Jerome's Understanding of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament

Kato, Teppei
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University

KYUSHU UNIVERSITY

Jerome's Understanding of Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*

by
Teppei Kato
Graduate School of Theology, Doshisha University
Kamigyo-ku, Kyoto 602-8580, Japan
teppei.kato@gmail.com

Abstract

Jerome compares Old Testament quotations in the New Testament with the Hebrew text and LXX in seven texts, for example in *Ep.* 57 written *c.*395. He adopts different opinions when the LXX disagrees with the Hebrew text and when the quotations disagree with the Hebrew text. In the first case, he demands a strict rendering of words, whereas in the second, he considers the quotations and the Hebrew text to have the same meaning even if their wordings differ. In other words, Jerome attributes more authority to the Evangelists and Paul than to the LXX translators. In this paper, I will explain two reasons—one negative and the other positive—for this dichotomy in Jerome's approach.

Keywords

Jerome, quotation, Hebrew text, LXX

Jerome is well known as one of the greatest Church Fathers who studied Hebrew and biblical exegesis under his Jewish teachers in Bethlehem and translated the Old Testament from the original Hebrew text into Latin.[1] This image of Jerome, however, can easily change when we examine the history of research related to him.

Gustave Bardy suggested that while Jerome claimed that his Jewish teachers had taught

---

[1] For standard biographies of Jerome, see, for example, O. Zöckler, *Hieronymus: Sein Leben und Wirken aus seinen Schriften dargestellt* (Gotha, 1865); G. Grützmacher, *Hieronymus: Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte* (3 vols.; Berlin, 1901-8); F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son œuvre* (2 vols.; Louvain, 1922); J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975); S. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: Prosopographische und sozialgeschtliche Untersuchungen* (Stuttgart, 1992).

him their exegesis, he, in fact, had plagiarized it from Greek predecessors such as Origen and Eusebius.[2] Jerome, who mastered Greek while living in Syria and Asia Minor, spent a lot of time reading the works of Origen and Eusebius and translated some of them into Latin. According to Bardy, Jerome learned Jewish interpretations of the Bible from their works but pretended to have learned them from his Jewish teachers in order to boast about his knowledge of Hebrew. Moreover, Pierre Nautin considered Jerome's linguistic competence in Hebrew to be quite low.[3] According to Nautin, Jerome knew so little Hebrew that he had no choice but to depend on his Greek predecessors. Nautin was generally sceptical about Jerome's statements. For instance, he concluded that Jerome's correspondence with Pope Damasus I was a complete fiction created to lend authority to his own remarks.[4] In addition, Nautin believed that the Latin Bible which Jerome claimed to have translated from the original Hebrew text was no more than a second-hand translation from the Hexaplaric (recension of the) LXX.

On the other hand, especially from the viewpoint of the Jewish studies, Jay Braverman and Benjamin Kedar-Kopfstein noted that Jerome was deeply indebted to his Jewish teachers for his exegesis. Further, contrary to Nautin's view, they estimated Jerome's competence in Hebrew to be high.[5] Kedar-Kopfstein, for instance, indicated that some interpretations of rabbinic literature and medieval Jewish exegetes were reflected in the passages of the Vulgate, which Jerome seemed to have mistranslated. In other words, it was not Jerome's low

---

[2] G. Bardy, "Saint Jérôme et ses maîtres hébreux," *RBen* 46 (1934): 145-64. Although some scholars before Bardy evaded the Jewish influence upon Jerome's biblical interpretations, they finally and reluctantly accepted it. See M.-J. Lagrange, "Saint Jérôme et la tradition juive dans la Genèse," *RB* 7 (1898): 563-6; A. Condamin, "L'influence de la tradition juive dans la version de Saint Jérôme," *RSR* 5 (1914): 1-21. Bardy went beyond two of his predecessors and almost denied any Jewish influence on Jerome (see, in particular, pp. 146-47, 154-55). However, regarding competence in Hebrew, he admired Jerome's achievement.

[3] P. Nautin, "Hieronymus," in *TRE* 15 (Berlin, 1986), 304-15.

[4] Ibid., 305. See also, Idem, "Le premier échange épistolaire entre Jérôme et Damase: lettres réelles ou fictives?" *FZPhTh* 30 (1983): 331-44.

[5] J. Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (Washington, DC, 1978); B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Vulgate as a Translation: Some Semantic and Syntactical Aspects of Jerome's Version of the Hebrew Bible" (Diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1968); B. Kedar, "The Latin Translations," in *Mikra: Text, 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; B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "Jewish Traditions in the Writings of Jerome," in *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context*, ed. D. R. G. Beattie and M. J. McNamara (Sheffield, 1994), 420-30. In fact, predecessors of Braverman and Kedar-Kopfstein were Jewish scholars of *Wissenschaft des Judentums* including Heinrich Grätz, Moritz Rahmer, Samuel Krauss and Louis Ginzberg. They compared patristic literature with rabbinic literature to find similar interpretations of the Bible. On this subject, see E. Lamirande, "Étude bibliographique sur les Péres de l'Église et l'Aggadah," *VC* 21 (1967): 1-11; J. R. Baskin, "Rabbinic-Patristic Exegetical Contacts in Late Antiquity: A Bibliographical Reappraisal," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* 5, ed. W. S. Green (BJS 32; Atlanta, 1985), 53-80; G. Stemberger, "Exegetical Contacts between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* 1, ed. M. Sæbø (Göttingen, 1996), 569-86; A. Kamesar, "Church Fathers, Rabbinic Midrash and," in *Encyclopedia of Midrash: Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism* 1, ed. J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck (Leiden, 2005), 20-40.

competence in Hebrew but his rather close relationship with Jewish teachers of the time that made passages different in the Vulgate from what they were in the Masoretic text. Furthermore, scholars of Biblical studies, such as Edmund F. Sutcliffe and James Barr, tried to restore the ancient pronunciations of Hebrew words as they were before the Masoretic text by using Jerome's Latin transliteration.[6] They obviously could not have conducted their research without being convinced of Jerome's competence in Hebrew.

Following the history of research on Jerome, we are confronted by two questions.[7] First, were all of Jerome's exegeses plagiarized from his Greek predecessors? Second, what was Jerome's competence in Hebrew? To answer these questions we first need to consider Jerome's understanding of Old Testament quotations in the New Testament (hereafter Quot.). When passages of the Old Testament are quoted in the New Testament, the wordings of some differ from those of the LXX which was the Old Testament for Christians in antiquity. Regarding these passages, Jerome claimed that their sources were not the LXX but the original Hebrew text. According to him, whenever the Evangelists and Paul quoted any passages of the Old Testament, they always chose the Hebrew text and translated it into Greek. If this assertion is correct and is based on an accurate knowledge of Hebrew, Jerome's originality of exegesis and his competence in Hebrew is likely to be confirmed. Accordingly, we will analyse seven texts of Jerome (See section II), especially his *Ep.* 57, or *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi*, written *c.*395. In these texts, Jerome provides examples which indicate that the source of the Quot. was not the LXX but the Hebrew text.

I. The Quotations and Jerome's "Conversion" to Hebrew

For Jerome's contemporary Christians, the "Old Testament" meant the LXX, which was considered a true, divine text translated under God's inspiration.[8] Although this sanctification of a simple translation appears to be odd, it was derived from an alteration of *Letter of*

---

[6] E. F. Sutcliffe, "St. Jerome's Pronunciation of Hebrew," *Bib* 29 (1948): 112-25; J. Barr, "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew," *BJRL* 49 (1966-67): 281-302; Idem, "St Jerome and the Sounds of Hebrew," *JSS* 12 (1967): 1-36. As Barr acknowledged in the latter article, he consulted the following researches on this topic: C. Siegfried, "Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus," *ZAW* 4 (1884): 34-83; A. Sperber, "Hebrew Based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations," *HUCA* 12-13 (1937-38): 103-274.

[7] For more details on these two questions, see, for example, E. Burstein, "La compétence de Jérôme en hébreu: Explication de certaines erreurs," *REAug* 21 (1975): 3-12; G. Stemberger, "Hieronymus und die Juden seiner Zeit," in *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter*, ed. D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger (Göttingen, 1993), 347-64; M. Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah* (VCS 90; Leiden, 2007), 1-12; H. I. Newman, "How Should We Measure Jerome's Hebrew Competence?" in *Jerome of Stridon: His Life, Writings and Legacy*, ed. A. Cain and J. Lössl (Farnham, 2009), 131-40.

[8] On the attitude of Christians towards the LXX, see W. Schwarz, *Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation: Some Reformation Controversies and their Background* (Cambridge, 1970), 17-44; M. Müller, "Graeca sive Hebraica Veritas? The Defence of the Septuagint in the Early Church," *SJOT* 1 (1989): 103-24.

Aristeas, which recorded the original legend of the LXX. The legend was adapted, for example, by Philo (*De vita Mosis* 2.32), Pseudo-Justin (*Oratio ad graecos* 13.3) and Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 3.21). They explained that the translators of the LXX worked separately in different cells without any possibility of communicating with one another and yet each translated the same text using the same words and expressions. The reason for this miracle was that the translators, like the prophets, were inspired by the Holy Spirit. Thus, with the original legend being expanded, the LXX was regarded as Holy Scripture in early Christianity. Jerome as a Christian may have shared this idea to some degree at first, but later he turned to the Hebrew text exclusively.

Jerome revised and translated the Bible three times.[9] At the first stage, in Rome in 384, he revised the Gospels and the Psalter of the Old Latin version. He started this work at the request of Pope Damasus I, whose secretary he was at the time. At the second stage, in Bethlehem from 389 to 392, Jerome revised the Psalter, Job, the Books of Solomon (sc. Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs) and Chronicles of the Old Latin version with the aid of Origen's *Hexapla*. Finally, at the third stage, in Bethlehem from 392 to 405, Jerome made a Latin translation from the Hebrew text. This translation was a primary part of the canon in the Catholic Church, that is, the so-called Vulgate Bible. He translated Samuel, Kings, the Psalter, the Prophets and Job by the year 392; Ezra and Nehemiah in 394; Chronicles in 396; the Books of Solomon and the Pentateuch by 401; and eventually Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Esther, Tobit and Judith by 405.[10]

It is generally agreed that Jerome's "conversion" to the Hebrew occurred around the year 390, namely in the period of the second stage mentioned above.[11] This assumption seems reasonable because at the second stage Jerome only collated the Old Latin text with the

---

[9] On the process of Jerome's revision or translation of the Bible, see W. H. Semple, "St. Jerome as a Biblical Translator," *BJRL* 48 (1965-66): 227-43; C. B. Tkacz, "'Labor tam utilis' The Creation of the Vulgate," *VC* 50 (1996): 42-72.

[10] Jerome dealt with the Psalter at every stage. The Psalter revised at the first stage is called the "Roman Psalter" (*Psalterium Romanum*), which is not extant. The Psalter revised at the second stage is called the "Gallican Psalter" (*Psalterium Gallicanum*), which became popular in Gaul during the medieval period after Alcuin referred to this version while revising the Bible. The Psalter translated at the third stage is called the "Hebrew Psalter" (*Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos*). In the Stuttgart edition, both the Gallican and Hebrew Psalters are printed side by side. On this subject, see R. Weber and R. Gryson (eds.), *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (hereafter, BSWG) (Stuttgart, ⁵2007), V-XXXIX; S. Rebenich, "Jerome: The 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas,'" *VC* 47 (1993): 50-77, esp. 52.

[11] L. Schade, *Die Inspirationslehre des heiligen Hieronymus: Eine biblisch-geschichtliche Studie* (Freiburg, 1910), 142-44; H. F. D. Sparks, "The Latin Bible," in *The Bible in its Ancient and English Versions*, ed. H. W. Robinson (Oxford, 1940), 100-27, esp. 112; E. F. Sutcliffe, "Jerome," in *Cambridge History of the Bible* 2, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Cambridge, 1969), 80-101, esp. 92; H. F. D. Sparks, "Jerome as Biblical Scholar," in *Cambridge History of the Bible* 1, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), 510-41, esp. 518-21; Schwarz, *Principles*, 28; Kelly, *Jerome*, 159; Müller, "Graeca sive Hebraica Veritas," 114; E. Schulz-Flügel, "The Latin Old Testament Tradition," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament* 1, 642-62, esp. 652; S. Rebenich, *Jerome* (London, 2002), 54; D. Brown, "Jerome and the Vulgate," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation* 1, ed. A. J. Hauser and D. F. Watson (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2003), 355-79, esp. 361.

Hexaplaric LXX, while at the third stage he made a translation from the Hebrew text. This implies that when comparing the Old Latin text with the LXX, Jerome gradually became dissatisfied with the LXX owing to the many disagreements of its wording with the Hebrew text. Accordingly, he decided to make a translation from the original text. This description accounts for the beginning of Jerome's "conversion" from the viewpoint of the differences between the two texts, namely the LXX and Hebrew text.

Adam Kamesar, however, pointed out that Jerome turned towards Hebrew during his stay in Rome (*c.*382–85), that is, in the period of the first stage.[12] Although this position is put forward for several reasons, it is especially noteworthy that in his letters of the Roman period (e.g. *Ep.* 20; 28; 34; 37), Jerome had already started to consider the Hebrew text to be of the highest value. Thus, he had discussions which otherwise could not have been performed without him having a profound knowledge of Hebrew. In these letters, he was asked about biblical interpretations by his friends and opponents, and he answered their questions and criticized their errors on the basis of his knowledge of Hebrew.

Following Kamesar's opinion, I emphasize Jerome's understanding of the Quot. as an indication that Jerome had already attached importance to the Hebrew during his Roman period. In *Ep.* 20.2, written in 383, Jerome notes for the first time that the Quot. agree not with the LXX but with the Hebrew text. One might even suggest that his awareness of the problem with the Quot. made him recognize the importance of the Hebrew text for the interpretation of the New Testament and eventually made him turn to the Hebrew. Accordingly, as Kamesar has correctly demonstrated, we cannot say that Jerome's preference for the Hebrew suddenly occurred at the second stage, as is generally agreed. At the same time, we must consider that the beginning of Jerome's Hebrew studies was a problem not between two texts—the LXX and Hebrew text—but three—the LXX, Hebrew text and Quot. More precisely, Jerome did not directly recognize the differences between the LXX and Hebrew text. Instead, he first recognized that the Quot. disagree with the LXX and agree with the Hebrew text and consequently perceived a disagreement between the LXX and Hebrew text.

II. Seven Texts on the Quotations

Let us first look closely at *Ep.* 20.2, in which Jerome mentions his understanding of the Quot. for the first time:

> Restat ergo, ut omissis opinionum rivulis ad ipsum fontem, unde ab evangelistis

---

[12] A. Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford, 1993), 41-58. On the date of Jerome's taking an interest in Hebrew, Michael Graves basically argues for Kamesar. See Graves, *Jerome's Hebrew Philology*, 87.

sumptum est, recurramus. Nam quomodo illud neque in Graecis neque in Latinis codicibus possumus invenire: "ut conpleretur id, quod dictum est per prophetas: Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur" (Matt 2:23), et illud: "Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum" (Matt 2:15), ita et nunc ex Hebraeis codicibus veritas exprimenda est.[13]

Here, Jerome indicates that Matt 2:23 (quoted from Isa 11:1) and Matt 2:15 (Hos 11:1) are the Quot. not from the LXX but from the Hebrew text. We shall now more thoroughly investigate whether this indication is correct.

Regarding Matt 2:23, we must also consult Jerome's *Comm. in Is.* 4.11.1 because his statement in *Ep.* 20 is unsatisfactory. According to this commentary, the source of the Quot. ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται, "He shall be called a Nazarene," is predicated on the Hebrew text of Isa 11:1, ויצא חטר מגזע ישי ונצר משרשיו יפרה, "A shoot shall come forth from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots," which is slightly different from the same verse in the LXX, Καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης Ιεσσαι, καὶ ἄνθος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης ἀναβήσεται, "And a rod shall come out of the root of Iessai, and a blossom shall come up out of his root." Jerome interprets the word נֵצֶר ("shoot") as נָצְרִי (*Nazareus*),[14] since the "shoot" grown from the roots of Jesse is nothing else but "Jesus."[15] Although, as Jerome puts it, people of the Church could not find out the source of this verse, he knew it because he was taught by educated Hebrews (*eruditi Hebraeorum*). The LXX translators did not know this interpretation; indeed, they had no idea when they mistranslated the word as ἄνθος ("blossom").[16] On the other hand, regarding Matt 2:15, while the Quot. ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου, "Out of Egypt I have called my son," agrees with the Hebrew text of Hos 11:1, וממצרים קראתי לבני, "And out of Egypt I have called my son," the LXX translators treat this verse as καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα

---

[13] *Ep.* 20.2 (CSEL 54, 104-5).

[14] See *Ep.* 57.7 (CSEL 54, 515-16): *Nam in eo loco, ubi nos legimus atque transtulimus: "Et exiet virga de radice Iesse et flos de radice conscendet," in Hebraeo iuxta linguae illius* ἰδίωμα *ita scriptum est: "Exiet virga de radice Iesse et Nazareus de radice eius crescet." Cur hoc omiserunt Septuaginta? Si non licet verbum transferre pro verbo, sacrilegium est vel celasse vel ignorasse mysterium.*

[15] The word נָצְרִי is usually employed in the sense of "Jesus" or a "Christian," but it also means "Nazarene," that is, a member of Jewish Christians. On this subject, see G. F. Moore, "Nazarene and Nazareth," in *The Beginnings of Christianity. Part I: The Acts of the Apostles* 1, ed. F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake (5 vols.; London, 1920), 426-32; R. Kimelman, "*Birkat Ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* 2, ed. E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (Philadelphia, 1981), 226-44, 391-403. On the other hand, Jerome also interprets the word *NEZER* as נָזִיר ("Nazirite"). On this discrepancy in interpretations, see S. Lyonnet, "'Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur' (Mt 2, 23): L'interprétation de S. Jérôme," *Bib* 25 (1944): 196-206; R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids, Mich., ²1999), 129.

[16] See *Comm. in Is.* 4.11.1–3 (R. Gryson et al. [eds.], *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le Prophète Isaïe* [hereafter, *Gryson*] 1 [5 vols.; Freiburg, 1993-9], 436-37): *Pro radice, quam soli LXX transtulerunt, in hebraico scriptum habet GEZA, . . . id est truncum, et pro flore, qui hebraice dicitur NEZER, germen transtulerunt, ut ostenderent quod . . . quasi de trunco Maria et de Maria Christus exortus sit. Illud quod in evangelio Matthei omnes quaerunt ecclesiastici et non inveniunt ubi scriptum sit "Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur," eruditi Hebraeorum de hoc loco assumptum putant.*

τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ, "And out of Egypt I recalled his children." Exactly as Jerome says, the Quot. and Hebrew text write "my son," and the LXX, "his children."[17]

Let us now return to the discussion of *Ep.* 20.2. According to Jerome, the reason for these changes is that the Evangelist chose not the LXX but the Hebrew text when quoting the Old Testament. If so, for the discovery of the source of these Quot., we should refer to neither the LXX nor the Old Latin but to the "Hebrew codices" because these are the "spring itself which was adopted by the Evangelists" and certainly, whence "the truth (*veritas*) is to be expressed."[18]

As stated previously, Jerome mentions his understanding of the Quot. for the first time in *Ep.* 20.2, written in 383. After that, while repeatedly referring to this subject, he gradually adds some verses which, in his view, exemplify a preference for the Hebrew over the Greek of the LXX.[19] We can find seven texts in which Jerome adduces these verses:

1.	*Ep.* 20.2	Matt 2:23 (Isa 11:1), Matt 2:15 (Hos 11:1)
2.	*Vir. ill.* 3	Matt 2:15, Matt 2:23
3.	*Praef. in Ezra*	Matt 2:23, Matt 2:15, John 19:37 (Zech 12:10)
4.	*Ep.* 57.7–9	12 verses (See section III)
5.	*Praef. in Par. (IH)*	Matt 2:15, Matt 2:23, John 19:37, 1 Cor 2:9 (Isa 64:3), John 7:38 (Prov 18:4/5:16?)
6.	*Praef. in Pent.*	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

As shown above, the second text is *De viris illustribus* 3, written in 392, and in this,   Jerome cites the same two verses as in *Ep.* 20.2, namely Matt 2:23 and Matt 2:15. The third text is *Praefatio in Ezra*, written in 394, in which he adds John 19:37 to the two former verses. The

---

[17] See *Ep.* 57.7 (CSEL 54, 514-15): *Scribit supra dictus evangelista* [sc. Matthew] . . . *"Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum." Hoc nostri codices non habent, sed in Osee propheta iuxta Hebraicam scribitur veritatem: . . . "Et ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum." Pro quo in eodem loco Septuaginta transtulerunt: . . . "Et ex Aegypto vocavi filios eius."*

[18] The word *veritas* ("truth") here suggests Jerome's original term *Hebraica veritas*, which he used later to express his attitude towards the Hebrew text. Jerome decided to study Hebrew so that he could seek the true meaning of the Bible (=*Hebraica veritas*), which would appear only through its original language. The first appearance of these words is in the preface of *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim*, written in 390–391. Because of this fact, scholars consider Jerome's turning to the Hebrew to have occurred in the second stage (389–392). However, as can be seen in *Ep.* 20.2, similar wording, which indicates the same meaning as *Hebraica veritas*, can be found elsewhere, even in his works that predate 390. On this subject, see Kamesar, *Jerome*, 42-49.

[19] G. J. M. Bartelink made a list of Jerome's seven texts of the Quot. but did not examine them critically. See Bartelink, *Hieronymus, Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57): Ein Kommentar* (Leiden, 1980), 80-2.

fourth text is *Ep.* 57.7–9, written in 395, in which he cites 12 verses including the three former verses. This letter is discussed further in the next section. The fifth text is *Praef. in Paralipomena* (*iuxta Hebraeos*, hereafter *IH*), in which he adds 1 Cor 2:9 and John 7:38 to the three verses appearing in *Praef. in Ezra*. The sixth text is *Praef. in Pentateucho*, written in 404, in which Jerome refers to the same five verses as mentioned in *Praef. in Par.* (*IH*). Finally, the seventh text is *Comm. in Is.* 3.6.9, written in 408–10, in which Jerome refers to the same four verses as in *Praef. in Pent.* except 1 Cor 2:9.

We have seen the first text already; therefore let us consider other examples, namely *Praef. in Ezra*, the third text. Incidentally, the second text, *Vir. ill.* 3, requires no detailed discussion because here Jerome refers to the same verses as those in this preface.[20] In *Praef. in Ezra*, Jerome adds John 19:37 to the former two verses:

> Mittite eum [sc. an opponent] ad Evangelia, in quibus multa ponuntur quasi de Veteri Testamento, quae apud Septuaginta interpretes non habentur, velut illud: "Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur," et: "Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum," et: "Videbunt quem compunxerunt" (John 19:37), multaque alia quae latiori operi reservamus.[21]

Concerning John 19:37, according to Jerome, the Quot. ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν, "They will look on the one whom they have pierced," agrees with the Hebrew text of Zech 12:10, והביטו אלי את אשר דקרו, "They will look on me whom they have pierced," but differs from the same verse of the LXX, καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, "And they will look to me because they have danced triumphantly." In his *Comm. in Zach.* 3.12.10, Jerome explains that the LXX translators mistook *DACARU* (דקרו) for *RACADU* (רקדו), because of the apparent similarity of the letters *DALETH* (ד) and *RES* (ר). The reading *DACARU* can result in the translation "they have pierced," but *RACADU* will result in "they have danced."[22] However, Jerome overlooks that the word אלי ("to me") in the Hebrew text is omitted in the Quot., while the LXX correctly translates it as πρός με. For this particular word, the LXX seems more accurate than the Quot., but some scholars adopt אליו ("to him") instead of אלי in the *Urtext* of this verse.[23] At any rate, regarding the word דקרו, one may say that the Quot. agrees with

---

[20] About the Quot. in *Vir. ill.* 3, see T. P. Halton (trans.), *Saint Jerome: On Illustrious Men* (Washington, DC, 1999), 10-11.

[21] *Praef. in Ezra* (BSWG, 638).

[22] See *Comm. in Zach.* 3.12.10 (CChr.SL 76a, 867-68): *Hebraicae litterae DALETH et RES, hoc est D et R, similes sunt, et parvo tantum apice distinguuntur. Ex quo evenit ut idem verbum diverse legentes, aliter atque aliter transferant. . . . Si enim legatur DACARU,* ἐξεκέντησαν, *id est compunxerunt sive confixerunt accipitur; sin autem contrario ordine, litteris commutatis, RACADU,* ὠρχήσαντο, *id est saltaverunt intelligitur. Et ob similitudinem litterarum error est natus.* About this verse, see also A. Sperber, "New Testament and Septuagint," *JBL* 59 (1940): 193-293, esp. 199-200.

[23] See C. L. Meyers and E. M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 25c; New York, 1993), 336-37.

the Hebrew text but differs from the LXX.

Before examining *Ep*. 57, the fourth text, in the following section, let us consider *Praef. in Par.* (*IH*), the fifth text, in order to demonstrate how Jerome's understanding of the Quot. emerged:

> Scripsi nuper librum *De optimo genere interpretandi* [sc. *Ep*. 57], ostendens illa de Evangelio: "Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum," et: "Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur," et: "Videbunt in quem compunxerunt," et illud Apostoli: "Quae oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, et in cor hominis non ascenderunt, quae praeparavit Deus diligentibus se" (1 Cor 2:9), 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" (John 7:38). Utique scriptum est quod Salvator scriptum esse testatur. Ubi scriptum est? Septuaginta non habent, apocrifa nescit Ecclesia; ad Hebraeos igitur revertendum est, unde et Dominus loquitur et discipuli exempla praesumunt.[24]

To begin with, Jerome divides the New Testament between the Gospels and Pauline epistles, and adduces three verses from the former and one from the latter. The three verses from the Gospels are the same as those in *Praef. in Ezra*, and the one verse from the Pauline epistles is 1 Cor 2:9. Furthermore, Jerome considers John 7:38 as a new example (We will discuss 1 Cor 2:9 and John 7:38 later). It is noteworthy that the verse John 7:38 contains the words of Jesus and, at the same time, a quotation from the Old Testament. If the quotations of Jesus as well as those of the Evangelists and Paul are adopted not from the LXX but from the Hebrew text, it is necessary to return to the original Hebrew text.

There are two reasons why we must examine *Ep*. 57 more carefully than the other texts. First, Jerome touches upon this letter in both *Praef. in Ezra* and *Praef. in Par.* (*IH*), which were written before and after this letter, respectively. In the former preface, Jerome says: *multaque alia quae latiori operi reservamus*. We can say with fair certainty that this *latior opera* is *Ep*. 57 because he wrote it soon after *Praef. in Ezra*. In the latter preface, citing the title of *Ep*. 57, Jerome refers to the five verses which he discussed in it.[25] In other words, Jerome regards *Ep*. 57 as a type of summary of them and tries to let readers consult it for

---

[24] *Praef. in Par.* (BSWG, 546-47).
[25] That Jerome spontaneously titled the *Ep*. 57 "*De optimo genere interpretandi*" emphasizes his high regard for this letter. He also mentions this title in his *Comm. in Matt.* 4.26.31, *Comm. in Mal.* 3.1, *Comm. in Ion.* prol. and *Ep*. 112.20. Incidentally, this title is an imitation of Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum*. See Bartelink, *Ein Kommentar*, 25-26.

discussions which he could not sufficiently make in other texts. Second, in *Ep.* 57, while Jerome selects not only the combinations of the verses in which the Quot. agree with the Hebrew text but disagree with the LXX, he also selects other combinations. It is worthwhile to compare the combinations which we discuss with the others. Accordingly, in the next section we focus on *Ep.* 57.

III. Analysis of *Ep*. 57

Ep. 57 is a letter addressed to Pammachius, Jerome's friend, written in *c.*395, but the beginning of this writing has been traced back to two years earlier.[26] At that time, Epiphanius of Salamis wrote a letter to John of Jerusalem to refute his opinion about Origen's orthodoxy.[27] This letter became so famous for its content and, in particular, for its stylistic elegance that the whole of Palestine fought for its copies. Since Eusebius of Cremona, one of Jerome's friends, knew little Greek, he asked Jerome to translate the letter into Latin and summarize it for easy understanding. On account of this personal request, Jerome made a rough translation and asked Eusebius to keep it private; however, a "fake monk" (*pseudomonachus*) stole it from Eusebius' study, and, to make matters worse, handed it to one of Jerome's opponents.[28] The opponent criticized Jerome's translation for not being as literal as the Greek text of Epiphanius at places and blamed him for mistranslation. In response, Jerome cited some examples of translated literature and asserted that eminent translators would aim not at a "literal translation" (*verbum e verbo*) but at a "free translation" (*sensum de sensu*).[29] He meant that translators did not always translate while following the same word order, but rather kept the same sense by altering the form, just as an idiom, and translated

---

[26] About *Ep.* 57, see G. Bartelink, "Quelques observations sur la lettre LVII de S. Jérôme," *RBen* 86 (1976): 296-306; Idem, *Ein Kommentar*, 1-7; M. Banniard, "Jérôme et l'elegantia d'après le *De optimo genere interpretandi*," in *Jérôme entre l'occident et l'orient: XVIᵉ centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem*, ed. Y.-M. Duval (Paris, 1988), 305-22.

[27] On the "Origenist controversy" between Epiphanius and John of Jerusalem, see, for example, Kelly, *Jerome*, 195-209; Rebenich, *Jerome*, 41-51.

[28] The identity of Jerome's opponent is unknown. On this subject, see N. Adkin, "Who is 'accusator meus' at the Start of Jerome's *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi* (*Epist.* 57)?" *Latomus* 55 (1996): 875-7.

[29] Jerome believed that translators basically had to make a "free translation," but he admitted to the importance of a "literal translation" too in case of translating the Holy Scripture, for even the order of the words was a mystery (However, he did not apply this principle to the Evangelists and Paul). See Jerome's well-known statement in *Ep.* 57.5 (CSEL 54, 508): *Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor me in interpretatione Graecorum absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu.* Jerome's (and Cicero's) dualism, namely, "free translation" and "literal translation," were possibly a prelude to some translation theories in the Western world. On this subject, see G. Cuendet, "Cicéron et Saint Jérôme traducteurs," *Revue des études latines* 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*, ed. J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen (JSOTSup 184; Sheffield, 1994), 321-48; B. G. Wright III, "Access to the Source: Cicero, Ben Sira, The Septuagint and Their Audiences," *JSJ* 34 (2003): 1-27; M. Oustinoff, *La traduction* (Paris, ³2009), 27-9.

words in a manner which suited the target language.[30] Jerome reinforced this statement by giving instances of translation theories of Cicero, Horace and Terence for classical literature and of Evagrius of Antioch and Hilary of Poitiers for patristic literature. Furthermore, Jerome referred to 12 verses from the Bible in *Ep.* 57.7–9, saying that even the LXX translators and the Evangelists made use of a "free translation."

We now discuss *Ep.* 57.7–9 in detail. Jerome cites these verses at random, and it is difficult to find a rule governing them. Accordingly, we first list the 12 verses as they appear in *Ep.* 57.7–9, and then, after considering his point, rearrange them. Jerome enumerates the verses as follows:

Ch.7	(1) Mark 5:41	Ch.8	(7) Matt 1:23 (Isa 7:14)
	(2) Matt 27:9–10 (Zech 11:12–13)		(8) Matt 2:6 (Mic 5:1)
	(3) John 19:37 (Zech 12:10)	Ch.9	(9) Mark 1:2–3 (Mal 3:1, Isa 40:3)
	(4) Matt 26:31 (Zech 13:7)		(10) Mark 2:26 (1 Sam 21)
	(5) Matt 2:15 (Hos 11:1)		(11) 1 Cor 2:9 (Isa 64:3)
	(6) Matt 2:23 (Isa 11:1)		(12) Rom 9:33 (Isa 8:14)

Among them, four verses—John 19:37, Matt 2:15, Matt 2:23 and 1 Cor 2:9—are also cited in *Praef. in Par.* (*IH*), which we examined in the preceding section. It is, therefore, clear 1 Cor 2:9 appears for the first time not in *Praef. in Par.* (*IH*) but in *Ep.* 57. However, John 7:38, which appears as a quotation of Jesus in this preface, is not listed in *Ep.* 57. Instead, Jerome refers to Rom 9:33 as an example which matches a condition of his understanding.[31] Viewed in this light, the five verses—John 19:37, Matt 2:15, Matt 2:23, 1 Cor 2:9 and Rom 9:33—can be regarded as the verses in which the Quot. agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX.

On the basis of this analysis and following Jerome's account, we can classify the other verses in *Ep.* 57.7–9: Matt 27:9–10 and Matt 1:23 are the verses in which the Quot., Hebrew text and LXX all disagree with one another, and Matt 26:31 and Matt 2:6 are those in which the Hebrew text agrees with the LXX, but the Quot. disagrees with both of them. Since the rest of the verses—Mark 5:41, Mark 1:2–3 and Mark 2:26—are unfit for these classifications and also irrelevant to the main subject, we do not discuss them at present.

Accordingly, we can rearrange the verses in *Ep.* 57.7–9 as follows:

---

[30] See *Ep.* 57.5 (CSEL 54, 509): *Nec converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiis isdem et earum formis tam quam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis.* This sentence was cited from Cicero's *De optimo genere oratorum* 13–14.

[31] The "condition" here is, of course, that the Quot. agrees not with the LXX but with the Hebrew text. Jerome comments on this verse in *Ep.* 57.9 (CSEL 54, 520): *Discordat a translatione veteri et tamen cum Hebraica veritate concordat.*

1. *The Quot. agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX*:
    (3) John 19:37, (5) Matt 2:15, (6) Matt 2:23, (11) 1 Cor 2:9, (12) Rom 9:33
2. *The Quot., Hebrew text and LXX all disagree with one another*:
    (2) Matt 27:9–10, (7) Matt 1:23
3. *The Hebrew text agrees with the LXX, but the Quot. disagrees with both of them*:
    (4) Matt 26:31, (8) Matt 2:6

In the following discussion, we do not consider John 19:37, Matt 2:15 and Matt 2:23, because we have already examined them in the preceding section. Regarding the other verses, we rely on Jerome's explanation in *Ep.* 57, but we also consult some of his commentaries written in later years.

1. *The Quot. agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX*

Before considering 1 Cor 2:9, we discuss Rom 9:33 because the former needs a more detailed discussion. Regarding Rom. 9:33, Jerome considers in *Ep.* 57.9 that the phrase of the Quot., λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, "a stone of offence and a rock of stumbling," agrees with the Hebrew text of Isa 8:14, ולאבן נגף ולצור מכשול, "and to a stone of offence and to a rock of stumbling," but disagrees with the LXX, καὶ . . . λίθου προσκόμματι . . . πέτρας πτώματι, "and . . . offence caused by a stone . . . fall caused by a rock." Certainly, the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word מכשול was translated differently in the Quot. and LXX, namely Paul translated it as σκάνδαλον ("stumbling"), while the LXX translated it as πτῶμα ("fall"). To resolve this contradiction, Jerome cites 1 Pet 2:8, καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, as an example of the same phrase as that in the Paul's Quot.,[32] and he concludes that the Hebrew text agrees with the Quot. but disagrees with the LXX. Interestingly, only in *Ep.* 57 Jerome refers to Rom 9:33 as a Quot. which agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX. Furthermore, in *Comm. in Is.* 3.8.11–15, although Jerome indicates a difference between the Hebrew text and LXX, he does not refer to the relation of the Quot. with the Hebrew text and LXX. I cannot ascertain why Jerome omitted Rom 9:33 in *Praef. in Par.* (*IH*), *Praef. in Pent.* and *Comm. in Is.* 3.6.9. However, it seems reasonable to suppose that Jerome later considered this verse inappropriate for his understanding of the Quot.

Turning now to 1 Cor 2:9, the Quot. is ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, "What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him." According to Jerome (*Ep.* 57.9), "someone" (*quidam*) indicates that the source of this Quot. is

---

[32] See *Ep.* 57.9 (CSEL 54, 520): *. . . apostolus quoque Petrus Hebraeis Pauloque consentiens ita posuerit:* "*Incredulis autem lapis offensionis et petra scandali.*"

Apocalypse of Elijah, one of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, because there are no equivalent verses in the Old Testament. The "someone" here is actually Origen, who in his commentary claimed that *Apocalypse of Elijah* was the source.[33] In other words, Origen considered a book other than the Bible to be the source, because the LXX could not be used as one. On the other hand, Jerome claims that the source is neither *Apocalypse of Elijah* nor the LXX but the Hebrew text of Isa 64:3: ומעולם לא שמעו לא האזינו עין לא ראתה אלהים זולתך יעשה למחכה לו, "No one has heard or perceived by the ear, no eye has seen a God besides you, who works for those who wait for him." The same verse of the LXX is as follows: ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδὲ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον θεὸν πλὴν σοῦ καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου, ἃ ποιήσεις τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν ἔλεον, "In olden times we have not heard, nor have our eyes seen any God besides you, and your works, which you will do to those who wait for mercy." Comparing the Quot., Hebrew text and LXX, the divergence of the LXX can hardly be said to be greater here than in the four verses above (John 19:37, Matt 2:15, Matt 2:23 and Rom 9:33).[34] Furthermore, Jerome at least recognizes that the Quot. of Paul disagrees with the Hebrew text in its wording, saying: "The Apostle did not speak word for word, but 'paraphrastically' indicated the same meaning by different wording."[35] If the Quot. is paraphrased, it is obvious that its wording disagrees with the Hebrew text. Although Jerome refers to this verse in *Praef. in Par.* (*IH*), we still face the issue of resolving this contradiction.

As we have seen in the four above-discussed verses, Jerome discusses the differences between the LXX and Hebrew text in detail. However, in this verse, Jerome only notes that it was unnecessary to use the Pseudepigraphon as a source for the Quot. as Origen did; Jerome does not require the agreement of wording between the Quot. and Hebrew text. In other words, while the disagreement between the LXX and Hebrew text is regarded as a mistranslation, that between the Quot. and Hebrew text is accepted as a "paraphrase" and can even be considered as having the "same meaning." Accordingly, it may be that the criteria of the disagreement with the Hebrew text are different between the LXX and Quot. or the LXX translators and the Evangelists (as well as the Apostles) have a different degree of importance to Jerome. Our assumption shall be justified by Jerome's own testimony in *Praef. in Pent.*:

> Audi igitur, aemule, obtrectator ausculta: non damno, non reprehendo Septuaginta, sed confidenter cunctis illis Apostolos praefero. Per istorum os mihi Christus sonat,

---

[33] Origen, *Comm. in Mt.* 117 (GCS 40, 250): *Sciens quoniam et apostolus scripturas quasdam secretorum profert, sicut dicit alicubi: "Quod oculus non videt nec auris audivit;" in nullo enim regulari libro hoc positum invenitur nisi in secretis Eliae prophetae.* On this subject, see also Bartelink, *Ein Kommentar*, 95-8.

[34] Scholars believe that Paul put together some verses from memory, such as Isa 64:4, 52:15, 65:17; Jer 3:16; Sir 1:10. See W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, *I Corinthians: A New Translation* (AB 32; New York, 1977), 157.

[35] *Ep.* 57.9 (CSEL 54, 520): *. . . apostolus non verbum expressit e verbo, sed* παραφραστικῶς *eundem sensum aliis sermonibus indicavit.*

quos ante prophetas inter spiritalia charismata positos lego, in quibus ultimum paene gradum interpretes tenant.[36]

Here, Jerome makes it a rule to prioritize the Apostles (sc. the Evangelists and Paul) over the interpreters (sc. the LXX translators). According to Jerome, since the Evangelists and Paul quote from the Hebrew text, the meaning of the Quot. always agrees with the Hebrew text even if their wordings seem to differ. Similarly, since the LXX is based on the original Hebrew text, it should agree with the Hebrew text, at least regarding its meaning. Jerome, however, accepts a free translation by the Evangelists and Paul but demands a literal translation from the LXX translators. Therefore, we may say that according to Jerome, the Quot. has the "same meaning" as the Hebrew text, whereas the Quot., Hebrew text and LXX all have "different wordings."

The question now arises: how could Jerome make it a rule to prefer the Evangelists and Paul to the LXX translators? Full discussion of this question is presented in the next section (IV). At present, we may expect some indications about his preference for the Evangelists and Paul and of his allowance for the disagreements of the Quot. and Hebrew text in the second and third cases below, in which the Quot. always disagrees with the Hebrew text.

2. *The Quot., Hebrew text and LXX all disagree with one another*

In Matt 27:9–10, the Quot. is τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, (10) καὶ ἔδωκαν αὐτὰ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως, καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος, "Then what had been spoken by the prophet Jeremiah was fulfilled, saying, 'And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him on whom a price had been assessed by the sons of Israel, (10) and they gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord commanded me.'"

First, in *Ep.* 57.7, Jerome notes that the source of the Quot. is not Jeremiah, as Matthew said, but Zechariah (11:12–13). Then, while comparing the Quot. with the LXX and Hebrew text, he explains: *Quantum distet ab evangelistae testimonio Septuaginta translatio, perspicuum est. Sed et in Hebraeo, cum sensus idem sit, verba praepostera sunt et paene diversa.*[37] Jerome admits that the Quot. does not agree with both the LXX and Hebrew text regarding its wording. Most interestingly, however, he declares that the meaning of the Quot. agrees only with the Hebrew text. According to him, even if the wording of the Quot. is slightly different from that of the Hebrew text, their meanings are the same. The Hebrew text of Zech 11:12–13 and the same verses of the LXX are as follows:

---

[36] *Praef. in Pent.* (BSWG, 4).
[37] *Ep.* 57.7 (CSEL 54, 513).

וישקלו את שכרי שלשים כסף: (13) ויאמר יהוה אלי השליכהו אל היוצר אדר היקר אשר יקרתי
מעליהם ואקחה שלשים הכסף ואשליך אתו בית יהוה אל היוצר:

They weighed out as my wages thirty shekels of silver. (13) Then the Lord said to me, "Cast it into the treasury: the goodly price at which I was paid off by them." So I took the thirty shekels of silver and cast them into the treasury in the house of the Lord.

καὶ ἔστησαν τὸν μισθόν μου τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς. (13) καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρός με Κάθες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον, καὶ σκέψομαι εἰ δόκιμόν ἐστιν, ὃν τρόπον ἐδοκιμάσθην ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. καὶ ἔλαβον τοὺς τριάκοντα ἀργυροῦς καὶ ἐνέβαλον αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου εἰς τὸ χωνευτήριον.

And they weighed my wages as thirty pieces of silver. (13) And the Lord said to me, "Place them in the smelting-furnace, and I will examine whether it is genuine, as I have been approved for them." And I took the thirty pieces of silver and threw them into the house of the Lord, into the smelting-furnace.

Jerome does not fully analyse the wordings of these verses but only mentions that the Hebrew text disagrees with the LXX and therefore the Quot. disagrees with both. Moreover, Jerome declares: *Accusent apostolum falsitatis, quod nec cum Hebraico nec cum septuaginta congruat translatoribus et, quod his maius est, erret in nomine—pro Zacharia quippe Hieremiam posuit—; sed absit hoc de pedisequo Christi dicere, cui curae fuit non verba et syllabas aucupari, sed sententias dogmatum ponere.*[38] Here, upholding Matthew's honour, Jerome advocates that a true follower of Christ who establishes the "meanings of dogmas" is not involved with trivialities. Besides, as we have seen, Jerome believes that the meaning of the Quot. is always the same as that of the Hebrew text, even if their wordings are different; therefore, it is obvious that Jerome does not question this verse at all.

Regarding Matt 1:23, the Quot. is καὶ καλέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ, "and they will call his name Emmanuel," the Hebrew text of Is 7:14 is וקראת שמו עמנו אל, "You will call his name Immanuel," and the same verse of the LXX is καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Εμμανουηλ, "and you will call his name Emmanuel." Paying attention to the verb of these verses, the subject of the Quot. is "They" (3. *c. plur.*), that of the Hebrew text is "You" (2. *f. sing.*) and that of the LXX is "You" (2. *c. sing.*). Thus, at a glance, it seems that this verse should be classified into the third case below in which the Hebrew text agrees with the LXX, but the Quot. disagrees with both of them. Yet, in *Ep.* 57.8, Jerome explains: *Si verba calumniantur, . . . non est ipsud . . . "vocabunt" et "vocabitis." Porro in Hebraeo ita scriptum legimus: "Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabit nomen eius Emmanuhel."*[39] From this account we should notice that Jerome clearly realizes that the subject in the Hebrew text was "She." Similar to

---

[38] *Ep.* 57.7 (CSEL 54, 513).
[39] *Ep.* 57.8 (CSEL 54, 516).

Modern Hebrew grammar, the word וְקָרָאת should be read usually as "You will call" (2. *f. sing.*), which is why the LXX translated the word as καλέσεις. However, Gesenius explains that we can read this verse as "She will call" (3. *f. sing.*) on the basis of the analogy of the *lamed-he* forms, namely reading וְקָרָאת as a synonym for וְקָרְאָה (see GKC, §44 *f* and §74 *g*).[40] Therefore, we can consider that although the Quot., Hebrew text and LXX all seem to disagree with one another regarding this verse, Jerome did not question the disagreement between the Quot. and Hebrew text because he knew that the correct meaning of this verse conformed to Hebrew grammar. He gives an account of this disagreement in his *Comm. in Is.* 3.7.14: *In multis testimoniis quae evangelistae vel apostoli de libris veteribus assumpserunt, curiosius attendendum est non eos verborum ordinem secutos esse, sed sensum. Unde et in praesenti loco . . . Mattheus posuit . . . pro "vocabis" "vocabunt."*[41] According to Jerome, Matthew switched the subject in the context of his Gospel because he followed the "meanings" of the Hebrew text.[42]

3. *The Hebrew text agrees with the LXX, but the Quot. disagrees with both of them*

In Matt 26:31, the Quot. is πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης, "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered," the Hebrew text of Zech 13:7 is הך את הרעה ותפוצין הצאן, "Smite the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered," and the same verse of the LXX is πατάξατε τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τὰ πρόβατα, "Smite the shepherds, and pull out the sheep." Jerome confirms that the Quot. disagrees with the Hebrew text and LXX, saying: *At in Septuaginta et in Hebraeo multo aliter est; non enim ex persona dei dicitur, ut evangelista* [sc. Matthew] *vult, sed ex prophetae* [sc. Zechariah] *deum patrem rogantis: "Percute pastorem, et dispergentur oves."*[43] According to Jerome, in the Quot., God would smite the shepherd by himself, while in the Hebrew text and LXX the prophet asked God to smite the shepherd.[44] Consequently, the verb "to smite" in the Quot. has the

---

[40] Some scholars follow Gesenius' explanation about the person of the verb. See, for example, F. Delitzsch, *Biblical Commentary on The Prophecies of Isaiah* 1 (trans. J. Martin; 2 vols.; Edinburgh, 1886), 216; J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 19; New York, 2000), 229, n. l.

[41] *Comm. in Is.* 3.7.14 (*Gryson* 1, 349-50). Similar to Jerome's explanation, there is a widespread conviction that Matthew himself changed the word καλέσεις into καλέσουσιν when quoting the Old Testament. However, according to Maarten J. J. Menken, Matthew's source text reads καλέσουσιν probably under the influence of a Hebrew variant reading and Matthew just found the quotation in the form in which he presents it. See Menken, "The Textual Form of the Quotation from Isaiah 7:14 in Matthew 1:23," *NovT* 43 (2001): 144-60.

[42] About the controversies over the interpretations of "Virgin" in this verse, see A. Kamesar, "The Virgin of Isaiah 7:14: The Philological Argument from the Second to the Fifth Century," *JTS* n.s. 41 (1990): 51-75. According to Kamesar, Jerome's interpretation of this verse is clearly based on the Hebrew rather than Greek text and, therefore, fundamentally different from the arguments employed by the majority of the Greek Fathers.

[43] *Ep.* 57.7 (CSEL 54, 514).

[44] The verse of Zech 13:7 is usually interpreted as God asking the sword to smite the shepherd. Cf., RSV: "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who stands next to me," says the LORD of hosts.

indicative mood and first person, while verbs in the Hebrew text and LXX have imperative mood and second person. Jerome attributes this disagreement to the Evangelist: *In hoc, ut arbitror, loco iuxta quorundam prudentiam evangelista piaculi reus est, quod ausus sit prophetae verba ad dei referre personam.*[45]

Finally, with regard to Matt 2:6, the Quot. is καὶ σὺ Βηθλέεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα, "And you, O Bethlehem, the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah," the Hebrew text of Mic 5:1 is ואתה בית לחם אפרתה צעיר להיות באלפי יהודה, "And you, O Bethlehem Ephratha, who are little to be among the thousands of Judah," and the same verse of the LXX is Καὶ σύ, Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ιουδα, "And you, O Bethlehem, house of Ephratha, are very small in number to be among the thousands of Judah." Although the LXX adds the word οἶκος ("house"), it has almost the same verse as that in the Hebrew text. The Quot., however, is very different from them. In the Quot., Bethlehem is "by no means least among the rulers of Judah," while in the other texts it is "the least one/very small in number." Jerome explains this contradiction in *Comm. in Mich.* 2.5.2: *Quod testimonium* [sc. the Quot.] *nec Hebraico, nec Septuaginta interpretibus convenire, me quoque tacente perspicuum est, et arbitror, Matthaeum volentem arguere scribarum et sacerdotum, erga divinae scripturae lectionem, neglegentiam, sic etiam posuisse, ut ab eis dictum est.*[46] Although Jerome admits that the Quot. does not agree with the Hebrew text, he emphasizes that Matthew deliberately intended to change the locution of the verse.

IV. Reasons behind Jerome's Preferences

As mentioned in the preceding section, in *Ep.* 57.7–9 Jerome adduces three cases about the combination of the Quot., Hebrew text and LXX. We can now say that he has adopted different attitudes for the case in which the Hebrew text disagreed with the LXX and that in which the Hebrew text disagreed with the Quot. While in the former case he demands strict agreement of the wording between the Hebrew text and LXX, in the latter case he considers the Hebrew text and Quot. to have the same meaning even if their wordings are different. In other words, Jerome is disposed to prioritize the Evangelists and Paul over the LXX translators.

How, then, could Jerome formulate this idea? While it might be obvious that Jerome as a Christian simply regarded the New Testament as more important than the LXX, this view is unsatisfactory. There are two reasons why Jerome had this preference. Yet, before we discuss these reasons, another more important point must be clarified: why does the LXX disagree

---

"Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered; I will turn my hand against the little ones."
[45] *Ep.* 57.7 (CSEL 54, 514).
[46] *Comm. in Mich.* 2.5.2 (CChr.SL 76, 481).

with the Hebrew text in the first place?

As we have seen, *Letter of Aristeas* has a legendary account of the LXX as a translation.[47] According to this letter, to stock the library in Alexandria with Jewish laws, Ptolemy II Philadelphus, the king of Egypt, called 72 elders from Jerusalem and asked them to translate the Pentateuch. The elders counselled together and compared their individual translations to ensure that the translations agreed. Jerome interprets this legend in *Praef. in Pent.*:

> Iudaei prudenti factum dicunt esse consilio, ne Ptolomeus, unius dei cultor, etiam apud Hebraeos duplicem divinitatem deprehenderet, quos maximi idcirco faciebat, quia in Platonis dogma cadere videbantur. Denique ubicumque sacratum aliquid Scriptura testatur de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto, aut aliter interpretati sunt aut omnino tacuerunt, ut et regi satisfacerent et arcanum fidei non vulgarent.[48]

Jerome here explains that the translators carefully conferred with each other so that Ptolemy might not discover "two-fold divinities" (*duplicem divinitatem*). Ptolemy gave a cordial reception to the elders because he misunderstood that they also believed in the same god that was his "one god" according to "Plato's dogma." On the other hand, since the elders recognized Ptolemy's misunderstanding, they had to conceal from him the fact that their "God" was not his "god" and that there were "two-fold divinities." Therefore, while translating, they intentionally placed incorrect constructions or completely ignored constructions in the original text to adjust their "God" to Ptolemy's "god." The notable point in relation to Jerome's theory is that the translators also misinterpreted and disregarded "holy mysteries about the Father, Son and Holy Spirit." In other words, the LXX disagrees with the Hebrew text because the elders distorted it.[49] Accordingly, the LXX was so unreliable that Jerome preferred the Evangelists and Paul over the LXX translators. I call this a negative reason, but a positive reason also exists for Jerome's preference to the Evangelists and Paul.[50]

---

[47] For the legend of the LXX in *Letter of Aristeas*, see, for example, E. Bickerman, "The Septuagint as a Translation," *PAAJR* 28 (1959): 1-39; S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford, 1968), 29-58; A. Wasserstein and D. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge, 2006), 19-26.

[48] *Praef. in Pent.* (BSWG, 3).

[49] According to Adam Kamesar, Jerome collected information about this explanation from two sources, namely Eusebius and a certain Jewish aggada, and exploited them to support his assertion about the LXX. See Kamesar, *Jerome*, 64-7. For more details, see 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 Id., *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (Göttingen, 1978), 179-93; H. Grätz, "Die Septuaginta im Talmud," *Zeitschrift für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums* 2 (Elftes Heft, November 1845): 429-37.

[50] Jerome's first mention of the negative reason is found in *Qu. Hebr. Gen.* prol., but that of the positive one appears in *Praef. in Pent.* About the former reason in *Qu. Hebr. Gen.*, see C. T. R. Hayward, *Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis: Translated with an Introduction and Commentary* (Oxford, 1995), 94-6.

The positive reason is the superiority of *historia* over *prophetia*.[51] Since the time of Philo of Alexandria, the LXX was considered a divinely inspired translation because the episode that the elders made exactly the same translations of the Pentateuch without collating the texts was grafted onto the original story in the *Letter of Aristeas*. Moreover, this episode was expanded upon in Christian tradition: although Ptolemy secluded the elders in isolated cells to prevent them from disguising the Bible's truth, the translations of all the books of the Bible, which each of the elders made separately, agreed with one another and also had exactly the same wording. This supernatural origin of the LXX was derived from the Holy Spirit: through the descent of the Holy Spirit, the elders became not just translators but also prophets and produced the same inspired text. On the other hand, Jerome traces back the original account of *Letter of Aristeas* (and Josephus) and discovers that the amplified part of the legend is no more than a bold fantasy. According to Jerome, being a prophet is, in itself, irreconcilable with being a translator because a prophet tells of the future as an instrument of God's words but a translator tells of what he understands by himself. Therefore, it must be impossible that these two, who have different natures, lived together within the elders. Jerome gives further account of this problem in *Praef. in Pent.*:

> Aliud est enim vatem, aliud esse interpretem: ibi spiritus ventura praedicit, hic eruditio et verborum copia ea quae intellegit transfert; nisi forte putandus est Tullius [sc. Cicero] *Oeconomicum* Xenofontis et Platonis *Protagoram* et Demosthenis *Pro Ctesifonte* afflatus rethorico spiritu transtulisse, aut aliter de hisdem libris per Septuaginta interpretes, aliter per Apostolos Spiritus Sanctus testimonia texuit, ut quod illi tacuerunt, hii scriptum esse mentiti sint. Quid igitur? . . . Illi [sc. the LXX translators] interpretati sunt ante adventum Christi et quod nesciebant dubiis protulere sententiis, nos post passionem et resurrectionem eius non tam prophetiam quam historiam scribimus; aliter enim audita, aliter visa narrantur: quod melius intellegimus, melius et proferimus.[52]

Thus, Jerome's rhetoric points to the denial of the argument that the LXX was inspired by the Holy Spirit. To begin with, Jerome assumes that if one translated not through his erudition or large vocabulary (*eruditio et verborum copia*) but through the Holy Spirit (*spiritus*), then some translators like Cicero also translated through the Holy Spirit. However, applying this assumption to the Old Testament produces an apparent contradiction, for if both the LXX and Quot. were translated through the same Holy Spirit, there should have been no disagreeing

---

[51] On this subject, see, for example, Schwarz, *Principles*, 25f.; S. Kamin, "The Theological Significance of the 'Hebraica Veritas' in Jerome's Thought," in Id., *Jews and Christians Interpret the Bible* (Jerusalem, 2008), vii-xx, esp. xiii.
[52] *Praef. in Pent.* (BSWG, 3-4).

verses. In other words, if we had different translations such as the LXX and Quot., there would have been at least two different Holy Spirits. Since this situation is impossible in principle, the very assumption that people translate through the Holy Spirit is an error. From this it follows that a translation is the fruit of scholarship or rich vocabulary and has nothing to do with inspiration by the Holy Spirit. Thus, the argument converges to a simple question: which is reliable as a translation, the LXX or the Quot.? Since Jerome read the Old Testament as a Christian, the crucial point of this question for him was which of them reported the advent of Christ more accurately. In this respect, while the 72 elders translated the text of the Old Testament as the unknowable future in a manner of *prophetia* before the advent of Christ, the Evangelists and Paul translated it after the advent, as *historia* which they already knew. Following the principle that "we translate better what we understand better" (*quod melius intellegimus, melius et proferimus*), it is clear that the Evangelists and Paul translated better.

V. Other Cases: Acts 28:26 and John 7:38

It was observed in the preceding section that Jerome had two reasons for preferring the Evangelists and Paul over the LXX translators. Following his reasons, whenever the Quot. and LXX disagree, the former always precedes the latter. Accordingly, in the three cases analysed above, even if the wording of the Quot. disagrees with that of the Hebrew text, their meanings are regarded as the same. The LXX, however, always needs exactly the same wording as that in the Hebrew text.

If we fully consider combinations of the Quot., Hebrew text and LXX, in addition to the three above-discussed cases, we theoretically have two more cases for which Jerome does not adduce examples in *Ep.* 57. The first is the case in which the Quot., Hebrew text and LXX all agree with one another. However, needless to say, it is unnecessary to question this case because there is no disagreement. The second is the case in which the Quot. agrees with the LXX but disagrees with the Hebrew text. This case undermines the premise that the Evangelists and Paul quoted from the Hebrew text, suggesting rather that they quoted from the LXX. Jerome comments on this issue in *Comm. in Is.* 3.6.9, the last of the seven texts. Here, he notes that the Quot. of Paul's line in Acts 28:26 completely agrees with the LXX text of Isa 6:9 as its source, ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε, "You shall indeed hear but never understand, and you shall indeed see but never perceive," while they both disagree with the Hebrew text, שמעו שמוע ואל תבינו וראו ראו ואל תדעו, "Hear and hear, but do not understand; see and see, but do not perceive." Jerome explains this situation as follows:

Ac primum illa solvenda est quaestio quae nobis obici potest: quare apostolus Paulus

> cum Hebraeis disptans non iuxta hebraicum, quod rectum esse cognoverat, sed secundum LXX sit locutus? Evangelistam Lucam tradunt veteres ecclesiae tractatores medicinae artis fuisse scientissimum et magis graecas litteras scisse quam hebraeas. Unde et sermo eius tam in evangelio quam in Actibus apostolorum, id est in utroque volumine, comptior est et saecularem redolet eloquentiam magisque testimoniis graecis utitur quam hebraeis. 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.[53]

Thus, Jerome explains that the second case (sc. *The Quot. agrees with the LXX but disagrees with the Hebrew text*) cannot be applied to Matthew and John but only appears in Luke because he was more familiar with Greek than with Hebrew. Accordingly, Jerome excludes Luke's works, namely the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, from the object of his study. Thereafter, he adduces four verses from Matthew and John which satisfy the condition of the case in which the Quot. agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX. Incidentally, our information on Jerome's opinion on Mark is limited, leaving room for further investigation.

Finally, let us briefly turn to John 7:38, in which the Quot. in Jesus's line agrees with the Hebrew text but disagrees with the LXX. The Quot. is ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος, "He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, 'Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water.'" In *Praef. in Pent.*, the sixth of the seven texts, Jerome points out that the source of this verse is the Proverbs in Hebrew.

> 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" (John 7:38), 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 [sc. our opponents] 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, quantum aeque in Isaia.[54]

---

[53] *Comm. in Is.* 3.6.9 (*Gryson* 1, 324-25).
[54] *Praef. in Pent.* (BSWG, 3).

If John 7:38 was truly cited from Proverbs, which verse does Jerome consider to be the source? Robert Weber and Roger Gryson supposed that it was Prov 18:4, whereas Joel C. Elowsky surmised that it was Prov 5:16.[55] The Hebrew text of Prov 18:4 is מים עמקים דברי פי איש נחל נבע מקור חכמה, "The words of a man's mouth are deep waters; the fountain of wisdom is a flowing torrent," and the same verse of the LXX is ὕδωρ βαθὺ λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνδρός, ποταμὸς δὲ ἀναπηδύει καὶ πηγὴ ζωῆς, "A word in the heart of a man is deep water, and a river and a fountain of life leap up." On the other hand, the Hebrew text of Prov 5:16 is יפוצו מעינתיך חוצה ברחבות פלגי מים, "Let your springs be scattered abroad, streams of water in the streets," and the same verse of the LXX is μὴ ὑπερεκχείσθω σοι τὰ ὕδατα ἐκ τῆς σῆς πηγῆς, εἰς δὲ σὰς πλατείας διαπορευέσθω τὰ σὰ ὕδατα, "Let not the waters out of your well overflow for you; rather let your waters flow into your streets." We are unaware of Jerome's opinion on this Quot. because he wrote no commentary on the Proverbs. Moreover, it seems that both of these verses considerably disagree with the Quot. of John.

Conclusion

Jerome compares Old Testament quotations in the New Testament with the Hebrew text and LXX in seven texts, and adopts different opinions when the LXX disagrees with the Hebrew text and when the quotation disagrees with the Hebrew text. In the first case he demands a strict rendering of words, whereas in the second he considers the quotation and Hebrew text to have the same meaning even if their wordings differ. In other words, Jerome attributes more authority to the Evangelists and Paul than to the LXX translators. There are two reasons—one negative and the other positive—why he does so. First, so far as the negative side is concerned, the LXX was unreliable because the translators deliberately distorted the original text to adapt their concept of divinity to that of Ptolemy. Second, as long as the translation is made not through the Holy Spirit but through the translator's knowledge, the Evangelists and Paul have an advantage because they knew the advent of Christ not as *prophetia* but as *historia*. Consequently, the Evangelists' and Paul's translations are more accurate than the LXX.

We have considered the problems of the Quot. in order to examine whether all of Jerome's exegetical plagiarisms stemmed from his Greek predecessors and whether we can estimate Jerome's competence in Hebrew. Concerning the first issue, as seen in 1 Cor 2:9, Jerome clearly rejects Origen's opinion. While Origen offered the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha as a source of the Quot., Jerome claims that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is its source. Regarding the second issue, as seen in John 19:37, Matt 2:15 and Matt

---

[55] BSWG, 3; J. C. Elowsky, *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament IVa John 1–10* (Downers Grove, Ill., 2006), 265, n. 7.

1:23, it is obvious that Pierre Nautin exaggerated when he said that Jerome had no competence in Hebrew. This is because in each of these verses, Jerome correctly notices mistakes in the translation of the LXX according to Hebrew grammar. The New Testament contains more than 300 Old Testament quotations;[56] that is why Jerome was so much interested in *Hebraica veritas*.

---

[56] G. L. Archer and G. C. Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey* (Chicago, 1983), xxiii. We should note that Archer and Chirichigno do not mention all verses which Jerome considered to be Old Testament quotations. For example, John 7:38 is not regarded as an Old Testament quotation.