

Hebrews, Apostles, and Christ: Three Authorities of Jerome' s Hebraica Veritas

Kato, Teppei
Japan Society for the Promotion of Science

<https://hdl.handle.net/2324/7343244>

出版情報 : Vigiliae Christianae. 73 (4), pp.420-439, 2019-08-31. Brill Academic Publishers
バージョン :
権利関係 :



Hebrews, Apostles, and Christ: Three Authorities of Jerome's *Hebraica Veritas*

Teppei Kato

Japan Society for the Promotion of Science; Kyoto University

teppei.kato@gmail.com

Published version:

Vigiliae Christianae, Vol. 73, No. 4 (2019): 420-439.

To request a PDF copy of the final published version, please email me at
teppei.kato@gmail.com

Abstract

Against many defenders of the LXX, such as Hilary of Poitiers and Augustine, Jerome tries to prove the superiority of the Hebrew text as a source text of translation. To do so, in his *Preface to the Chronicles (iuxta Hebraeos)*, Jerome relies on three authorities: the Hebrews, the Apostles, and Christ. The Hebrews philologically endorse Jerome's translation, by judging whether it literally agrees with the Hebrew text. The Apostles support Jerome's position both philologically and theologically: sometimes their Old Testament quotations literally agree with the Hebrew text; at other times they spiritually agree with the Hebrew text, even though they do not literally. Christ functions as the highest authority. Relying on these three, Jerome's real purpose concerning *Hebraica veritas* is not only the philological discussion between the Hebrew text and the LXX, but also the theological discussion between these two texts and the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament.

Keywords

Jerome – Hebrews – Apostles – Christ – *Hebraica veritas* – John 7:38

1 Introduction

The translation of the Old Testament “according to the Hebrews,” prepared (if we follow his own account and the traditional view) by Jerome of Stridon during the years 390 to 406/7 in

Bethlehem, had a considerable impact on the Western Church.¹ He created this translation with the idea that the source text of translation should be the Hebrew text, while naming the idea *Hebraica veritas* (“Hebrew truth”).² This labored achievement of the monk in Bethlehem was, however, unacceptable to his contemporary Christians, because the “correct” Old Testament for them was not the Hebrew text but its divinely-inspired Greek translation called the Septuagint (= LXX). Although some educated Christians were already informed of the fact that the LXX was no more than a translated work with a text different from the Hebrew text, this philologically observed fact was not strong enough to overturn the Church’s adherence to the LXX.

Two representative arguments for the defense of the authority of the LXX and for the justification of its textual difference from the Hebrew text are found in Hilary of Poitiers and Augustine of Hippo.³ According to Hilary, since Moses transmitted to the seventy elders a “certain more secret mystery of the Law from the hidden sources” (*quaedam ex occultis legis secretiora mysteria*), namely, the oral Torah, the elders translated ambiguous words and expressions of the Hebrew text into accurate Greek, following the higher knowledge derived from Moses (Cf. Exod 24:1, 9-11 and Num 11:16-17, 24-25).⁴ In other words, even though the LXX has a different text, its authority remains absolutely flawless, because the LXX possesses the Mosaic mystery on a deeper level. On the other hand, according to Augustine, the seventy elders made exactly the same translation, as if having one mouth, “with the presence of the Holy Spirit” (*praesentia Sancti Spiritus*), although each one of them was

¹ References to line numbers of the prefaces of Jerome’s revisions and translations of the Bible follow Weber/Gryson = R. Weber and R. Gryson (eds.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Stuttgart, 2007).

² On the concept of *Hebraica veritas*, see F. Stummer, “Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der *Hebraica Veritas*,” *Biblica* 10 (1929) 3-30; P. Jay, *L’exégèse de Saint Jérôme d’après son “Commentaire sur Isaïe”* (Paris, 1985) 89-102; C.P. Bammel, “Die Hexapla des Origenes: Die *Hebraica Veritas* im Streit der Meinungen,” *Aug* 28 (1988) 125-49; G. Miletto, “Die *Hebraica Veritas* in S. Hieronymus,” in *Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition: Festschrift für Johann Maier zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. H. Merklein, K. Müller, and G. Stemberger (Frankfurt am Main, 1993) 56-65; S. Rebenich, “Jerome: The *Vir Trilinguis* and the *Hebraica Veritas*,” *VC* 47 (1993) 50-77; Ch. Marksches, “Hieronymus und die *Hebraica Veritas*: ein Beitrag zur Archäologie des protestantischen Schriftverständnisses?” in *Die Septuaginta: zwischen Judentum und Christentum*, ed. M. Hengel and A.M. Schwemer (Tübingen, 1994) 131-81; E. Prinzivalli, “*Sicubi dubitas, Hebraeos interroga*: Girolamo tra difesa dell’*Hebraica veritas* e polemica anti giudaica,” *Annali di storia dell’esegesi* 14 (1997) 179-206; I.P. Baumann, “Jerome and the *Hebraica Veritas*: A Portrait of Jerome and his Relationship with the Hebrew Text,” *Revista Batista Pioneira* 5 (2016) 133-48; S. Weigert, *Hebraica Veritas: Übersetzungsprinzipien und Quellen der Deuteronomiumübersetzung des Hieronymus* (Stuttgart, 2016).

³ A. Kamesar, “Jerome,” in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible* 1, ed. J.C. Paget and J. Schaper (Cambridge, 2013) 653-75, esp. 662-63. For other patristic authorities from this period for whom Jerome’s approach to the Hebrew text problematized matters of biblical exegesis, see J. Lössl, “A Shift in Patristic Exegesis: Hebrew Clarity and Historical Verity in Augustine, Jerome, Julian of Aeclanum and Theodore of Mopsuestia,” *AugSt* 32 (2001) 157-75.

⁴ Hilary of Poitiers, *Tract. in Psal.* 2.2 (CSEL 22:38-39). On the details about Hilary’s view of the origins of the LXX, see A. Kamesar, “Hilary of Poitiers, Judeo-Christianity, and the Origins of the LXX: A Translation of *Tractatus super Psalmos* 2.2-3 with Introduction and Commentary,” *VC* 59 (2005) 264-85.

isolated in a cell separately during the work of translation.⁵ Augustine claims that the dispensation of Providence guided these translators to bring out the truth in the Bible, which was hidden by the Jews. In other words, the textual difference actually proves the authority of the LXX, for the translators deliberately rendered the text in such a way as the Holy Spirit thought most suitable for the Gentiles. In sum, both Hilary and Augustine skillfully explain, without contradiction, firstly that the LXX is textually different from the Hebrew text, and secondly that the former has more authority than the latter.

To these arguments defending the divine authority of the LXX, what kind of approach could Jerome possibly take to prove the superiority of the Hebrew text as a source text of translation?⁶ In short, Jerome took a philological as well as a theological approach in combination. We define the term “philological approach” as a way to judge the textual difference between the Hebrew text and its translation by simply focusing on the literal sense alone, whereas the “theological approach” is a way to evaluate the textual difference between the two texts by paying attention to the spiritual sense, beyond the literal sense. Modern scholars generally tend to regard Jerome more as a philologist than a theologian.⁷ Although there is much plausibility in this view to some extent, Jerome actually had no choice but to step into the theological discussion, for, as seen above, the defenders of the LXX also shared the basic philological knowledge about the textual difference between the Hebrew text and the LXX, while, at the same time, having the theological opinion exactly counter to Jerome.

From the similar point of view, Sarah Kamin examines the significance of the *Hebraica veritas* in the theological aspect of Jerome’s thought.⁸ According to Kamin, “philological, ‘scientific’ considerations alone cannot account for Jerome’s revolutionary step in undertaking his translation of the Hebrew biblical text ... We must look beyond philological factors and look for a theological reason which can account for Jerome’s rejection

⁵ Augustine, *Doct. chr.* 2.22 (CChr.SL 32:47-48). Augustine gives a similar but more sophisticated explanation also in *Civ. Dei* 18.43. On the Augustine’s view of the LXX, see C. Harrison, “Augustine,” in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible* 1, 676-96; E.L. Gallagher, “Augustine on the Hebrew Bible,” *JThS* (n.s.) 67 (2016) 97-114.

⁶ Jerome, while claiming the superiority of the Hebrew text, also says that his purpose is not to blame the LXX (*Praef. in Ps. (IH)* 31-33; *Praef. in Sam. et Reg.* 58-59; *Praef. in Job (IH)* 37-38; *Praef. in lib. Sal.* 23; *Praef. in Pent.* 4-7; *Praef. in Jos.* 7). Indeed, Jerome was proud of his Hexaplaric recension based on the LXX as an independent work (*Ep.* 71.5; *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 2.24; 3.25). Nevertheless, he considers that many texts of the LXX used in churches need to be revised, because the LXX as a translated text may contain mistakes at each stage of translation, emendation, and copying (*Praef. in Evang.* 14-16). His purpose is to make clear and correct the texts, which are ambiguous, deleted, or distorted (*Praef. in Job (IH)* 38-40).

⁷ A. Fürst, “Hieronymus und Augustinus,” in *Augustinus-Lexikon* 3 (Basel, 2004) 317-36, esp. 321; repr. in Fürst, *Von Origenes und Hieronymus zu Augustinus: Studien zur antiken Theologiegeschichte* (Berlin, 2011) 337-58, esp. 342; Kamesar, “Jerome,” 674.

⁸ S. Kamin, “The Theological Significance of the *Hebraica Veritas* in Jerome’s Thought,” in *Sha’arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon*, ed. M. Fishbane and E. Tov (Winona Lake, 1991) 243-53; repr. in Kamin, *Jews and Christians Interpret the Bible* (Jerusalem, 2008) vii-xx.

of the sanctity of the LXX and acceptance of the authentic Hebrew text, the *Hebraica veritas*, as the decisive text.”⁹ By especially dealing with Jerome’s *Preface to the Pentateuch*, Kamin correctly elucidates some aspects of Jerome’s achievement, coming to the conclusion that “Jerome wished to establish a *Christian* translation for the Christian world.”¹⁰ Her thesis is, however, unsatisfactory, firstly because it is based on but one source in Jerome’s writings, as she herself admits.¹¹ Secondly, the definition of the terms “philological” and “theological” remain ambiguous. Accordingly, the present paper aims to clarify in what case Jerome’s arguments are philological or theological, by dealing with his *Preface to the Chronicles (iuxta Hebraeos, hereafter, IH)*, in which he refers to three authorities—the Hebrews, the Apostles, and Christ.

2 Jerome’s *Preface to the Chronicles*

It is generally accepted that Jerome’s *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)* was written around 395/96, which corresponds to the middle period of his revision/translation project, starting with the revision of the Gospels around 383 and ending with the translation of the Book of Tobit and Judith around 406/7.¹² This preface is addressed to Chromatius, who is Bishop of Aquileia as well as one of Jerome’s patrons, supporting him financially.¹³ In the preface, Jerome points out that the original text of the LXX has been corrupted, since the different copies were being circulated according to the different regions: Egypt authorized the Hesychian recension, Asia accepted the Lucianic recension, and the region between them, namely, Palestine, followed Hexaplaric recension, which was prepared by Origen and propagated by Eusebius and Pamphilus. Jerome considers this state of confusion to be problematic, calling it *trifaria varietas* (“Threefold variety”).¹⁴ Subsequently, although

⁹ Kamin, “Theological Significance,” x-xi.

¹⁰ Kamin, “Theological Significance,” xiv.

¹¹ Kamin, “Theological Significance,” xv.

¹² A German translation and a brief commentary of *Praef. in Par. (IH)* are found in A. Fürst, *Hieronymus: Askese und Wissenschaft in der Spätantike* (Freiburg, 2016) 338-43. A French translation is in A. Canellis (ed.), *Jérôme: Préfaces aux livres de la Bible* (Paris, 2017) 348-57. For some characteristics of Jerome’s prefaces, see A. Cain, “Apology and Polemic in Jerome’s Prefaces to his Biblical Scholarship,” in *Hieronymus als Exeget und Theologe: Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zum Koheletkommentar des Hieronymus*, ed. E. Birnbaum and L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger (Leuven, 2014) 107-28.

¹³ Chromatius met Jerome around 370 and became friends with him ever after. In 393 (or 388?), Chromatius was appointed as Bishop of Aquileia. Jerome, in return for financial support, dedicated to the bishop some of his works, such as *Comm. in Abac.*, *Comm. in Jon.*, and his translations of the Chronicles, the Books of Solomon, and Tobit. Since Chromatius maintained a good relationship not only with Jerome but also Rufinus, he tried to mediate between these two scholars after the deterioration of their relationship due to the Origenist Controversy. For the details of the life of Chromatius, see Ch. Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* 2 (Leiden, 2004) 1088-93; Fürst, *Hieronymus*, 177-78.

¹⁴ On the philological details about the *trifaria varietas*, see S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern*

positively introducing Origen's scientific attitude in composing *Tetrapla* (a copy of four columns of *Hexapla*), Jerome points out that Origen audaciously filled the deficiency in the LXX with the translation of Theodotion, so that the churches come to read a text which the seventy elders did not know.¹⁵ In other words, since the original version of the LXX is no longer extant, Jerome made the entirely new translation based on the Hebrew text. Then, he moves on to the following important remarks:

Why do my Latin people not accept me, who composed such a new edition, while the old edition is inviolate, that I would validate my work in the judgement of the Hebrews as authorities and, what is greater, in the judgement of the Apostles as authorities? Recently I have written a book *On the Best Method of Translating*, demonstrating that these verses from the Gospels: *From Egypt I called my son* (Matt 2:15), *Since he will be called a Nazaren* (Matt 2:23), *They will look to him whom they pricked* (John 19:37), and this verse of the Apostle: *Those which the eye did not see, the ear did not hear, and did not go up to the heart of human, those which God prepared for those who love him* (1 Cor 2:9), and the other similar verses are found in the books of the Hebrews. Certainly the Apostles and the Evangelists knew the seventy interpreters, but from where was it for them to say those things which are not in the Seventy? Christ, our God, and the founder of each Testament, says in the Gospel according to John: *The one believing in me, as the Scripture said, rivers of living water flow out of his belly* (John 7:38). That which the Savior attests that it is written is certainly written. Where is it written? The Seventy does not have it, and the Church does not know Apocrypha. Accordingly one should return to the Hebrew books, from which even the Lord speaks and the disciples draw their examples.¹⁶

Study (Oxford, 1968) 134-71.

¹⁵ For Jerome's view on Origen's approach to the LXX, see A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford, 1993) 7, 59-63. Here Kamesar points out that Origen was basically attempting to restore the original form of the text of the LXX, but exceptionally with regard to the book of Daniel, he seemed to be in favor of replacing the LXX version with that of Theodotion.

¹⁶ Jerome, *Praef. in Par. (IH)* 19-31 (Weber/Gryson, 546): ... *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? Scripsi nuper librum De optimo genere interpretandi, ostendens illa de Evangelio: "Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum" et "Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur" et "Videbunt in quem conpunerunt" et illud Apostoli "Quae oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, et in cor hominis non ascenderunt, quae praeparavit Deus diligentibus se" ceteraque his similia in Hebraeorum libris inveniri. Certe Apostoli et Evangelistae Septuaginta interpretes noverant, et unde eis haec dicere quae in Septuaginta non habentur? Christus Deus noster utriusque Testamenti conditor in Evangelio secundum Iohannem, "Qui credit," inquit, "in me, sicut dixit Scriptura, flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae." Utique scriptum est quod Salvator scriptum esse testatur. Ubi scriptum est? Septuaginta non habent, apocrypha nescit Ecclesia; ad Hebraeos igitur revertendum est, unde et Dominus loquitur et discipuli exempla praesumunt.*

Jerome complains that the Latin readers do not accept him despite the high quality of his “new edition” and, at the same time, although the “old edition,” namely the LXX remains inviolate. He was completely confident in his translation, because he validated it “in the judgment of the Hebrews as authorities and, what is greater, in the judgment of the Apostles as authorities” (*Hebraeis et, quod his maius est, Apostolis auctoribus*). Moreover, Jerome justifies himself even by invoking the name of Christ and concludes that “one should return to the Hebrew books, from which even the Lord speaks and the disciples draw their examples” (*ad Hebraeos igitur revertendum est, unde et Dominus loquitur et discipuli exempla praesumunt*). In other words, Jerome relies on the Hebrews, the Apostles, and Christ, who endorse the idea that the source text of translation should be the Hebrew text. But how do they function as authorities?

3 The Hebrews as Philological Authorities

The Hebrews guaranteed the accuracy of Jerome’s translation on a philological level. Jerome sometimes suggests the readers ask the Hebrews whether his translation is correct.¹⁷ Concerning biblical translation and interpretation, he has many informants among the Jews or the Jewish Christians.¹⁸ According to Jerome’s own words, a Hebrew (*Hebraeus*) in the desert of Chalcis¹⁹ and a Chaldean (*Chaldaeus*) in Antioch²⁰ taught him Hebrew and Aramaic. Interestingly enough, Jerome later reports that in Rome, he borrowed Hebrew volumes, presumably some kind of midrashic works, from a local synagogue.²¹ He seemed to have studied these volumes with a Jewish teacher. After Jerome started translating the Bible in

¹⁷ E.g. Jerome, *Praef. in Ps. (IH)* 26-28; *Praef. in Sam. et Reg.* 68-71; *Praef. in Esdr. et Neh.* 31-32, *Praef. in Pent.* 43-44; *Ep.* 112.20. See also Kamesar, *Jerome*, 61 n. 78.

¹⁸ On the relationship between Jerome and his Jewish informants, see E.F. Sutcliffe, “St. Jerome’s Pronunciation of Hebrew,” *Biblica* 29 (1948) 117-25; B. Kedar, “The Latin Translations,” in *Mikra: Texts, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling (Philadelphia, 1988) 229-338, esp. 315; H.I. Newman, “Jerome and the Jews” (PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997) (in Hebrew); M. Graves, *Jerome’s Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah* (Leiden, 2007) 88-92; M.H. Williams, “Lessons from Jerome’s Jewish Teachers: Exegesis and Cultural Interaction in Late Antique Palestine,” in *Jewish Biblical Interpretation and Cultural Exchange: Comparative Exegesis in Context*, ed. N.B. Dohrmann and D. Stern (Philadelphia, 2008) 66-86, 258-63; W.L. Krewson, *Jerome and the Jews: Innovative Supersessionism* (Eugene, Ore., 2017). Some scholars, on the other hand, contest the extent of Jerome’s contacts with the Jews in some cases. See G. Bardy, “Saint Jérôme et ses maitres hébreux,” *RBen* 46 (1934) 145-64; P. Nautin, “Hieronymus,” in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 15 (Berlin, 1986) 304-15; G. Stemberger, “Hieronymus und die Juden seiner Zeit,” in *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Schreckenberg*, ed. D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (Göttingen, 1993) 347-64.

¹⁹ Jerome, *Ep.* 125.12 (CSEL 56/1:131); *Praef. in Dan.* 11-19 (Weber/Gryson, 1341).

²⁰ Jerome, *Ep.* 18A.10 (CSEL 54:86).

²¹ Jerome, *Ep.* 36.1 (CSEL 54:268).

Bethlehem, it became essential for him to consult with his Jewish teachers to make an accurate translation. In translating the Book of Job, Jerome paid a considerable amount of money as a consultation fee to a teacher from Lod (*Lyddeus*), who was regarded as a leading scholar among the Hebrews.²² Another Jewish teacher whom Jerome mentions by name is Baraninas.²³ Since the Jews were not allowed to live in Jerusalem and the surrounding area after the suppression of the Bar Kokhba revolt in 135, Baraninas might have traveled from the residential areas of the Jews, including Hebron and Lod, all the way to Bethlehem to see Jerome.²⁴ The relationship between Baraninas and Jerome even caught the attention of Rufinus, a former friend of Jerome as well as a later critic. He mentions this Jewish teacher with sarcasm.²⁵

Jerome calls these Jews and Jewish Christians the Hebrews (*Hebraei*), using them as authorities of the accuracy of his translation.²⁶ The Hebrews mainly serve the readers as outside experts. Jerome himself has a strong confidence that his translation precisely reflects the truth in the Hebrew text, but in case the readers do not believe him, he recommends they ask the Hebrews about the accuracy of his translation.²⁷ The endorsement of the Hebrews convinced the educated bilingual Latin readers, who generally read a translated text in Latin while comparing it with its original text in Greek.²⁸ This matter is discussed, for example, in

²² Jerome, *Praef. in Job (IH)* 20-23 (Weber/Gryson, 731).

²³ Jerome, *Ep.* 84.3 (CSEL 55:123). Moritz Rahmer identifies this Baraninas with Rabbi Hama bar Haninah in the Palestinian Talmud, but Samuel Krauss considers that this identification is impossible. See M. Rahmer, *Die hebräischen Traditionen in den Werken des Hieronymus durch eine Vergleichung mit den jüdischen Quellen* (Breslau, 1861), 8; Krauss, "Church Fathers," in *Jewish Encyclopedia* 4 (1903) 80-86, esp. 81.

²⁴ Stemberger, "Hieronymus," 356. See also the same author's *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land: Palestine in the Fourth Century* (trans. Ruth Tuschling; Edinburgh, 2000) 40-43.

²⁵ Rufinus, *Apol. adv. Hier.* 2.15 (CChr.SL 20:95); 2.38 (CChr.SL 20:113).

²⁶ Günter Stemberger claims that most of Jerome's informants, including a Hebrew in the desert of Chalcis and a Chaldean in Antioch, are actually not Jews but Jewish Christians, namely Jewish converts to Christianity. Moreover, there is a possibility that even Baraninas is a Jewish Christian (Stemberger, "Hieronymus," 356-58). However, it is ultimately difficult or even impossible to discern who are the genuine Jews and who are the Jewish Christians, as Nicholas de Lange states: "Today we speak easily about 'Rabbinic' and 'Hellenistic' Judaism, about 'Jewish Christians' and so forth, but these are modern terms, which would have meant little to the ancients" (N. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-century Palestine* (Cambridge, 1976) 29).

²⁷ Similar expressions of appeal to the Hebrews can be found in many places (See note 17). In particular, the following two instances, appearing with the term *Hebraica veritas*, are extremely important for the discussion in the present study: Jerome, *Praef. in Ps. (IH)* 26-28 (Weber/Gryson, 768): *Certe confidenter dicam et multos huius operis testes citabo, me nihil dumtaxat scientem de hebraica veritate mutasse. Sicubi ergo editio mea a veteribus discreparit, interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum*"; Jerome, *Praef. in Sam. et Reg.* 68-71 (Weber/Gryson, 365-66): *... quamquam mihi omnino conscius non sim mutasse me quippiam de hebraica veritate. Certe si incredulus es, lege graecos codices et latinos et confer cum his opusculis, et ubicumque inter se videris discrepare, interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum cui magis accomodare debeas fidem.*

²⁸ S. Bassnet, *Translation Studies* (London, 2002) 48-51; B.G. Wright III, "Access to the Source: Cicero, Ben Sira, The Septuagint and Their Audiences," *JSJ* 34 (2003) 1-27; Th.A.W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (Leuven, 2007) 35-46.

the correspondence between Augustine and Jerome.²⁹ Augustine's adherence to the LXX derives not only from the above-mentioned theological or spiritual position, but also from the following simple philological or textual argument: The source text of biblical translation should be Greek, a universally well-known language, so that the readers will be able to examine the original text, by comparing it with the Latin translation.³⁰ What Augustine requires is comparability between the original text and the translated text. Indeed, in terms of the New Testament, he highly evaluates Jerome's "translation" (actually his emendation), based on the fact that Jerome translated it from Greek, not because he translated it from the original text:

Nevertheless we give thanks to God in no small measure for your work in translating the Gospels from the Greek; when we compared it with the Greek Scriptures we found hardly anything to object to in the whole work. And if anyone were to persist in his support of false readings of the old version, he would easily be convinced or confuted if the manuscripts were produced and a comparison made.³¹

Here Augustine clearly states that he actually made a comparison of Jerome's Latin "translation" of the Gospels with the Greek original text. Moreover, he claims that the supporters of the Old Latin versions would easily be refuted by comparing them with the Greek text. All of these comparisons were made possible because the source text was Greek. With regard to the Old Testament, Augustine likewise attached importance to the LXX, because, firstly, as stated in his *On Christian Doctrine*, it is an inspired text by the Holy Spirit, and secondly it is written in Greek.³²

²⁹ On the correspondence between Augustine and Jerome, see D. de Bruyne, "La correspondance échangée entre Augustin et Jérôme," *ZNW* 31 (1932) 233-48; R.J. O'Connell, "When Saintly Fathers Feuded: The Correspondence between Augustine and Jerome," *Thought* 54 (1979) 344-64; C. White, *The Correspondence (394-419) between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo* (Lewiston, New York, 1990); R. Hennings, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal. 2, 11-14* (Leiden, 1993); A. Fürst, *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus* (Münster, 1999); Idem (ed.), *Augustinus-Hieronymus: Epistulae Mutuae-Briefwechsel* (2 vols.; Turnhout, 2002).

³⁰ T. Kato, "Greek or Hebrew? Augustine and Jerome on Biblical Translation," in *Studia Patristica* 98, ed. Markus Vinzent (Leuven, 2017) 109-19, esp. 116.

³¹ Augustine, *Ep.* 71.6 (= *Ep.* 104.6 in Jerome's edition) (*Augustinus-Hieronymus* 1, ed. Fürst, 164-66): *Proinde non parvas deo gratias agimus de opere tuo, quod evangelium ex Graeco interpretatus es, quia et paene in omnibus nulla offensio est, cum scripturam Graecam contulerimus. Unde si quisquam veteri falsitati contentiosus favet, prolatis collatisque codicibus vel docetur facillime vel refellitur*. English translation follows, with some modifications, White, *Correspondence*, 93.

³² Augustine does not claim that knowledge about the original languages of the Bible is unnecessary. Rather he clearly recommends the Latin readers learn Hebrew and Greek (*Doct. chr.* 2.11.16). However, according to Augustine, those who cannot master such difficult languages have the option of possessing multiple literal translations, so that they can use them to correct the freedom or the error of the translators. See Augustine, *Doct. chr.* 2.13.19 (CChr.SL 32:44-45): *Aut linguarum illarum, ex quibus in latinam scriptura pervenit, petenda cognitio est aut habendae interpretationes eorum, qui se verbis nimis*

In contrast, Jerome, who claims the superiority of the Hebrew text as a source text of translation, recommends the readers consult with the Hebrews:

And if, as you say, you approve of my revision of the New Testament, the reason you give for your approval being that there are many people with a knowledge of Greek who can judge my work, then you ought to believe that my work on the Old Testament is equally authentic, for in it I did not include my own ideas but only translated the divine texts as I found them in the Hebrews. If you do not believe me, ask the Hebrews!³³

Simply by asking the Hebrews, says Jerome, the readers will be able to secure a way of comparison between the source text and the translated text without knowing any single word of Hebrew. In response to this, Augustine later changes his mind according to the endorsement of the Jews.³⁴ Moreover, he reevaluates Jerome's contribution, and finally admits that not only the LXX but also the Hebrew text is an inspired text.³⁵

4 The Apostles as Philological and Theological Authorities

The Apostles, on the other hand, function as philological as well as theological authorities. After stating in the *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)* that both the Hebrews and the Apostles can serve as authorities, Jerome reports that he recently proved in his *On the Best Method of Translating* (= *Ep.* 57) that at least four quotations in the Gospels and the Pauline letters were taken not from the LXX but the Hebrew text, giving specific examples: Matt 2:15, Matt 2:23, John 19:37, and 1 Cor 2:9. The selection of the verses indicates that the word "Apostles" does not just mean the disciples of Jesus, but especially the Evangelists and Paul. Among these examples, comparing the quotation in Matt 2:15 (ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου, "Out of

obstrinxerunt; non quia sufficiunt, sed ut ex eis libertas vel error dirigatur aliorum, qui non magis verba quam sententias interpretando sequi maluerunt.

³³ Jerome, *Ep.* 112.20 (= *Ep.* 75.20 in Augustine's edition) (*Augustinus-Hieronymus* 1, ed. Fürst, 224): *Et si me, ut dicis, in novi testamenti emendatione suscipis exponisque causam cur suscipias, quia plurimi linguae Graecae habentes scientiam de meo possent opere iudicare, eandem integritatem debueras etiam in veteri credere testamento, quod non nostra confinximus, sed ut apud Hebraeos invenimus, divina transtulimus. Sicubi dubitas, Hebraeos interroga!* White, *Correspondence*, 135-36.

³⁴ Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 18.43 (CChr.SL 48:639): *Sed eius [sc. Jerome's] tam litteratum laborem quamvis Iudaei fateantur esse veracem, septuaginta vero interpretes in multis errasse contendunt.*

³⁵ Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 18.43 (CChr.SL 48:640): *Si ergo, ut oportet, nihil aliud intueamur in scripturis illis, nisi quid per homines dixerit Dei Spiritus, quidquid est in Hebraeis codicibus et non est apud interpretes septuaginta, noluit ea per istos, sed per illos prophetas Dei Spiritus dicere. Quidquid vero est apud Septuaginta, in Hebraeis autem codicibus non est, per istos ea maluit quam per illos idem Spiritus dicere, sic ostendens utrosque fuisse prophetas.*

Egypt I have called my son”) with its source text Hos 11:1, we can find that the quotation agrees with the Hebrew text (וממצרים קראתי לבני, “And out of Egypt I have called my son”), but disagrees with the LXX (καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ, “And out of Egypt I recalled his children”).³⁶ As is clear from this instance, Jerome, relying on the fact that the Evangelists and Paul depend on the Hebrew text in quoting the Bible, claims that the truth resides in the Hebrew text, not in the LXX.³⁷

The above-mentioned discussion in the *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)* is actually a recapitulation of a broader theological discussion for readers’ convenience. The complete discussion is found in his *Ep. 57* or *On the Best Method of Translating*, which Jerome mentions in the preface.³⁸ This is an apologetic treatise against Jerome’s opponents who harshly criticize him for making many mistakes in translating Epiphanius of Salamis’s letter addressed to John of Jerusalem. Jerome refutes these opponents, by explaining that his translation is not necessarily in one-to-one correspondence to the original text, for he adopts translation according to sense as his own method, following Cicero’s translation theory.³⁹ In order to justify this attitude, Jerome refers to twelve verses, including verses mentioned in the *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)*, as examples, in which the seventy translators and the Apostles also offer translation according to sense (*Ep. 57.7-9*).

Although Jerome seems to have cited these twelve verses at random, careful consideration about agreement/disagreement between the Hebrew text, the LXX, and the quotation, enables us to classify them into three categories:⁴⁰ first, the quotation agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX (John 19:37; Matt 2:15; Matt 2:23; 1 Cor. 2:9;

³⁶ See also Jerome, *Comm. in Osee* 3.11.1-2 (CChr.SL 76:121): *Pro eo quod nos diximus: “Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum,” Septuaginta transtulerunt: “Ex Aegypto vocavi filios eius,” quod in Hebraico non habetur; nullique dubium est, Matthaeum de hoc loco sumpsisse testimonium iuxta Hebraicam veritatem.*

³⁷ In fact, many of the Old Testament passages in the New Testament are cited from the LXX, but it is generally accepted that at least the authors of the Gospels according to Matthew and John, Paul, and the author of Revelation had some knowledge of the Hebrew Bible. On this subject, see D.C. Allison, JR., “The Old Testament in the New Testament,” in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible* 1, 479-502. For the more detailed analysis on the specific verses, see, for example, S. Hashimoto, “The Function of the Old Testament Quotations and Allusions in the Marcan Passion Narrative” (ThD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1970).

³⁸ For the detail about Jerome’s *Ep. 57*, see G.J.M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus, Liber de Optimo Genere Interpretandi (epistula 57): Ein Kommentar* (Leiden, 1980); N. Adkin, “Who is *accusator meus* at the Start of Jerome’s *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi* (Epist. 57)?” *Latomus* 55 (1996) 875-77.

³⁹ On Jerome’s theory of translation, see G. Cuendet, “Cicéron et Saint Jérôme traducteurs,” *REL* 11 (1933) 380-400; W. Adler, “*Ad Verbum* or *Ad Sensum*: The Christianization of a Latin Translation Formula in the Fourth Century,” in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen (Sheffield, 1994) 321-48. For the detailed analysis on his practice of translation, see B. Kedar-Kopfstein, “The Vulgate as a Translation: Some Semantic and Syntactical Aspects of Jerome’s Version of the Hebrew Bible” (PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1968); Weigert, *Hebraica Veritas*, 30-67; M.A. Kraus, *Jewish, Christian, and Classical Exegetical Traditions in Jerome’s Translation of the Book of Exodus: Translation Technique and the Vulgate* (Leiden, 2017).

⁴⁰ T. Kato, “Jerome’s Understanding of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament,” *VC* 67 (2013) 289-315, esp. 302.

Rom 9:33); second, the quotation, the Hebrew text, and the LXX disagree with one another (Matt 27:9-10; Matt 1:23); and third, the Hebrew text agrees with the LXX, but the quotation disagrees with both of them (Matt 26:31; Matt 2:6). Jerome adopts different attitudes for the case in which the Hebrew text disagrees with the LXX (as in the first and second categories mentioned above) and that in which the Hebrew text disagrees with the quotation (as in the second and third categories). In the former case, he simply considers the disagreement as mistranslation of the Hebrew text by the seventy translators, whereas in the latter, he accepts the disagreement as free translation by the Apostles, with the idea that the quotation and the Hebrew text have the same meaning even if their wordings are different. For Jerome, the quotation never disagrees with the Hebrew text: when they agree with one another, there is no problem, and even when they disagree with one another in wording, the superficial disagreement does not mean that the quotation lost the truth contained in the Old Testament, because the Apostles cited it directly from the Hebrew text. Here we observe that strict philological judgment, whether the translation literally agrees with the source text, is only imposed on the seventy elders, whereas the Apostles are almost free from it and are allowed to have a theological standard in which their quotations spiritually agree with the Hebrew text, even though they do not literally.

This asymmetry of Jerome's approach between the Apostles and the seventy elders seems to be odd at first glance, since the source text of the elders is the Hebrew text, too. Why is Jerome intolerant only of the elders? In his *Preface to the Pentateuch*, Jerome, following the "historical" accounts of the origin of the LXX recorded in the *Letter of Aristeas* and Josephus's *Judean Antiquities*, gives two reasons for the justification of his favoritism:⁴¹ first, the seventy elders are less reliable as translators, because they deliberately distorted the original text to adapt their concept of divinity to that of King Ptolemy;⁴² second, the Apostles are more reliable, because they experienced the Advent of Christ as a history, unlike the seventy elders who knew it only as a prophecy.⁴³ Since "what we understand better, we

⁴¹ Kato, "Jerome's Understanding," 308-12.

⁴² Jerome, *Praef. in Pent.* 21-25 (Weber/Gryson, 3). According to Adam Kamesar, Jerome was inspired by two different sources in formulating this argument: Eusebius of Caesarea and a certain Jewish aggada (Kamesar, *Jerome*, 64-67). See also D. Barthélemy, "Eusèbe, la Septante et 'les autres,'" in *La Bible et les Pères: Colloque de Strasbourg (1er-3 octobre 1969)*, ed. A. Benoit and P. Prigent (Paris, 1971) 51-65; repr. in Barthélemy, *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (Göttingen, 1978) 179-93; E. Tov, "The Rabbinic Tradition Concerning the 'Alterations' Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and Their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX," *JSJ* 15 (1984) 65-89.

⁴³ Jerome, *Praef. in Pent.* 35-38 (Weber/Gryson, 4): *Illi interpretati sunt ante adventum Christi et quod nesciebant dubiis protulere sentiis, nos post passionem et resurrectionem eius non tam prophetiam quam historiam scribimus*. In this regard, Sarah Kamin points out that Jerome expresses conflicting views concerning the Seventy (Kamin, "Theological Significance," xvii): "[According to Jerome,] the Seventy left verses untranslated or changed their meaning in translation precisely because they did understand these verses [which reflect the Advent of Christ]; on the other hand, they translated decisive verses 'but vaguely' because they did not understand (and could not have understood) because they lived before the coming of Jesus." In my opinion, however, this is not a contradiction. Jerome does not say that the Seventy was

translate better” (*quod melius intellegimus, melius et proferimus*),⁴⁴ the Apostles, who lived with Jesus in the same age, were in a better position to make an accurate translation. Because of these two reasons, Jerome judges the LXX on a philological level, but the Apostles both on a philological and theological level. In other words, he clearly attributes more authority to the Apostles than to the seventy elders.⁴⁵

5 Christ as the Highest Authority

Just like the Apostles, Christ also functions as a philological and theological authority, but as the highest one. As seen above in his *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)*, Jerome indicates that he validated his own translation in the judgment of the Hebrews and the Apostles. After enumerating the four quotations by the Apostles, he eventually points out the fact that an Old Testament quotation, disagreeing with the LXX but agreeing with the Hebrew text, is also found in the word of Jesus in John 7:38 (ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥέουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος, “The one believing in me, as the Scripture said, rivers of living water flow out of his belly”). When the Old Testament quotations of “Christ, our God, and the founder of each Testament” agree with the Hebrew text but disagree with the LXX, they can be regarded as the strongest evidence of the superiority of the Hebrew text as a source text of translation. Accordingly, Jerome reaches the natural conclusion that “one should return to the Hebrew books, from which both the Lord speaks and the disciples draw their examples.”

Since his Roman period (c. 382-385), Jerome has been collecting concrete examples of the quotations that agree with the Hebrew text but disagree with the LXX, discussing this matter in the following seven texts:⁴⁶

completely ignorant of the Advent. They knew it not as *historia* but as *prophetia*. In other words, the Seventy’s knowledge about the Advent was not as precise as that of the Apostles (and of Jerome himself) who understood it as something that had already happened. The Seventy, however, at least recognized it as something that would happen in the future.

⁴⁴ Jerome, *Praef. in Pent.* 38-39 (Weber/Gryson, 4).

⁴⁵ Jerome, *Praef. in Pent.* 39-42 (Weber/Gryson, 4): *Audi igitur, aemule, obtrectator ausculta: non damno, non reprehendo Septuaginta, sed confidenter cunctis illis Apostolos praefero. Per istorum os mihi Christus sonat, quos ante prophetas inter spiritalia charismata positos lego, in quibus ultimum paene gradum interpretes tenent.* Contrary to Jerome, Hilary of Poitiers uses the exact same logic concerning *prophetia* and *historia* rather to support the authority of the LXX. According to Hilary’s understanding, since the seventy elders translated early, before the Advent of Christ, there is no way that their translation could have included an adulation of Christ. In other words, anteriority releases them of any bias fitted to the Christian events. See Hilary of Poitiers, *Tract. in Psal.* 2.3 (CSEL 22:39): *Sed perfecta horum septuaginta interpretum auctoritas manet. Primum, quod ante adventum corporalem domini transtulerunt, nec adulationis interpretandi adhibita temporis arguetur, tanto anteriore interpretationis aetate.*

⁴⁶ Bartelink, *Hieronymus*, 80-82. For a detailed examination of Jerome’s use of each of the Old Testament quotations, see Kato, “Jerome’s Understanding,” 297.

1. *Ep.* 20.2 (Matt 2:23; Matt 2:15)
2. *Vir. ill.* 3.4 (Matt 2:15; Matt 2:23)
3. *Praef. in Ezra* 25-26 (Matt 2:23; Matt 2:15; John 19:37)
4. *Ep.* 57.7-9 (John 19:37; Matt 2:15; Matt 2:23; 1 Cor 2:9; Rom 9:33)
5. *Praef. in Par. (IH)* 22-29 (Matt 2:15; Matt 2:23; John 19:37; 1 Cor. 2:9; John 7:38)
6. *Praef. in Pent.* 12-16 (Matt 2:15; Matt 2:23; John 19:37; John 7:38; 1 Cor 2:9)
7. *Comm. in Is.* 3.6.9 (Matt 2:15; Matt 2:23; John 7:38; John 19:37)

A brief review of Jerome's collection of the examples demonstrates that he mentions the word of Jesus in John 7:38 for the first time in the *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)*, subsequently dealing with it in every text. However, except for the *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)*, he places this verse on the same level with the quotations of the Apostles without any emphasis.⁴⁷

Other than the above-mentioned texts, the significance of the quotations in the words of Jesus is especially highlighted in the *Apology against Rufinus*, which was presumably published in 401/2, namely, between the *Preface to the Pentateuch* and the *Commentary on Isaiah* in the list above.⁴⁸ In Book Two of this polemical work, Jerome gives lengthy citations from his own prefaces to the Pentateuch, Samuel and Kings, Chronicles (*IH*), Ezra and Nehemiah, Job (*IH*), the Psalters (*IH*), the Books of Solomon (*IH*), Isaiah, and Daniel, to defend his position. Among them, the citation of the prefaces to the Pentateuch and the Chronicles (*IH*) contain the discussion about the quotations. By these citations of the prefaces, Jerome first explains the fact that the Apostles clearly use the Hebrew text, and then offers the following concluding remark at the very end of Book Two:

The Lord and Savior, whenever He refers to ancient Scripture, quotes examples from

⁴⁷ Jerome, *Praef. in Pent.* 11-19 (Weber/Gryson, 3): *Maximeque Evangelistarum et Apostolorum auctoritas, in quibus multa de Veteri Testamento legimus quae in nostris codicibus non habentur, ut est illud: "Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum," et: "Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur," et: "Videbunt in quem compunxerunt," et: "Flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae," et: "Quae nec oculus vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascenderunt quae praeparavit Deus diligentibus se," et multa alia quae proprium σύνταγμα desiderant. Interrogemus ergo eos ubi haec scripta sint, et cum dicere non potuerint, de libris hebraicis proferamus. Primum testimonium est in Osee, secundum in Isaia, tertium in Zaccharia, quartum in Proverbiis, quintum aequè in Isaia. Jerome, Comm. in Is. 3.6.9 (R. Gryson and P.-A. Deproost (ed.), Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe, Livres I-IV (Freiburg, 1993) 324-25): Mattheus autem et Iohannes, quorum alter hebraeo alter graeco sermone evangelia texuerunt, testimonia de hebraico proferunt, ut est illud: "Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum," et: "Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur," et: "Flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae," et: "Videbunt in quem compunxerunt," et cetera his similia.*

⁴⁸ The dating of publication follows a full list of Jerome's works in Fürst, *Hieronymus*, 363-97. For the details about Jerome's *Apol. adv. Ruf.*, see P. Lardet, *Saint Jérôme, Apologie contre Rufin: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et index* (Paris, 1983); Idem, *L'Apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin: Un commentaire* (Leiden, 1993). For the life and works of Rufinus, see F.X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia (345-411): His Life and Works* (Washington, D.C., 1945).

the Hebrew volumes, such as the following: *The one believing in me, as the Scripture said, rivers of living water flow out of his belly* (John 7:38). And on the cross itself: *Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, which means: My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?* (Matt 27:46) not, as it is quoted in the LXX: *O God, my God, look upon me, why have you forsaken me?* and many other passages similar to these. We do not say this because we wish to rebuke the seventy translators, but because the authority of the Apostles and of Christ is greater; and wherever the seventy translators are not at variance with the Hebrew, there the Apostles took their examples from their translation; but where they differ, they quoted in Greek what they had learned from the Hebrews. Therefore, just as I am pointing it out that there are many quotations in the New Testament taken from the ancient books which are not found in the LXX, and am showing that they were written in Hebrew, in like manner, my accuser should also point out any passage in the New Testament taken from the seventy translators which is not found in the Hebrew, and the controversy is over.⁴⁹

Here Jerome presents not only John 7:38, as in the *Preface to the Chronicles (IH)*, but also Matt 27:46, as examples of the word of Jesus, in which the Old Testament quotation agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX.

The Greek text of John 7:38 has been regarded as being quite problematic throughout the history of its interpretation.⁵⁰ Even modern biblical scholars have not yet reached a consensus, for example, about its punctuation. Some consider the word preceding the formula “as the Scripture said” to be a quotation, but most interpreters, including Jerome, consider the quotation to begin after the formula.⁵¹

⁴⁹ Jerome, *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 2.34 (CChr.SL 79:71-72): *Dominus atque Salvator, ubicumque Veteris Scripturae meminit, de hebraeis voluminibus ponit exempla, ut est illud: “Qui credit in me, sicut dicit Scriptura, flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae,” et in ipsa cruce: “Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani, quod interpretatur: Deus meus, Deus meus, quare me dereliquisti?” non ut a Septuaginta positum est: “Deus, Deus meus, respice me, quare me dereliquisti?” et multa his similia. Nec hoc dicimus quod Septuaginta interpretes suggillemus, sed quo apostolorum et Christi sit maior auctoritas, et ubicumque Septuaginta ab hebraico non discordant, ibi apostolos de interpretatione eorum exempla sumpsisse; ubi vero discrepant, id posuisse in graeco quod apud Hebraeos didicerant. Sicut ergo ego ostendo multa in Novo Testamento posita de veteribus libris quae in Septuaginta non habentur, et haec scripta in hebraico doceo, sic accusator ostendat aliquid scriptum esse in Novo Instrumento de Septuaginta interpretibus quod in hebraico non habetur, et finita contentio est.* The English translation is cited, with some modification, from J.N. Hritzu (trans.), *Saint Jerome: Dogmatic and Polemical Works* (Washington, D.C., 1965) 160.

⁵⁰ On the discussion about this verse, see R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium* 2 (Freiburg, 1971) 211-17; M.A. Daise, “‘If Anyone Thirsts, Let That One Come to Me and Drink’: The Literary Texture of John 7:37b-38a,” *JBL* 122 (2003) 687-99.

⁵¹ There is also a third view, according to which the formula does not lead a specific quotation, but indicates the Bible in general. See, for example, a catena on John 7.38 under the name of Ammonius the Presbyter (J.A. Cramer (ed.), *Catena in Evangelia S. Lucae et S. Joannis ad Fidem Codd. Mss.* (Hildesheim, 1967) 269): Ποῦ δὲ εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, “ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥέουσιν,” οὐδαμῶς. Τί οὖν ἐστὶν “ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή;” ἐνταῦθα ὑποστίξαι δεῖ, ἵνα ᾗ “ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥέουσιν,” τῆς αὐτοῦ

In his *Preface to the Pentateuch*, Jerome indicates that the source of the quotation is Proverbs, without specifying the verse.⁵² According to modern scholars, for Jerome there are two possibilities in Proverbs as the source of the quotation: Francis A. Gasquet, Robert Weber with Roger Gryson, and Gerard J.M. Bartelink suggest Prov 18:4,⁵³ whereas Hugo Rahner and Joel C. Elowsky propose Prov 5:15-16.⁵⁴ Among them, Rahner most extensively discusses this matter in a convincing way: the one who identified the source of the quotation in John 7:38 as Prov 5:15-16 is, in fact, Origen, and Jerome follows this identification.⁵⁵ Since chapter seven of Origen's *Commentary on John* has been lost, Rahner explores the immense corpus of Origen, and finally finds that Origen in his *Homily on Genesis* 12.5 connected LXX Prov 5:15-16 with the quotation in John 7:38.⁵⁶ The Greek text of LXX Prov 5:15-16 is as follows: πίνε ὕδατα ἀπὸ σῶν ἀγγείων, καὶ ἀπὸ σῶν φρεάτων πηγῆς. μὴ ὑπερεκχεῖσθω σοι τὰ ὕδατα ἐκ τῆς σῆς πηγῆς, εἰς δὲ σὰς πλατείας διαπορευέσθω τὰ σὰ ὕδατα, "Drink water from your vessels and from the cisterns of your well. Let not the waters out of your well overflow for you; rather let your waters flow into your streets." This identification of Origen was taken over by Ambrose and Jerome, and became widespread in the Latin-speaking world. On the other hand, Rahner considers that it is less convincing to regard the source of the quotation as Prov 18:4, because the supporters of this idea have no other evidence than the arbitrary

ἀποφάσεως. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι Υἱὸς Θεοῦ ἐστὶ, καὶ δημιουργὸς πάσης κτίσεως, καὶ συνάνταρχος τῷ Πατρὶ, καὶ ὅτι μέλλει ἄνθρωπος γίνεσθαι, καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκ πλάνης λυτροῦσθαι, διὰ τοῦτο τῆς γραφῆς ἐμνημόνευσεν, ὅτι ὁ οὕτως, ὡς αὐτὴ λέγει, πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, "ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσι." Τὸ θαψιλὲς καὶ ἄφθονον τῆς χάριτος αἰνιττόμενος.

⁵² Jerome, *Praef. in Pent.* 11-19 (Weber/Gryson, 3) (See note 47). Within the Hieronymian corpus in CChr.SL and CSEL, he never explains the source of the quotation in John 7:38 in 24 total occurrences (*Comm. in Eccl.* 9.7-8; 11.1; *Tract. Psal.* 77.15; 99.8; *Apol. adv. Ruf.* 2.25, 27, 34; *Comm. in Os.* 3.13.3; *Comm. in Ioel* 3.18; *Comm. in Am.* 2.5.4-5; 3.8.11-14; *Comm. in Nah.* 1.12-13; *Comm. in Zach.* 3.14.8-9; *Comm. in Is.* 3.6.9-10; 4.12.3; 9.30.25; 10.32.1-8; 12.41.17-20; 15.55.1-2; 17.64.8-12; *Comm. in Ezech.* 9.29.3-7; *Comm. in Jer.* 3.76 (17.12-13); 6.24 (31 [38].25-26); *Ep.* 120.9.11). In many cases, the "living water flowing out of his belly" in the quotation is interpreted as the biblical truth, for which the Gentiles thirst. Accordingly, Jerome cites with the quotation in John 7.38 many verses (e.g. Jer 2:13; Ps 68:27; 36:10; 46:4; 65:10; John 4:13-14) with the image of a spring or a stream of water, which irrigate a dry land. See, for example, *Comm. in Is.* 4.12.3; 9.30.25; 10.32.1-8; 12.41.17-20; 15.55.1-2; *Comm. in Ezech.* 9.29.3-7.

⁵³ F.A. Gasquet et al. (ed.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam Versionem ad Codicum Fidem iussu PII PP. XI, Librum Genesis* (Rome, 1926) 65; Weber/Gryson, 3; Bartelink, *Hieronymus*, 81. Prov 17.4 in *Patrologia Latina* (vol. 28, col. 180) should be read Prov 18.4 instead.

⁵⁴ H. Rahner, "Flumina de ventre Christi: Die patristische Auslegung von Joh 7, 37. 38," *Biblica* 22 (1941) 269-302, 367-403, esp. 299-301; J.C. Elowsky, *John 1-10: Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture* (Downers Grove, IL, 2006) 265 n. 7.

⁵⁵ Rahner, "Patristische Auslegung," 280.

⁵⁶ Origen, *Hom. 1-16 in Gen.* 12.5 (GCS Neue Folge 17 = Origenes Werke 6:177-78): *Temptemus facere etiam illud, quod sapientia conmonet dicens: "bibe aquas de tuis fontibus, et de tuis puteis, et sit tibi fons tuus proprius" [Prov 5:15]. Tempta ergo et tu, O auditor, habere proprium puteum et proprium fontem, ut et tu, cum apprehenderis librum scripturarum, incipias etiam ex proprio sensu proferre aliquem intellectum et secundum ea, quae in ecclesia didiscisti, tempta et tu bibere de fonte ingenii tui ... Si enim suscepisti in te verbum Dei, si accepisti ab Iesu "aquam vivam" et fideliter accepisti, fiet in te "fons aquae salientis in vitam aeternam."* Rahner considers that the last line alludes to both John 4:14 and 7:38 (p. 281).

decision by Dominic Vallarsi, a Jesuit monk in the eighteenth century who edited Jerome's works. Rather, Francisco de Toledo, another Jesuit monk in the sixteenth century, had already pointed out, before Vallarsi, that Jerome regarded the source of the quotation as Prov 5:15-16.⁵⁷

However, granted that what Rahner claims is true, it is still unclear whether John 7:38 is in accord with Jerome's argument. We must recall the fact that Jerome cited this verse to prove the superiority of the Hebrew text as a source text of translation, by demonstrating that the quotation in the word of Jesus agrees with the Hebrew text, but disagrees with the LXX. The Hebrew text of Prov 5:15-16 is as follows: שתה מים מבורך וגו' מותך בארץ. יפוצו מעינתך חוצה ברחבות פלגי מים, "Drink water from your own cistern, running water from your own well. Your springs will gush forth, in streams in the public squares." Comparison of the quotation with the Hebrew text and the LXX does not convey as clear a contrast between them as we have seen in other verses, but at least the LXX is greatly different from the Hebrew text with regard to a negative particle $\mu\eta$ in the second half of the verse. Because of this, the LXX becomes a negative sentence ("Let *not* the waters out of your well overflow for you"), whereas the Hebrew text is an affirmative sentence ("Your springs will gush forth"), just as the quotation ("Rivers of living water flow out of his belly"). Moreover, since the presence of the negative particle is mentioned in the *Hexapla*, one can safely state that Jerome also noticed this point.⁵⁸ We, however, lack definite information about Jerome's intention, as unfortunately he did not write a commentary on Proverbs.⁵⁹

By contrast, Jerome's discussion about Matt 27:46 is straightforward. As stated in the *Apology against Rufinus* 2.34, the quotation ($\eta\lambda\iota\ \eta\lambda\iota\ \lambda\epsilon\mu\alpha\ \sigma\alpha\beta\alpha\chi\theta\alpha\nu\iota$; τοῦτ' ἔστιν· θεέ μου θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες; "'Eli Eli Lema Sabachthani?' namely, 'My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?') agrees with the Hebrew text of Ps 22:2 ($\text{אֱלֹהִי אֱלֹהִי לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי}$), "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?"), but disagrees with the LXX Ps 21:2 ($\delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$, πρόσχες μοι· ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με; "God, my God, *look upon me*; why have you forsaken me?"). The LXX inserts the phrase "look upon me" after the appeal to God. In his *Commentary on Matthew* 4.27.46, Jerome warns that one should not interpret Ps 22:2 to be spoken by the persona of David, or of Esther and Mordecai, because this verse is actually a prophecy of the Passion of the Lord.⁶⁰ According to Jerome, other verses in this chapter, including 21:17 and 21:19, support this interpretation. In comparison with John 7:38, Jerome cites Matt 27:46 only

⁵⁷ Rahner, "Patristische Auslegung," 300-1.

⁵⁸ F. Field (ed.), *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* 2 (Oxford, 1875) 319.

⁵⁹ Moreover, the question still remains: why did Jerome especially adopt Origen's opinion at the very moment when he gives a concluding remark? We have no answer so far.

⁶⁰ Jerome, *Comm. in Matt.* 4.27.46 (CChr.SL 77:274): *Principio vicesimi primi psalmi abusus est illudque quod in medio versiculo legitur: Respice me, superfluum est. Legitur enim in hebraeo: Deus meus, Deus meus, quare me dereliquisti? Ergo impii sunt qui psalmum ex persona David sive Hester et Mardochei dictum putant, cum etiam evangelistae testimonia ex eo sumpta super Salvatore intellegant ...*

a few times in his entire corpus.⁶¹ Furthermore, Jerome does not refer much to this verse in the above-mentioned seven texts, except for the brief comments in *On the Best Method of Translating* (*Ep.* 57.10.4). In spite of his less frequent attention, he dares to cite this verse at the concluding remark of the *Apology*, only because it contains the quotation in the words of Jesus. In sum, both in John 7:38 and Matt 27:46, Jerome uses Jesus Christ as the highest authority in order to silence his opponents, and to put the controversy to rest.

6 Conclusion

The results of the present investigation may now be summarized as follows: Jerome tries to prove the superiority of the Hebrew text as a source text of translation not only on a philological level, but also a theological level, for he has to be on an equal footing with Hilary and Augustine. In order to do so, he relies on three authorities, namely, the Hebrews, the Apostles, and Christ. First, the Hebrews give the purely philological endorsement to Jerome's discussions. Educated readers, who generally read a translated text in comparison with the original text, require the source text of the Old Testament to be the LXX, a text written in a universally well-known language. Therefore Jerome recommends the readers of his translation ask the Hebrews about accuracy, so that the readers can secure a way of comparison without knowing Hebrew. Secondly, the Apostles—especially the Evangelists and Paul—as authorities validate Jerome's position, starting at a philological level and shifting to a theological level. Based on the philological fact that some Old Testament quotations in the New Testament agree with the Hebrew text but disagree with the LXX, Jerome demonstrates the Hebrew text more precisely prophesied the revelation that would be attested in the quotations in the New Testament. Then he tries to seek deeper meaning: Even if the quotations seem not to literally agree with the Hebrew text, Jerome considers that they spiritually agree with the Hebrew text. In other words, Jerome's philological observations on the quotations trigger his theological decision to attribute more authority to the Apostles than to the seventy elders. Finally, Christ functions as the highest authority of the *Hebraica veritas*. If the quotations in the words of Jesus are also in accord with the Hebrew text, no one could question the authority of the Hebrew text as a source text of translation.

In conclusion, the ultimate purpose of Jerome's project concerning *Hebraica veritas* is not only to solve the philological problem between the two texts—the Hebrew text and the LXX—by questioning which one of them is more correct as the Old Testament. Rather,

⁶¹ I checked all the occurrences of Matt 27:46 in CChr.SL and CSEL, and found out that Jerome referred to this verse only six times (*Nom. Heb.* Matt. E; *Tract. in Psal.* 88.39; *Comm. in Is.* 13.49.8-13; 14.53.1-4; *Comm. in Matt.* 4.27.46; *Ep.* 57.10.4). Except for *Comm. in Matt.* and *Ep.* 57, with which we dealt here, he gives no explanation about the textual difference of the LXX.

Jerome also deals with the theological problem between the three texts—the Hebrew text, the LXX, and the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament—by investigating which version of the Old Testament more precisely prophesied the revelation which would be attested in the quotations in the New Testament.

Acknowledgement

Previous version of this paper was read at the NAPS annual meeting in Chicago, May 25, 2017, and subsequently incorporated into my doctoral dissertation in Japanese, submitted to Doshisha University, Kyoto. I would like to thank Prof. Adam Kamesar (Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati), who inspired me in various areas of Greek and Latin biblical scholarship through his teaching and personal guidance. My gratitude also goes to Dr. Guy Ridge for his valuable comments and stylistic improvements.