**, or else used another word-pair such as — **עתודי || רזני** or **עתודי || קציני**, for which no ready-made Lat. terms were available. In the Com. Jerome adheres to MT (iv, 177): "nisi forte animas regum quos interfecerat, insultantes regi Babylonio occurrisse credimus." The second Com. reverts to the V wording.⁴⁴

Omission of Words

In a few instances another well-known flaw in textual transmission, *i.e.*, the accidental omission of words, can be detected in a Heb. MSS used by Jerome. The first example resulted from a haplography in the Heb. text underlying V:

43 Cp. BH; *Prophet. Posteriores* ed. C.D. Ginsburg (London 1911). MT has **בהם || בהם**. This may have invited attempts to variate (cp. Is. 13:17, p. 188). But also a graphic interchange $\text{י} < \text{ת}$ may have taken place.

44 A similar case of lack of variation in a word pair we seem to have in Is. 26:18 **ארץ || תבל** — "terra... terra". As Jerome is very consequent in his rendering **תבל** through "orbis" we suspect that his Hebrew MS did indeed have twice **ארץ**. The Com. corrects this and Jerome explains (IV, 355–356): "inter 'orbem' qui Hebraice THEBEL et graece dicitur οἰκόμενη, ac 'terram' multa diversitas sit."

Is. 17:12–13	V	MT
Vae multitudo populorum multorum		הוי המון עמים רבים
ut multitudo maris sonantis		כהמות ימים יהמיון
et tumultus turbarum		ושאון לאומים
sicut sonitus aquarum multarum		כשאון מים כבירים
sonabunt		ישאון
populi sicut sonitus aquarum inundantium		לאמים כשאון מים רבים
et increpabit eum...		ישאון יגער בו

The second **ישאון** was not translated. This left the clause **כשאון מים רבים** without a predicate. Thus the last word of the preceding clause, **ישאון** — “sonabunt”, was drawn to “populi...”. The printed editions of V here follow Jerome’s own explanation of this rendition (iv, 283): “Sonabunt enim populi in spectaculis theatralis luxuriae, et amphiteatri crudelitate, et circi furoribus, sicut sonitus aquarum inundantium.” “Sonabunt”, then, opens the sentence, thus proving that the Heb. text underlying V had omitted the second **ישאון**. The *lemma* corrects according to the MT (*ib.*): “...sicut sonitus aquarum multarum sonabunt. Populi sicut multitudo aquarum inundantium sonabunt: et increpabit eum...”.

Is. 40:15	MT: הן איים כדק יטול [=Is-a]
G:	καὶ ὡς σίελος λογισθήσονται
Aq.:	ἰδου νησοι ὡς δροσος βαλλομενη [Sym., Th.]
Aq.(?):	... λεπτον βαλλομενον
T:	הא נגווחא כדוקא כפרח
V:	ecce insulae quasi pulvis exiguus

A plausible explanation of V would be that “exiguus” stands for **יטול**, whatever might have been the reason for this equation (none of the other VSS offers a clue). However, the doubt remains whether “pulvis exiguus” is not an explanatory rendering of the one word **דק**. Jerome defines this word in his Com. (iv, 488 and 491) “significari ‘tenuissimum pulverem’”, adding the interesting remark (iv, 488): “Minutissima ergo frusta pulveris et pene invisibilia, hoc verbo appellantur: quas forsitan Democritus cum Epicuro suo atomos vocat.” But in this case the following word, **יטול**, was not translated. Had his *Vorlage* omitted it? Anyhow, in the Com. it is reflected (*ib.*): “...tenuissimum pulverem, qui vento raptante saepe in oculos mittitur.”

- Is. 3:7 MT: ישא ביום ההוא לאמר [וישא: Is-a]
 G: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνη
 V: respondebit in die illa dicens

The V rendering is straightforward in itself. The equation ישא “respondebit” is acceptable in this context and leans on G. Jerome, though, presents it in his Com. as an insertion (iv, 55): “‘Respondebit’ in Hebraeo non habetur, sed de LXX additum est. In Hebraeo enim his quae supra scripta sunt jungitur: ‘in illa die dicit, non sum medicus’ et reliqua.” The joining of “in illa die...” with “ruina autem haec sub manu tua” (והמכשלה הזאת תחת ידך) seems proof that Jerome at that time relied on a divergent text that omitted the word ישא and probably read: ביום ההוא יאמר.

- Is. 14:19 MT: לכוש הרגים מטעני חרב
 G: μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίραις
 Aq.: ενδεδυμενοις ανηρημενους βεβαρημενους μαχαιρα
 T: חפי קטילין מטעני חרב
 V: et obvolutus cum his qui interfecti sunt gladio

V translates only one of the words הרגים — מטעני. Later Jerome may have thought that in this he had followed the textual tradition of a Greek predecessor. He quotes Symmachus (iv, 179): “Etiam cum his qui occiduntur in bello”, and G (iv, 255): “Involutus cum interfectis gladio”. Yet, the first is a very free quotation, and the second abbreviated reading is not supported by our Greek MSS. Thus the question remains if his *Vorlage* did not omit one of the synonyms, thus proving, perhaps, that we have here a double reading: a) הרגי חרב b) מטעני חרב; or a gloss — הרגים — on the difficult מטעני. Be this as it may, the *lemma* of the later Com. corrects according to the MT (iv, 255): “Involutus cum interfectis et confossis gladio.”

Inner-Latin Variants

The Com. may help us to establish the original text where the MSS of V differ among themselves. Thus it is easy to restore from it the original rendering of להגא by “in festivitatem” (Is. 19:17),⁴⁵ as against “in pavorem” which is

45 Thus MSS Amiatinus, Cavensis, Toletanus; Vulgata ed. Vallarsi ix, 711. Similarly, “dicit” can be eliminated from the V text (Is. 5:9) on the base of the Com. (iv, 74): “...nos juxta Hebraeos vertimus ‘In auribus meis sunt haec Domini exercituum’”. Again, “surgent” for תאמנה (Is. 60:4) in the printed edition and very good MSS (Cavensis, Complutensis, Toletanus and others; Amiatinus has “surgunt”) can be corrected into “sugent” according to the Com. (iv, 720): “...in Christo lactantes...”

found in many MSS, and in the Clementine edition. True, in the Com. Jerome presents both these translations as legitimate (iv, 206 and 295); but then he goes on to state the priority of the former (*ib.*): “In eo quod transtuli: ‘...in festivitatem’.” However, he may have corrected it in later MSS edited by him, and through this correction, or directly through his remarks in the Com., the variant arose.

Is. 3:16 MT: הלוך וטפף תלכנה וברגליהם תעכסנה

V: ibant et plaudebant ambulabant pedibus suis et composito gradu incedebant⁴⁶ [ed. Cl.]

Com. iv, 59: ibant et plaudebant et ambulabant et pedibus suis composito gradu incedebant [*lemma*]

Amiat.: ibant et plaudebant ambulabant et in pedibus suis composito gradu incedebant [Vallarsi ix, 690]

The reading which inserts “et” between “ambulant” and “(in) pedibus” at first sight seems to be preferable; it is in accordance with the MT and avoids the platitude “ambulare pedibus”. In his Com., however, Jerome indirectly supports the difficult reading by connecting the word “pedibus” with the first part of the clause and separating it from “composito gradu incedebant”/ תעכסנה (iv, 60): “...et plaudunt tam manibus quam pedibus, et ut composito incedant gradu...”. Yet he hardly would have used the commonplace “ambulare pedibus” were it not for a Heb. text that forced him to do so. His *Vorlage* then probably read: הלוך וטפף תלכנה וברגליהם ותעכסנה; the *waw* stands for “so that...”, as aptly understood in the Com.

Is. 9:2 MT: כאשר יגילו בחלקם שלל

V: sicut exsultant victores capta praeda quando dividunt spolia

Vallarsi ix, 997: sicut exultant victores quando dividunt spolia

Amiat.: sicut exultant quando dividunt spolia

The words “victores capta praeda” might strike us as an interpolation and we may be inclined to prefer the readings which omit them. Yet by an explanatory remark Jerome reveals that he had such a redundant text before him (iv, 131): “Et sicut exultant victores, qui captam dividunt praedam. Quum enim fortis captus fuerit et ligatus, omnis domus ejus diripitur, et dividuntur spolia.” Now, it is quite feasible that fragments from the Com., or correc-

46 Cp. Sym.: εὐστῆμας βαίνουσαι. Another instance of a transposed *waw*:

Is. 22:1 MT: מה לך אפוא כי עליה כלך לגנות

V: quidnam quoque tibi est quia ascendisti et tu omnis in tecta

(based on וכלך); however, in the Com. we have (iv, 220): “Quid haves, inquit; Sion, quod etiam tu ascendisti omnis in tecta.”

tions, sometimes were incorporated into MSS of V. But in the present case it seems obvious that the ample and good Lat. explanation "qui capta dividunt praedam" is a variation of the precise "capta praeda" motif (cp. V: "composito gradu incedebant" with the commentary: "composito incedant gradu" in the preceding example). The redundance in the original Lat. version could have resulted from a double interpretation, or even from a double reading in the Heb. text, *i.e.*: capta praeda – בלקחם שלל and dividunt spolia – בחלקם שלל.⁴⁷

III

The preceding analysis of textual data brought into full relief the glaring discrepancy between Jerome's translation of the Bible and his Commentary. In an attempt to explain this phenomenon some remarks on Jerome's biography are in order.⁴⁸

Jerome had arrived in Palestine in the year 386. He began his gigantic Latin translation from the "Hebraica veritas" in 391 and completed it in 405. True, scholars differ in the exact dating of his work on each Biblical book. However, it is universally agreed that the Prophetic books were completed by 392.

In contrast, the dating of Jerome's other scholarly undertakings presents great difficulties. His exegetical work which is of interest for textual criticism begins with his *quaestiones hebraicae*, composed about 389, and ends close to his death in 420 with the Commentary on Jeremiah. The date of each book must be examined separately. As far as Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah is concerned we can establish the following facts: In the year 397 he composed a commentary for chapters 13 to 23. But the completion of the Commentary (which contained also a new exegesis of the chapters just mentioned) had to wait until after the conclusion of the Commentary on the Dodekapropheton and Daniel, that is to say until after the year 407. In fact, there is sufficient

47 Double translation may be observed in the following instances:

Ez. 39:14 MT: המקברים

V: qui sepeliant et requirant eos (מבקר/מקברים)

18:17 MT: מעני השיב ידו

G: καὶ ἀπὸ ἀδικίας ἀπέστρεψε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ

V: a pauperis iniuria avertit manum suam (עני/ἀδικίας)

Is. 29:3 MT: והקמתי עליך מצרות

Is-a: והקמתי עליך מצודות

V: et munimenta ponam in obsidionem tuam

("munimentum" = (מצד)ה; "obsidio" = (מצור). Cp. Kutscher, *op. cit.*, 196.

48 For details cp. O. Bardenhewer, *Hieronymus* (München 1905); *id.*, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 3 (Freiburg 1912); Stummer, *op. cit.*; H. Lietzmann, *Kleine Schriften* 1, 305 ff.; P. de Labriolle, *Latin Christianity* (London 1924) 334 ff.

reason for postulating that certain chapters of the Isaiah Commentary were written as late as the second half of 408.⁴⁹

Accordingly a considerable length of time separates the Vulgate from the *Commentarius*, a period in which Jerome constantly deepened his knowledge of Hebrew and broadened his proficiency in the Bible text and Versions. Consequently, his translation, which had been made at a much earlier stage of his life, now would not always satisfy him. Therefore he introduced corrections into the Commentary some of which even found their way — with his consent or without it — into later copies of V. Jerome certainly was unable to remember exactly the thought-processes that had produced his Latin translation two decennaries earlier; but he tried to reconstruct them. Comparing his translation, whenever it diverged from the Hebrew, with the Greek versions, he discovered that apparently he had often followed the latter (“...secuti sumus...”). It stands to reason that in most cases he was successful in tracing the source of his deviations. However, the few instances in which he erred in the attribution of his deviant translation to the influence of one of the Greek versions positively prove that his explanatory remarks on his method of translation were made in retrospect.⁵⁰

Of a major concern for our purpose here are the cases where Jerome was at a complete loss as how to possibly explain his rendering when it did not agree with the Hebrew text, neither could it be derived from a Greek version, nor could it be justified by stylistic considerations. He then would try to smooth out the discrepancy, to belittle its importance or to correct it tacitly in his remarks. Apparently it never occurred to him that a divergent Hebrew reading

49 For the composition of chapters 13–23 cp. *epistula* 71, 7. The prologue to book xi mentions the death of the Vandal Stilicho which occurred in August 408 C.E. In the prologue to book ix he writes: “Variis molestiis occupati, explanationes in Isaiam prophetam per intervalla dictamus.”

50 Two instances out of many will illustrate Jerome’s failure to remember correctly how he had arrived at his translation:

1. Is. 26:3 MT: יצר סמוך V: vetus error abiit

In the Com. he explains (iv, 345): “Hebraice JESER SAMUCH, quod Aquila et Symmachus similiter transtulerunt, πλάσμα ἐπηραιοσμένον, hoc est, error noster ablati est, sive cogitatio nostra firmata est... Pro quo nos ut sensus manifestior fieret, transtulimus, ‘vetus error abiit.’” A *tour de force* from an inaccurate rendering of the Greek to his own translation. At first he mentions only in passing another possible rendering, perhaps that of his Hebrew informant. But later he comes back to it, obviously deeming it the most correct (*ib.*): “...et quia cogitatio nostra firmata est...”

2. Is. 13:10 MT: וכסיליהם V: splendor earum.

The Com. declares (iv, 172): “CHISILE... Nos generaliter sequentes Symmachum, stellam diximus.” But “stellae” stands for (השמים) כוכבי.

might have caused his rendering in the first instance. But it is exactly this conclusion to which we must incline now.

Very little is known about the Hebrew MSS which Jerome had at his disposal.⁵¹ One fact, however, seems indisputable: the man who so excitedly would report to his friends whenever he chanced upon a Hebrew MS, and who would beg a Jew to bring him stealthily scrolls from the synagogue for the use within the short hours of the night, certainly did not have in his own possession complete Hebrew Bible scrolls. He possibly had acquired a scroll or two at an earlier stage (*e.g.*, for reciting the Psalms in Hebrew). Or again, at a later stage, his monastery may have succeeded in acquiring some Hebrew MSS. But while occupying himself with the V translation, Jerome had to resort to all kind of MSS which he obtained by devious ways, and for limited periods only. It stands to reason that five, let alone twenty years later, when he was occupied with his Biblical Commentary, he had before him MSS which were different from those which he had used for his translation.

Why, though, did he never give any thought to this possible cause of a divergent rendering? After all, he had had much experience with corrupt texts. In fact, text corruption had triggered off his scholarly activity, namely, the revision of the Old Latin translation. He was also well versed in the comparison of MSS. Still, with regard to the Hebrew text we have only the one remark on Hab. 2:19 which proves his knowledge of a Hebrew text in which כל of MT: כל רוח אין בקרבו was missing (vi, 630): "Praeterea sciendum in quibusdam Hebraicis Columinibus non esse additum OMNIS, sed absolute SPIRITUM legi."⁵²

It appears that his high esteem for the "Hebraica veritas", the haste with which he worked on it, and the relative stability of its text, as compared with the abundant divergent readings in the Greek and Latin Bibles, tended to blunt his perception of textual questions within the Hebrew text.

If this proposition is accepted, interesting conclusions can be drawn: In Jerome's time there still existed more divergency in Hebrew Bible texts than is commonly supposed, though standardization was continually advancing. Variant readings attested by the earlier VSS, the Qumran Scrolls or even quotations in Rabbinical works sometimes may obtain their confirmation through Jerome's writings, and some new variants may be added to the known ones.

51 Cp. E.F. Sutcliffe, "St. Jerome's Hebrew Manuscripts", *Biblica* 29 (1948) 112-125.

52 A second remark on Is. 38:11 (MT: ישיבי חדל; MSS: חלד) "...sermo, enim, Hebraicus HOLED si legatur aut scribatur ELED 'requiem', si EDEL 'occidentem' sonat..." (iv, 472) is much too enigmatic to be adduced for textual criticism. As regards the OT quotations in the NT Jerome remarks (vii, 437): "Ex quo mihi videtur, aut veteres Hebraeorum libros aliter habuisse, quam nunc habent, aut Apostolum."

It may be assumed that in a more advanced stage of his life, when the great Latin translator could afford to acquire less popular and more exact MSS, he approached the *textus receptus*; but traces of a previous and more challenging situation remain.