peror told him that that should be bought which was cheap in the market, since it was sure to rise in price. Whereupon Onkelos went on his way. He repaired to Jerusalem, and studied the Law under R. Eleazar and R. Jehoshua, and his face became wan. When he returned to the court, one of the courtiers observed the pallor of his countenance, and said to Titus, "Onkelos appears to have studied the Law." Interrogated by Titus, he admitted the fact, adding that he had done it by his advice. No nation had ever been so exalted, and none was now held cheaper among the nations than Israel: "Therefore," he said, "I concluded that in the end none would be of higher price."

This is all the information to be found in ancient authorities about Onkelos and the Targum which bears his name. Surprisingly enough, the latter is well known to the Babylonian Talmud (whether to the Jerusalem Talmud is questionable) and the Midrashim, and is often quoted, but *never once as Targum Onkelos*. The quotations from it are invariably introduced with כדמתרגמינן, "As we [Babylonians] translate;" and the version itself is called (*e. g.* Kiddush. 49*a*) תרגום דדן, "Our Targum," exactly as Ephraim Syrus (*Opp.* i. 380) speaks of the Peshito as "Our translation."

Yet we find on the other hand another current version invariably quoted in the Talmud by the name of its known author, viz. תרגם עקילס, "the [Greek] Version of Akilas:" a circumstance which, by showing that it was customary to quote the author by name, excites suspicion as to the relation of Onkelos to the Targum Onkelos. Still more surprising, however, is, as far as the person of Onkelos is concerned (whatever be the discrepancies in the above accounts), the similarity between the incidents related of him and those related of Akilas. The latter (עקילס, אקילס) is said, both in Sifra (Lev. xxv. 7) and the Jerusalem Talmud (Demai, xxvii.*d*), to have been born in Pontus, to have been a proselyte, to have thrown his paternal inheritance into an asphalt lake (T. Jer. Demai, 25*d*), to have translated the Torah before R. Eliezer and R. Joshua, who praised him (קלסו, in allusion perhaps to his name, עקילס); or, according to other accounts, before R. Akiba (comp. Jer. Kidd. 1, 1, 2, &c.; Jer. Meg. 1, 11; Babli Meg. 3*a*). We learn further that he lived in the time of Hadrian (Chag. 2, 1), that he was the son of the Emperor's sister (Tanch. 28, 1), that he became a convert against the Emperor's will (ib. and Shem. Rabba, 146*c*), and that he consulted Eliezer and Jehoshua about his conversion (Ber. R. 78*d*; comp. Midr. Koh. 102*b*). First he is said to have gone to the former, and to have asked him whether that was all the love God bore a proselyte, that He promised him bread and a garment (Gen. xxviii. 20). "See," he said, "what exquisite birds and other delicacies I now have: even my slaves do not care for them any longer." Whereupon R. Eliezer became wroth, and said, "Is that for which Jacob prayed, 'And give me bread to eat and a garment to wear,' so small in thine eyes?—Comes he, the proselyte, and receives these things without any trouble!"—And Akilas, dissatisfied, left the irate Master and went to R Joshua. He pacified him, and explained to him that "Bread" meant the Divine Law, and "Garment," the Talith, or sacred garment to be worn during prayer. "And not this alone, he continued, but the Proselyte may marry his daughter to a Priest, and his offspring may become a High-Priest, and offer burnt-offerings in the Sanctuary." More striking still is a Greek quotation from *Onkelos*, the Chaldee translator (Midr. Echa, 58*c*), which in reality is found in and quoted (Midr. Shir hashir. 27*d*) from Akilas, the Greek translator.

That Akilas is no other than Aquila (Ἀκύλας), the well-known Greek translator of the Old Testament, we need hardly add. He is a native of Pontus (Iren. *adv. Haer.* 3, 24; Jer. *De Vir. Ill.* c. 54; Philastr. *De Haer.* §90). He lived under Hadrian (Epiph. *De Pond. et Mens.* §12). He is called the πενθερίδες (Chron. Alex. πενθερός) of the Emperor (*ib.* §14), becomes a convert to Judaism (§15), whence he is called the Proselyte (Iren. *ib.*; Jerome to Is. viii. 14, &c.), and receives instructions from Akiba (Jer. *ib.*). He translated the O. T., and his Version was considered of the highest import and authority among the Jews, especially those unacquainted with the Hebrew language (Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* l. c.; Augustin, *Civ. D.* xv. 23; Philastr. *Haer.* 90; Justin, *Novell.* 146). Thirteen *distinct* quotations[P] from this Version are preserved in Talmud and Midrash, and they tally, for the most part, with the corresponding passages preserved in the Hexapla; and for those even which do not agree, there is no need to have recourse to corruptions. We know from Jerome (on Ezek. iii. 15) that Aquila prepared a further edition of his Version, called by the Jews κατ' ἀκρίβειαν, and there is no reason why we should not assume, *caeteris paribus*, that the differing passages belong to the different editions.

If then there can be no reasonable doubt as to the identity of Aquila and Akilas, we may well now go a step further, and from the threefold accounts adduced,—so strikingly parallel even in their anachronisms and contortions—safely argue the identity, as of Akilas and Aquila, so of Onkelos '*the translator*,' with Akilas or Aquila. Whether in reality a proselyte of that name had been in existence at an earlier date—a circumstance which might explain part of the contradictory statements; and whether the difference of the forms is produced through the ע (ng, nk), with which we find the name sometimes spelt, or the Babylonian manner, occasionally to insert an *n*, like in Adrianus, which we always find spelt Andrianus in the Babylonian Talmud; or whether we are to read Gamaliel II. for Gamaliel the Elder, we cannot here examine; anything connected with the person of an Onkelos no longer concerns us, since he is not the author of the Targum; indeed, as we saw, only *once* ascribed to him in the passage of the Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 3*a*), palpably corrupted from the Jerusalem Talmud (Meg. i. 9). And not before the 9th century (Pirke der. Eliezer to Gen. xlv. 27) does this mischievous mistake seem to have struck root, and even from that time three centuries elapsed, during which the Version was quoted often enough, but without its authorship being ascribed to Onkelos.

[P] *Greek quotations*:—Gen. xvii. 1, in Beresh. Rab. 51*b*; Lev. xxiii. 40, Jer. Succah, 3, 5, fol. 53*d* (comp. Vaj. Rab. 200*d*); Is. iii. 20, Jer. Shabb. 6, 4, fol. 8*b*; Ez. xvi. 10, Midr. Thren. 58*c*; Ez. xxiii. 43, Vaj. Rab. 203*d*; Ps. xlviii. 15 (Masor. T., xlvii. according to LXX.), Jer. Meg 2, 3, fol. 73*b*; Prov. xviii. 21, Vaj. Rab. fol. 203*b*; Esth. i. 6, Midr. Esth. 120*d*; Dan. v. 5, Jer. Joma, 3, 8, fol. 41*a*.—*Heorew quotations*, re-translated from the Greek:—Lev. xix. 20, Jer. Kid. i. 1, fol. 59*a*; Dan. viii. 13, Ber. Rab, 24*c*.—*Chaldee quotations*:—Prov. xxv. 11; Beresh. Rab. 104*b*; Is. v. 6, Midr. Koh. 113*c*, *d*.

From all this it follows that those who, in the face of this overwhelming mass of evidence, would fain retain Onkelos in the false position of translator of our Targum, must be ready to admit that there were two men living simultaneously of most astoundingly similar names; both proselytes to Judaism, both translators of the Bible, both disciples of R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua; it being of both reported by the same authorities that they translated the Bible, and that they were disciples of the two last-mentioned Doctors; both supposed to be nephews of the reigning emperor, who disapproved of their conversion (for this account comp. Dion Cass. lxvii. 14, and Deb. Rab. 2; where Domitian is related to have had a near relative executed for his inclining towards Judaism), and very many more palpable improbabilities of the same description.

The question now remains, why was this Targum called that of Onkelos or Akilas? It is neither a translation of it, nor is it at all done in the same spirit. All that we learn about the Greek Version shows us that its chief aim and purpose was, to counteract the LXX. The latter had at that time become a mass of arbitrary corruptions—especially with respect to the Messianic passages—as well on the Christian as on the Jewish side. It was requisite that a translation, scrupulously literal, should be given into the hands of those who were unable to read the original. Aquila, the disciple, according to one account, of Akiba; the same Akiba who expounded (*durash*) for Halachistic purposes the seemingly most insignificant Particles in the Scripture (*e. g.* the את, sign of accusative; Gen. R. 1; Tos. Sheb. 1; Talm. Sheb. 26*a*), fulfilled his task according to his master's method. "Non solum verba sed et etymologias verborum transferre conatus est. . . . Quod Hebraei non solum habent ἄρθρα sed et πρόαρθρα, ille κακοζήλως et syllabas interpretetur et litteras, dictatque σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τὴν γῆν quod graeca et latina lingua non recipit" (Jer. *de Opt. Gen. interpret.*). Targum Onkelos, on the other hand, is, if not quite a paraphrase, yet one of the very freest versions. Nor do the two translations, with rare exceptions, agree even as to the renderings of proper nouns, which each occasionally likes to transform into something else. But there *is* a reason. The Jews in possession of this most slavishly accurate Greek Bible-text, could now on the one hand successfully combat arguments, brought against them from interpolated LXX. passages, and on the other follow the expoundings of the School and the Halachah, based upon the letter of the Law, as closely as if they had understood the original itself. That a version of this description often marred the sense, mattered less in times anything but favourable to the literal meaning of the Bible. It thus gradually became such a favourite with the people, that its renderings were household words. If the day when the LXX. was made was considered a day of distress like the one on which the golden calf was cast, and was actually entered among the fast days (8th Tebeth; Meg. Taanith);—this new version, which was to dispel the mischievous influences of the older, earned for its author one of the most delicate compliments in the manner of the time. The verse of the Scripture (Ps. xlv. 3), "Thou art more beautiful (*jofjefita*) than the sons of men," was applied to him—in allusion to Gen. ix. 27, where it is said that Japhet, (*i. e.* the Greek language), should one day dwell in the tents of Shem (*i. e.* Israel), Meg. 1, 11, 71 *b* and *c*; 9 *b*, Ber. Rab. 40 *b*.—Οὕτω γὰρ Ἀκύλας δουλεύων τῇ ἑβραϊκῇ λεξει ἐκδέδωκεν εἰπεῖν . . . φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις, ἡρμενευκέναι τὴν γραφήν, &c. (Orig. *ac Afric.* 2).

What, under these circumstances, is more natural than to suppose that the new Chaldee Version—at least as excellent in its way as the Greek—was started under the name which had become expressive of the type and ideal of a Bible-translation; that, in fact, it should be called a Targum done in the manner of Aquila:—*Aquila-Targum*. Whether the title of recommendation was, in consideration of the merits of the work upon which it was bestowed, gladly endorsed and retained—or for aught we know, was not bestowed upon it until it was generally found to be of such surpassing merit, we need not stop to argue.

Being thus deprived of the dates which a close examination into the accounts of a translator's life might have furnished us, we must needs try to fix the time of our Targum as approximately as we can by the circumstances under which it took its rise, and by the quotations from it which we meet in early works. Without unnecessarily going into detail, we shall briefly record, what we said in the introduction, that the Targum was begun to be committed to writing about the end of the 2nd century, A.D. So far, however, from its superseding the oral Targum at once, it was on the contrary strictly forbidden to read it in public (Jer. Meg. 4, 1). Nor was there any uniformity in the version. Down to the middle of the 2nd century we find the masters most materially differing from each other with respect to the Targum of certain passages, (Seb. 54 *a*.) and translations quoted not to be found in any of our Targums. The necessity must thus have pressed itself upon the attention of the spiritual leaders of the people to put a stop to the fluctuating state of a version, which, in the course of time must needs have become naturally surrounded with a halo of authority little short of that of the original itself. We shall thus not be far wrong in placing the work of collecting the different fragments with their variants, and reducing them into one—finally authorized Version—about the end of the 3rd, or the beginning of the 4th century, and in assigning Babylon to it as the birthplace. It was at Babylon, that about this time the light of learning, extinguished in the blood-stained fields of Palestine, shone with threefold vigour. The Academy at Nahardea, founded according to legend during the Babylonian exile itself, had gathered strength in the same degree as the numerous Palestinian schools began to decline, and when in 259 A.D. that most ancient school was destroyed, there were three others simultaneously flourishing in its stead:—Tiberias, whither the college of Palestinian Jabneh had been transferred in the time of Gamaliel III. (200); Sora, founded by Chasda of Kafri (293); and Pumbadita founded by R. Jehudah b. Jecheskeel (297). And in Babylon for well nigh a thousand years "the crown of the Law" remained, and to Babylon, the seat of the "Head of the Golah" (Dispersion), all Israel, scattered to the ends of the earth, looked for its spiritual guidance. That one of the first deeds of these Schools must have been the fixing of the Targum, as soon as the fixing of it became indispensable, we may well presume; and as we see the text fluctuating down to the middle of the 2nd century, we must needs assume that the redaction took place as soon afterwards as may reasonably be supposed. Further corroborative arguments are

found for Babylon as the place of its final redaction, although Palestine was the country where it grew and developed itself. Many grammatical and idiomatical signs—the substance itself, *i. e.* the words, being Palestinian—point, as far as the scanty materials in our hands permit us to draw conclusions as to the true state of language in Babylon, to that country. The Targum further exhibits a greater linguistic similarity with the Babylonian, than with the Palestinian Gemara. Again, terms are found in it which the Talmud distinctly mentions as peculiar to Babylon,[q] not to mention Persian words, which on Babylonian soil easily found their way into our work. One of the most striking hints is the unvarying translation of the Targum of the word נהר, "River," by Euphrates, *the* River of Babylon. Need we further point to the terms above mentioned, under which the Targum is exclusively quoted in the Talmud and the Midrashim of Babylon, viz., "*Our* Targum," "As *we* translate," or its later designation (Aruch, Rashi, Tosafoth, &c.) as the "Targum of Babel"? Were a further proof needed, it might be found in the fact that the two Babylonian Schools, which, holding different readings in various places of the Scripture, as individual traditions of their own, consequently held different readings in the Targum ever since the time of its redaction.

The opinions developed here are shared more or less by some of the most competent scholars of our day: for instance, Zunz (who now repudiates the dictum laid down in his *Gottesdienstl. Vortr.*, that the translation of Onkelos dates from about the middle of the first century, A.D.; comp. Geiger, *Zeitschr.* 1843, p. 179, note 3), Grätz, Levy, Herzfeld, Geiger, Frankel, &c. The history of the investigation of the Targums, more especially that of Onkelos, presents the usual spectacle of vague speculations and widely contradictory notions, held by different investigators at different times. Suffice it to mention that of old authorities, Reuchin puts the date of the Targum as far back as the time of Isaiah—notwithstanding that the people, as we are distinctly told, did not understand even a few Aramaic words in the time of Jeremiah. Following Asaria de Rossi and Eliah Levita (who, for reasons now completely disposed of, assumed the Targum to have first taken its rise in Babylon during the Captivity), Bellarmin, Sixtus Senensis, Aldret, Bartolocci, Rich. Simon, Hottinger, Walton, Thos. Smith, Pearson, Allix, Wharton, Prideaux, Schickard, take the same view with individual modifications. Pfeiffer, B. Meyer, Steph. Morinus, on the other hand, place its date at an extremely late period, and assign it to Palestine. Another School held that the Targum was not written until after the time of the Talmud—so Wolf, Havermann, partly Rich. Simon, Hornbeck, Joh. Morinus, &c.: and their reasons are both the occurrence of "Talmudical Fables" in the Targum and the silence of the Fathers. The former is an argument to which no reply is needed, since we do not see what it can be meant to prove, unless the "Rabbinus Talmud" has floated before their eyes, who, according to 'Henricus Seynensis Capucinus' (*Ann. Eccl.* tom. i. 261), must have written all this gigantic literature, ranging over a thousand years, out of his own head, in which case, indeed, every dictum on record, dating before or after the compilation of the Talmud, and in the least resembling a passage or story contained therein, must be a plagiarism from its sole venerable author. The latter argument, viz. the silence of the Fathers, more especially of Origen, Jerome, and Epiphanius, has been answered by Walton; and what we have said will further corroborate his arguments to the effect, that they did not mention it, not because it did not exist in their days, but because they either knew nothing of it, or did not understand it. In the person of an Onkelos, a Chaldee translator, the belief has been general, and will remain so, as long as the ordinary Handbooks—with rare exceptions—do not care to notice the uncontested results of contemporary investigation. How scholars within the last century have endeavoured to reconcile the contradictory accounts about Onkelos, more particularly how they have striven to smooth over the difficulty of their tallying with those of Akilas—as far as either had come under their notice—for this and other minor points we must refer the reader to Eichhorn, Jahn, Berthold, Hävernick, &c.

We now turn to the Targum itself.

Its language is Chaldee, closely approaching in purity of idiom to that of Ezra and Daniel. It follows a sober and clear, though not a slavish exegesis, and keeps as closely and minutely to the text as is at all consistent with its purpose, viz., to be chiefly, and above all, a version for the people. Its explanations of difficult and obscure passages bear ample witness to the competence of those who gave it its final shape, and infused into it a rare unity. Even where foreign matter is introduced, or, as Berkowitz in his Hebrew work *Oteh Or* keenly observes, where it most artistically blends two translations: one literal, and one figurative, into one; it steadily keeps in view the real sense of the passage in hand. It is always concise and clear, and dignified, worthy of the grandeur of its subject. It avoids the legendary character with which all the later Targums entwine the Biblical word, as far as ever circumstances would allow. Only in the poetical passages it was compelled to yield—though reluctantly—to the popular craving for Haggadah; but even here it chooses and selects with rare taste and tact.

Generally and broadly it may be stated that alterations are never attempted, save for the sake of clearness; tropical terms are dissolved by judicious circumlocutions, for the correctness of which the authors and editors—in possession of the living tradition of a language still written, if not spoken in their day—certainly seem better judges than some modern critics, who through their own incomplete acquaintance with the idiom, injudiciously blame Onkelos. Highly characteristic is the aversion of the Targum to anthropopathies and anthropomorphisms; in fact, to any term which could in the eyes of the multitude lower the idea of the Highest Being. Yet there are many passages retained in which human affections and qualities are attributed to Him. He speaks, He sees. He hears, He smells the odour of sacrifice, is angry, repents, &c.:—the Targum thus showing itself entirely opposed to the allegorising and symbolising tendencies, which in those, and still more in later days, were prone to transform Biblical history itself into the most extraordinary legends and fairy tales with or without a moral. The Targum, however, while retaining terms like the arm of God, the right hand of God, the finger of God—for

[q] נערה, "a girl," is rendered by רביא; "for thus they call in Babylon a young girl," שכן קורין בבבל לינוקא רביא (Chag. 13 *a*).

Power, Providence, &c.—replaces terms like foot, front, back of God, by the fitting figurative meaning. We must notice further its repugnance to bring the Divine Being into too close contact, as it were, with man. It erects a kind of reverential barrier, a sort of invisible medium of awful reverence between the Creator and the creature. Thus terms like "the Word" (Logos = Sanse. Ôm), "the Shechinah" (Holy Presence of God's Majesty, "the Glory"), further, human beings talking not *to*, but "before" God, are frequent. The same care, in a minor degree, is taken of the dignity of the persons of the patriarchs, who, though the Scripture may expose their weaknesses, were not to be held up in their iniquities before the multitude whose ancestors and ideals they were. That the most curious ὕστερα πρότερα and anachronisms occur, such as Jacob studying the Torah in the academy of Shem, &c., is due to the then current typifying tendencies of the Haggadah. Some extremely cautious, withal poetical, alterations also occur when the patriarchs speak of having acquired something by violent means: as Jacob (Gen. xlviii. 22), by his "sword and bow," which two words become in the Targum, "prayers and supplications." But the points which will have to be considered chiefly when the Targum becomes a serious study—as throwing the clearest light upon its time, and the ideas then in vogue about matters connected with religious belief and exercises—are those which treat of prayer, study of the law, prophecy, angelology, and the Messiah.

The only competent investigator who, after Winer (*De Onkeloso*, 1820), but with infinitely more minuteness and thorough knowledge of the subject, has gone fully into this matter, is Luzzatto. Considering the vast importance of this, the oldest Targum, for biblical as well as for linguistic studies in general,—not to mention the advantages that might accrue from it to other branches of learning, such as geography, history, &c.: we think it advisable to give—for the first time—a brief sketch of the results of this eminent scholar. His classical, though not rigorously methodical, *Oheb Ger* (1830) is, it is true, quoted by every one, but in reality known to but an infinitely small number, although it is written in the most lucid modern Hebrew.

He divides the discrepancies between Text and Targum into four principal classes.

(A.) Where the language of the Text has been changed in the Targum, but the meaning of the former retained.

(B.) Where both language and meaning were changed.

(C.) Where the meaning was retained, but additions were introduced.

(D.) Where the meaning was changed, and additions were introduced.

He further subdivides these four into thirty-two classes, to all of which he adds, in a most thorough and accurate manner, some telling specimens. Notwithstanding the apparent pedantry of his method, and the undeniable identity which necessarily must exist between some of his classes, a glance over their whole body, aided by one or two examples in each case, will enable us to gain as clear an insight into the manner and "genius" of the Onkelos-Targum as is possible without the study of the work itself.

(A.) Discrepancies where the language of the text has been changed in the Targum., but the meaning of the former has been retained.

1. Alterations owing to the idiom: *e. g.* the singular,[r] "Let there be [*sit*] lights" (Gen. i. 14), is transformed into the plur.[s] [*sint*] in the Targum "man and woman,"[t] as applied to the animals (Gen. vii. 2), becomes, as unsuitable in the Aramaic, "male and female."[u]

2. Alterations out of reverence towards God, more especially for the purpose of doing away with all ideas of a plurality of the Godhead: *e. g.* the terms Adonai, Elohim, are replaced by Jehovah, lest these might appear to imply more than one God. Where Elohim is applied to idolatry it is rendered "Error."[x]

3. Anthropomorphisms, where they could be misunderstood and construed into a disparagement or a lowering of the dignity of the Godhead among the common people, are expunged: *e. g.* for "And God smelled a sweet smell" (Gen. viii. 21), Onkelos has, "And Jehovah received the sacrifice with grace;" for "And Jehovah went[y] down to see the city" (Gen. xi. 5), "And Jehovah *revealed*[z] Himself," a term of frequent use in the Targum for verbs of motion, such as "to go down," "to go through," &c., applied to God. "I shall pass over[a] you" (Ex. xii. 13), the Targum renders, "I shall protect you."[b] Yet only anthropomorphisms which clearly stand figuratively and might give offence, are expunged, not as Maimonides, followed by nearly all commentators, holds, *all* anthropomorphisms, for words like "hand, finger, to speak, see," &c. (see above), are retained. But where the words remember, think of,[c] &c., are used of God, they always, whatever their tense in the text, stand in the Targum in the present; since a past or future would imply a temporary forgetting on the part of the Omniscient.[d] A keen distinction is here also established by Luzzatto between חזי and גלי, the former used of a real, external seeing, the latter of a seeing "into the heart."

4. Expressions used of and to God by men are brought more into harmony with the idea of His dignity. Thus Abraham's question, "The Judge of the whole earth, should he not (לא) do justice?" (Gen. xviii. 25) is altered into the affirmative: "The Judge . . . verily He will do justice." Laban, who speaks of his gods[e] in the text, is made to speak of his religion[f] only in the Targum.

5. Alterations in honour of Israel and their ancestors. Rachel "stole"[g] the Teraphim (xxxi. 19) is softened into Rachel "took;"[h] Jacob "fled" from Laban (Ib. 22), into "went";[k] "The sons of Jacob answered Shechem with craftiness"[m] (xxxiv. 13), into "with wisdom."[n]

6. Short glosses introduced for the better understanding of the text: "for it is my mouth that speaks to you" (xiv. 12), Joseph said to his brethren: Targum, "in your tongue,"[o] *i. e.* without an interpreter. "The people who had made

---

[r] יהי [s] יהון [t] איש ואשתו
[u] דכר ונוקבא [x] טעוות עממיא
[y] וירד [z] ואתגלי [a] פסחתי
[b] אחום [c] פקד, זכר
[d] Comp. Prayer for Rosh hashana, "ואין שכחה וכו'
"And there is no forgetting before the throne of Thy glory."
[e] אלהים [f] דחלתי [g] ותגנוב
[h] ונסיבת [i] בורח [k] אזיל
[m] במרמה [n] בחוכמא [o] בלשניכון

the calf" (Ex. xxxii. 35), Targum, "worshipped,"[p] since not they, but Aaron made it.

7. Explanation of tropical and allegorical expressions: "Be fruitful (lit. 'creep,' from שרץ) and multiply" (Gen. i. 28), is altered into "bear children;"[q] "thy brother Aaron shall be thy *prophet*"[r] (Ex. vii. 1), into "thy interpreter"[s] (Meturgeman); "I made thee a god (Elohim) to Pharaoh" (Ex. vii. 1), into "a master;"[t] "to a head and not to a tail" (Deut. xxviii. 13), into "to a strong man and not to a weak;"[u] and finally, "Whoever says of his father and his mother, I saw them not" (Deut. xxxii. 9), into "Whoever is not merciful[x] towards his father and his mother."

8. Tending to ennoble the language: the "washing" of Aaron and his sons is altered into "sanctifying;"[y] the "carcasses"[z] of the animals of Abraham (Gen. xv. 11) become "pieces;"[a] "anointing"[b] becomes "elevating, raising;"[c] "the wife of the bosom,"[d] "wife of the covenant."[e]

9. The last of the classes where the terms are altered, but the sense is retained, is that in which a change of language takes place in order to introduce the explanations of the oral law and the traditions: *e. g.* Lev. xxiii. 11, "On the morrow after the Sabbath[f] (*i. e.* the feast of the unleavened bread) the priest shall wave it (the sheaf)," Onkelos for Sabbath, *feast-day*.[g] For frontlets[a] (Deut. vi. 8), Tefillin (phylacteries).[i]

(B.) Change of both the terms and the meaning.

10. To avoid phrases apparently derogatory to the dignity of the Divine Being: "Am I in God's stead?"[k] becomes in Onkelos, "Dost thou ask [children] from me?[m] from before God thou shouldst ask them" (Gen. xxx. 2).

11. In order to avoid anthropomorphisms of an objectionable kind. "With the breath of Thy nose"[n] ("blast of Thy nostrils," A. V., Ex. xv. 8), becomes "With the word of Thy mouth."[o] "And I shall spread my hand over thee"[p] (Ex. xxxiii. 22), is transformed into "I shall with my word protect thee."[q] "And thou shalt see my back parts,[r] but my face[s] shall not be seen" (Ex. xxxiii. 23): "And thou shalt see what is behind me,[t] but that which is before me[u] shall not be seen" (Deut. xxxiii. 12).

12. For the sake of religious euphemisms: *e. g.* "And ye shall be like God"[x] (Gen. iii. 5), is altered into "like princes."[y] "A laughter[z] has God made me" (Gen. xxi. 6), into "A joy[a] He gives me"—"God" being entirely omitted.

13. In honour of the nation and its ancestors: *e. g.* "Jacob was an upright man, a dweller in tents"[b] (Gen. xxv. 27), becomes "an upright man, frequenting the house of learning."[c] "One of the people[d] might have lain with thy wife" (Gen. xxvi. 10)—"One singled out among the people.'[e] *i. e.* the king. "Thy brother came and took my blessing with deceit"[f] (Gen. xxvii. 35), becomes "with wisdom"[g]

14. In order to avoid similes objectionable on aesthetical grounds. "And he will bathe his foot in oil"[h]—"And he will have many delicacies[i] of a king" (Deut. xxxiii. 24).

15. In order to ennoble the language. "And man became a living being"[k] (Gen. ii. 7)—"And *it* became in man a speaking spirit."[m] "How good are thy *tents*,[n] O Jacob"—"How good are thy *lands*,[o] O Jacob" (Num. xxiv. 5).

16. In favour of the Oral Law and the Rabbinical explanations "And go into the land of Moriah"[p] (Gen. xxii. 2), becomes "into the land of worship" (the future place of the Temple). "Isaac went to walk[q] in the field" (Gen. xxiv. 63), is rendered "to *pray*."[r] [Comp. SAM. PENT., p. 1114*b*]. "Thou shalt not boil a kid[s] in the milk of its mother" (Ex. xxxiv. 26)—as meat and milk,[t] according to the Halachah.

(C.) Alterations of words (circumlocutions, additions, &c.) without change of meaning.

17. On account of the difference of idiom: *e. g.* "Her father's brother"[u] (=relation), (Gen. xxix. 12), is rendered "The son of her father's sister."[x] "What God does[y] (future) he has told Pharaoh" (Gen. xli. 28)—"What God will do,"[z] &c.

18. Additions for the sake of avoiding expressions apparently derogatory to the dignity of the Divine Being, by implying polytheism and the like: "Who is like unto Thee[a] among the gods?" is rendered, "There is none like unto Thee,[b] Thou art God" (Ex. xv. 11). "And they sacrifice to demons who are no gods"[c]—"of no use"[d] (Deut. xxxii. 17).

19. In order to avoid erroneous notions implied in certain verbs and epithets used of the Divine Being: *e. g.* "And the Spirit of God[e] moved" (Gen. i. 2)—"A wind from before the Lord."[f] "And Noah built God an altar"[g] (Gen. viii. 20)—"an altar before[h] the Lord." "And God[i] was with the boy" (Gen. xxi. 20)—"And the word of God[k] was in the aid of the boy." "The mountain of God" (Ex. iii. 1)—"The mountain upon which was revealed the glory[m] of God." "The staff of God" (Ex. iv. 20)—"The staff with which thou hast done the miracles before[n] God."

---

[p] דאשתעבדו [q] אתילידו [r] נביאך
[s] מתורגמנך [t] רב [u] לתקיף ולא לחלש
[x] רחים [y] ויקדשון [z] פגרים
[a] (בתרים) פלגיא [b] משח [c] תרבי
[d] אישת חיקך [e] אישת קיימך
[f] שבת [g] יומא טבא [h] טוטפות
[i] תפילין [k] התחת אל׳ אנכי
[m] המני את בעיא וכו׳ [n] וברוח אפיך
[o] ובמימר פומך [p] וישכותי כפי
[q] ואנין בממרי [r] אחור [s] פני
[t] ית דבתרי [u] ית דקדמי [x] אלהים
[y] רברבין [z] צחוק [a] חדוא
[b] יושב אהלים [c] משמש בבית אולפנא
[d] אחד העם [e] חד דמיחד בעמא

[a] שמן [b] בחוכמא [c] במרמה
[d] לנפש חיה [e] תפנוקי
[f] אהליך [g] והות באדם לרוח ממללא
[h] לישוח. [i] מוריה [k] ארעך
[m] פולחנא. [Abraham instituted, according to the Midrash, the morning- (Shaharith), Isaac the afternoon- (Minha), and Jacob the evening-prayer (Maarib).]
[n] בשר וחלב [o] גדי בחלב
[p] עושה [q] בר אחת [r] אחי
[s] לית בר מנך [t] מי כמוך [u] עתיד למעבד
[x] לית בהן צרוך [y] לא אלהי
[z] רוח מן קדם אלהים [a] רוח אלהים
[b] אל׳ [c] קדם ה׳ [d] לה׳
[e] מן קדם ה׳ [f] יקרא [g] מימרא דה׳

"And I shall see[o] what will be their end"—"It is open (revealed) before me,"[p] &c. The Divine Being is in fact very rarely spoken of without that spiritual medium mentioned before; it being considered, as it were, a want of proper reverence to speak to or of Him directly. The terms "Before" (קדם), "Word" (Λόγος, מימרא), "Glory" (יקרא), "Majesty" (שכנתיה), are also constantly used instead of the Divine name: *e. g.* "The voice of the Lord God was heard" (Gen. iii. 8)—"The voice of the Word." "And He will dwell in the tents of Shem" (ix. 27)—"And the Shechina [Divine Presence] will dwell." "And the Lord went up from Abraham" (Gen. xvii. 22)—"And the glory of God went up." "And God came to Abimelech" (Gen. xx. 3)—"And the word from [before] God came to Abimelech."

20. For the sake of improving seemingly irreverential phrases in Scripture. "Who is God that I should listen unto His voice?" (Ex. v. 2)—"The name of God has not been revealed to me, that I should receive His word."[q]

21. In honour of the nation and its ancestors. "And Israel said to Joseph, Now I shall gladly die"[r] (Gen. xlvi. 30), which might appear frivolous in the mouth of the patriarch, becomes "I shall be comforted[s] now." "And he led his flock towards[t] the desert" (Ex. iii. 1)—"towards a good spot of pasture[u] in the desert."

22. In honour of the Law and the explanation of its obscurities. "To days and years" (Gen. i. 14)—"that days and years should be counted by them."[x] "A tree of knowledge of good and evil"—"A tree, and those who eat its fruits[y] will distinguish between good and evil." "I shall not further curse for the sake of[z] man" (viii. 21)—"through the sin[a] of man." "To the ground shall not be forgiven the blood[b] shed upon it" (Num. xxv. 33)—"the *innocent*[c] blood."

23. For the sake of avoiding similes, metonymical and allegorical passages, too difficult for the comprehension of the multitude: *e. g.* "Thy seed like the dust of the earth" (Gen. xiii. 16)—"mighty[d] as the dust of the earth." "I am too small for all the benefits" (Gen. xxxii. 10)—"My good deeds[e] are small." "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart"—"the folly of thy heart."[f]

24. For the sake of elucidating apparent obscurities, &c., in the written Law. "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother" (Gen. ii. 24)—"the home"[g] (not really his parents). "The will of Him who dwelleth in the bush"—"of Him that dwelleth in heaven[h] [whose Shechinah is in heaven], and who revealed Himself in the bush to Moses."

25. In favour of the oral Law and the traditional explanations generally. "He punishes the sins of the parents on their children" (Ex. xx. 5), has the addition, "when the children follow the sins of their parents" (comp. Ez. xviii. 19). "The righteous and the just ye shall not kill" (Ex. xxiii. 7)—"He who has left the tribunal as innocent, thou shalt not kill him," *i. e.*, according to the Halacha, he is not to be arraigned again for the same crime. "Doorposts" (*mesusoth*) (Deut. vi. 9)—"And thou shalt write them . . . *and affix them* upon the posts," &c.

(D.) Alteration of language and meaning.

26. In honour of the Divine Being, to avoid apparent multiplicity or a likeness. "Behold man will be like one of us, knowing good and evil" (Gen. iii. 22)—"He will be the only one in the world[i] to know good and evil." "For who is a God in heaven and on earth who could do like Thy deeds and powers?" (Deut. iii. 24)—"Thou art God, Thy Divine Presence (Shechinah) is in heaven[k] above, and reigns on earth below, and there is none who does like unto Thy deeds," &c.

27. Alteration of epithets employed of God. "And before Thee shall I hide myself"[m] (Gen. iv. 14)—"And before Thee it is not possible to hide."[n] "This is my God and I will praise[o] Him, the God of my father and I will extol[p] Him" (Ex. xv. 2)—"This is my God, and I will build Him a sanctuary;[q] the God of my fathers, and I will pray before Him."[r] "In one moment I shall go up in thy midst and annihilate thee"—"For one hour will I take away my majesty[s] from among thee" (since no evil can come from above).

28. For the ennobling of the sense. "Great is Jehovah above all gods"—"Great is God, and there is no other god beside Him." "Send through him whom thou wilt send" (Ex. iv. 13)—"through him who is worthy to be sent."

29. In honour of the nation and its ancestors. "And the souls they made[t] in Haran" (Gen. xii. 5)—"the souls they made subject to the Divine Law[u] in Haran." "And Isaac brought her into the tent of his mother Sarah" (Gen. xxiv. 67)—"And lo righteous were her works,[x] like the works of his mother Sarah." "And he bent his shoulder to bear, and he became a tributary servant" (Gen. xlix. 15)—"And he will conquer the cities of the nations and destroy their dwelling-places, and those that will remain there will serve him and pay tribute to him." "People, foolish and not wise" (Deut. xxxii. 6)—"People who has received the Law and has not become wise."[y]

30. Explanatory of tropical and metonymical phrases. "And besides thee no man shall raise his hand and his foot in the whole land of Egypt" (Gen. xli. 44)—"There shall not a man raise his hand to seize a weapon, and his foot to ride on a horse."

31. To ennoble or improve the language. "Coats of skin" (Gen. iii. 21)—"Garments of honour on the skin of their flesh." "Thy two daugh-

---

[o] ידעתי [p] גלי קדמי

[q] לא אתגלי לי דאקבל במימריה

[r] אחר המ׳ [s] אנחמה [t] אמותה

[x] לממני בהון [y] שפר רעיה ב׳

[z] בעבור [a] ואילון דאכלין פירוהי

[b] לדם [c] לדם נקי [d] בדיל חובי

זעירן זכוותי [e] סגיאין

[f] בית מישכביה [g] טפשות לבך

[h] דשכנתיה בשמיא יחידא בעלמא

[m] אסתתר [k] שכנתך בשמיא

[n] אנוהו [o] לית אפשר לאטמרא

[p] ארוממנהו [q] אבני ליה מקדש

[r] אפלח קדמוהי [s] אסלק שכנתי

[t] עשו [u] דשעבידו לאורייתא

[x] ותקנין עובדהא

[y] סבילו אורייתא ולא חכימו

[z] לבושין דיקר

ters who are found with thee" (Gen. xix. 15)—"who were found faithful with thee." "May Reuben live and not die" (Deut. xxxiii. 6)—"May Reuben live in the everlasting life."

The foregoing examples will, we trust, be found to bear out sufficiently the judgment given above on this Targum. In spite of its many and important discrepancies, it never for one moment forgets its aim of being a clear, though free, translation *for the people*, and nothing more. Wherever it deviates from the literalness of the text, such a course, in its case, is fully justified—nay, necessitated—either by the obscurity of the passage, or the wrong construction that naturally would be put upon its wording by the multitude. The explanations given agree either with the real sense, or develop the current tradition supposed to underlie it. The specimens adduced by other investigators, however differently classified or explained, are easily brought under the foregoing heads. They one and all tend to prove that Onkelos, whatever the objections against single instances, is one of the most excellent and thoroughly competent interpreters. A few instances only—and they are very few indeed—may be adduced, where even Onkelos, as it would appear, "dormitat." Far be it from us for one moment to depreciate, as has been done, the infinitely superior knowledge both of the Hebrew and Chaldee idioms on the part of the writers and editors of our document, or to attribute their discrepancies from modern translations to ignorance. They drank from the fullness of a highly valuable traditional exegesis, as fresh and vigorous in their days as the Hebrew language itself still was in the circles of the wise, the academies and schools. But we have this advantage, that words which then were obsolete, and whose meaning was known no longer—only guessed at—are to us familiar by the numerous progeny they have produced in cognate idioms, known to us through the mighty spread of linguistic science in our days; and if we are not aided by a traditional exegesis handed down within and without the schools, perhaps ever since the days of the framing of the document itself, neither are we prejudiced and fettered by it. Whatever may be implied and hidden in a verse or word, we have no reason to translate it accordingly, and, for the attaining of this purpose, to overstrain the powers of the roots. Among such small shortcomings of our translator may be mentioned that he appears to have erroneously derived שאת (Gen. iv. 7) from נשא; that נוכחת (xx. 6) is by him rendered אוכחת; אברך (Gen. xli. 43) by אבא למלכא; אֹבֵד (Deut. xxiv. 5) אֲבֵד; and the like. Comp. however the Commentators on these passages.

The bulk of the passages generally adduced as proofs of want of knowledge on the part of Onkelos have to a great part been shown in the course of the foregoing specimens to be intentional deviations; many other passages not mentioned merely instance the want of knowledge on the part of his critics.

Some places, again, exhibit that blending of two distinct translations, of which we have spoken; the catchword being apparently taken in two different senses. Thus Gen. xxii. 13, where he translates: "And Abraham lifted up his eyes after these, and behold there was a ram;" he has not "in his perplexity" mistranslated אחר for אחר, but he has only placed for the sake of clearness the אחר after the verb (he saw), instead of the noun (ram); and the חדא, which is moreover wanting in some texts, has been added, not as a translation of אחר or אחד, but in order to make the passage more lucid still. A similar instance of a double translation is found in Gen. ix. 6: "Whosoever sheds a man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed"—rendered "Whosoever sheds the blood of man, by witnesses through the sentence of the judges shall his blood be shed;" באדם, by man, being taken first as "witness," and then as "judges."

We may further notice the occurrence of two *Messianic* passages in this Targum: the one, Gen. xlix. 10, Shiloh; the other, Num. xxiv. 17, "sceptre:" both rendered "Messiah."

A fuller idea of the "Genius" of Onkelos as Translator and as Paraphrast, may be arrived at from the specimens subjoined in pp. 1659-61.

We cannot here enter into anything like a minute account of the dialect of Onkelos or of any other Targum. Regarding the linguistic shades of the different Targums, we must confine ourselves to the general remark, that the later the version, the more corrupt and adulterated its language. Three dialects, however, are chiefly to be distinguished: as in the Aramaic idiom in general, which in contradistinction to the Syriac, or Christian Aramaic, may be called Judaeo-Aramaic, so also in the different Targums; and their recognition is a material aid towards fixing the place of their origin; although we must warn the reader that this guidance is not always to be relied upon.

1. The Galilean dialect, known and spoken of already in the Talmud as the one which most carelessly confounds its sounds, vowels as well as consonants. "The Galileans are negligent with respect to their language,[a] and care not for grammatical forms"[b] is a common saying in the Gemara. We learn that they did not distinguish properly between B and P (ב, פ), saying Tapula instead of Tabula, between Ch and K (כ and ק) saying χείριος for κύριος. Far less could they distinguish between the various gutturals, as is cleverly exemplified in the story where a Judaean asked a Galilean, when the latter wanted to buy an אמיר, whether he meant עֵמֶר (wool), or אִמֵּר (a lamb), or חֲמַר (wine), or חֲמוֹר (an ass). The next consequence of this their disregard of the gutturals was, that they threw them often off entirely at the beginning of a word *per aphaeresin*. Again they contracted, or rather wedged together, words of the most dissimilar terminations and beginnings. By confounding the vowels like the consonants, they often created entirely new words and forms. The Mappik H (ה) became Ch (somewhat similar to the Scotch pronunciation of the initial H). As the chief reason for this Galilean confusion of tongues (for which comp. Matt. xxvi. 73; Mark xiv. 70) may be assigned the increased facility of intercourse with the neighbouring nations owing to their northern situation.

2. The Samaritan Dialect, a mixture of vulgar Hebrew and Aramean, in accordance with the origin of the people itself. Its chief characteristics are the frequent use of the *Ain* (which not only stands for other gutturals, but is even used as *mater lectionis*), the commutation of the gutturals in general, and the indiscriminate use of the mute consonants ב for ו, ק for כ, ח for ק, &c.

3. The Judaean or Jerusalem Dialect (comp.

[a] לא הקפידו [b] לא דייקא לישנא

Ned. 66 *b*) scarcely ever pronounces the gutturals at the end properly, often throws them off entirely. Jeshuâ, becomes Jeshu ; Sheba—Shib. Many words are peculiar to this dialect alone. The appellations of "door," [c] "light," [d] "reward," [e] &c., are totally different from those used in the other dialects. Altogether all the peculiarities of provincialism, shortening and lengthening of vowels, idiomatic phrases and words, also an orthography of its own, generally with a fuller and broader vocalisation, are noticeable throughout both the Targums and the Talmud of Jerusalem, which, for the further elucidation of this point as of many others have as yet not found an investigator.

The following recognised Greek words, the greater part of which also occur in the Talmud and Midrash, are found in Onkelos: Ex. xxviii. 25, [f] *βήρυλλος* ; Ex. xxviii. 11, [g] *γλυφή* ; Gen. xxviii. 17, [h] *ἰδιώτης* ; Lev. xi. 30, [i] *κωλώτης* ; Ex. xxviii. 19, [k] *θράκιος* (Plin. xxxvii. 68); Ex. xxxix. 11, [m] *Καρχηδόνιοι*, comp. Pes. der. Kah. xxxii. (Carbunculi); Deut. xx. 20, [n] *χαράκωμα* (Ber. R. xcviii.) ; Ex. xxviii. 20, [o] *χρῶμα* ; Num. xv. 38, Deut. xxii. 12, [p] *κράσπεδον* ; Ex. xxx. 34, [q] *κίστος* ; Gen. xxxvii. 28, [r] *λῆδον* ; Ex. xxiv. 16, [s] *φάρσος* ; Ex. xxvi. 6, [t] *πόρπη* ; Gen. vi. 14, [u] *κέδρος* ; Ex. xxviii. 19, [z] *κέγχρος* (Plin. xxxvii. 4). To these may be added the unrecognised [y] *κεραμίς* (Ex. xxi. 18), [x] *λιβρούχης*, or *λεβρόχη* (Gen. xxx. 14), &c.

The following short rules on the general mode of transcribing the Greek Letters in Aramaic and Syriac (Targum, Talmud, Midrash, &c.), may not be out of place:—

Γ before palatals, pronounced like *ν*, becomes נ.

Z is rendered by ז.

H appears to have occasionally assumed the pronunciation of a consonant (Digamma); and a ו is inserted.

Θ is ת, T ט. But this rule, even making allowances for corruptions, does not always seem to have been strictly observed.

K is ק, sometimes כ.

M, which before labials stands in lieu of a *ν*, becomes נ : occasionally a נ is inserted before labials where it is not found in the Greek word.

Ξ, generally כס, sometimes, however, נז or כצ.

Π is פ, sometimes, however, it is softened into ב.

P is sometimes altered into ל or נ.

'P becomes either רה or הר at the beginning of a word.

Σ either ס or ז.

The *spiritus asper*, which in Greek is dropped in the middle of a word, reappears again sometimes (*συνέδροι*—San*h*edrin). Even the *lenis* is represented sometimes by a ה at the beginning of a word ; sometimes, however, even the *asper* is dropped.

As to the vowels no distinct rule is to be laid down, owing principally to the original want of vowel-points in our texts.

Before double consonants at the beginning of a word an א *prostheticum* is placed, so as to render the pronunciation easier. The terminations are frequently Hebraised:—thus *οι* is sometimes rendered by the termination of the Masc. Pl. ים, &c.

A curious and instructive comparison may be instituted, between this mode of transcription of the Greek letters into Hebrew, and that of the Hebrew letters into Greek, as found chiefly in the LXX.

א sometimes inaudible (*spirit. len.*) Ἀαράν, Ἐλκανά ; sometimes audible (as *spirit. asper*), Ἀβραάμ, Ἠλίας.

ב = β: Ῥεβέκκα; sometimes φ: Ἰακεβζήφ, sometimes υ: Ῥααῦ, sometimes μβ: Ζερομβαβέλ, sometimes it is completely changed into μ: Ἰαμνεία (2 Chr. xxvi. 6).

ג = γ: Γόμερ, sometimes κ: Δωήκ, sometimes χ: Σερούχ.

ד = δ: once = τ Ματραίθ (Gen. xxxvi. 39).

ה = א, either *spirit. asp.* like Ὀδοβρά, or *spir len.* like Ἀβέλ.

ו = υ, not the vowel, but our *v*: Ἔυα, Λευί: thus also ου (as the Greek writers often express the Latin *v* by ου): Ἰεσσουά: sometimes = β: Σαβύ (Gen. xiv. 5); sometimes it is entirely left out, Ἀστί for Vashti.

ז = ζ, sometimes σ: Σαβουλών, Χασβί; rarely ξ: Βαύξ (Gen. xxii. 21).

ח, often entirely omitted, or represented by a *spir. len.* in the beginning, or the reduplication of the vowel in the middle or at the end of the word, sometimes = χ: Χάμ ; sometimes = κ: Τάβεκ (Gen. xxii. 24).

ט = τ: Σαφάτ ; sometimes = δ: Φούδ (Gen. x. 6); or θ: Ἐλιφαλάδ (2 Sam. v. 16).

י = *i*: Ἰακώβ, or *i* before ρ (ר): Ἱερεμίας. Between several vowels it is sometimes entirely omitted: Ἰωαδά.

כ = χ: Χαναάν ; sometimes κ: Σαβαθακά (Gen. x. 7); rarely = γ: Γαφθωρείμ.

ל, נ, ר = λ, ν, ρ ; but they are often found interchanged: owing perhaps to the similarity of the Greek letters. נ is sometimes also rendered μ (see above).

מ = μ, sometimes β: Νεβρώδ, Σεβλά (1 Chr i. 47).

ש and ס = σ: Συμεών, Σηείρ, Σίν.

ע = *spir. len.*: Ἐφρών ; sometimes = γ (ξ) Γομορρα ; sometimes κ, Ἀρβόκ (Gen. xxiii. 2).

פ = φ: Φαλέγ, or π: Σαλπαάδ.

צ = σ: Σιδών ; sometimes ζ: Οὐζ (Gen. x. 23; Cod. Alex. Ὦς; xxii. 21: Ὦξ).

ק = κ: Βαλάκ ; sometimes χ: Χεττουρά ; also γ: Χελέγ.

ת = θ: Ἰαφέθ ; sometimes τ: Τοχός.

As to the Bible Text from which the Targum was prepared, we can only reiterate that we have no certainty whatever on this head, owing to the extraordinarily corrupt state of our Targum texts. Pages upon pages of Variants have been gathered by Cappellus, Kennicott, Buxtorf, De Rossi, Clericus, Luzzatto, and others, by a superficial comparison of a few copies only, and those chiefly printed ones. Whenever the very numerous MSS. shall be collated, then the learned world may possibly come to certain probable conclusions on it. It would appear, however, that broadly speaking, our present Masoretic text has been the one from which th

---

[c] דשא for בבא
[d] בוציני for ישרני
[e] אגר for סוטר
[f] ברלא
[g] גלף
[h] הדיוט
[i] חלטתא
[k] טרקיא
[m] כרכדינא
[n] כרכום
[o] כרום (ימא) (Mich. *Lex. Syr.* 435, makes it *Fersian*)
[p] כרוספדא
[q] כשת
[r] לטום
[s] פרסא
[t] פורפא
[u] קדרום
[z] כורמיזא
[y] ינרוחין
[x] קנכרי

Onk. Version was, if not made, yet edited, at all events; unless we assume that late hands have been intentionally busy in mutually assimilating text and translation. Many of the inferences drawn by De Rossi and others from the discrepancies of the version to discrepancies of the original from the Masor. Text, must needs be rejected if Onkelos' method and phraseology, as we have exhibited it, are taken into consideration. Thus, when, Ex. xiv. 7, "before the people" is found in Onkelos, while our Hebrew text reads "in the ears," it by no means follows that Onkelos read באזני: it is simply his way of explaining the unusual phrase, to which he remains faithful throughout. Or, "Lead the people *unto the place* (A.V.) of which I have spoken" (Ex. xxxii. 34), is solely Onkelos' translation of אל אשר, *scil.* the place, and no מקום need be conjectured as having stood in Onkelos' copy; as also, Ex. ix. 7, his addition "From the cattle of '*the children of*' Israel" does not prove a בני to have stood in his Codex.

And this also settles (or rather leaves unsettled), the question as to the authenticity of the Targumic Texts, such as we have them. Considering that no MS. has as yet been found older than at most 600 years, even the careful comparison of all those that do exist would not much further our knowledge. As far as those existing are concerned, they teem with the most palpable blunders,—not to speak of variants, owing to sheer carelessness on the part of the copyists;—but few are of a nature damaging the sense materially. The circumstance that Text and Targum were often placed side by side, column by column, must have had no little share in the incorrectness, since it was but natural to make the Targum resemble the Text as closely as possible, while the nature of its material differences was often unknown to the scribe. In fact, the accent itself was made to fit both the Hebrew and the Chaldee wherever a larger addition did not render it utterly impossible. Thus letters are inserted, omitted, thrust in, blotted out, erased, in an infinite number of places. But the difference goes still further. In some Codices synonymous terms are used most arbitrarily as it would appear: ארעה and אדמתא earth, אדם and אנשא man, אורח and מהלך path, יהוה and אלהים, Jehovah and Elohim, are found to replace each other indiscriminately. In some instances, the Hebrew Codex itself has, to add to the confusion, been emendated from the Targum.

A Masorah has been written on Onkelos, without, however, any authority being inherent in it, and without, we should say, much value. It has never been printed, nor, as far as we have been able to ascertain, is there any MS. now to be found in this country, or in any of the public libraries abroad. What has become of Buxtorf's copy, which he intended to add to his never printed "Babylonia"—a book devoted to this same subject—we do not know. Luzzatto has lately found such a "Masorah" in a Pentateuch MS., but he only mentions some variants contained in it. Its title must not mislead the reader; it has nothing whatever to do with *the* Masorah of the Bible, but is a recent work, like the *Masorah of the Talmud*, which has nothing whatever to do with the Talmud Text.

The MSS. of Onkelos are extant in great number—a circumstance easily explained by the injunction that it should be read every Sabbath at home, if not in the Synagogue. The Bodleian has 5, the British Museum 2, Vienna 6; Augsburg 1, Nuremberg 2, Altdorf 1, Carlsruhe 3. Stuttgart 2, Erfurt 3, Dresden 1, Leipsic 1, Jena 1, Dessau 1, Helmstadt 2, Berlin 4, Breslau 1, Brieg 1, Regensburg 1, Hamburg 7, Copenhagen 2, Upsala 1 Amsterdam 1, Paris 8, Molsheim 1, Venice 6, Turin 2, Milan 4, Leghorn 1, Sienna 1, Genoa 1, Florence 5, Bologna 2, Padua 1, Trieste 2, Parma about 40, Rome 18 more or less complete Codd. containing Onkelos.

Editio Princeps, Bologna 1482, fol. (Abr. b. Chajjim) with Hebr. Text and Rashi. Later Edd. Soria 1490, Lisbon 1491, Constantinople 1505: from these were taken the texts in the Complutensian (1517) and the Venice (Bomberg) Polyglotts (1518, 1526, 1547-49), and Buxtorf's Rabbinical Bible (1619). This was followed by the Paris Polyglott (1645), and Walton's (1657). A recent and much emendated edition dates Wilna 1852.

Of the extraordinary similarity between Onkelos and the Samaritan version we have spoken under SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH [p. 1114]. There also will be found a specimen of both, taken from the Barberini Codex. Many more points connected with Onkelos and his influence upon later Hermeneutics and Exegesis, as well as his relation to earlier or later versions, we have no space to enlarge upon, desirable as an investigation of these points might be. We have, indeed, only been induced to dwell so long upon this single Targum, because in the first instance a great deal that has been said here will, *mutatis mutandis*, hold good also for the other Targums; and further, because Onkelos is THE CHALDEE VERSION *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, while, from Jonathan downwards, we more and more leave the province of Version and gradually arrive from Paraphrase to Midrash-Haggadah. We shall therefore not enter at any length into these, but confine ourselves chiefly to main results.

II. TARGUM ON THE PROPHETS

viz. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve Minor Prophets,—called TARGUM OF JONATHAN BEN UZZIEL.

Next in time and importance to Onkelos on the Pentateuch stands the Targum on the Prophets, which in our printed Edd. and MSS.—none older, we repeat it, than about 600 years—is ascribed to Jonathan ben Uzziel, of whom the Talmud contains the following statements:—(1.) "Eighty disciples had Hillel the Elder, thirty of whom were worthy that the Shechinah (Divine Majesty) should rest upon them, as it did upon Moses our Lord; peace be upon him. Thirty of them were worthy that the sun should stand still at their bidding as it did at that of Joshua ben Nun. Twenty were of intermediate worth. The greatest of them all was Jonathan b. Uzziel, the least R. Johanan b. Saccai; and it was said of R. Johanan b. Saccai, that he left not (uninvestigated) the Bible, the Mishna, the Gemara, the Halachahs, the Haggadahs, the subtleties of the Law, and the subtleties of the Soferim . . . . ; the easy things and the difficult things [from the most awful Divine mysteries to the common popular proverbs] . . . If this is said of the least of them, what is to be said of the greatest, *i.e.* Jonathan b. Uzziel?" (Bab. Bath. 134 *a*; comp. Succ. 28 *a*). (2.) A second passage (see Onkelos) referring more especially to our present subject, reads as follows: "The Targum of Onkelos was made by Onkelos the Proselyte from the mouth of R. Eliezer and R. Jehoshua, and that of the Prophets by Jonathan b. Uzziel from the mouth

of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi. And in that hour was the Land of Israel shaken three hundred parasangs. . . . And a voice was heard, saying, 'Who is this who has revealed my secrets unto the sons of man?' Up rose Jonathan ben Uzziel and said: 'It is I who have revealed Thy secrets to the sons of man. . . . But it is known and revealed before Thee, that not for my honour have I done it, nor for the honour of my father's house, but for Thine honour; that the disputes may cease in Israel.' . . . And he further desired to reveal the Targum to the Hagiographa, when a voice was heard:—'Enough.' And why?—because the day of the Messiah is revealed therein (Meg. 3*a*)." Wonderful to relate, the sole and exclusive authority for the general belief in the authorship of Jonathan b. Uzziel, is this second Hagadistic passage exclusively; which, if it does mean anything, does at all events not mean our Targum, which is found mourning over the "Temple in ruins," full of invectives against Rome (Sam. xi. 5; Is. xxxiv. 9, &c. &c.), mentioning Armillus (Is. x. 4) (the Antichrist), Germania (Ez. xxxviii. 6):—not to dwell upon the thousand and one other internal and external evidences against a date anterior to the Christian era. If interpolations must be assumed,—and indeed Rashi speaks already of corruptions in his MSS.—such solitary additions are at all events a very different thing from a wholesale system of intentional and minute interpolation throughout the bulky work. But what is still more extraordinary, this belief—long and partly still upheld most reverentially against all difficulties—is completely modern: that is, not older than at most 600 years (the date of our oldest Targum MSS.), and is utterly at variance with the real and genuine sources: the Talmud, the Midrash, the Babylonian Schools, and every authority down to Hai Gaon (12th cent.). Frequently quoted as this Targum is in the ancient works, it is never once quoted as the Targum of Jonathan. But it is invariably introduced with the formula: "R. Joseph[a] (bar Chama, the Blind, euphemistically called the clear-sighted, the well-known President of Pumbaditha in Babylonia, who succeeded Rabba in 319 A.D.) says," &c. (Moed Katon 26 *a*, Pesach. 68 *a*, Sanh. 94 *b*). Twice even it is quoted in Joseph's name, and with the addition, "Without the Targum to this verse (due to him) we could not understand it." This is the simple state of the case: and for more than two hundred years critics have lavished all their acumen to defend what never had any real existence, or at best owed its apparent existence to a heading added by a superficial scribe.

The date which the Talmud thus in reality assigns to our Targum fully coincides with our former conclusions as to the date of written Targums in general. And if we may gather thus much from the legend that to write down the Targum to the Prophets was considered a much bolder undertaking—and one to which still more reluctantly leave was given—than a Targum on the Pentateuch, we shall not be far wrong in placing *this* Targum some time, although not long, after Onkelos, or about the middle of the fourth century;—the latter years of R. Joseph, who, it is said, occupied himself chiefly with the Targum when he had become blind. The reason given for that reluctance is, although hyperbolically expressed, perfectly clear: "The Targum on the Prophets revealed the secrets"—that is, it allowed free scope to the wildest fantasy to run riot upon the prophetic passages—tempting through their very obscurity,—and to utter explanations and interpretations relative to present events, and oracles of its own for future times, which might be fraught with grave dangers in more than one respect. The Targum on the Pentateuch (permitted to be committed to writing, Meg. 3 *a*; Kidd. 69 *a*) could not but be, even in its written form, more sober, more dignified, more within the bounds of fixed and well known traditions, than any other Targum; since it had originally been read publicly, and been checked by the congregation as well as the authorities present;—as we have endeavoured to explain in the Introduction. There is no proof, on the other hand, of more than fragments from the Prophets having ever been read and translated in the synagogue. Whether, however, R. Joseph was more than the redactor of this the second part of the Bible-Targum, which was originated in Palestine, and was reduced to its final shape in Babylon, we cannot determine. He may perhaps have made considerable additions of his own, by filling up gaps or rejecting wrong versions of some parts. So much seems certain, that the schoolmen of his Academy were the collectors and revisers, and he gave it that stamp of unity which it now possesses, spite of the occasional difference of style:—adapted simply to the variegated hues and dictions of its manifold biblical originals.

But we do not mean to reject in the main either of the Talmudical passages quoted. We believe that there was such a man as Jonathan b. Uzziel, that he was one of the foremost pupils of Hillel, and also that he did translate, either privately or publicly, parts of the prophetical books; chiefly, we should say, in a mystical manner. And so startling were his interpretations—borne aloft by his high fame—that who but prophets themselves could have revealed them to him? And, going a step further, who could reveal prophetic allegories and mysteries of *all* the prophetic books, but those who, themselves the last in the list, had the whole body of sacred oracles before them? This appears to us the only rational conclusion to be drawn from the facts:—as they stand, not as they are imagined. That nothing save a few snatches of this *original* paraphrase or Midrash could be embodied in our Targum, we need not urge. Yet for these even we have no proof. Zunz, the *facile princeps* of Targumic as well as Midrashic investigation, who, as late as 1830 (*Gottesd. Vortr.*), still believed himself in the modern notion of Jonathan's authorship ("first half of first century, A.D."), now utterly rejects the notion of "our possessing *anything* of Jonathan ben Uzziel" (Geiger's *Zeitschr.* 1837, p. 250).

Less conservative than our view, however, are the views of the modern School (Rappoport, Luzzatto, Frankel, Geiger, Levy, Bauer, Jahn, Bertholdt, Levysohn, &c.), who not only reject the authorship of Jonathan, but also utterly deny that there was any ground whatsoever for assigning a Targum to him, as is done in the Talmud. The passage, they say, is not older, but younger than our Targum, and in fact does apply, erroneously of course, to this, and to no other work of a similar kind. The popular cry for a great "name, upon which to hang"—in Talmudical phraseology—all that is cherished and venerated, and the wish of those eager to impart to

[a] "Sinai," "Possessor of Wheat," in allusion to his vast mastery over the traditions.

this Version a lasting authority, found in Jonathan the most fitting person to father it upon. Was he not the greatest of the great, "who had been dusted with the dust of Hillel's feet?" He was the wisest of the wise, the one most imbued with knowledge human and divine, of all those eighty, the least of whom was worthy that the sun should stay its course at his bidding. Nay, such were the flames[b] that arose from his glowing spirit, says the hyperbolic Haggadah, that "when he studied in the Law, the very birds that flew over him in the air, were consumed by fire" (*nisrephu*[c]—not, as Landau, in the preface to his Aruch, apologetically translates, *became Seraphs*). At the same time we readily grant that we see no reason why the great Hillel himself, or any other much earlier and equally eminent Master of the Law, one of the Soferim perhaps, should not have been fixed upon.

Another suggestion, first broached by Drusius, and long exploded, has recently been revived under a somewhat modified form. Jonathan (Godgiven), Drusius said, was none else but Theodotion (Godgiven), the second Greek translator of the Bible after the LXX., who had become a Jewish proselyte. Considering that the latter lived under Commodus II., and the former at the time of Christ; that the latter is said to have translated the Prophets only (neither the Pentateuch, nor the Hagiographa), while the former translated the *whole* Bible; that Jonathan translated into Aramaic and Theodotion into Greek,—not to mention the fact that Theodotion was, to say the least, a not very competent translator, since "ignorance or negligence" (Montfaucon, *Pref. to Hexapla*), or both, must needs be laid at the door of a translator, who, when in difficulties, simply transcribes the hard Hebrew words into Greek characters, without troubling himself any further;[d] while the mastery over both the Hebrew and the Aramaic displayed in the Jonathanic Version are astounding:—considering all this, we need not like Walton ask caustically, why Jonathan ben Uzziel should not rather be identified with the Emperor Theodosius, whose name also is "Godgiven;"—but dismiss the suggestion as Carpzov long since dismissed it. We are, however, told now (Luzzatto, Geiger, &c.), that as the Babylonian Targum on the Pentateuch was called a Targum "in the manner of Aquila or Onkelos," *i.e.* of sterling value, so also the continuation of the Babylonian Targum, which embraced the Prophets, was called a Targum "in the manner of Theodotion" = Jonathan; and by a further stretch, Jonathan-Theodotion became the Jonathan b. Uzziel. We cannot but disagree with this hypothesis also—based on next to nothing, and carried to more than the usual length of speculation. While Akyla is quoted continually in the Talmud, and is deservedly one of the best known and best beloved characters, every trait and incident of whose personal history is told even twice over, not the slightest trace of such a person as Theodotion is to be found anywhere in the Talmudical literature. What, again, was it that could have acquired so transcendent a fame for his translation and himself, that a Version put into the mouths of the very prophets should be called after him, "in order that the people should like it"?—a translation which was, in fact, deservedly unknown, and, properly speaking, no translation at all. It was, as we learn, a kind of private emendation of some LXX. passages, objectionable to the pious Proselyte in their then corrupted state. It was only the Book of Daniel which was retained from Theodotion's pen, because in this book the LXX. had become past correction. If, moreover, the intention was "to give the people a Hebrew for a Greek name, because the latter might sound too foreign," it was an entirely gratuitous one. Greek names abound in the Talmud, and even names beginning with Theo like Theodorus are to be found there.

On the other hand, the opinion has been broached that this Targum was a post-Talmudical production, belonging to the 7th or 8th cent. A.D. For this point we need only refer to the Talmudical quotations from it. And when we further add, that Jo. Morinus, a man as conspicuous by his want of knowledge as by his most ludicrous attacks upon all that was "Jewish" or "Protestant" (it was he, *e.g.* who wished to see the "forged" Masoretic Code corrected from the Samaritan Pentateuch, *q.v.*) is the chief, and almost only, defender of this theory, we have said enough. On the other theory of there being more than one author to our Targum (Eichhorn, Bertholdt, De Wette), combated fiercely by Gesenius, Hävernick, and others, we need not further enlarge, after what we have already said. It certainly is the work, not of one, or of two, but of twenty, of fifty and more Meturgemanim, Haggadists, and Halachists. The edition, however, we repeat it advisedly, has the undeniable stamp of one master-mind; and its individual workings, its manner and peculiarity are indelibly impressed upon the whole labour from the first page to the last. Such, we hold, must be the impression upon every attentive reader; more especially, if he judiciously distinguishes between the first and the last prophets. That in the historical relations of the former, the Version must be, on the whole, more accurate and close (although here too, as we shall show, Haggadah often takes the reins out of the Meturgeman's or editor's hands), while in the obscurer Oracles of the latter the Midrash reigns supreme: is exactly what the history of Targumic development leads us to expect.

And with this we have pointed out the general character of the Targum under consideration. Gradually, perceptibly almost, the translation becomes the τράγημα, a frame, so to speak, of allegory, parable, myth, tale, and oddly masked history—such as we are wont to see in Talmud and Midrash, written under the bloody censorship of Esau-Rome; interspersed with some lyrical pieces of rare poetical value. It becomes, in short, like the Haggadah, a whole system of Eastern phantasmagorias whirling round the sun of the Holy Word of the Seer. Yet, it is always aware of being a translation. It returns to its verse after long excurses, often in next to no perceptible connexion with it. Even in the midst of the full swing of fancy, swayed to and fro by the many currents of thought that arise out of a single word, snatches of the verse from which the flight was taken will suddenly appear on the surface like a refrain or a keynote, showing that in reality there is a

---

[b] The simile of the fire—"as the Law was given in fire on Sinai"—is a very favourite one in the Midrash.

[c] נשרפו.

[d] *e.g.*, Lev. vii. 13, פנול, T. Φεγγώλ, or Φεγγούλ, by way of emendation; Lev. xiii. 6, מספחת, Μασφάα; ib. שאת, Σήθ; Lev. xviii. 23, תבל, θάβελ; Is. lxiv. 6, עדים, Ἐδδίμ.

connexion, though hidden to the uninitiated. For long periods again, it adheres most strictly to its text and to its verse, and translates most conscientiously and closely. It may thus fairly be described as holding in point of interpretation and enlargement of the text, the middle place between Onkelos, who only in extreme cases deviates into paraphrase, and the subsequent Targums, whose connexion with their texts is frequently of the most flighty character. Sometimes indeed our Targum coincides so entirely with Onkelos,—being, in fact, of one and the same origin and growth, and a mere continuation and completion as it were of the former work, that this similarity has misled critics into speculations of the priority in date of either the one or the other. Hävernick, *e. g.* holds—against Zunz—that Onkelos copied, plagiarised in fact, Jonathan. We do not see, quite apart from our placing Onkelos first, why either should have used the other. The three passages (Judg. v. 26 and Deut. xxii. 5; 2 K. xiv. 6 and Deut. xxiv. 16; Jer. xlviii. 45, 46 and Num. xxi. 28, 29) generally adduced, do not in the first place exhibit that literal closeness which we are led to expect, and which alone could be called "copying;" and in the second place, the two last passages are not, as we also thought we could infer from the words of the writers on either side, extraneous paraphrastic additions, but simply the similar translations of similar texts: while in the first passage Jonathan only refers to an injunction contained in the Pentateuch-verse quoted. But even had we found such paraphrastic additions, apparently not belonging to the subject, we should have accounted for them by certain traditions—the common property of the whole generation,—being recalled by a certain word or phrase in the Pentateuch to the memory of the *one* translator; and by another word or phrase in the Prophets to the memory of the *other* translator. The interpretation of Jonathan, where it adheres to the text, is mostly very correct in a philosophical and exegetical sense, closely literal even, provided the meaning of the original is easily to be understood by the people. When, however, similes are used, unfamiliar or obscure to the people, it unhesitatingly dissolves them and makes them easy in their mouths like household words, by adding as much of explanation as seems fit; sometimes, it cannot be denied, less sagaciously, even incorrectly, comprehending the original meaning. Yet we must be very cautious in attributing to a Version which altogether bears the stamp of thorough competence and carefulness that which may be single corruptions or interpolations, as we find them sometimes indicated by an introductory "Says the Prophet"[e]: although, as stated above, we do not hesitate to attribute the passages displaying an acquaintance with works written down to the 4th century, and exhibiting popular notions current at that time, to the Targum in its original shape. Generally speaking, and holding the difference between the nature of the Pentateuch (supposed to contain in its very letters and signs Halachistic references, and therefore only to be handled by the Meturgeman with the greatest care) and that of the Prophets (freest Homiletes themselves) steadily in view—the rules laid down above with respect to the discrepancies between Original and Targum, in Onkelos, hold good also with Anthropomorphisms it avoids carefully. Geographical names are, in most cases, retained as in the Original, and where translated, they are generally correct. Its partiality for Israel never goes so far that anything derogatory to the character of the people should be willingly suppressed, although a certain reluctance against dwelling upon its iniquities and punishments longer than necessary, is visible. Where, however, that which redounds to the praise of the individual—more especially of heroes, kings, prophets—and of the community, is contained in the text, there the paraphrase lovingly tarries. Future bliss, in this world and the world to come, liberation from the oppressor, restoration of the Sanctuary on Mount Zion, of the Kingdom of Jehovah and the House of David, the re-establishment of the nation and of its full and entire independence, as well as of the national worship, with all the primitive splendour of Priest and Levite, singer and musician and prophet—these are the favourite dreams of the people and of Jonathan, and no link is overlooked by which those strains may be drawn in as variations to the Biblical theme. Of Messianic passages, Jonathan has pointed out those mentioned below[f]; a number not too large, if we consider how, with the increased misery of the people, their ardent desire to see their Deliverer appear speedily must have tried to find as many places in the Bible as possible, warranting His arrival. So far from their being suppressed (as, by one of those unfortunate accidents that befall sometimes a long string of *investigators*, who are copying their information at third and fourth hand, has been unblushingly asserted by almost everybody up to Gesenius, who found its source in a *misunderstood sentence of Carpzov*), they are most prominently, often almost pointedly brought forward. And there is a decided polemical animus inherent in them—temperate as far as appearance goes, but containing many an unspoken word: such as a fervent human mind pressed down by all the woes and terrors, written and unwritten, would whisper to itself in the depths of its despair. These passages extol most rapturously the pomp and glory of the Messiah to come—by way of contrast to the humble appearance of Christ: and all the places where suffering and misery appear to be the lot forecast to the Anointed, it is Israel, to whom the passage is referred by the Targum.

Of further dogmatical and theological peculiarities (and this Targum will one day prove a mine of instruction chiefly in that direction, besides the other vast advantages inherent in it, as in the older Targums, for linguistic, patristic, geographical, historical, and other studies) we may mention briefly the "Stars of God" (Is. xiv. 13; comp. Dan. viii. 10; 2 Macc. ix. 10, being referred—in a similar manner—to "the people of Israel;") the doctrine of the second death (Isa. xxii. 14, lxv. 15), &c. As to the general nature of its idiom, what we have said above holds good here. Likewise our remarks on the relation between the text of the Original of Onkelos, and its own text, may stand for Jonathan, who never appears to differ from the Masoretic text without a very cogent reason. Yet, since Jonathan's MSS., though very much smaller in number, are in a still worse plight than those

[e] אמר נביא.

[f] 1 Sam. ii. 10; 2 Sam. xxiii. 3; 1 K. iv. 33; Is. iv. 2, 6, x. 27, xi. 1, 6, xv. 2, xvi. 1, 5, xxviii. 5, xlii. 1, xliii. 10, xlv. 1, lii. 13, liii. 10; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxx. 21 xxxiii. 13, 15; Hos. iii. 5, xiv. 8; Mic. iv. 8, v 2, 18, Zech. iii. 8, iv. 7, vi. 12, x. 4.

of Onkelos, we cannot speak with great certainty on this point. Respecting, however, the individual language and phraseology of the translation, it lacks to a certain, though small, degree, the clearness and transparency of Onkelos; and is somewhat alloyed with foreign words. Not to such a degree, however, that we cannot fully endorse Carpzov's dictum: "Cujus nitor sermonis Chaldaei et dictionis laudatur puritas, ad Onkelosum proxime accedens et parum deflectens a puro tersoque Chaldaismo biblico" (*Crit. Sacr.* p. 461), and incline to the belief of Wolf (*Bibl. Hebr.* ii. 1165): "Quae vero, vel quod ad voces novas et barbaras, vel ad res aetate ejus inferiores, aut futilia nonnulla, quamvis pauca triplicis hujus generis exstent, ibi occurrunt, ex merito falsarii cujusdam ingenio adscribuntur." Of the manner and style of this Targum, the few subjoined specimens will we hope give an approximate idea.

In conclusion, we may notice a feature of our Targum, not the least interesting perhaps, in relation to general or "human" literature: viz., that the Shemitic fairy and legendary lore, which for the last two thousand years—as far as we can trace it,—has grown up in East and West to vast glittering mountain-ranges, is to a very great extent to be found, in an embryo state, so to say, in this our Targum. When the literary history of those most wonderful circles of medieval sagas—the sole apparent fruit brought home by the crusaders from the Eastern battle-fields — shall come to be written by a competent and thorough investigator, he will have to extend his study of the sources to this despised "fabulosus" Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel. And the entire world of pious biblical legend, which Islam has said and sung in the Arabic, Persian, Turkish, and all its other tongues, to the delight of the wise and the simple for twelve centuries now, is contained almost fully developed, from beginning to end, but clearer, purer, and incomparably more poetically conceived, in our Targum-Haggadah.

The *Editio Princeps* dates Leiria, 1494. The later editions are embodied in the Antwerp, Paris, and London Polyglotts. Several single books have likewise been repeatedly edited (comp. Wolff, Le Long, Rosenmüller, &c.).

JUDGES V.

AUTHORISED VERSION.	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] TO THE PROPHETS.
1 THEN sang Deborah and Barak the son of Abinoam on that day, saying,	1 AND Deborah and Barak the son of Abinoam gave praise for the miracle and the salvation which were wrought for Israel on that day, and spake:
2 Praise ye the LORD for the avenging of Israel, when the people willingly offered themselves.	2 When the children of Israel rebel against the Law, then the nations come over them and drive them out of their cities; but when they return to do the Law, then they are mighty over their enemies, and drive them out from the whole territory of the land of Israel. Thus has been broken Sisera and all his armies to his punishment, and to a miracle and a salvation for Israel. Then the wise returned to sit in the houses of the synagogue . . . and to teach unto the people the doctrine of the Law. Therefore praise ye and bless the Lord.
3 Hear, O ye kings; give ear, O ye princes; I, *even* I, will sing unto the LORD; I will sing *praise* to the LORD God of Israel.	armies nor with your power have ye conquered and become mighty over the house of Israel]—said Deborah in prophecy before God: I praise, give thanks and blessings before the Lord, the God of Israel.
4 LORD, when thou wentest out of Seir, when thou marchedst out of the field of Edom, the earth trembled, and the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water.	4 [O Lord, Thy Law which Thou gavest to Israel, when they transgress it, then the nations rule over them: but when they return to it, then they become powerful over their enemies.] O Lord, on the day when Thou didst reveal Thyself to give it unto them from Seir, Thou becamest manifest unto them in the splendour of Thy glory over the territories of Edom: the earth trembled, the heavens showered down, the clouds dropped rain.
5 The mountains melted from before the LORD, *even* that Sinai from before the LORD God of Israel.	5 The mountains trembled before the Lord, the mountains of Tabor, the mountain of Hermon, and the mountain of Carmel, spake with each other, and said one to the other: Upon me the Shechinah will rest, and to me will It come. But the Shechinah rested upon Mount Sinai, which is the weakest and smallest of all the mountains. . . . This Sinai trembled and shook, and its smoke went up as goes up the smoke of an oven: because of the glory of the God of Israel which had manifested itself upon it.
6 In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and the travellers walked through byways.	6 When they transgressed in the days of Shamgar the son of Anath in the days of Jael, ceased the wayfarers: they who had walked in well-prepared ways had again to walk in furtive paths.
7 *The inhabitants of* the villages ceased, they ceased in Israel, until that I Deborah arose, that I arose a mother in Israel.	7 Destroyed were the open cities of the land of Israel: their inhabitants were shaken off and driven about, until I, Deborah, was sent to prophesy over the house of Israel.
8 They chose new gods; then *was* war in the gates: was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?	8 When the children of Israel went to pray unto new idols [errors], which recently had come to be worshipped, with which their fathers did not concern themselves, there came over them the nations and drove them out of their cities: but when they returned to the Law, they could not prevail against them until they made themselves strong, and Sisra went up against them, the enemy and the adversary, with forty thousand chiefs of troops, with fifty thousand holders of the sword, with sixty thousand holders of spears, with seventy thousand holders of shields, with eighty thousand throwers of arrows and slings, besides nine hundred iron chariots which he had with him, and his own chariots. All these thousands and all these hosts could not stand before Barak and the ten thousand men he had with him

AUTHORISED VERSION.	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] TO THE PROPHETS.
9 My heart *is* toward the governors of Israel, that offered themselves willingly among the people. Bless ye the LORD.	9 Spake Deborah in prophecy: I am sent to praise the scribes of Israel, who, while this tribulation lasted, ceased not to study in the Law: and it redounds well unto them who sat in the houses of congregation, wide open, and taught the people the doctrine of the Law, and praised and rendered thanks before the Lord.
10 Speak, ye that ride on white asses, ye that sit in judgment, and walk by the way.	10 Those who had interrupted their occupations are riding on asses covered with many-coloured caparisons, and they ride about freely in all the territory of Israel, and congregate to sit in judgment. They walk in their old ways, and are speaking of the power Thou hast shown in the land of Israel, &c.

JUDGES XI.

39 AND it came to pass, at the end of two months, that she returned unto her father, who did with her *according* to his vow which he had vowed: and she knew no man. And it was a custom in Israel.	39 AND it was at the end of two months, and she returned to her father, and he did unto her according to the vow which he had vowed: and she had known no man. And it became a statute in Israel. *Addition* (תוספת), that no man should offer up his son or his daughter as a burnt-offering, as Jephta the Gileadite did, who asked not Phinehas the priest. If he had asked Phinehas the priest, then he would have dissolved his vow with money [for animal sacrifices].

1 SAM. II.

1 AND Hannah prayed, and said, My heart rejoiceth in the LORD; mine horn is exalted in the LORD; my mouth is enlarged over mine enemies; because I rejoice in thy salvation.	1 AND Hannah prayed in the spirit of prophecy, and said: [Lo, my son Samuel will become a prophet over Israel; in his days they will be freed from the hand of the Philistines; and through his hands shall be done unto them wondrous and mighty deeds: therefore] be strong my heart in the portion which God gave me. [And also Heman the son of Joel, the son of my son Samuel, shall arise, he and his fourteen sons, to say praise with nablia (harps?) and cythers, with their brethren the Levites, to sing in the house of the sanctuary: therefore] Let my horn be exalted in the gift which God granted unto me. [And also on the miraculous punishment that would befal the Philistines who would bring back the ark of the Lord in a new chariot, together with a sin-offering: therefore let the congregation of Israel say] I will open my mouth to speak great things over my enemies; because I rejoice in thy salvation.
2 *There is* none holy as the LORD: for *there is* none beside thee, neither	2 [Over Sanherib the king of Ashur did she prophesy, and she said:

AUTHORISED VERSION.	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] TO THE PROPHETS.
is there any rock like our God.	He will arise with all his armies over Jerusalem, and a great sign will be done with him. There shall fall the corpses of his troops: Therefore praise ye all the peoples and nations and tongues, and cry]: There is none holy but God; there is not beside Thee; and Thy people shall say, There is none mighty but our God.
3 Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let *not* arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the LORD *is* a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed.	3 [Over Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babel did she prophesy and say: Ye Chaldeans, and all nations who will once rule over Israel] Do not speak grandly; let no blasphemy go out from your mouth: for God knows all, and over all his servants he extends his judgment; also from you he will take punishment of your guilt.
4 The bows of the mighty *are* broken, and they that stumbled are girded with strength.	4 [Over the kingdom Javan she prophesied and said] The bows of the mighty ones [of the Javanites] will be broken; [and those of the house of the Asmoneans] who are weak, to them will be done miracles and mighty deeds.

1 SAM. XVII.

8 AND he stood and cried unto the armies of Israel, and said unto them, Why are ye come out to set *your* battle in array? *Am* not I a Philistine, and ye servants to Saul? choose you a man for you, and let him come down to me.	8 AND he arose, and he cried unto the armies of Israel, and said unto them: Why have you put yourselves in battle array? Am I not the Philistine, and you the servants of Saul? [I am Goliath the Philistine from Gath, who have killed the two sons of Eli, the priests Chofna and Pinehas, and carried captive the ark of the covenant of the Lord, I who have carried it to the house of Dagon, my *Error*, and it has been there in the cities of the Philistines seven months. And in every battle which the Philistines have had I went at the head of the army, and we conquered in the battle, and we strew the killed like the dust of the earth, and until now have the Philistines not thought me worthy to become captain of a thousand over them. And you, O children of Israel, what mighty deed has Saul the son of Kish from Gibeah done for you that you made him king over you? If he is a valiant man, let him come out and do battle with me; but if he is a weak man], then choose for yourselves a man, and let him come out against me, &c.

1 KINGS XIX.

11, 12 AND he said, Go forth, and stand upon the mount before the LORD. And, behold, the LORD	11, 12 AND he said [to Elijah], Arise and stand on the mountain before the Lord. And God revealed

AUTHORISED VERSION.	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] TO THE PROPHETS.
passed by, and a great and strong wind rent the mountains, and brake in pieces the rocks, before the LORD; *but* the LORD *was* not in the wind: and after the wind an earthquake; *but* the LORD *was* not in the earthquake: And after the earthquake a fire; *but* the Lord *was* not in the fire: and after the fire a still small voice.	himself: and before him a host of angels of the wind, cleaving the mountain and breaking the rocks before the Lord; but not in the host of angels was the Shechinah. And after the host of the angels of the wind came a host of angels of commotion; but not in the host of the angels of commotion was the Shechinah of the Lord. And after the host of the angels of commotion came a host of angels of fire; but not in the host of the angels of fire was the Shechinah of the Lord. But after the host of the angels of the fire came voices singing in silence.
13 And it was *so*, when Elijah heard *it*, that he wrapped his face in his mantle, and went out, and stood in the entering in of the cave: and, behold, *there came* a voice unto him, and said, What doest thou here, Elijah?	13 And it was when Elijah heard this, he hid his face in his mantle, and he went out and he stood at the door of the cave; and, lo! with him was a voice, saying, What doest thou here, O Elijah! &c.

ISAIAH XXXIII.

22 FOR the LORD *is* our judge, the LORD *is* our lawgiver, the LORD *is* our king; he will save us.	22 FOR the Lord is our judge, who delivered us with his power from Mizraim; the Lord is our teacher, for He has given us the doctrine of the Torah from Sinai; the Lord is our king: He will deliver us, and give us righteous restitution from the army of Gog.

JEREM. X.

11 THUS shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, *even* they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens.	11 THIS is the copy of the letter which Jeremiah the prophet sent to the remaining ancient ones of the captivity in Babel: "And if the nations among whom you are will say unto you, Pray to our *Errors*:—O house of Israel, then you shall answer thus, and speak in this wise: The Errors unto which you pray are Errors which are of no use: they cannot rain from heaven; they cannot cause fruit to grow from the earth. They and their worshippers will perish from the earth, and will be destroyed from under these heavens.

MICAH VI.

4 FOR I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam.	4 FOR I have taken thee out from the land of Mizraim, and have released thee from the house of thy bondage: and have sent before thee three prophets; Moses, to teach thee the tradition of the ordinances; Aaron, to atone for the people: and Miriam, to teach the women

III. and IV. TARGUM OF JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL AND JERUSHALMI-TARGUM ON THE PENTATEUCH.

Onkelos and Jonathan on the Pentateuch and Prophets, whatever be their exact date. place, authorship and editorship, are, as we have endeavoured to show, the oldest of existing Targums, and belong, in their present shape, to Babylon and the Babylonian academies flourishing between the 3rd and 4th centuries A.D. But precisely as two parallel and independent developments of the Oral Law (חשבפ) have sprung up in the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds respectively, so also recent investigation has proved to demonstration the existence of two distinct cycles of Targums on the Written Law (חשבכתב)—*i. e.* the entire body of the Old Testament. Both are the offspring of the old, primitive institution of the public "reading and translating of the Torah," which for many hundred years had its place in the Palestinian synagogues. The one first collected, revised, and edited in Babylon, called—more especially that part of it which embraced the Pentateuch (Onkelos)—the Babylonian, *Ours*, by way of eminence, on account of the superior authority inherent in all the works of the Madinchaë (Babylonians, in contradistinction to the Maarbae or Palestinians). The other, continuing its oral life, so to say, down to a much later period, was written and edited—less carefully, or rather with a much more faithful retention of the oldest and youngest fancies of Meturgemanim and Darshanim—on the soil of Judaea itself. Of this entire cycle, however, the Pentateuch and a few other books and fragmentary pieces only have survived entire, while of most of the other books of the Bible a few detached fragments are all that is known, and this chiefly from quotations. The injunction above mentioned respecting the sabbatical reading of the Targum on the Pentateuch—nothing is said of the Prophets—explains the fact, to a certain extent, how the Pentateuch Targum has been religiously preserved, while the others have perished. This circumstance, also, is to be taken into consideration, that Palestine was in later centuries well-nigh cut off from communication with the Diaspora, while Babylon, and the gigantic literature it produced, reigned paramount over all Judaism, as, indeed, down to the 10th century, the latter continued to have a spiritual leader in the person of the Resh Gelutha (Head of the Golah). residing in Babylon. As not the least cause of the loss of the great bulk of the Palestinian Targum may also be considered the almost uninterrupted martyrdom to which those were subjected who preferred, under all circumstances, to live and die in the Land of Promise.

However this may be, the Targum on the Pentateuch has come down to us: and not in one, but in two recensions. More surprising still, the one hitherto considered a fragment, because of its embracing portions only of the individual books, has in reality never been intended to embrace any further portion, and we are thus in the possession of two Palestinian Targums, preserved in their original forms. The one, which extends from the first verse of Genesis to the last of Deuteronomy, is known under the name of Targum Jonathan (ben Uzziel) or Pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch. The other, interpreting single verses, often single words only, is extant in the following proportions:

a third on Genesis, a fourth on Deuteronomy, a fifth on Numbers, three-twentieths on Exodus, and about one-fourteenth on Leviticus. The latter is generally called Targum *Jerushalmi*, or, down to the 11th century (Hai Gaon, Chananel), *Targum Erets Israel*, Targum of Jerusalem or of the land of Israel. That Jonathan ben Uzziel, the same to whom the prophetical Targum is ascribed, and who is reported to have lived either in the 5th-4th century B.C., or about the time of Christ himself (see above), could have little to do with a Targum which speaks of Constantinople (Num. xxiv. 19, 24), describes very plainly the breaking-up of the West-Roman Empire (Num. xxiv. 19-24), mentions the Turks (Gen. x. 2), and even Mohammed's two wives, Chadidja and Fatime (Gen. xxi. 21), and which exhibits not only the fullest acquaintance with the edited body of the Babylonian Talmud, by quoting entire passages from it, but adopts its peculiar phraseology:—not to mention the complete disparity between the style, language, and general manner of the Jonathanic Targum on the Prophets, and those of this one on the Pentateuch, strikingly palpable at first sight,—was recognised by early investigators (Morinus, Pfeiffer, Walton, &c.), who soon overthrew the old belief in Jonathan b. Uzziel's authorship, as upheld by Menahem Rekanati, Asariah de Rossi, Gedaljah, Galatin, Fagius, &c. But the relation in which the two Targums, so similar and yet so dissimilar, stood to each other, how they arose, and where and when—all these questions have for a long time, in the terse words of Zunz, caused many of the learned such dire misery, that whenever the "Targum Hierosolymitanum comes up," they, instead of information on it and its twin-brother, prefer to treat the reader to a round volley of abuse of them. Not before the first half of this century did the fact become fully and incontestibly established (by the simple process of an investigation of the sources), that both Targums were in reality one—that both were known down to the 14th century under no other name than Targum Jerushalmi—and that some forgetful scribe about that time must have taken the abbreviation יו"ת–'*T. J.*' over one of the two documents, and, instead of dissolving it into Targum-Jerushalmi, dissolved it erroneously into what he must till then have been engaged in copying—viz., Targum-Jonathan, sc. ben Uzziel (on the Prophets). This error, fostered by the natural tendency of giving a well-known and far-famed name—without inquiring too closely into its accuracy—to a hitherto anonymous and comparatively little known version, has been copied again and again, until it found its way, a hundred years later, into print. Of the intermediate stage, when only a few MSS. had received the new designation, a curious fact, which Azariah de Rossi (Cod. 37 *b*) mentions, gives evidence. "I saw," he says, "two complete Targums on the whole Pentateuch, word for word alike; one in Reggio, which was described in the margin, 'Targum of Jonathan b. Uzziel;' the other in Mantua, described at the margin as 'Targum Jerushalmi.'" In a similar manner quotations from either in the Aruch confound the designation. Benjamin Mussaphia (d. 1674), the author of additions and corrections to the Aruch, has indeed pronounced it as his personal conjecture that both may be one and the same, and Drusius, Mendelssohn, Rapoport, and others shared his opinion. Yet the difficulty of their obvious dissimilarity, if they were identical, remained to be accounted for. Zunz tries to solve it by assuming that Pseudo-Jonathan is the original Targum, and that the fragmentary Jerushalmi is a collection of variants to it. The circumstance of its also containing portions identical with the codex, to which it is supposed to be a collection of readings, he explains by the negligence of the transcriber. Frankel, however, followed by Traub and Levysohn, has gone a step further. From the very identity of a proportionately large number of places, amounting to about thirty in each book, and from certain palpable and consistent differences which run through both recensions, they have arrived at a different conclusion, which seems to carry conviction on the face of it, viz., that Jerushalmi is a collection of emendations and additions to single portions, phrases, and words of Onkelos, and Pseudo Jonathan a further emendated and completed edition to the whole Pentateuch of Jerushalmi-Onkelos. The chief incentive to a new Targum on the Pentateuch (that of Onkelos being well known in Palestine), was, on the one hand, the wish to explain such of the passages as seemed either obscure in themselves or capable of greater adaptation to the times; and on the other hand the great and paramount desire for legendary lore, and ethical and homiletical motives, intertwined with the very letter of Scripture, did not and could not feel satisfied with the (generally) strictly literal version of Onkelos, as soon as the time of eccentric, prolix, oral Targums had finally ceased in Palestine too, and written Targums of Babylon were introduced as a substitute, once for all. Hence variants, exactly as found in Jerushalmi, not to the whole of Onkelos, but to such portions as seemed most to require "improvement" in the direction indicated. And how much this thoroughly paraphrastic version was preferred to the literal is, among other signs, plainly visible from the circumstance that it is still joined, for instance, to the reading of the Decalogue on the Feast of Weeks in the synagogue. At a later period the gaps were filled up, and the whole of the existing Jerushalmi was recast, as far again as seemed fitting and requisite. This is the Jonathan, so called for the last four hundred years only. And thus the identity in some, and the divergence in other places finds its most natural solution.

The Jerushalmi, in both its recensions, is written in the Palestinensian dialect, the peculiarities of which we have briefly characterised above. It is older than the Masora and the conquest of Western Asia by the Arabs. Syria or Palestine must be its birthplace, the second half of the 7th century its date, since the instances above given will not allow of any earlier time. Its chief aim and purpose is, especially in its second edition, to form an entertaining compendium of all the Halachah and Haggadah, which refers to the Pentateuch, and takes its stand upon it. And in this lies its chief use to us. There is hardly a single allegory, parable, mystic digression, or tale in it which is not found in the other haggadistic writings—Mishna, Talmud, Mechilta, Sifra, Sifri, &c.; and both Winer and Petermann, not to mention the older authorities, have wrongly charged it with inventing its interpretations. Even where no source can be indicated, the author has surely only given utterance to the leading notions and ideas of his times, extravagant and abstruse as they may oftentimes appear to our modern Western minds. Little value is inherent in its critical emendations on the exegesis of Onkelos. It sometimes endeavours either to find an entirely new

significat on for a word, and then it often falls into grave errors, or it restores interpretations rejected by Onkelos, only it must never be forgotten that translation is quite a secondary object with Jerushalmi. It adheres, however, to the general method followed by Onkelos and Jonathan. It dissolves similes and widens too concise diction. Geographical names it alters into those current in its own day. It avoids anthropomorphisms as well as anthropopathisms. The strict distinction between the Divine Being and man is kept up, and the word קדם "before" is put as a kind of medium between the former and the latter, no less than the other —"Shechinah," "Word," "Glory," &c. It never uses Elohim where the Scripture applies it to man or idols. The same care is taken to extol the good deeds of the people and its ancestors, and to slur over and excuse the evil ones, &c.:— all this, however, in a much more decided and exaggerated form than either in Onkelos or Jonathan. Its language and grammar are very corrupt; it abounds—chiefly in its larger edition, the Pseudo-Jonathan—in Greek, Latin, Persian, and Arabic words; and even making allowances for the many blunders of ignorant scribes, enough will remain to pronounce the diction ungrammatical in very many places.

Thus much briefly of the Jerushalmi as one and the same work. We shall now endeavour to point out a few characteristics belonging to its two recensions respectively. The first, Jerushalmi *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, knows very little of angels; Michael is the only one ever occurring: in Jonathan, on the other hand, angelology flourishes in great vigour: to the Biblical Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, are added the Angel of Death, Samael, Sagnugael, Shachassai, Usiel; seventy angels descend with God to see the building of the Babylonian tower; nine hundred millions of punishing angels go through Egypt during the night of the Exodus, &c. Jerushalmi makes use but rarely of Halachah and Haggadah, while Jonathan sees the text as it were only through the medium of Haggadah: to him the chief end. Hence Jonathan has many Midrashim not found in Jerushalmi, while he does not omit a single one contained in the latter. There are no direct historical dates in Jerushalmi, but many are found in Jonathan, and since all other signs indicate that but a short space of time intervenes between the two, the late origin of either is to a great extent made manifest by these dates. The most striking difference between them, however, and the one which is most characteristic of either, is this, that while Jerushalmi adheres more closely to the language of the Mishna, Jonathan has greater affinity to that of the Talmud. Of either we subjoin short specimens, which, for the purpose of easier comparison, and reference, we have placed side by side with Onkelos. The Targum Jerushalmi was first printed in Bomberg's Bible, Venice, 1518, ff., and was reprinted in Bomberg's edd., and in Walton, vol. iv. Jonathan to the Pentateuch, a MS. of which was first discovered by Ashur Purinz in the Library of the family of the Puahs in Venice, was printed for the first time in 1590, as "Targum Jonathan ben Uzziel," at Venice, reprinted at Hanau, 1618, Amsterdam, 1640, Prague, 1646, Walton, vol. iv., &c.

GENESIS III. 17-24.

AUTHORISED VERSION.	ONKELOS.	TARGUM JERUSHALMI. *First Recension.*	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] JERUSHALMI. *Second Recension.*
17 AND unto Adam he said, Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed *is* the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat *of* it all the days of thy life;	17 AND to Adam he said, For that thou hast accepted the word of thy wife, and hast eaten from the tree of which I have commanded unto thee, and said, Thou shalt not eat from it: cursed shall the earth be for thy sake; with trouble shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;	—	17 AND to Adam he said, Because thou hast received the word of thy wife, and hast eaten from the fruit of the tree, of which I commanded thee, Thou shalt not eat from it: cursed be the earth, because it has not shown unto thee thy fault; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life;
18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;	18 And thorns and thistles it shall grow for thee; and thou shalt eat the grass of the field;	18 And thorns and thistles shall it multiply for thee; and thou shalt eat the grass that is on the face of the earth. Then began Adam and said, I pray, through the Mercy that is before Thee, Jehovah, let us not be accounted before Thee as the beasts that eat the grass on the face of the field: may we be permitted to arise and toil with the toil of our hands, and eat food from the fruits of the earth; and thus may there be a difference before Thee between the sons of man and the offspring of cattle.	18 And thorns and thistles shall grow and multiply for thy sake; and thou shalt eat the grass that is on the face of the field. Adam answered and said, I pray, by the Mercy that is before Thee, Jehovah, that we may not be deemed like unto the beasts, that we should eat grass that is on the face of the field; may we be allowed to arise and toil with the toiling of our hands, and eat food from the food of the earth, and thus may there be a distinction now before Thee, between the sons of men and the offspring of cattle.

AUTHORISED VERSION.	ONKELOS.	TARGUM JERUSHALMI. *First Recension.*	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] JERUSHALMI. *Second Recension.*
19 In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou *art*, and unto dust shalt thou return.	19 In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou returnest unto the earth from which thou art created: for dust art thou, and to dust shalt thou return.		19 . . . In the toil of the palm of thy hand shalt thou eat food, until thou returnest unto the dust from which thou wert created: for dust art thou, and to dust shalt thou return: for from the dust thou wilt once rise to give judgment and account for all that thou hast done, on the day of the great Judgment.
20 And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living.	20 And Adam called the name of his wife Chavah; for that she was the mother of all sons of man.		20 And Adam called the name of his wife Chavah; for she is the mother of all the sons of man.
21 Unto Adam also and to his wife did the LORD God make coats of skins, and clothed them.	21 And Jehovah Elohim made unto Adam and his wife garments of glory, on the skin of their flesh, and clothed them.		21 And Jehovah Elohim made unto Adam and his wife garments of honour, from the skin of the serpent which he had cast out of it, on the skin of their flesh, instead of their beauty which they had cast off; and he clothed them.
22 And the LORD God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever:	22 And Jehovah Elohim said, Behold Adam is the only one in the world knowing good and evil: perchance now he might stretch forth his hand and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live for evermore.	22 And the Word of Jehovah Elohim said, Lo! man, whom I created, is alone in this world, as I am alone in the highest Heavens; mighty nations will spring from him; from him also will arise a people that will know to distinguish between good and evil: now it is better to expel him from the garden of Eden, before he stretch out his hand and take also from the fruits of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.	22 And Jehovah Elohim said to the angels that were ministering before him, Lo! there is Adam alone on the earth, as I am alone in the highest Heavens, and there will spring from him those who know to distinguish between good and evil: if he had kept the commandment I commanded, he would have been living and lasting, like the tree of life, for evermore. Now since he has not kept what I commanded, We decree against him and expel him from the garden of Eden. before he may stretch out his hand and take from the fruits of the tree of life; for if he ate therefrom he would live and remain for ever.
23 Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.	23 And Jehovah Elohim sent him from the garden of Eden, to till the earth whence he was created.		23 And Jehovah Elohim expelled him from the garden of Eden, and he went and he settled on the Mount of Moriah, to till the earth of which he was created.
24 So he drove out the man; and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, [!] and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life.	24 And he drove out Adam; and he placed before the garden of Eden the Cherubim and the sharp sword, which turns to guard the way to the tree of life.	24 And He expelled Adam, and caused to reside the splendour of His Shechinah from the beginning at the east of the garden of Eden, above the two Cherubim. Two thousand years before the world was created, he created the Law, and prepared Gehinnom [Hell] and Gan Eden [Paradise]: He prepared Gan Eden for the Righteous, that they may eat and delight in the fruits of	24 And He drove out Adam from where He had made to reside the glory of His Shechinah from the beginning between the two Cherubim. Before He created the world He has created the Law: He has prepared the garden of Eden for the Righteous, that they shall eat and delight in the fruits of the tree, because they have acted during their life according to the doctrine of

AUTH. VERSION.	ONKELOS.	TARGUM JERUSHALMI. *First Recension.*	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] JERUSHALMI. *Second Recension.*
		the tree, because they kept the commandments of the Law in this world, and prepared Gehinnom for the wicked, for it is like unto a sharp sword that eats from both sides; He has prepared within it sparks of light and coals which consume the wicked, to punish them in the future world for their not having kept the commandments of the Law. For the tree of life that is the Law; whosoever keeps it in this world, he will live and last like the tree of life: good is the Law to whomsoever keeps it in this world, like the fruit of the tree of life in the world to come.	the Law in this world, and have kept its commandments: He has prepared the Gehinnom for the wicked, which is likened unto a sharp sword that eats from two sides: He prepared within it sparks of light and coals of fire to judge with them the wicked who rebelled in their lives against the doctrine of the Law. Better is this Law to him who acts according to it than the fruits of the tree of life, for the Word of Jehovah has prepared for him who keeps it, that he shall live and walk in the paths of the way of the life of the future world.

THE LAST CHAPTER OF DEUTERONOMY, v. 1–3.

AUTHORISED VERSION.	ONKELOS.	TARGUM JERUSHALMI. *First Recension.*	TARGUM [JONATHAN-BEN-UZZIEL] JERUSHALMI. *Second Recension.*
1 AND Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountain of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, that is over against Jericho. And the LORD shewed him all the land of Gilead, unto Dan,	1 AND Moses ascended from the encampment of Moab to the mountain of Nebo: the head of the height that is opposite Jericho. And Jehovah showed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan.	1 AND Moses ascended from the plain of Moab to the mountain of Nebo, the summit of the hill which is opposite Jericho. And God showed him the whole land: Gilead unto Dan of Caesarea.	1 AND Moses ascended from the plains of Moab to the mountain of Nebo, the summit of the height which is over against Jericho, and the word of Jehovah showed him all the mighty ones of the land: the powerful deeds which Jephtha from Gilead would do, and the victories of Samson the son of Manoah, from the tribe of Dan.
2 And all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the utmost sea,	2 And all Naphtali and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah to the hindmost sea.	2 And all the land of Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim and Manasseh, and the whole land of Judah, to the hindmost sea.	2 And the thousand princes from the house of Naphtali who joined issue with Balak, and the kings whom Joshua the son of Nun from the tribe of Efraim, would kill, and the power of Gideon the son of Joash from the tribe of Manasseh, and all the kings of Israel, and the kingdom of the house of Judah who would rule in the land until the second Sanctuary would be laid low.
3 And the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm trees, unto Zoar.	3 And the west and the plain of the valley of Jericho the city of the palms, unto Zoar.	3 And west, and the plain of the valley of Jericho the city which produces the palms, that is Zeër.	3 And the king of the south who would join the king of the north to destroy the inhabitants of the land, and the Ammonites and Moabites, the inhabitants of the valleys who would oppress Israel, and the exile of the disciples of Elija who would be driven out from the plain of Jericho, and the exile of the disciples of Elisha who would be driven out from the city of palms by their brethren, the house of Israel: two hundred thousand men. And the woes of each generation and the punishment of *Armalgua* [Armillus] the evil one and the battle-array of Gog. And in this great misery Michael will arise with the sword: to save, &c.

V. TARGUMS OF "JOSEPH THE BLIND" ON THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

"When Jonathan ben Uzziel began to paraphrase the Cethubim" (Hagiographa), we read in the Talmudical passage before quoted, "a mysterious voice was heard saying: It is enough. Thou hast revealed the secrets of the Prophets—why wouldst thou also reveal those of the Holy Ghost?"—It would thus appear, that a Targum to these books (Job excepted) was entirely unknown up to a very late period. Those Targums on the Hagiographa which we now possess have been attributed vaguely to different authors, it being assumed in the first instance that they were the work of one man. Now it was Akylas the Greek

translator, mentioned in Bereshith Rabba (see above); now Onkelos, the Chaldee translator of the Pentateuch, his mythical double; now Jonathan b. Uzziel, or Joseph (Jose) the Blind (see above). But the diversity in the different parts of the work warring too palpably against the unity of authorship, the blindness of the last-named authority seemed to show the easiest way out of the difficulty. Joseph was supposed to have dictated it to different disciples at different periods, and somehow every one of the amanuenses infused part of his own individuality into his share of the work. Popular belief thus fastened upon this Joseph the Blind, since a name the work must needs have, and to him in most of the editions, the Targum is affiliated. Yet, if ever he did translate the Hagiographa, certain it is that those which we possess are not by his or his disciples' hands—that is, of the time of the 4th century. Writers of the 13th century already refuted this notion of Joseph's authorship, for the assumption of which there never was any other ground than that he was mentioned in the Talmud, like Onkelos-Akylas and Jonathan, in connection with Targum; and, as we saw, there is indeed reason to believe that he had a share in the redaction of "Jonathan" to the Prophets, which falls in his time. Between him and our hagiographical Targums, however, many centuries must have elapsed. Yet we do not even venture to assign to them more than an approximate round date, about 1000 A.D. Besides the Targums to the Pentateuch and the Prophets, those now extant range over Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the five Megilloth, *i.e.* Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Esther, Ecclesiastes; the Chronicles and Daniel. Ezra and Nehemiah alone are left without a Targum at present; yet we can hardly help believing that ere long one will also be found to the latter, as the despaired-of Chronicles was found in the 17th century, and Daniel—a sure trace of it at least—so recently, that as yet nobody has considered it worth his while to take any notice of it. We shall divide these Targums into four groups: Proverbs, Job, Psalms;—Megilloth;—Chronicles;—and Daniel.

1. Targum on Psalms, Job, Proverbs.

Certain linguistic and other characteristics [e] exhibited by these three Targums, lead to the conclusion that they are nearly contemporaneous productions, and that their birthplace is, most likely, Syria. While the two former, however, are mere paraphrases, the Targum on Proverbs comes nearer to our idea of a version than almost any Targum, except perhaps that of Onkelos. It adheres as closely to the original text as possible. The most remarkable feature about it, however, and one which has given rise to endless speculations and discussions, is its extraordinary similarity to the Syriac Version. It would indeed sometimes seem as if they had copied each other—an opinion warmly advocated by Dathe, who endeavoured to prove that the Chaldee had copied or adapted the Syrian, there being passages in the Targum which could, he assumed, only be accounted for by a misunderstanding of the Syriac translation.[h] It has, on the other hand, been argued that there are a greater number of important passages which distinctly show that the Targumist had used an original Hebrew text, varying from that of the Syriac, and had also made use of the LXX. against the latter.[i] The Syriasms would easily be accounted for by the Aramaic idiom itself, the forms of which vary but little from, and easily merge into, the sister dialect of Syria. Indeed nearly all of them are found in the Talmud, a strictly Aramaic work. It has been supposed by others that neither of these versions, as they are now in our hands, exhibit their original form. A late editor, as it were, of the (mutilated) Targum, might have derived his emendations from that version which came nearest to it, both in language and in close adherence to the Hebrew text—viz., the Syriac; and there is certainly every reason to conclude from the woefully faulty state in which this Targum is found (Luzzatto counts several hundred corrupt readings in it), that many and clumsy hands must have been at work upon the later Codd. The most likely solution of the difficulty, however, seems to be that indicated by Frankel—viz., that the LXX. is the common source of both versions, but in such a manner that the Aramaic has also made use of the Hebrew and the Greek—of the latter, however, through the Syriac medium. As a specimen of the curious similarity of both versions, the following two verses from the beginning of the book may find a place here:—

Chap. I. 2-3.

Targum (Ver. 2).	Syr. (Ver. 2).
למדע חכמתא ומרדותא	ܠܡܕܥ ܚܟܡܬܐ ܘܡܪܕܘܬܐ
לאתבין אמרי ביונתא׃	ܠܡܐܚܙܐ ܡܠܐ ܕܣܟܠܘܬܐ׃
Ver. 3.	Ver. 3.
למקבלא מרדותא דשוכלא	ܠܡܩܒܠܐ ܡܘܣܪ ܣܟܠܘܬܐ
וצדקתא ודינא ותריצותא׃	ܘܙܕܩܬܐ ܘܕܝܢܐ ܘܡܝܫܪ׃

[e] *e.g.* The use of the word אגנלי for angel in Targ. Ps. and Job, the נ, affixed to the 3rd p. plur. praef. Peal, the Infin. with praef. מן, besides several more or less unusual Greek and Syriac words common to all three.

[h] *e.g.*, ch. xxix. 5, the Heb. word קִרְיָה, "city," is rendered ܟܪܟܐ, "city," in Syr. Targum translates כדבא, "a lie," which is only to be accounted for by a misunderstanding or misreading of the Syriac ܟܪܟܐ, where for the second *c* the Chaldee translator read a *b*, ܟܪܒܐ.

[i] Prov. xxvi. 10, the Masoretic text reads: רַב מְחוֹלֵל כֹּל וְשֹׂכֵר כְּסִיל; LXX. πολλὰ χειμάζεται σὰρξ ἀφρονων (=בשר כסיל); Targ. סני חיש בשרא דסיכלא; thus adopting exactly the reading of the LXX. against the received text: xxix. 21, מפנק מנער עבדו, quoted in the same manner in Talm. Succah. 52 *b*; LXX. ὃς καταπαταλᾷ ἐκ παιδὸς οἰκέτης ἔσται; evidently reading עבד יהיה=Targ. לעבדא נהוי. Comp. also xxvii 16, xxx. 30, &c.

Compare also vers. 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13; ch. ii. vers. 9, 10, 13-15; iii. 2-9, &c.

We must not omit to observe that no early Jewish commentator—Rashi, Ibn Ezra, &c.—mentions the Targum either to Proverbs, or to Job and Psalms. Nathan ben Jechiel (12th century) is the first who quotes it.

Respecting the two latter Targums of this group, Psalms and Job, it is to be observed that they are, more or less, mere collections of fragments. That there must have existed paraphrases to Job at a very early period follows from the Talmudical passages which we quoted in the introduction—nay, we almost feel inclined to assume that this book, considered by the learned as a mere allegory ("Job never was, and never was created," is the dictum found in the Talmud, Baba Bathra, 15*a*: *i. e.* he never had any real existence, but is a poetical, though sacred, invention), opened the list of written paraphrases. How much of the primitive version is embodied in the one which we possess it is of course next to impossible to determine, more especially in the state of infancy in which the investigation of the Targums as yet remains. So much, however, is palpable, that the Targums of both Psalms and Job in their present shape contain relics of different authors in different times: some paraphrasts, some strictly translators. Very frequently a second version of the same passage is introduced by the formula תרגום אחר, "another Targum," and varies most widely from its predecessor; while, more especially in the Psalms, a long series of chapters translated literally, is followed by another series translated in the wildest and most fanciful character. The Cod. Erpen. still exhibits these various readings, as such, side by side, on its margin; thence, however, they have in our printed editions found their way into the text. How much of these variants, or of the entire text, belongs to the Palestinian Cycles, which may well have embraced the whole Torah:—or whether they are to be considered exclusively the growth of later times, and have thus but a very slender connexion with either the original Babylonian or the Palestinian Targum-works, future investigation must determine.

The most useful in this group is naturally the Targum on Proverbs, it being the one which translates most closely, or rather the only one which does *translate* at all. Besides the explanation it gives of difficult passages in the text, its peculiar affinity to the Syriac Version naturally throws some light upon both, and allows of emendations in and through either. As to Job and Psalms, their chief use lies in their showing the gradual dying stages of the idiom in which they are written, and also in their being in a manner guides to the determination of the date of certain stages of Haggadah.

2, 3. Targums on the five Megilloth.

These Targums are likewise not mentioned before the 12th century, when the Aruch quotes them severally:—although Esther must have been translated at a very early period, since the Talmud already mentions a Targum on it. Of this, we need hardly add, no trace is found in our present Targum. The freedom of a "version" can go no further than it does in these Targums on the Megilloth. They are, in fact, mere Haggadah, and bear the most striking resemblance to the Midrash on the respective books. Curiously enough, the gradual preponderance of the Paraphrase over the text is noticeable in the following order: Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Song of Songs. The latter is fullest to overflowing of those "*nugæ atque frivolitates*," which have so sorely tried the temper of the wise and grave. Starting from the almost comical notion that all they found in the books of Mohammedanism and of Judaism, of Rome and of Greece, if it seemed to have any reference to "Religio," however unsupported, and however plainly bearing the stamp of poetry—good or bad—on its face, must needs be a religious creed, and the creed forced upon every single believer:—they could not but get angry with mere 'day-dreams' being interspersed with the sacred literature of the Bible. Delitzsch, a scholar of our generation, says of the Targums in general that "history becomes in them most charming, most instructive poetry; but this poetry is not the invention, the phantasma of the writer, but the old and popular venerable tradition or legend .... the Targums are poetical, both as to their contents and form" (*Gesch. d. Jüd. Poesie*, p. 27): and further, "The wealth of legend in its gushing fullness did not suffer any formal bounds; legend bursts upon legend, like wave upon wave, not to be dammed in even by any poetical forms. Thus the Jerusalem Targum in its double Recensions [to the Pentateuch], and the Targums on the five Megilloth are the most beautiful national works of art, through which there runs the golden thread of Scripture, and which are held together only by the unity of the idea" (p. 135). Although we do not share Delitzsch's enthusiasm to the full extent, yet we cannot but agree with him that there are, together with stones and dust, many pearls of precious price to be gathered from these much despised, because hardly known, books.

The dialect of these books occupies the mean between the East and West Aramean, and there is a certain unity of style and design about all the five books, which fully justifies the supposition that they are, one and all, the work of one author. It may be that, taken in an inverted series, they mark the successive stages of a poet's life; glowing, rapturous, overflowing in the first; stately, sober, prosy in the last. As to the time of its writing or editing, we have again to repeat, that it is most uncertain, but unquestionably belongs to a period much later than the Talmud. The Book of Esther, enjoying both through its story-like form and the early injunction of its being read or heard by every one on the Feast of Purim, a great circulation and popularity, has been targumised many times, and besides the one embodied in the five Megilloth, there are two more extant (*not three*, as generally stated: the so-called third being only an abbreviation of the first), which are called respectively the first: a short one without digressions, and the second —(*Targum sheni*): a larger one, belonging to the Palestinian Cycle. The latter Targum is a collection of Eastern romances, broken up and arranged to the single verses: of gorgeous hues and extravagant imagination, such as are to be met with in the Adshaib or Chamis, or any Eastern collection of legends and tales.

VI. Targum on the Book of Chronicles.

This Targum was unknown, as we said before, up to a very recent period. In 1680, it was edited for the first time from an Erfurt MS. by M. F. Beck, and in 1715 from a more complete as well as correct MS. at Cambridge, by D. Wilkins. The name of Hungary occurring in it, and its frequent use of the

Jerusalem-Targum to the Pentateuch, amounting sometimes to simple copying (comp. the Genealogical Table in chap. i., &c.), show sufficiently that its author is neither "Jonathan b. Uzziel" nor "Joseph the Blind," as has been suggested. But the language, style, and the Haggadah, with which it abounds, point to a late period and point out Palestine as the place where it was written. Its use must be limited to philological, historical, and geographical studies; the science of exegesis will profit little by it. The first edition appeared under the title *Paraphrasis Chaldaica libr. Chronicorum*, cura M. F. Beckii, 2 tom. Aug. Vind. 1680-83, 4to.; the second by D. Wilkins, *Paraphrasis ... auctore R. Josepho*, &c. Amst., 1715, 4to. The first edition has the advantage of a large number of very learned notes, the second that of a comparatively more correct and complete text.

VII. The Targum to Daniel.

It is for the first time that this Targum, for the non-existence of which many and weighty reasons were given (that the date of the Messiah's arrival was hidden in it, among others), is here formally introduced into the regular rank and file of Targums, although it has been known for now more than five-and-twenty years. Munk found it, not indeed in the Original Aramaic, but in what appears to him to be an extract of it written in Persian. The MS. (Anc. Fond, No. 45, Imp. Library) is inscribed "History of Daniel," and has retained only the first words of the Original, which it translates likewise into Persian. This language is then retained throughout.

After several legends known from other Targums, follows a long prophecy of Daniel, from which the book is shown to have been written after the first Crusade. Mohammad and his successors are mentioned, also a king who coming from Europe (אן רומיאן) will go to Damascus, and kill the Ishmaelitic (Mohammedan) kings and princes; he will break down the minarets (מנארה), destroy the mosques (מסנדהא), and no one will after that dare to pronounce the name of the Profane (פסול = Mohammad). The Jews will also have to suffer great misfortunes (as indeed the knightly Crusaders won their spurs by dastardly murdering the helpless masses, men, women, and children, in the Ghettos along the Rhine and elsewhere, before they started to deliver the Holy tomb). By a sudden transition the Prophet then passes on to the "Messiah, son of Joseph," to Gog and Magog, and to the "true Messiah, the son of David." Munk rightly concludes that the book must have been composed in the 12th century, when Christian kings reigned for a brief period over Jerusalem (*Notice sur Saadia*, Par. 1838).

VIII. There is also a Chaldee translation extant of the apocryphal pieces of Esther, which, entirely lying apart from our task, we confine ourselves to mention without further entering into the subject. De Rossi has published them with Notes and Dissertations. Tübingen, 1783, 8vo.

Further fragments of the Palestinian Targum.

Besides the complete books belonging to the Palestinian Cycle of Targum which we have mentioned, and the portions of it intersected as "Another Reading," "Another Targum," into the Babylonian Versions, there are extant several independent fragments of it. Nor need we as yet despair of finding still further portions, perhaps one day to see it restored entirely. There is all the more hope for this, as the Targum has not been lost very long yet. Abudraham quotes the Targum Jerushalmi to *Samuel* (i. 9, 13). Kimchi has preserved several passages from it to *Judges* (xi. 1, consisting of 47 words); to *Samuel* (i. 17, 18: 106 words); and *Kings* (i. 22, 21: 68 words; ii. 4, 1: 174 words, iv. 6: 55 words; iv. 7: 72 words; xiii. 21: 9 words), under the simple name of Toseftah, *i.e.* Addition, or Additional Targum. Luzzatto has also lately found fragments of the same, under the names "Targum of Palestine," "Targum of Jerushalmi," "Another Reading," &c., in an African Codex written 5247 A.M. = 1487 A.D., viz. to 1 Sam. xviii. 19; 2 Sam. xii. 12; 1 Kings v. 9, v. 11, v. 13, x. 18, x. 26, xiv. 13; to Hosea i. 1; Obad. i. 1.—To Isaiah, Rashi (*Isaaki*, not as people still persist in calling him, *Jarchi*), Abudraham and Farissol quote it: and a fragment of the Targum to this prophet is extant in Cod. Urbin. Vatican No. 1, containing about 120 words, and beginning: "Prophecy of Isaiah, which he prophesied at the end of his prophecy in the days of Manasseh the Son of Hezekiah the King of the Tribe of the House of Judah on the 17th of Tamuz in the hour when Manasseh set up an idol in the Temple," &c. Isaiah predicts in this his own violent death. Parts of this Targum are also found in Hebrew, in Pesiktah Rabbathi 6 *a*, and Yalkut Isa. 58 *d*. A Jerusalem Targum to Jeremiah is mentioned by Kimchi; to Ezekiel by R. Simeon, Nathan (Aruch), and likewise by Kimchi, who also speaks of a further additional Targum to Jonathan for this Book. A "Targum-Jerushalmi" to Micah is known to Rashi, and of Zechariah a fragment has been published in Bruns (Repert. Pt. 15, P. 174) from a Reuchlinian MS. (Cod. 354, Kennic. 25), written 1106. The passage, found as a marginal gloss to Zech. xii. 10, reads as follows:—

"Targum Jerushalmi. And I shall pour out upon the House of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of prophecy and of prayer for truth. And after this shall go forth Messiah the Son of Efraim to wage war against Gog. And Gog will kill him before the city of Jerushalaim. They will look up to me and they will ask me wherefore the heathens have killed Messiah the Son of Efraim. They will then mourn over him as mourn father and mother over an only son, and they will wail over him as one wails over a firstborn."—A Targum Jerushalmi to the third chapter of *Habakkuk*, quoted by Rashi, is mentioned by de Rossi (Cod. 265 and 405, both 13th century). It has been suggested that a Targum Jerushalmi on the Prophets only existed to the Haftarahs, which had at one time been translated perhaps, like the portion from the Law, in public; but we have seen that entire books, not to mention single chapters, possessed a Palestinian Targum, which never were intended or used for the purpose of Haftarah. And there is no reason to doubt that the origin of this Targum to the Prophets is precisely similar to, and perhaps contemporaneous with, that which we traced to that portion which embraces the Pentateuch. The Babylonian Version, the "Jonathan"-Targum, though paraphrastic, did not satisfy the apparently more imaginative Palestinian public. Thus from heaped-up additions and marginal glosses, the step to a total re-writing of the entire Codex in the manner and taste of the later times and the different locality, was easy enough. From a critique

of the work as such, however, we must naturally keep aloof, as long as we have only the few specimens named to judge from. But its general spirit and tendency are clear enough. So is also the advantage to which even the minimum that has survived may some day be put by the student of Midrashic literature, as we have briefly indicated above.

We cannot conclude without expressing the hope —probably a vain one—that linguistic studies may soon turn in the direction of that vast and most interesting, as well as important, Aramaic literature, of which the Targums form but a small item.

The writer finally begs to observe that the translations of all the passages quoted from Talmud and Midrash, as well as the specimens from the Targum, have been made by him directly from the respective originals.

N. Pfeiffer, *Critica Sacr.*; Tho. Smith, *Diatribe*; Gerhard, *De Script. Sacr.*; Helvicus, *De Chald. Bibl. Paraphr.*; Varen, *De Targ. Onkel.*; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.*; Carpzov, *Critica Sacra*; Joh. Morinus, *Exercitt. Bibl.*; Schickard, *Bechin. Happer.*; Jerar, *Proleg. Bibliae*; Rivet, *Isagoge ad S. S.*; Allix, *Judic. Eccles. Jud.*; Huet, *De Claris Interpp.*; Leusden, *Philol. Hebr.*; Prideaux, *Connect.*; Rambach, *Inst. Herm. Sacr.*; Elias Levita, *Meturgeman*; *Tishbi*; Luzzatto, *Oheb Ger*; Perkovitz, *Oteh Or*; Winer, *Onkelos*; Anger, *De Onkeloso*; Vitringa, *Synagoga*; Azariah De Rossi, *Meor Enajim*; Petermann, *De duabus Pent. Paraphr.*; Dathe, *De ratione consensus vers. Chald. et Syr. Prov. Sal.*; Lövy, in *Geiger's Zeitschr.*; Levysohn and Traub in Frankel's *Monatsschr.*; Zunz, *Gottesdienstl. Vorträge*; Geiger, *Urschrift*; Frankel, *Vorstudien zur LXX.*; *Beiträge f. Pal. Exeg. Zeitschrift*; *Monatsschrift*; Geiger, *Zeitschrift*; Fürst, *Orient*; *Hall. Allg. Liter. Zeitg.* 1821 and 1832; *Introductions* of Walton, Eichhorn, Keil, Hävernick, Jahn, Herbst, Bertheau, Davidson, &c.; Gesenius. *Jesaia*; Horne, *Aruch*; *Geschichten* of Jost, Herzfeld, Grätz, &c.; Delitzsch, *Gesch. d. Jüd. Poesie*; Sach's *Beiträge*; Fürst, *Chald. Gramm.*; E. Deutsch in *Westerm. Monatschr.*, 1859; *Zeitschrift* and *Verhandlungen der Deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellsch.*, &c. &c.

[E. D.]

VERSION, AUTHORISED. The history of the English translations of the Bible connects itself with many points of interest in that of the nation and the Church. The lives of the individual translators, the long struggle with the indifference or opposition of men in power, the religious condition of the people as calling for, or affected by, the appearance of the translation, the time and place and form of the successive editions by which the demand, when once created, was supplied;—each of these has furnished, and might again furnish, materials for a volume. It is obvious that the work now to be done must lie within narrower limits; and it is proposed, therefore, to exclude all that belongs simply to the personal history of the men, or the general history of the time, or that comes within the special province of Bibliography. What will be aimed at will be to give an account of the several versions as they appeared; to ascertain the qualifications of the translators for the work which they undertook, and the principles on which they acted; to form an estimate of the final result of their labours in the received Version, and, as consequent on this, of the necessity or desirableness of a new or revised translation; and, finally, to give such a survey of the literature of the subject as may help the reader to obtain a fuller knowledge for himself.

I. EARLY TRANSLATIONS.—It was asserted by Sir Thomas More, in his anxiety to establish a point against Tyndal, that he had seen English translations of the Bible, which had been made before Wycliffe, and that these were approved by the Bishops, and were allowed by them to be read by laymen, and even by devout women (*Dialogues*, ch. viii-xiv. col. 82). There seem good grounds, however, for doubting the accuracy of this statement. No such translations—versions, *i. e.* of the entire Scriptures—are now extant. No traces of them appear in any contemporary writer. Wycliffe's great complaint is, that there is no translation (Forshall and Madden, *Wycliffe's Bible*, *Pref.* p. xxi. *Prol.* p. 59). The Constitutions of Archbishop Arundel (A.D. 1408) mention two only, and these are Wycliffe's own, and the one based on his and completed after his death. More's statement must therefore be regarded either as a rhetorical exaggeration of the fact that parts of the Bible had been previously translated, or as rising out of a mistake as to the date of MSS. of the Wycliffe version. The history of the English Bible will therefore begin, as it has begun hitherto, with the work of the first great reformer. One glance, however, we may give, in passing, to the earlier history of the English Church, and connect some of its most honoured names with the great work of making the truths of Scripture, or parts of the Books themselves, if not the Bible as a whole, accessible to the people. We may think of Caedmon as embodying the whole history of the Bible in the alliterative metre of Anglo-Saxon poetry (Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 24); of Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, in the 7th century, as rendering the Psalter; of Bede, as translating in the last hours of his life the Gospel of St. John (*Epist. Cuthberti*); of Alfred, setting forth in his mother-tongue as the great ground-work of his legislation, the four chapters of Exodus (xx.-xxiii.) that contained the first code of the laws of Israel (Pauli's *Life of Alfred*, ch. v.). The wishes of the great king extended further. He desired that "all the free-born youth of his kingdom should be able to read the English Scriptures"[a] (*Ibid.*). Portions of the Bible, some of the Psalms, and extracts from other Books, were translated by him for his own use and that of his children. The traditions of a later date, seeing in him the representative of all that was good in the old Saxon time, made him the translator of the whole Bible (*Ibid.* Supp. to ch. v.).

The work of translating was, however, carried on by others. One Anglo-Saxon version of the four Gospels, interlinear with the Latin of the Vulgate, known as the Durham Book, is found in the Cottonian MSS. of the British Museum, and is referred to the 9th or 10th century. Another, known as the Rushworth Gloss, and belonging to the same period, is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.

[a] So Pauli (Eng. transl.). But would "Englisc gewrit" mean "the Scriptures" exclusively? Do not the words of Alfred point to a general as well as a religious education?

[b] One interesting fact connected with this version is that its text agrees with that of the Codex Bezae where that MS. differs most from the *textus receptus* of the N. T. Another is its publication by Foxe the Martyrologist in 1571, at the request of Abp. Parker. It was subsequently edited by Dr. Marshall in 1665.

It may be noticed, as bearing upon a question afterwards

Another, of a somewhat later date, is in the same collection, and in the library of C. C. College, Cambridge. The name of Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, is connected with a version of the Psalms; that of Aelfric, with an Epitome of Scripture History, including a translation of many parts of the historical Books of the Bible (Lewis, *Hist. of Transl.* ch. I.; Forshall and Madden, *Preface*; Bagster's *English Hexapla*, Pref.). The influence of Norman ecclesiastics, in the reigns that preceded or followed the Conquest, was probably adverse to the continuance of this work. They were too far removed from sympathy with the subjugated race to care to educate them in their own tongue. The spoken dialects of the English of that period would naturally seem to them too rude and uncouth to be the channel of Divine truth. Pictures, mysteries, miracle plays, rather than books, were the instruments of education for all but the few who, in monasteries under Norman or Italian superintendence, devoted themselves to the study of theology or law. In the remoter parts of England, however, where their influence was less felt, or the national feeling was stronger, there were those who carried on the succession, and three versions of the Gospels, in the University Library at Cambridge, in the Bodleian, and in the British Museum, belonging to the 11th or 12th century, remain as attesting their labours. The metrical paraphrase of the Gospel history, known as the Ormulum, in alliterative English verse, ascribed to the latter half of the 12th century, is the next conspicuous monument, and may be looked upon as indicating a desire to place the facts of the Bible within reach of others than the clergy.[e] The 13th century, a time in England, as throughout Europe, of religious revival, witnessed renewed attempts. A prose translation of the Bible into Norman-French, circ. A.D. 1260, indicates a demand for devotional reading within the circle of the Court, or of the wealthier merchants, or of convents for women of high rank. Further signs of the same desire are found in three English versions of the Psalms—one towards the close of the 13th century; another by Schorham, circ. A.D. 1320; another—with other canticles from the O.T. and N.T.—by Richard Rolle of Hampole, circ. 1349; the last being accompanied by a devotional exposition: and in one of the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, and of all St. Paul's Epistles (the list includes the Apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans), in the Library of C. C. College, Cambridge. The fact stated by Archbishop Arundel in his funeral sermon on Anne of Bohemia, wife of Richard II., that she habitually read the Gospels in the vulgar tongue, with divers expositions, was probably true of many others of high rank.[d] It is interesting to note these facts, not as detracting from the glory of the great Reformer of the 14th century, but as showing that for him also there had been a preparation; that what he supplied met a demand which had for many years been gathering strength. It is almost needless to add that these versions started from nothing better than the copies of the Vulgate, more or less accurate, which each translator had before him (Lewis, ch. I.; Forshall and Madden *Preface*).

II. WYCLIFFE (b. 1324; d. 1384).—(1). It is singular, and not without significance, that the first translation from the Bible connected with the name of Wycliffe should have been that of part of the Apocalypse.[e] The *Last Age of the Church* (A.D. 1356) translates and expounds the vision in which the Reformer read the signs of his own times, the sins and the destruction of "Antichrist and his meynee" (=multitude). Shortly after this he completed a version of the Gospels, accompanied by a commentary "so that pore Cristen men may some dele know the text of the Gospel, with the comyn sentence of olde holie doctores" (*Preface*). Wycliffe, however, though the chief, was not the only labourer in the cause. The circle of English readers was becoming wider, and they were not content to have the Book which they honoured above all others in a tongue not their own.[f] Another translation and commentary appear to have been made about the same time, in ignorance of Wycliffe's work, and for the "manie lewid men that gladlie would kon the Gospelle, if it were draghen into the Englisch tung." The fact that many MSS. of this period are extant, containing in English a Monotessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels, accompanied by portions of the Epistles, or portions of the O. T., or an epitome of Scripture history, or the substance of St. Paul's Epistles, or the Catholic Epistles at full length, with indications more or less distinct, of Wycliffe's influence, shows how wide-spread was the feeling, that the time had come for an English Bible. (Forshall and Madden, *Pref.* pp. xiii.-xvii.) These preliminary labours were followed up by a complete translation of the N.T. by Wycliffe himself. The O.T. was undertaken by his coadjutor, Nicholas de Hereford, but was interrupted probably by a citation to appear before Archbishop Arundel in 1382, and ends abruptly (following so far the order of the Vulgate) in the middle of Baruch. Many of the MSS. of this version now extant present a different recension of the text, and it is probable that the work of Wycliffe and Hereford was revised by Richard Purvey, circ. A.D. 1388. To him also is ascribed the interesting Prologue, in which the translator gives an account both of his purpose and his method. (Forshall and Madden, *Pref.* p. xxv.)

(2). The former was, as that of Wycliffe had been, to give an English Bible to the English

---

the subject of much discussion, that in this and the other Anglo-Saxon versions the attempt is made to give vernacular equivalents even for the words which, as belonging to a systematic theology, or for other reasons, most later versions have left practically untranslated. Thus *baptisma* is "fyllith" (washing); *poenitentia*, "doed-bote" (redress for evil deeds). So *scribae* are "bocere" (bookmen). Synagogues "gesamnungum" (meetings); amen, "sothlice" (in sooth); and phylacteries, "healsbec" (neck-books). See Lewis, *Hist. of Translations*, p. 9.

[e] The Ormulum, edited by Dr. White, was printed at the Oxford University Press in 1852.

[d] Chronologically, of course, the Gospels thus referred to may have been Wycliffe's translation; but the strong opposition of Arundel to the work of the Reformer makes it probable that those which the queen used belonged to a different school, like that of the versions just mentioned.

[e] The authorship of this book has however been disputed (comp. Todd's *Preface*).

[f] "One comfort is of knightes; they saveren much the Gospelle, and have wille to read in Englische the Gospelle of Christes life" (Wycliffe, *Prologue*). Compare the speech ascribed to John of Gaunt (13 Ric. II.). "We will not be the dregs of all, seeing other nations have the law of God, which is the law of our faith, written in their own language" (Foxe, *Pref. to Saxon Gospels* Lewis, p. 29).

people. He appeals to the authority of Bede, of Alfred, and of Grostête, to the examples of "Frenshe, and Beemers (Bohemians), and Britons." He answers the hypocritical objections that men were not holy enough for such a work; that it was wrong for "idiots" to do what the great doctors of the Church had left undone. He hopes "to make the sentence as trewe and open in Englishe as it is in Latine, or more trewe and open."

It need hardly be said, as regards the method of the translator, that the version was based entirely upon the Vulgate.[g] If, in the previous century, scholars like Grostête and Roger Bacon, seeking knowledge in other lands, and from men of other races, had acquired, as they seem to have done, some knowledge both of Greek and Hebrew, the succession had, at all events, not been perpetuated. The war to be waged at a later period with a different issue between Scholastic Philosophy and "Humanity" ended, in the first struggle, in the triumph of the former, and there was probably no one at Oxford among Wycliffe's contemporaries who could have helped him or Purvey in a translation from the original. It is something to find at such a time the complaint that "learned doctoris taken littel heede to the lettre," the recognition that the Vulgate was not all sufficient, that "the texte of oure bokis" (he is speaking of the Psalter, and the difficulty of understanding it) "discordeth much from the Ebreu."[h] The difficulty which was thus felt was increased by the state of the Vulgate text. The translator complains that what the Church had in view was not Jerome's version, but a later and corrupt text; that "the comune Latyne Bibles han more neede to be corrected as manie as I have seen in my life, than hath the Englishe Bible late translated." To remedy this he had recourse to collation. Many MSS. were compared, and out of this comparison, the true reading ascertained as far as possible. The next step was to consult the *Glossa Ordinaria*, the commentaries of Nicholas de Lyrâ, and others, as to the meaning of any difficult passages. After this (we recognise here, perhaps, a departure from the right order) grammars were consulted. Then came the actual work of translating, which he aimed at making idiomatic rather than literal. As he went on, he submitted his work to the judgment of others, and accepted their suggestions.[i] It is interesting to trace these early strivings after the true excellence of a translator; yet more interesting to take note of the spirit, never surpassed, seldom equalled, in later translators, in which the work was done. Nowhere do we find the conditions of the work, intellectual and moral, more solemnly asserted. "A translator hath grete nede to studie well the sentence, both before and after," so that no equivocal words may mislead his readers or himself, and then also "he hath nede to lyve a clene life, and be ful devout in preiers, and have not his wit occupied about worldli things, that the Holie Spiryt, author of all wisedom, and cunnynge and truthe, dresse (= train) him in his work, and suffer him not for to err" (Forshall and Madden, *Prol.* p. 60).

(3). The extent of the circulation gained by this version may be estimated from the fact that, in spite of all the chances of time, and all the systematic efforts for its destruction made by Archbishop Arundel and others, not less than 150 copies are known to be extant, some of them obviously made for persons of wealth and rank, others apparently for humbler readers. It is significant as bearing, either on the date of the two works, or on the position of the writers, that while the quotations from Scripture in Langton's *Vision of Piers Plowman* are uniformly given in Latin, those in the *Persone's Tale* of Chaucer are given in English, which for the most part agrees substantially with Wycliffe's translation.

(4). The following characteristics may be noticed as distinguishing this version: (1) The general homeliness of its style. The language of the Court or of scholars is as far as possible avoided, and that of the people followed. In this respect the principle has been acted on by later translators. The style of Wycliffe is to that of Chaucer as Tyndal's is to Surrey's, or that of the A. V. to Ben Jonson's. (2) The substitution, in many cases, of English equivalents for quasi-technical words. Thus we find "fy" or "fogh" instead of "Raca" (Matt. v. 22); "they were *washed*" in Matt. iii. 6; "richesse" for "mammon" (Luke xvi. 9, 11, 13); "bishop" for "high-priest" (*passim*). (3) The extreme literalness with which, in some instances, even at the cost of being unintelligible, the Vulgate text is followed, as in 2 Cor. i. 17-19.

III. TYNDAL.—The work of Wycliffe stands by itself. Whatever power it exercised in preparing the way for the Reformation of the 16th century, it had no perceptible influence on later translations. By the reign of Henry VIII. its English was already obsolescent, and the revival of classical scholarship led men to feel dissatisfied with a version which had avowedly been made at second-hand, not from the original. With Tyndal, on the other hand, we enter on a continuous succession He is the patriarch, in no remote ancestry, of the Authorised Version. With a consistent, unswerving purpose, he devoted his whole life to this one work; and through dangers and difficulties, amid enemies and treacherous friends, in exile and loneliness, accomplished it. More than Cranmer or Ridley he is the true hero of the English Reformation. While they were slowly moving onwards, halting between two opinions, watching how the Court-winds blew, or, at the best, making the most of opportunities, he set himself to the task without which, he felt sure, Reform would be impossible, which, once accomplished, would render it inevitable. "Ere many years," he said, at the age of thirty-six (A.D. 1520), he would cause "a

[g] A crucial instance is that of Gen. iii. 15: "*She* shall trede thy head."

[h] This knowledge is, however, at second hand, "bi witnesse of Jerom, of Lire, and other expositouris."

[i] It is worth while to give his own account of this process:—"First this simple creature," his usual way of speaking of himself, "hedde myche travaile, with diverse felawis and helperis, to gedere manie elde bibles, and othere doctoris, and comune glosis, and to make oo Latyn bible sumdel trewe, and thanne to studie it of the new, the text with the glose, and othere doctoris, as he mizte, and speciali Lire on the elde testament, that helpid full myche in this werk, the thridde time to counsel with elde grammarians and elde dyvynis of harde wordes and harde sentences how those mizte best be understode and translated, the iiij^th tyme to translate as clearlie as he coude to the sentence, and to have manie good felawis and kunnynge at the correcting of the translacioun" (*Preface*, c. xv.). The note at the close of the preface on the grammatical idioms of different languages, the many English equivalents, *e. g.*, for the Latin ablative absolute, shews considerable discernment.

boy that driveth the plough" to know more of Scripture than the great body of the clergy then knew (Foxe, in Anderson's *Annals of English Bible*, i. 36). We are able to form a fairly accurate estimate of his fitness for the work to which he thus gave himself. The change which had come over the Universities of Continental Europe since the time of Wycliffe had affected those of England. Greek had been taught in Paris in 1458. The first Greek Grammar, that of Constantine Lascaris, had been printed in 1476. It was followed in 1480 by Craston's Lexicon. The more enterprising scholars of Oxford visited foreign Universities for the sake of the new learning. Grocyn (d. 1519), Linacre (d. 1524), Colet (d. 1519), had, in this way, from the Greeks whom the fall of Constantinople had scattered over Europe, or from their Italian pupils, learnt enough to enter, in their turn, upon the work of teaching. When Erasmus visited Oxford in 1497, he found in these masters a scholarship which even he could admire. Tyndal, who went to Oxford circ. 1500, must have been within the range of their teaching. His two great opponents, Sir Thomas More and Bishop Tonstal, are known to have been among their pupils. It is significant enough that after some years of study, Tyndal left Oxford and went to Cambridge. Such changes were, it is true, common enough. The fame of any great teacher would draw round him men from other Universities, from many lands. In this instance, the reason of Tyndal's choice is probably not far to seek (Walter, *Biog. Notice* to Tyndal's *Doctrinal Treatises*). Erasmus was in Cambridge from 1509 to 1514. All that we know of Tyndal's character and life, the fact especially that he had made translations of portions of the N.T. as early as 1502 (Offor, *Life of Tyndal*, p. 9), leads to the conclusion that he resolved to make the most of the presence of one who was emphatically the scholar and philologist of Europe. It must be remembered, too, that the great scheme of Cardinal Ximenes was just then beginning to interest the minds of all scholars. The publication of the Complutensian Bible, it is true, did not take place till 1520; but the collection of MSS. and other preparations for it began as early as 1504. In the mean time Erasmus himself, in 1516, brought out the first published edition of the Greek Testament; and it was thus made accessible to all scholars. Of the use made by Tyndal of these opportunities we have evidence in his coming up to London (1522), in the vain hope of persuading Tonstal (known as a Greek scholar, an enlightened Humanist) to sanction his scheme of rendering the N. T. into English, and bringing a translation of one of the orations of Isocrates as a proof of his capacity for the work. The attempt was not successful. "At the last I understood not only that there was no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the N.T., but also that there was no place to do it in all England" (*Pref. to Five Books of Moses*).

It is not so easy to say how far at this time any knowledge of Hebrew was attainable at the English universities, or how far Tyndal had used any means of access that were open to him. It is probable that it may have been known, in some measure, to a few bolder than their fellows, at a time far earlier than the introduction of Greek. The large body of Jews settled in the cities of England must have possessed a knowledge, more or less extensive, of their Hebrew books. On their banishment, to the number of 16,000, by Edward I., these books fell into the hands of the monks, superstitiously reverenced or feared by most, yet drawing some to examination, and then to study. Grostête, it is said, knew Hebrew as well as Greek. Roger Bacon knew enough[k] to pass judgment on the Vulgate as incorrect and misleading. Then, however, came a period in which linguistic studies were thrown into the background, and Hebrew became an unknown speech even to the best-read scholars. The first signs of a revival meet us towards the close of the 15th century. The remarkable fact that a Hebrew Psalter was printed at Soncino in 1477 (forty years before Erasmus's Greek Testament), the Pentateuch in 1482, the Prophets in 1486, the whole of the O. T. in 1488, that by 1496 four editions had been published, and by 1596 not fewer than eleven (Whitaker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry*, p. 22), indicates a demand on the part of the Christian students of Europe, not less than on that of the more learned Jews. Here also the progress of the Complutensian Bible would have attracted the notice of scholars. The cry raised by the "Trojans" of Oxford in 1519 (chiefly consisting of the friars, who from the time of Wycliffe had all but swamped the education of the place) against the first Greek lectures—that to study that language would make men Pagans, that to study Hebrew would make them Jews—shows that the latter study as well as the former was the object of their dislike and fear[l] (Anderson, i. 24; Hallam, *Lit. of Eur.* i. 403).

Whether Tyndal had in this way gained any knowledge of Hebrew before he left England in 1524 may be uncertain. The fact that in 1530-31 he published a translation of Genesis, Deuteronomy, and Jonah,[m] may be looked on as the first-fruits of his labours, the work of a man who was giving this proof of his power to translate from the original (Anderson, *Annals*, i. 209-288). We may perhaps trace, among other motives for the many wanderings of his exile, a desire to visit the cities Worms, Cologne, Hamburgh, Antwerp (Anderson, pp. 48-64), where the Jews lived in greatest numbers, and some of which were famous for their Hebrew learning. Of at least a fair acquaintance with that language we have, a few years later, abundant evidence in the table of Hebrew words prefixed to his translation of the five books of Moses, and in casual etymologies scattered through his other works, *e. g.* Mammon (*Parable of Wicked Mammon*, p. 68[n]), Cohen (*Obedience*, p. 255), Abel Mizraim (p. 347), Pesah

[k] The boast of Bacon, that any one using his method could learn Hebrew and Greek within a week, bold as it is, shews that he knew something of both (*De Laude Sac. Script.* c. 28).

[l] As indicating progress, it may be mentioned that the first Hebrew professor, Robert Wakefield, was appointed at Oxford in 1530, and that Henry VIII.'s secretary, Pace, knew Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldee.

[m] The existence of a translation of Jonah by Tyndal, previously questioned by some editors and biographers, has been placed beyond a doubt by the discovery of a copy (believed to be unique) in the possession of the Ven. Lord Arthur Hervey. It is described in a letter by him to the *Bury Post* of Feb. 3, 1862, transferred shortly afterwards to the *Athenæum*.

[n] The references to Tyndal are given to the Parker Society edition

p. 353). A remark (*Preface to Obedience*, p 148) shows how well he had entered into the general spirit of the language. "The properties of the Hebrew tongue agreeth a thousand times more with the Englishe than with the Latine. The manner of speaking is in both one, so that in a thousand places thou needest not but to translate it into Englishe word for word." When Spalatin describes him in 1534 it is as one well-skilled in seven languages, and one of these is Hebrew [o] (Anderson, i. 397).

The N. T. was, however, the great object of his care. First the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark were published tentatively, then in 1525 the whole of the N. T. was printed in 4to. at Cologne and in small 8vo. at Worms.[p] The work was the fruit of a self-sacrificing zeal, and the zeal was its own reward. In England it was received with denunciations. Tonstal, Bishop of London, preaching at Paul's Cross, asserted that there were at least 2000 errors in it, and ordered all copies of it to be bought up and burnt. An Act of Parliament (35 Hen. VIII. cap. 1) forbade the use of all copies of Tyndal's "false translation." Sir T. More (*Dialogues*, l. c. *Supplication of Souls*, *Confutation of Tindal's Answer*) entered the lists against it, and accused the translator of heresy, bad scholarship, and dishonesty, of "corrupting Scripture after Luther's counsel." The treatment which it received from professed friends was hardly less annoying. Piratical editions were printed, often carelessly, by trading publishers at Antwerp.[q] A scholar of his own, George Joye, undertook (in 1534) to improve the version by bringing it into closer conformity with the Vulgate, and made it the vehicle of peculiar opinions of his own, substituting "life after this life," or "verie life," for "resurrection," as the translation of ἀνάστασις. (Comp. Tyndal's indignant protest in Pref. to edition of 1534.) Even the most zealous reformers in England seemed disposed to throw his translation overboard, and encouraged Coverdale (*infra*) in undertaking another. In the mean time the work went on. Editions were printed one after another.[r] The last appeared in 1535, just before his death, "diligently compared with the Greek," presenting for the first time systematic chapter-headings, and with some peculiarities in spelling specially intended for the pronunciation of the peasantry (Offor, *Life*, p. 82). His heroic life was brought to a close in 1536. We may cast one look on its sad end—the treacherous betrayal, the Judas-kiss of the false friend, the imprisonment at Vilvorden, the last prayer, as the axe was about to fall, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes."[s]

The work to which a life was thus nobly devoted was as nobly done. To Tyndal belongs the honour of having given the first example of a translation based on true principles, and the excellence of later versions has been almost in exact proportion as they followed his. Believing that every part of Scripture had one sense and one only, the sense in the mind of the writer (*Obedience*, p. 304), he made it his work, using all philological helps that were accessible, to attain that sense. Believing that the duty of a translator was to place his readers as nearly as possible on a level with those for whom the books were originally written, he looked on all the later theological associations that had gathered round the words of the N. T. as hindrances rather than helps, and sought, as far as possible, to get rid of them. Not "grace," but "favour," even in John i. 17 (in edition of 1525); not "charity," but "love;" not "confessing," but "acknowledging;" not "penance," but "repentance;" not "priests," but "seniors" or "elders;" not "salvation," but "health;" not "church," but "congregation," are instances of the changes which were then looked on as startling and heretical innovations (Sir T. More, *l. c.*). Some of them we are now familiar with. In others the later versions bear traces of a reaction in favour of the older phraseology. In this, as in other things, Tyndal was in advance, not only of his own age, but of the age that followed him. To him, however, it is owing that the versions of the English Church have throughout been popular, and not scholastic. All the exquisite grace and simplicity which have endeared the A. V. to men of the most opposite tempers and contrasted opinions—to J. H. Newman (*Dublin Review*, June, 1853) and J. A. Froude—is due mainly to his clear-sighted truthfulness.[t] The desire to make the Bible a people's book led him in one edition to something like a provincial, rather than a national translation, but on the whole it kept him free from the besetting danger of the time, that of writing for scholars, not for the people; of a version full of "inkhorn" phrases, not in the spoken language of the English nation. And throughout there is the pervading stamp, so often wanting in other like works, of the most thorough truthfulness. No word has been altered to court a king's favour, or please bishops, or make out a case for or against a particular opinion. He is working freely, not in the fetters of prescribed rules. With the most entire sincerity he could say, "I call God to record, against the day we shall appear before our Lord Jesus to give a reckoning of our doings, that I

[o] Hallam's assertion that Tyndal's version "was avowedly taken from Luther's" originated probably in an inaccurate reminiscence of the title-page of Coverdale's (*Lit. of Europe*, i. 526).

[p] The only extant copy of the 8vo. edition is in the Library of the Baptist College at Bristol. It was reproduced in 1862 in *fac-simile* by Mr. Francis Fry, Bristol, the impression being limited to 177 copies. Mr. Fry proves, by a careful comparison of type, size, water-mark, and the like, with those of other books from the same press, that it was printed by Peter Schoeffer of Worms.

[q] In two of these (1534 and 1535) the words, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood," in 1 Cor. xi. were omitted (Anderson, i. 415). By a like process Mr. Anderson (i. 63) fixes Cologne as the place, and Peter Quentel as the printer of the 4to.

[r] The localities of the editions are not without interest. Hamburgh, Cologne, Worms, in 1525; Antwerp in 1526, '27, '28; Marlborow (= Marburg) in 1529; Strasburg (Joye's edit.) in 1531; Bergen-op-Zoom in 1533 (Joye's); John c. vi. at Nuremberg in 1533; Antwerp in 1534 (Cotton, *Printed Editions*, pp. 4-6).

[s] Two names connect themselves sadly with this version. A copy of the edition of 1534 was presented specially to Anne Boleyn, and is now extant in the British Museum. Several passages, such as might be marked for devotional use, are underscored in red ink. Another reforming Lady, Joan Bocher, was known to have been active in circulating Tyndal's N. T. (Neal, i. 43; Strype, *Mem.* i. c. 26).

[t] The testimony of a Roman Catholic scholar is worth quoting:—"In point of perspicacity and noble simplicity, propriety of idiom and purity of style, no English version has as yet surpassed it" (Geddes, *Prospectus for a new Translation*, p. 89). The writer cannot forbear adding Mr. Froude's judgment in his own words:—"The peculiar genius, if such a word may be permitted, which breathes through it, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the preternatural grandeur, unequalled, unapproached, in the attempted improvements of modern scholars,—all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man, and that man William Tyndal" (*Hist. of Eng.* iii. 84).

never altered one syllable of God's word against my conscience, nor would this day, if all that is in the world, whether it be pleasure, honour, or riches, might be given me" (Anderson, i. 349).

IV. COVERDALE.—(1.) A complete translation of the Bible, different from Tyndal's, bearing the name of Miles Coverdale, printed probably at Zurich, appeared in 1535. The undertaking itself, and the choice of Coverdale as the translator, were probably due to Cromwell. Tyndal's controversial treatises, and the polemical character of his prefaces and notes, had irritated the leading ecclesiastics and embittered the mind of the king himself against him. All that he had written was publicly condemned. There was no hope of obtaining the king's sanction for anything that bore his name. But the idea of an English translation began to find favour. The rupture with the see of Rome, the marriage with Anne Boleyn, made Henry willing to adopt what was urged upon him as the surest way of breaking for ever the spell of the Pope's authority. The bishops even began to think of the thing as possible. It was talked of in Convocation. They would take it in hand themselves. The work did not, however, make much progress. The great preliminary question whether "venerable" words, such as hostia, penance, pascha, holocaust, and the like, should be retained, was still unsettled (Anderson, i. 414).[u] Not till "the day after doomsday" (the words are Cranmer's) were the English people likely to get their English Bible from the bishops (ib. i. 577). Cromwell, it is probable, thought it better to lose no further time, and to strike while the iron was hot. A divine whom he had patronised, though not, like Tyndal, feeling himself called to that special work (*Pref. to Coverdale's Bible*), was willing to undertake it. To him accordingly it was entrusted. There was no stigma attached to his name, and, though a sincere reformer, neither at that time nor afterwards did he occupy a sufficiently prominent position to become an object of special persecution.[x]

(2.) The work which was thus executed was done, as might be expected, in a very different fashion from Tyndal's. Of the two men, one had made this the great object of his life, the other, in his own language, "sought it not, neither desired it," but accepted it as a task assigned him. One prepared himself for the work by long years of labour in Greek and Hebrew. The other is content to make a translation at second hand "out of the Douche (Luther's German Version) and the Latine."[y] The one aims at a rendering which shall be the truest and most exact possible. The other loses himself in weak commonplace as to the advantage of using many English words for one and the same word in the original, and in practice oscillates between "penance" and "repentance," "love" and "charity," "priests" and "elders," as though one set of words were as true and adequate as the other (*Preface*, p. 19). In spite of these weaknesses, however, there is much to like in the spirit and temper of Coverdale. He is a second-rate man, labouring as such contentedly, not ambitious to appear other than he is. He thinks it a great gain that there should be a diversity of translations. He acknowledges, though he dare not name it, the excellence of Tyndal's version,[a] and regrets the misfortune which left it incomplete. He states frankly that he had done his work with the assistance of that and of five others.[a] If the language of his dedication to the king, whom he compares to Moses, David, and Josiah, seems to be somewhat fulsome in its flattery, it is, at least, hardly more offensive than that of the Dedication of the A. V., and there was more to palliate it.[b]

(3.) An inspection of Coverdale's version serves to show the influence of the authorities he followed.[c] The proper names of the O. T. appear for the most part in their Latin form, Elias, Eliseus, Ochozias; sometimes, as in Esay and Jeremy, in that which was familiar in spoken English. Some points of correspondence with Luther's version are not without interest. Thus "Cush," which in Wycliffe, Tyndal, and the A. V. is uniformly rendered "Ethiopia," is in Coverdale "Morians' land" (Ps. lxviii. 31; Acts viii. 27, &c.), after the "Mohrenlande" of Luther, and appears in this form accordingly in the P. B. version of the Psalms. The proper name Rabshakeh passes, as in Luther, into the "chief butler" (2 K. xviii. 17; Is. xxxvi. 11). In making the sons of David "priests" (2 Sam. viii. 18), he followed both his authorities. Ἐπίσκοποι are "bishops" in Acts xx. 28 ("overseers" in A. V.). "Shiloh," in the prophecy of Gen. xlix. 10, becomes "the worthy," after Luther's "der Held." "They houghed oxen" takes the place of "they digged down a wall," in Gen. xlix. 6. The singular word "Lamia" is taken from the Vulg., as the English rendering of *Ziim* ("wild beasts," A. V.) in Is. xxxiv. 14. The "tabernacle of witness," where the A. V. has "congregation," shows the same influence. In spite of Tyndal, the Vulg. "plena gratiâ," in Luke i. 28, leads to "full of grace;"

---

[u] A list of such words, 99 in number, was formally laid before Convocation by Gardiner in 1542, with the proposal that they should be left untranslated, or Englished with as little change as possible (Lewis, *Hist.* ch. 2).

[x] It is uncertain where this version was printed, the title-page being silent on that point. Zurich, Cologne, and Frankfort have all been conjectured. Coverdale is known to have been abroad, and may have come in contact with Luther.

[y] There seems something like an advertising tact in this title-page. A scholar would have felt that there was no value in any translation but one from the original. But the "Douche" would serve to attract the Reforming party, who held Luther's name in honour; while the "Latine" would at least conciliate the conservative feeling of Gardiner and his associates. Whitaker, however, maintains that Coverdale knew more Hebrew than he chose, at this time, to acknowledge, and refers to his translation of one difficult passage ("Ye take youre pleasure under the okes and under all grene trees, the children beynge slaine in the valleys," Is. lvii. 5) as proving an independent judgment against the authority of Luther and the Vulgate (*Hist. and Crit. Enquiry*, p. 52).

[z] "If thou [the reader] be fervent in prayer, God shall not only send thee it [the Bible] in a better [version] by the ministration of those that began it before, but shall also move the hearts of those that before meddled not withal."

[a] The five were probably—(1) The Vulgate. (2) Luther's (3) The German Swiss version of Zurich. (4) the Latin of Pagninus, (5) Tyndal's. Others, however, have conjectured a German translation of the Vulgate earlier than Luther's, and a Dutch version from Luther (Whitaker, *Hist and Crit. Enquiry*, p. 49).

[b] He leaves it to the king, *e. g.*, "to correct his translation, to amend it, to improve [= condemn] it, yea, and clean to reject it, if your godly wisdom shall think necessary."

[c] Ginsburg (*App. to Coheleth*) has shewn that, with regard to one book at least of the O. T., Coverdale followed the German-Swiss version printed at Zurich in 1531, with an almost servile obsequiousness

while we have, on the other hand, "congregation" throughout the N. T. for ἐκκλησία, and "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Cor. xiii. It was the result of the same indecision that his language as to the Apocrypha lacks the sharpness of that of the more zealous reformers. "Baruch" is placed with the canonical books, after "Lamentations." Of the rest he says that they are "placed apart," as "not held by ecclesiastical doctors in the same repute" as the other Scriptures, but this is only because there are "dark sayings" which seem to differ from the "open Scripture." He has no wish that they should be "despised or little set by." "Patience and study would show that the two were agreed."

(4.) What has been stated practically disposes of the claim which has sometimes been made for this version of Coverdale's, as though it had been made from the original text (Anderson, i. 564; Whitaker, *Hist. and Crit. Inquiry*, p. 58). It is not improbable, however, that as time went on he added to his knowledge. The letter addressed by him to Cromwell (*Remains*, p. 492, Parker Soc.) obviously asserts, somewhat ostentatiously, an acquaintance "not only with the standing text of the Hebrew, with the interpretation of the Chaldee and the Greek," but also with "the diversity of reading of all texts." He, at any rate, continued his work as a pains-taking editor. Fresh editions of his Bible were published, keeping their ground in spite of rivals, in 1537, 1539, 1550, 1553. He was called in at a still later period to assist in the Geneva version. Among smaller facts connected with this edition may be mentioned the appearance of Hebrew letters—of the name Jehovah—in the title-page (יהוה), and again in the margin of the alphabetic poetry of Lamentations, though not of Ps. cxix. The plural form "Biblia" is retained in the title-page, possibly however in its later use as a singular feminine [comp. BIBLE]. There are no notes, no chapter-headings, no divisions into verses. The letters A, B, C, D, in the margin, as in the early editions of Greek and Latin authors, are the only helps for finding places. Marginal references point to parallel passages. The O. T., especially in Genesis, has the attraction of woodcuts. Each book has a table of contents prefixed to it.[d]

V. MATTHEW.—(1.) In the year 1537, a large folio Bible appeared as edited and dedicated to the king, by Thomas Matthew. No one of that name appears at all prominently in the religious history of Henry VIII., and this suggests the inference that the name was pseudonymous, adopted to conceal the real translator. The tradition which connects this Matthew with John Rogers, the proto-martyr of the Marian persecution, is all but undisputed. It rests (1) on the language of the indictment and sentence which describe him (Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, p. 1029, 1563; Chester, *Life of Rogers*, pp. 418-423), as Joannes Rogers alias Matthew, as if it were a matter of notoriety; (2) the testimony of Foxe himself, as representing, if not personal knowledge, the current belief of his time; (3) the occurrence at the close of a short exhortation to the Study of Scripture in the Preface, of the initials J. R.;[e] (4) internal evidence. This subdivides itself. (*a.*) Rogers, who had graduated at Pembroke Coll. Cambridge in 1525, and had sufficient fame to be invited to the new Cardinal's College at Oxford, accepted the office of chaplain to the merchant adventurers of Antwerp, and there became acquainted with Tyndal, two years before the latter's death. Matthew's Bible, as might be expected, if this hypothesis were true, reproduces Tyndal's work, in the N. T. entirely, in the O. T. as far as 2 Chr., the rest being taken with occasional modifications from Coverdale. (*b.*) The language of the Dedication is that of one who has mixed much, as Rogers mixed, with foreign reformers. "This hope have the godlie even in strange countries, in your grace's godliness."

(2.) The printing of the book was begun apparently abroad, and was carried on as far as the end of Isaiah. At that point a new pagination begins, and the names of the London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, appear. The history of the book was probably something like this: Coverdale's translation had not given satisfaction—least of all were the more zealous and scholar-like reformers contented with it. As the only complete English Bible, it was, however, as yet, in possession of the field. Tyndal and Rogers, therefore, in the year preceding the imprisonment of the former, determined on another, to include O. T., N. T., and Apocrypha, but based throughout on the original. Left to himself, Rogers carried on the work, probably at the expense of the same Antwerp merchant who had assisted Tyndal (Poyntz), and thus got as far as Isaiah. The enterprising London printers, Grafton and Whitechurch, then came in (Chester, *Life of Rogers*, p. 29). It would be a good speculation to enter the market with this, and so drive out Coverdale's, in which they had no interest. They accordingly embarked a considerable capital, 500*l*., and then came a stroke of policy which may be described as a miracle of audacity. Rogers's name, known as the friend of Tyndal, is suppressed, and the simulacrum of Thomas Matthew disarms suspicion. The book is sent by Grafton to Cranmer. He reads, approves, rejoices. He would rather have the news of its being licensed than a thousand pounds (Chester, pp. 425-427). Application is then made both by Grafton and Cranmer to Cromwell. The king's license is granted, but the publisher wants more. Nothing less than a monopoly for five years will give him a fair margin of profit. Without this, he is sure to be undersold by piratical, inaccurate editions, badly printed, on inferior paper. Failing this, he trusts that the king will order one copy to be bought by every incumbent, and six by every abbey. If this was too much, the king might, at least, impose that obligation on all the popishly-inclined clergy. That will bring in something, besides the good it may possibly do them (Chester, p. 430). The application was, to some extent, successful. A copy was ordered, by royal proclamation, to be set up in every church, the cost being divided between the clergy and the parishioners. This was, therefore, the first Authorised Version. It is scarcely conceivable, however, that Henry could have read the book which he thus sanctioned, or known that it was substantially identical with what had been publicly stigmatised in his Acts of Parliament (*ut supra*). What had before given most offence had been the polemic character of Tyndal's annotations, and here were notes bolder, and more thorough still. Even the significant W. T. does not appear to have attracted notice.

[d] A careful reprint, though not a fac-simile, of Coverdale's version has been published by Bagster (1838).

[e] These ornamental initials are curiously selected. H. R. for the king's name, W. T. (at the end of the O T.) for William Tyndal, R. G. for Richard Grafton the printer.

(3.) What has been said of Tyndal's Version applies, of course, to this. There are, however, signs of a more advanced knowledge of Hebrew. All the technical words connected with the Psalms, Neginoth, Shiggaion, Sheminith, &c., are elaborately explained. Ps. ii. is printed as a dialogue. The names of the Hebrew letters are prefixed to the verses of Lamentations. Reference is made to the Chaldee Paraphrase (Job vi.), to Rabbi Abraham (Job xix.), to Kimchi (Ps. iii.). A like range of knowledge is shown in the N. T. Strabo is quoted to show that the Magi were not kings, Macrobius as testifying to Herod's ferocity (Matt. ii.), Erasmus's Paraphrase on Matt. xiii., xv. The popular identification of Mary Magdalene with "the woman that was a sinner" is discussed, and rejected (Luke x.). More noticeable even than in Tyndal is the boldness and fullness of the exegetical notes scattered throughout the book. Strong and earnest in asserting what he looked on as the central truths of the Gospel, there was in Rogers a Luther-like freedom in other things which has not appeared again in any authorised translation or popular commentary. He guards his readers against looking on the narrative of Job i. as literally true. He recognises a definite historical starting-point for Ps. xlv. ("The sons of Korah praise Solomon for the beauty, eloquence, power, and nobleness, both of himself and of his wife"), Ps. xxii. ("David declareth Christ's dejection ..... and all, under figure of himself"), and the Song of Solomon ("Solomon made this balade for himself and his wife, the daughter of Pharaoh, under the shadow of himself, figuring Christ," &c.). The chief duty of the Sabbath is "to minister the fodder of the Word to simple souls," to be "pitiful over the weariness of such neighbours as laboured sore all the week long." "When such occasions come as turn our rest to occupation and labour, then ought we to remember that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Jer. xvii.). He sees in the Prophets of the N. T. simply "expounders of Holy Scripture" (Acts xv.). To the man living in faith, "Peter's fishing after the resurrection, and all deeds of matrimony are pure spiritual;" to those who are not, "learning, doctrine, contemplation of high things, preaching, study of Scripture, founding of churches and abbeys, are works of the flesh" (*Pref. to Romans*).[f] "Neither is outward circumcision or outward baptism worth a pin of themselves, save that they put us in remembrance to keep the covenant" (1 Cor. vii.). "He that desireth honour, gaspeth after lucre. . . . castles, parks, lordships . . . . desireth not a work, much less a good work, and is nothing less than a bishop" (1 Tim. iii.). Ez. xxxiv. is said to be "against bishops and curates that despise the flock of Christ" The ἄγγελος ἐκκλησίας of Rev. ii. and iii. appears (as in Tyndal) as "the messenger of the congregation." Strong protests against Purgatory are found in notes to Ez. xviii. and 1 Cor. iii., and in the "Table of Principal Matters" it is significantly stated under the word Purgatory that "it is not in the Bible, but the purgation and remission of our sins is made us by the abundant mercy of God." The Preface to the Apocrypha explains the name, and distinctly asserts the inferiority of the books. No notes are added, and the translation is taken from Coverdale, as if it had not been worth while to give much labour to it.

(4.) A few points of detail remain to be noticed. In the order of the books of the N. T. Rogers follows Tyndal, agreeing with the A. V. as far as the Epistle to Philemon. This is followed by the Epistles of St. John, then that to the Hebrews, then those of St. Peter, St. James, and St. Jude. Woodcuts, not very freely introduced elsewhere are prefixed to every chapter in the Revelation. The introduction of the "Table" mentioned above gives Rogers a claim to be the Patriarch of Concordances, the "father" of all such as write in Dictionaries of the Bible. Reverence for the Hebrew text is shown by his striking out the three verses which the Vulgate has added to Ps. xiv. In a later edition, published at Paris, not by Rogers himself, but by Grafton, under Coverdale's superintendence, in 1539, the obnoxious Prologue and Prefaces were suppressed, and the notes systematically expurgated and toned down. The book was in advance of the age. Neither booksellers nor bishops were prepared to be responsible for it.

VI. TAVERNER (1539). (1.) The boldness of the pseudo-Matthew had, as has been said, frightened the ecclesiastical world from its propriety. Coverdale's Version was, however, too inaccurate to keep its ground. It was necessary to find another editor, and the printers applied to Richard Taverner. But little is known of his life. The fact that, though a layman, he had been chosen as one of the canons of the Cardinal's College at Oxford indicates a reputation for scholarship, and this is confirmed by the character of his translation. It professes, in the title-page, to be "newly recognised, with great diligence, after the most faithful exemplars." The editor acknowledges "the labours of others (*i. e.* Tyndal, Coverdale, and Matthew, though he does not name them) who have neither undiligently nor unlearnedly travelled," owns that the work is not one which can be done "absolutely" (*i. e.* completely) by one or two persons, but requires "a deeper conferring of many learned wittes together, and also a juster time, and longer leisure;" but the thing had to be done; he had been asked to do it. He had "used his talent" as he could.

(2.) In most respects this may be described as an expurgated edition of Matthew's. There is a Table of Principal Matters, and there are notes; but the notes are briefer, and less polemical. The passages quoted above are, *e. g.* omitted wholly or in part. The Epistles follow the same order as before.

VII. CRANMER. (1.) In the same year as Taverner's, and coming from the same press, appeared an English Bible, in a more stately folio printed with a more costly type, bearing a higher name than any previous edition. The title-page is an elaborate engraving, the spirit and power of which indicate the hand of Holbein. The king, seated on his throne, is giving the *Verbum Dei* to the bishops and doctors, and they distribute it to the people, while doctors and people are all joining in cries of "*Vivat Rex.*" It declares the book to be "truly translated after the verity of the Hebrew and Greek texts" by "divers excellent learned men, expert in the foresaid tongues." A preface, in April, 1540, with the initials T. C., implies the archbishop's sanction. In a later edition (Nov. 1540), his name appears on the titlepage, and the names of his coadjutors are given, Cuthbert (Tonstal) Bishop of Durham, and Nicholas (Heath) Bishop of Rochester

[f] The long preface to the Romans (seven folio pages) was substantially identical with that in Tyndal's edition of 1534.

but this does not exclude the possibility of others having been employed for the first edition.

(2.) Cranmer's Version presents, as might be expected, many points of interest. The prologue gives a more complete ideal of what a translation ought to be than we have as yet seen. Words not in the original are to be printed in a different type. They are added, even when "not wanted by the sense," to satisfy those who have "missed them" in previous translations, *i. e.* they represent the various readings of the Vulgate where it differs from the Hebrew. The sign * indicates diversity in the Chaldee and Hebrew. It had been intended to give all these, but it was found that this would have taken too much time and space, and the editors purposed therefore to print them in a little volume by themselves. The frequent hands (☞) in the margin, in like manner, show an intention to give notes at the end; but Matthew's Bible had made men cautious, and, as there had not been time for "the King's Council to settle them," they were omitted, and no help given to the reader beyond the marginal references. In absence of notes, the lay-reader is to submit himself to the "godly-learned in Christ Jesus." There is, as the title-page might lead us to expect, a greater display of Hebrew than in any previous version. The Books of the Pentateuch have their Hebrew names given, *Bereschith* (Genesis), *Velle Schemoth* (Exodus), and so on. 1 and 2 Chr. in like manner appear, as *Dibre Haiamim*. In the edition of 1541, many proper names in the O. T. appear in the fuller Hebrew form, as *e. g.* Amaziahu, Jeremiahu. In spite of this parade of learning, however, the edition of 1539 contains, perhaps, the most startling blunder that ever appeared under the sanction of an archbishop's name. The editors adopted the Preface which, in Matthew's Bible, had been prefixed to the Apocrypha. In that preface the common traditional explanation of the name was concisely given. They appear, however, to have shrunk from offending the conservative party in the Church by applying to the books in question so damnatory an epithet as Apocrypha. They looked out for a word more neutral and respectful, and found one that appeared in some MSS. of Jerome so applied, though in strictness it belonged to an entirely different set of books. They accordingly substituted that word, leaving the preface in all other respects as it was before, and the result is the somewhat ludicrous statement that the "books were called *Hagiographa*," because "they were read in secret and apart"!

(3.) A later edition in 1541 presents a few modifications worth noticing. It appears as "authorised" to be "used and frequented" in every church in the kingdom." The introduction, with all its elaborate promise of a future perfection disappears, and, in its place, there is a long preface by Cranmer, avoiding as much as possible all references to other translations, taking a safe Via Media tone, blaming those who "refuse to read," on the one hand, and "inordinate reading," on the other. This neutral character, so characteristic of Cranmer's policy, was doubtless that which enabled it to keep its ground during the changing moods of Henry's later years. It was reprinted again and again, and was the Authorised Version of the English Church till 1568 —the interval of Mary's reign excepted. From it, accordingly, were taken most, if not all, the portions of Scripture in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552. The Psalms, as a whole, the quotations from Scripture in the Homilies, the sentences in the Communion Services, and some phrases elsewhere,[g] still preserve the remembrance of it. The oscillating character of the book is shown in the use of "love" instead of "charity" in 1 Cor. xiii.; and "congregation" instead of "church" generally, after Tyndal; while in 1 Tim. iv. 14, we have the singular rendering, as if to gain the favour of his opponents, "with authority of priesthood." The plan of indicating doubtful texts by a smaller type was adhered to, and was applied, among other passages, to Ps. xiv. 5, 6, 7, and the more memorable text of 1 John v. 7. The translation of 1 Tim. iii. 16, "All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable," &c., anticipated a construction of that text which has sometimes been boasted of, and sometimes attacked, as an innovation. In this, however, Tyndal had led the way.

VIII. GENEVA.—(1.) The experimental translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew by Sir John Cheke into a purer English than before (Strype, *Life of Cheke*, vii. 3), had so little influence on the versions that followed that it hardly calls for more than a passing notice, as showing that scholars were as yet unsatisfied. The reaction under Mary gave a check to the whole work, as far as England was concerned; but the exiles who fled to Geneva entered on it with more vigour than ever. Cranmer's Version did not come up to their ideal. Its size made it too costly. There were no explanatory or dogmatic notes. It followed Coverdale too closely; and where it deviated, did so, in some instances, in a retrograde direction. The Genevan refugees—among them Whittingham, Goodman, Pullain, Sampson, and Coverdale himself—laboured "for two years or more, day and night." They entered on their "great and wonderful work" with much "fear and trembling." Their translation of the N. T. was "diligently revised by the most approved Greek examples" (MSS. or editions?) (*Preface*). The N. T., translated by Whittingham, was printed by Conrad Badius in 1557, the whole Bible in 1560.

(2.) Whatever may have been its faults, the Geneva Bible was unquestionably, for sixty years, the most popular of all versions. Largely imported in the early years of Elizabeth, it was printed in England in 1561, and a patent of monopoly given to James Bodleigh. This was transferred, in 1576, to Barker, in whose family the right of printing Bibles remained for upwards of a century. Not less than eighty editions, some of the whole Bible, were printed between 1558 and 1611. It kept its ground for some time even against the A. V., and gave way, as it were, slowly and under protest. The causes of this general acceptance are not difficult to ascertain. The volume was, in all its editions, cheaper and more portable—a small quarto, instead of the large folio of Cranmer's "Great Bible." It was the first Bible which laid aside the obsolescent black letter, and appeared in Roman type. It was the first which, following the Hebrew example, recognised the division into verses, so dear to the preachers or hearers of sermons. It was accompanied, in most of the editions after 1578, by a Bible Dictionary of considerable merit. The notes were often really helpful in dealing with the difficulties of Scripture, and were looked on as spiritual and evangelical. It was accordingly the version specially adopted by the great Puritan party through the whole reign of Elizabeth, and far into that of James. As might be expected, it was based on Tyndal's Version, often

[g] Such, *e. g.*, as "worthy fruits of penance."

returning to it where the intermediate renderings had had the character of a compromise.

(3.) Some peculiarities are worthy of special notice:—(1) It professes a desire to restore the "true writing" of many Hebrew names, and we meet accordingly with forms like Izhak (Isaac), Jaacob, and the like. (2) It omits the name of St. Paul from the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and, in a short Preface, leaves the authorship an open question. (3) It avows the principle of putting all words not in the original in Italics. (4) It presents, in a Calendar prefixed to the Bible, something like a declaration of war against the established order of the Church's lessons, commemorating Scripture facts, and the deaths of the great Reformers, but ignoring saints' days altogether. (5) It was the first English Bible which entirely omitted the Apocrypha. (6) The notes were characteristically Swiss, not only in their theology, but in their politics. They made allegiance to kings dependent upon the soundness of their faith, and in one instance (note on 2 Chr. xv. 16) at least seemed, to the easily startled James I., to favour tyrannicide.[h]

(4.) The circumstances of the early introduction of the Geneva Version are worth mentioning, if only as showing in how different a spirit the great fathers of the English Reformation, the most conservative of Anglican theologians, acted from that which has too often animated their successors. Men talk now of different translations and various readings as likely to undermine the faith of the people. When application was made to Archbishop Parker, in 1565, to support Bodleigh's application for a licence to reprint the Geneva Version in 12mo., he wrote to Cecil in its favour. He was at the time looking forward to the work he afterwards accomplished, of "one other special Bible for the Churches, to be set forth as convenient time and leisure should permit;" but in the mean time it would "nothing hinder, but rather doo much good, to have diversity of translations and readings" (Strype, *Life of Parker*, iii. 6).[i] In many of the later reprints of this edition the N. T. purports to be based upon Beza's Latin Version; and the notes are said to be taken from Joac. Camer, P. Leseler, Villerius, and Fr. Junius.

IX. The Bishops' Bible.—(1.) The facts just stated will account for the wish of Archbishop Parker, in spite of his liberal tolerance, to bring out another version which might establish its claims against that of Geneva. Great preparations were made. The correspondence of Parker with his Suffragans presents some points of interest, as showing how little agreement there was as to the true theory of a translation. Thus while Sandys, Bishop of Worcester, finds fault with the "common translation" (Geneva?), as "following Munster too much," and so "swerving much from the Hebrew," Guest, Bishop of St. David's, who took the Psalms, acted on the principle of translating them so as to agree with the N. T. quotations, "for the avoiding of offence;" and Cox, Bishop of Ely, while laying down the sensible rule that "inkhorn terms were to be avoided," also went on to add "that the usual terms were to be retained so far forth as the Hebrew will well bear" (Strype, *Parker*, iii. 6). The principle of pious frauds, of distorting the truth for the sake of edification, has perhaps often been acted on by other translators. It has not often been so explicitly avowed as in the first of these suggestions.

(2.) The bishops thus consulted, eight in number, together with some deans and professors, brought out the fruit of their labours in a magnificent folio (1568 and 1572). Everything had been done to make it attractive. A long erudite preface vindicated the right of the people to read the Scriptures, and (quoting the authority of Bishop Fisher) admitted the position which later divines have often been slow to admit, that "there be yet in the Gospel many dark places which, without all doubt, to the posterity shall be made much more open." Wood-engravings of a much higher character than those of the Geneva Bible were scattered profusely, especially in Genesis. Three portraits of the Queen, the Earl of Leicester, and Lord Burleigh, beautiful specimens of copperplate engraving, appeared on the titlepages of the several parts.[k] A map of Palestine was given, with degrees of latitude and longitude, in the edition of 1572. A most elaborate series of genealogical tables, prepared by Hugh Broughton, the great Rabbi of the age (of whom more hereafter), but ostensibly by Speed the antiquary (Broughton's name being in disfavour with the bishops), was prefixed (Strype, *Parker*, iv. 20; Lightfoot, *Life of Broughton*). In some points it followed previous translations, and was avowedly based on Cranmer's. "A new edition was necessary." "This had led some well-disposed men to recognize it again, not as condemning the former translation, which has been followed mostly of any other translation, excepting the original text" (Pref. of 1572). Cranmer's Prologue was reprinted. The Geneva division into verses was adopted throughout.

(3.) Some peculiarities, however, appear for the first and last time. (1) The Books of the Bible are classified as legal, historical, sapiential, and prophetic. This was easy enough for the O. T., but the application of the same idea to the N. T. produced some rather curious combinations. The Gospels, the Catholic Epistles, and those to Titus, Philemon, and the Hebrews, are grouped together as legal, St. Paul's other Epistles as sapiential; the Acts appear as the one historical, the Revelation as the one prophetic Book. (2) It is the only Bible in which many passages, sometimes nearly a whole chapter, have been marked for the express purpose of being omitted when the chapters were read in the public service of the Church. (3) One edition contained the older version of the Psalms from Matthew's Bible, in parallel columns with that now issued, a true and practical acknowledgment of the benefit of a diversity of translations. (4) The initials of the translators were attached to the Books which they had severally undertaken. The work was done on the plan

[h] The note "Herein he showed that he lacked zeal, for she ought to have died," was probably one which Scotch fanatics had handled in connexion with the name of James's mother.

[i] The Geneva Version, as published by Barker, is that popularly known as the *Breeches* Bible, from its rendering of Gen. iii. 7. It had however been preceded in this by Wycliffe a.

[k] The fitness of these illustrations is open to question. Others still more incongruous found their way into the text of the edition of 1572, and the feelings of the Puritans were shocked by seeing a woodcut of Neptune in the initial letters of Jonah, Micah, and Nahum, while that of the Ep. to the Hebrews went so far as to give Leda and the Swan. There must, to say the least, have been very slovenly editorship to permit this

of limited, not joint liability. (5) Here, as in the Geneva, there is the attempt to give the Hebrew proper names more accurately, as, *e. g.*, in Heva, Isahac, Uziahu, &c.

(4.) Of all the English versions, the Bishop's Bible had probably the least success. It did not command the respect of scholars, and its size and cost were far from meeting the wants of the people. Its circulation appears to have been practically limited to the churches which were ordered to be supplied with it. It had however, at any rate, the right to boast of some good Hebrew scholars among the translators. One of them, Bishop Alley, had written a Hebrew Grammar; and though vehemently attacked by Broughton (Townley, *Literary History of the Bible*, iii. 190), it was defended as vigorously by Fulke, and, together with the A. V., received from Selden the praise of being "the best translation in the world" (*Table Talk*, *Works*, iii. 2009).

X. RHEIMS AND DOUAY.—(1.) The successive changes in the Protestant versions of the Scriptures were, as might be expected, matter of triumph to the controversialists of the Latin Church. Some saw in it an argument against any translation of Scripture into the spoken language of the people. Others pointed derisively to the want of unity which these changes displayed. There were some, however, who took the line which Sir T. More and Gardiner had taken under Henry VIII. They did not object to the principle of an English translation. They only charged all the versions hitherto made with being false, corrupt, heretical. To this there was the ready retort, that they had done nothing: that their bishops in the reign of Henry had promised, but had not performed. It was felt to be necessary that they should take some steps which might enable them to turn the edge of this reproach, and the English refugees who were settled at Rheims—Martin, Allen (afterwards cardinal), and Bristow—undertook the work. Gregory Martin, who had graduated at Cambridge, had signalized himself by an attack on the existing versions,[m] and had been answered in an elaborate treatise by Fulke, Master of Catherine Hall, Cambridge (*A Defence of the Sincere and True Translation*, &c.). The charges are mostly of the same kind as those brought by Sir T. More against Tyndal. "The old time-honoured words were discarded. The authority of the LXX. and Vulgate was set at nought when the translator's view of the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek differed from what he found in them." The new model translation was to avoid these faults. It was to command the respect at once of priests and people. After an incubation of some years it was published at Rheims in 1582. Though Martin was competent to translate from the Greek, it professed to be based on "the authentic text of the Vulgate." Notes were added, as strongly dogmatic as those of the Geneva Bible, and often keenly controversial. The work of translation was completed somewhat later by the publication of the O. T. at Douay in 1609. The language was precisely what might have been expected from men who adopted Gardiner's ideal of what a translation ought to be. At every page we stumble on "strange ink-horn words," which never had been English, and never could be, such, *e. g.*, as "the Pasche and the Azymes" (Mark xvi. 1), "the arch-synagogue" (Mark v. 35), "in prepuce" (Rom. iv. 9), "consonant with the fallacie of sin" (Heb. iii. 13), "a greater hoste" (Heb. xi. 4), "this is the annuntiation" (1 John v. 5), "pre-ordinate" (Acts xiii. 48), "the justifications of our Lord" (Luke i. 6), "what is to me and thee" (John ii. 4), "longanimity" (Rom. ii. 4), "purge the old leaven that you may be a new paste, as you are azymes" (1 Cor. iv. 7), "you are evacuated from Christ" (Gal. v. 4), and so on.[n]

(2.) A style such as this had, as might be expected, but few admirers. Among those few, however, we find one great name. Bacon, who leaves the great work of the reign of James unnoticed, and quotes almost uniformly from the Vulgate, goes out of his way to praise the Rhemish Version for having restored "charity" to the place from which Tyndal had expelled it, in 1 Cor. xiii. (*Of the Pacification of the Church*).

XI. AUTHORISED VERSION.—(1.) The position of the English Church in relation to the versions in use at the commencement of the reign of James was hardly satisfactory. The Bishops' Bible was sanctioned by authority. That of Geneva had the strongest hold on the affections of the people. Scholars, Hebrew scholars in particular, found grave fault with both. Hugh Broughton, who spoke Hebrew as if it had been his mother-tongue, denounced the former as being full of "traps and pitfalls," "overthrowing all religion," and proposed a new revision to be effected by an English Septuagint (72), with power to consult gardeners, artists, and the like, about the words connected with their several callings, and bound to submit their work to "one qualified for difficulties." This ultimate referee was, of course, to be himself (Strype, *Whitgift*, iv. 19, 23). Unhappily, neither his temper nor his manners were such as to win favour for this suggestion. Whitgift disliked him, worried him, drove him into exile. His feeling was, however, shared by others; and among the demands of the Puritan representatives at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604 (Dr. Reinolds being the spokesman), was one for a new, or, at least, a revised translation. The special objections which they urged were neither numerous (three passages only—Ps. cv. 28, cvi. 30, Gal. iv. 25. were referred to) nor important, and we must conclude either that this part of their case had not been carefully got up, or that the bullying to which they were exposed had had the desired effect of throwing them into some confusion. The bishops treated the difficulties which they did raise with supercilious scorn. They were "trivial, old, and often answered." Bancroft raised the cry of alarm which a timid Conservatism has so often raised since. "If every man's humour were to be followed, there would be no end of translating" (Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 188). Cranmer's words seemed likely to be fulfilled again. Had it been left to the bishops, we might have waited for the A.V. "till the day after doomsday." Even when the work was done, and the translators acknowledged that the Hampton Court Conference had been the starting-point of it, they could not

[m] "A discovery of the manifold corruptions of Holy Scriptures by the Heretikes of our days, specially of the English sectaries." The language of this and other like books was, as might be expected, very abusive. The Bible, in Protestant translations, was "not God's word, but the devil's."

[n] Even Roman Catholic divines have felt the superiority of the A. V., and Challoner, in his editions of the N. T. in 1748, and the Bible, 1763, often follows it in preference to the Rheims and Douay translations.

resist the temptation of a fling at their opponents. The objections to the Bishops' Bible had, they said, been nothing more than a shift to justify the refusal of the Puritans to subscribe to the Communion Book (*Preface* to A.V.). But the king disliked the politics of the Geneva Bible. Either repeating what he had heard from others, or exercising his own judgment, he declared that there was as yet no good translation, and that that was the worst of all. Nothing, however, was settled at the Conference beyond the hope thus held out.

(2.) But the king was not forgetful of what he thought likely to be the glory of his reign. The work of organising and superintending the arrangements for a new translation was one specially congenial to him, and in 1606 the task was accordingly commenced. The selection of the fifty-four scholars[o] to whom it was entrusted, seems, on the whole, to have been a wise and fair one. Andrews, Saravia, Overal, Montague, and Barlow, represented the "higher" party in the Church; Reinolds, Chaderton, and Lively that of the Puritans.[p] Scholarship unconnected with party was represented by Henry Savile and John Boys. One name is indeed conspicuous by its absence. The greatest Hebrew scholar of the age, the man who had, in a letter to Cecil (1595), urged this very plan of a joint translation, who had already translated several books of the O.T. (Job, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Lamentations) was ignominiously excluded. This may have been, in part, owing to the dislike with which Whitgift and Bancroft had all along regarded him. But in part, also, it was owing to Broughton's own character. An unmanageable temper showing itself in violent language, and the habit of stigmatizing those who differed from him, even on such questions as those connected with names and dates, as heretical and atheistic, must have made him thoroughly impracticable; one of the men whose presence throws a Committee or Conference into chaos.[q]

(3.) What reward other than that of their own consciences and the judgment of posterity were the men thus chosen to expect for their long and laborious task? The king was not disposed to pay them out of his state revenue. Gold and silver were not always plentiful in the household of the English Solomon, and from him they received nothing (Heywood, *State of Auth. Bibl. Revision*). There remained, however, an ingenious form of liberality, which had the merit of being inexpensive. A king's letter was sent to the archbishops and bishops, to be transmitted by them to their chapters, commending all the translators to their favourable notice. They were exhorted to contribute in all 1000 marks, and the king was to be informed of each man's liberality. If any livings in their gift, or in the gift of private persons, became vacant, the king was to be informed of it, that he might nominate some of the translators to the vacant preferment. Heads of colleges, in like manner, were enjoined to give free board and lodging to such divines as were summoned from the country to labour in the great work (Strype, *Whitgift*, iv.). That the king might take his place as the director of the whole, a copy of fifteen instructions was sent to each translator, and apparently circulated freely in both Universities.

(4.) The instructions thus given will be found in Fuller (*l. c.*), and with a more accurate text in Burnet (*Reform. Records*). It will not be necessary to give them here in full; but it will be interesting to note the bearing of each clause upon the work in hand, and its relation to previous versions. (1) The Bishops' Bible was to be followed, and as little altered as the original will permit. This was intended probably to quiet the alarm of those who saw, in the proposal of a new version, a condemnation of that already existing. (2) The names of prophets and others were to be retained, as nearly as may be as they are vulgarly used. This was to guard against forms like Izhak, Jeremiahu, &c., which had been introduced in some versions, and which some Hebrew scholars were willing to introduce more copiously. To it we owe probably the forms Jeremy, Elias, Osee, Core, in the N.T. (3) The old ecclesiastical words to be kept, as the word Church not to be translated Congregation. The rule was apparently given for the sake of this special application. "Charity," in 1 Cor. xiii. was probably also due to it. The earlier versions, it will be remembered, had gone on the opposite principle. (4) When any word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most eminent fathers, being agreeable to the propriety of the place and the analogy of faith. This, like the former, tends to confound the functions of the preacher and the translator, and substitutes ecclesiastical tradition for philological accuracy. (5) The division of the chapters to be altered either not at all, or as little as possible. Here, again, convenience was more in view than truth and accuracy, and the result is that divisions are perpetuated which are manifestly arbitrary and misleading. (6) No marginal notes to be affixed but only for the explanation of Hebrew and Greek words. This was obviously directed against the Geneva notes, as the special objects of the king's aversion. Practically, however, in whatever feeling it originated, we may be thankful that the A.V. came out as it did, without note or comment. The open Bible was placed in the hands of all readers. The work of interpretation was left free. Had an opposite course been adopted, we might have had the tremendous evil of a whole body of Exegesis imposed upon the Church by authority, reflecting the Calvinism of the Synod of Dort, the absolutism of James, the high-flying prelacy of Bancroft. (7) Such quotations of places to be marginally set down as may serve for fit reference of one Scripture to another. The principle that Scripture is its own best interpreter was thus recognised, but practically the marginal references of the A.V. of 1611 were somewhat scanty, most of those now printed having been added in later editions. (8 and 9) State plan of translation.

---

[o] Only forty-seven names appear in the king's list (Burnet, *Reform. Records*). Seven may have died, or declined to act; or it may have been intended that there should be a final Committee of Revision. A full list is given by Fuller (*Ch. Hist.* x.); and is reproduced, with biographical particulars, by Todd and Anderson.

[p] This side was, however, weakened by the death of Reinolds and Lively during the progress of the work. The loss of the latter, Hebrew professor at Cambridge for thirty years, was every way deplorable.

[q] It deserves notice that Broughton is the only English translator who has adopted *the Eternal* as the equivalent for Jehovah, as in the French version. To him also, perhaps, more than to any other divine, we owe the true interpretation of the Descent into Hell.

Each company of translators is to take its own books; each person to bring his own corrections. The company to discuss them, and having finished their work, to send it on to another company, and so on. (10) Provides for differences of opinion between two companies by referring them to a general meeting. (11) Gives power, in cases of difficulty, to consult any scholars. (12) Invites suggestions from any quarter. (13) Names the directors of the work: Andrews, Dean of Westminster; Barlow, Dean of Chester; and the Regius Professors of Hebrew and Greek at both Universities. (14) Names translations to be followed when they agree more with the original than the Bishops' Bible, *sc.* Tyndal's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, Whitchurch's, (Cranmer's), and Geneva. (15) Authorises Universities to appoint three or four overseers of the work.

(5.) It is not known that any of the correspondence connected with this work, or any minute of the meetings for conference is still extant. Nothing is more striking than the silence with which the version that was to be the inheritance of the English people for at least two centuries and a half was ushered into the world. Here and there we get glimpses of scholars coming from their country livings to their old college haunts to work diligently at the task assigned them (Peck, *Desiderata Curiosa*, ii. 87). We see the meetings of translators, one man reading the chapter which he has been at work on, while the others listen, with the original, or Latin, or German, or Italian, or Spanish versions in their hands (Selden, *Table Talk*). We may represent to ourselves the differences of opinion, settled by the casting vote of the "odd man," or by the strong overbearing temper of a man like Bancroft,[r] the minority comforting themselves with the thought that it was no new thing for the truth to be outvoted (Gell, *Essay towards Amendment of last Eng. transl. of Bible*, p. 321).[s] Dogmatic interests were in some cases allowed to bias the translation, and the Calvinism of one party, the prelatic views of another, were both represented at the expense of accuracy (Gell, *l. c.*).[t]

(6.) For three years the work went on, the separate companies comparing notes as directed. When the work drew towards its completion it was necessary to place it under the care of a select few. Two from each of the three groups were accordingly selected, and the six met in London, to superintend the publication. Now, for the first time, we find any more definite remuneration than the shadowy promise held out in the king's letter, of a share in the 1000 marks which Deans and Chapters would not contribute. The matter had now reached its business stage, and the Company of Stationers thought it expedient to give the six editors thirty pounds each, in weekly payments, for their nine months' labour. The final correction, and the task of writing the arguments of the several books, was given to Bilson, bishop of Winchester, and Dr. Miles Smith, the latter of whom also wrote the Dedication and the Preface. Of these two documents the first is unfortunately familiar enough to us, and is chiefly conspicuous for its servile adulation.[u] James I. is "that sanctified person," "enriched with singular and extraordinary graces," that had appeared "as the sun in his strength." To him they appeal against the judgment of those whom they describe, in somewhat peevish accents, as "Popish persons or self-conceited brethren." The Preface to the Reader is more interesting, as throwing light upon the principles on which the translators acted. They "never thought that they should need to make a new translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one." "Their endeavour was to make a good one better, or out of many good ones one principal good one." They claim credit for steering a middle course between the Puritans who "left the old ecclesiastical words," and the obscurity of the Papists "retaining foreign words of purpose to darken the sense." They vindicate the practice, in which they indulge very freely, of translating one word in the original by many English words, partly on the intelligible ground that it is not always possible to find one word that will express all the meanings of the Greek or Hebrew, partly on the somewhat childish plea that it would be unfair to choose some words for the high honour of being the channels of God's truth, and to pass over others as unworthy.

(7.) The version thus published did not all at once supersede those already in possession. The fact that five editions were published in three years, shows that there was a good demand. But the Bishops' Bible probably remained in many Churches, (Andrews takes his texts from it in preaching before the king as late as 1621), and the popularity of the Geneva Version is shown by not less than thirteen reprints, in whole or in part, between 1611 and 1617. It is not easy to ascertain the impression which the A. V. made at the time of its appearance. Probably, as in most like cases, it was far less for good or evil than friends or foes expected. The Puritans, and the religious portion of the middle classes generally, missed the notes of the Geneva book (Fuller, *Ch. Hist.* x. 50, 51). The Romanists spoke as usual, of the unsettling effect of these frequent changes, and of the marginal readings as leaving men in doubt what was the truth of Scripture.[x] One frantic cry

[r] Miles Smith, himself a translator and the writer of the Preface, complained of Bancroft that there was no contradicting him (Beard, *Revised Eng. Bible*).

[s] Gell's evidence, as having been chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, carries some weight with it. His works are to be found in the Brit. Mus. Library, Mr. Scrivener's statement to the contrary being apparently an oversight (*Supplement to A. V. of N. T.* p. 101).

[t] The following passages are those commonly referred to in support of this charge: (1) The rendering "such as should be saved," in Acts ii. 47. (2) The insertion of the words "any man" in Heb. x. 38 ("the just shall live by faith, but if *any man* draw back," &c.), to avoid an inference unfavourable to the doctrine of Final Perseverance. (3) The use of "bishopric," in Acts i. 20, of "oversight," in 1 Pet. v. 2, of "bishop," in 1 Tim. iii. 1, &c. and "overseers," in Acts xx. 28, in order to avoid the identification of Bishops and Elders. (4) The chapter-heading of Ps. cxlix. in 1611 (since altered), "The Prophet exhorteth to praise God for that power which he hath given the Church to bind the consciences of men." Blunt (*Duties of a Parish Priest*, Lect. II.) appears, in this question, on the side of the prosecution; Trench (*On the A. V of the N. T.* c. x.) on that of the defence. The charge of an undue bias against Rome in 1 Cor. xi. 27, Gal. v. 6, Heb. xiii. 4, is one on which an acquittal may be pronounced with little or no hesitation.

[u] It may be at least pleaded, in mitigation, that the flattery of the translators is outdone by that of Francis Bacon.

[x] Whitaker's answer, by anticipation, to the charge is worth quoting: "No inconvenience will follow if interpretations or versions of Scripture, when they have become obsolete, or ceased to be intelligible, may be afterwards changed or corrected" (*Dissert. on Script.* p. 232, Parker Soc. ed.). The wiser divines of the English Church had not then learnt to raise the cry of finality.

was heard from Hugh Broughton the rejected (*Works*, p. 661), who "would rather be torn in pieces by wild horses than impose such a version on the poor churches of England." Selden, a few years later, gives a calmer and more favourable judgment. It is "the best of all translations as giving the true sense of the original." This, however, is qualified by the remark that "no book in the world is translated as the Bible is, word for word, with no regard to the difference of idioms. This is well enough so long as scholars have to do with it, but when it comes among the common people, Lord! what gear do they make of it!" (*Table-Talk*). The feeling of which this was the expression, led even in the midst of the agitations of the Commonwealth to proposals for another revision, which, after being brought forward in the Grand Committee of Religion in the House of Commons in Jan. 1656, was referred to a sub-committee, acting under Whitelocke, with power to consult divines and report. Conferences were accordingly held frequently at Whitelocke's house, at which we find, mingled with less illustrious names, those of Walton and Cudworth. Nothing, however, came of it (Whitelocke, *Memorials*, p. 564; Collier, *Ch. Hist.* ii. 9). No report was ever made, and with the Restoration the tide of conservative feeling, in this as in other things, checked all plans of further alteration. Many had ceased to care for the Bible at all. Those who did care were content with the Bible as it was. Only here and there was a voice raised, like R. Gell's (*ut supra*), declaring that it had defects, that it bore in some things the stamp of the dogmatism of a party (p. 321).

(8.) The highest testimony of this period is that of Walton. From the editor of the Polyglott, the few words "inter omnes eminet" meant a good deal (*Pref.*). With the reign of Anne the tide of glowing panegyric set in. It would be easy to put together a long *catena* of praises stretching from that time to the present. With many, of course, this has been only the routine repetition of a traditional boast. "Our unrivalled Translation," and "our incomparable Liturgy," have been, equally, phrases of course. But there have been witnesses of a far higher weight. In proportion as the English of the 18th century was infected with a Latinised or Gallicised style, did those who had a purer taste look with reverence to the strength and purity of a better time as represented in the A. V. Thus Addison dwells on its ennobling the coldness of modern languages with the glowing phrases of Hebrew (*Spectator*, No. 405), and Swift confesses that "the translators of the Bible were masters of an English style far fitter for that work than any we see in our present writings" (*Letter to Lord Oxford*). Each half-century has naturally added to the prestige of these merits. The language of the A. V. has intertwined itself with the controversies, the devotion, the literature of the English people. It has gone, wherever they have gone, over the face of the whole earth. The most solemn and tender of individual memories are, for the most part, associated with it. Men leaving the Church of England for the Church of Rome turn regretfully with a yearning look at that noble "well of English undefiled," which they are about to exchange for the uncouth monstrosities of Rheims and Douay. In this case too, as in so many others, the position of the A. V. has been strengthened, less by the skill of its defenders than by the weakness of its assailants. While from time to time, scholars and divines (Lowth, Newcome, Waterland, Trench, Ellicott), have admitted the necessity of a revision, those who have attacked the present version and produced new ones have been, for the most part, men of narrow knowledge and defective taste (Purver, and Harwood, and Bellamy, and Conquest), just able to pick out a few obvious faults, and showing their competence for the task by entering on the work of translating or revising the whole Bible single-handed. One memorable exception must not, however, be passed over. Hallam (*Lit. of Europe*, iii. ch. 2, *ad fin.*) records a brief but emphatic protest against the "enthusiastic praise" which has been lavished on this translation. "It may, in the eyes of many, be a better English, but it is not the English of Daniel, or Raleigh, or Bacon, . . . It abounds, in fact, especially in the O. T., with obsolete phraseology, and with single words long since abandoned, or retained only in provincial use." The statement may, it is believed, be accepted as an encomium. If it had been the English of the men of letters of James's reign, would it have retained as it has done, for two centuries and a half, its hold on the mind, the memory, the affections of the English people?

XII. SCHEMES FOR A REVISION.—(1.) A notice of the attempts which have been made at various times to bring about a revision of the A. V. though necessarily brief and imperfect, may not be without its use for future labourers. The first half of the 18th century was not favourable for such a work. An almost solitary *Essay for a New Translation* by H. R. (Ross), 1702, attracted little or no notice (Todd, *Life of Walton*, i. 134). A Greek Testament with an English translation, singularly vulgar and offensive, was published in 1729, of which extracts are given by Lewis (*Hist. of Transl.* ch. v.). With the slight revival of learning among the scholars of the latter half of that period the subject was again mooted. Lowth in a Visitation Sermon (1758), and Secker in a Latin Speech intended for Convocation (1761), recommended it. Matt. Pilkington in his *Remarks* (1759), and Dr. Thomas Brett, in an *Essay on Ancient Versions of the Bible* (1760), dwelt on the importance of consulting them with reference to the O. T. as well as the N. T., with a view to a more accurate text than that of the Masoretic Hebrew, the former insisting also on the obsolete words which are scattered in the A. V., and giving a useful Alphabetic list of them. A folio *New and literal translation* of the whole Bible by Anthony Purver, a Quaker (1764), was a more ambitious attempt. He dwells at some length on the "obsolete, uncouth, clownish" expressions which disfigure the A. V. He includes in his list such words as "joyous," "solace," "damsel," "day-spring," "bereaved," "marvels," "bondmen." He substitutes "he hearkened to what he said," for "he hearkened to his voice;" "eat victuals," for "eat bread" (Gen. iii. 19); "was in favour with," for "found grace in the eyes of;" "was angry," for "his wrath was kindled." In spite of this defective taste, however, the work has considerable merit, is based upon a careful study of the original, and of many of the best commentators, and may be contrasted favourably with most of the single-handed translations that have followed. It was, at any rate, far above the depth of degradation and folly which was reached in Harwood's *Literal Translation of the N. T.* "with freedom, spirit, and elegance" (1768). Here again, a few samples are enough to show the character of the whole. "The young lady is not

dead" (Mark v. 39). "A gentleman of splendid family and opulent fortune had two sons" (Luke xv. 11). "The clergyman said, You have given him the only right and proper answer" (Mark xii. 32). "We shall not pay the common debt of nature, but by a soft transition, &c." (1 Cor. xv. 51).

(2.) Biblical revision was happily not left entirely in such hands as these. A translation by Worsley "according to the present idiom of the English tongue" (1770) was, at least, less offensive. Durell (*Preface to Job*), Lowth (*Preface to Isaiah*), Blayney (*Pref. to Jeremiah*, 1784), were all strongly in favour of a new, or revised translation. Durell dwells most on the arbitrary additions and omissions in the A. V. of Job, on the total absence in some cases, of any intelligible meaning. Lowth speaks chiefly of the faulty state of the text of the O. T., and urges a correction of it, partly from various readings, partly from ancient versions, partly from conjecture. Each of the three contributed, in the best way, to the work which they had little expectation of seeing accomplished, by labouring steadily at a single book and committing it to the judgment of the Church.[y] Kennicott's labours in collecting MSS. of the O. T. issued in his *State of the present Hebrew Text* (1753, 59), and excited expectations that there might before long be something like a basis for a new version in a restored original.

A more ambitious scheme was started by the Roman Catholic Dr. Geddes, in his *Prospectus for a New Translation* (1786). His remarks on the history of English translations, his candid acknowledgment of the excellences of the A. V., and especially of Tyndal's work as pervading it, his critical notes on the true principles of translation, on the A. V. as falling short of them, may still be read with interest. He too like Lowth finds fault with the superstitious adherence to the Masoretic text, with the undue deference to lexicons, and disregard of versions shown by our translators. The proposal was well received by many Biblical scholars, Lowth, Kennicott, and Barrington, being foremost among its patrons. The work was issued in parts, according to the terms of the Prospectus, but did not get further than 2 Chron. in 1792, when the death of the translator put a stop to it. Partly perhaps owing to its incompleteness, but still more from the extreme boldness of a Preface, anticipating the conclusions of a later criticism,[z] Dr. Geddes's translation fell rapidly into disfavour. A Sermon by White (famous for his Bampton Lectures) in 1779, and two Pamphlets by J. A. Symonds, Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, the first on the Gospels and the Acts, in 1789; the second on the Epistles, in 1794, though attacked in an *Apology for the Liturgy and Church of England* (1795), helped to keep the discussion from oblivion.

(3.) The revision of the A. V., like many other salutary reforms, was hindered by the French Revolution. In 1792, Archbishop Newcome had published an elaborate defence of such a scheme, citing a host of authorities (Doddridge, Wesley, Campbell, in addition to those already mentioned), and taking the same line as Lowth. Revised translations of the N. T. were published by Wakefield in 1795, by Newcome himself in 1796, by Scarlett in 1798. Campbell's version of the Gospels appeared in 1788, that of the Epistles by Macknight in 1795. But in 1796 the note of alarm was sounded. A feeble pamphlet by George Burges (*Letter to the Lord Bishop of Ely*), took the ground that "the present period was unfit," and from that time, Conservatism, pure and simple, was in the ascendant. To suggest that the A. V. might be inaccurate, was almost as bad as holding "French principles." There is a long interval before the question again comes into anything like prominence, and then there is a new school of critics in the *Quarterly Review* and elsewhere, ready to do battle vigorously for things as they are. The opening of the next campaign was an article in the *Classical Journal* (No. 36), by Dr. John Bellamy, proposing a new translation, followed soon afterwards by its publication under the patronage of the Prince Regent (1818). The work was poor and unsatisfactory enough, and a tremendous battery was opened upon it in the *Quarterly Review* (Nos. 37 and 38), as afterwards (No. 46) upon an unhappy critic, Sir J. B. Burges, who came forward with a Pamphlet in its defence (*Reasons in favour of a New Translation*, 1819). The rash assertion of both Bellamy and Burges that the A. V. had been made almost entirely from the LXX. and Vulgate, and a general deficiency in all accurate scholarship, made them easy victims. The personal element of this controversy may well be passed over, but three less ephemeral works issued from it, which any future labourer in the same field will find worth consulting. Whitaker's *Historical and Critical Inquiry*, was chiefly an able exposure of the exaggerated statement just mentioned. H. J. Todd, in his *Vindication of the Authorised Translation* (1819), entered more fully than any previous writer had done into the history of the A. V., and gives many facts as to the lives and qualifications of the translators not easily to be met with elsewhere.[a] The most masterly, however, of the manifestoes against all change, was a pamphlet (*Remarks on the Critical Principles*, &c., Oxford, 1820), published anonymously, but known to have been written by Archbishop Laurence. The strength of the argument lies chiefly in a skilful display of all the difficulties of the work, the impossibility of any satisfactory restoration of the Hebrew of the O. T., or any settlement of the Greek of the N. T., the expediency therefore of adhering to a *Textus receptus* in both. The argument may not be decisive, but the scholarship and acuteness brought to bear on it make the book instructive, and any one entering on the work of a translator ought at least to read it, that he may know what difficulties he has to face.[b]

(4.) A correspondence between Herbert Marsh, bishop of Peterborough, and the Rev. H. Walter, in 1828, is the next link in the chain. Marsh had spoken (*Lectures on Biblical Criticism*, p. 295) with some contempt of the A. V. as based on Tyndal's, Tyndal's on Luther's, and Luther's on

---

[y] Whatever be the demerits of Lowth's Isaiah, it deserves something better than the sarcasm of Hurd, that "its only use was to shew how little was to be expected from any new translation." As the Boswell of Warburton, Hurd could not resist the temptation of attacking an old antagonist of his master's.

[z] "I will not pretend to say that it [the history of the Pentateuch] is entirely unmixed with the leaven of the heroic ages. Let the father of Hebrew be tried by the same rules of criticism as the father of Greek history."

[a] A short epitome of this portion of Todd's book has been published by the S. P. C. K. as a tract, and will be found useful.

[b] About this period also (1819) a new edition of Newcome's version was published by Belsham and other Unitarian ministers, and, like Bellamy's attempt on the O. T., had the effect of stiffening the resistance of the great body of the clergy to all proposals for a revision.

Munster's Lexicon, which was itself based on the Vulgate. There was, therefore, on this view, no real translation from the Hebrew in any one of these. Substantially this was what Bellamy had said before, but Marsh was a man of a different calibre, and made out a stronger case. Walter, in his answer, proves what is plain enough, that Tyndal knew some Hebrew, and that Luther in some instances followed Rabbinical authority and not the Vulgate; but the evidence hardly goes to the extent of showing that Tyndal's version of the O. T. was entirely independent of Luther's, or Luther's of the Latin.

(5.) The last five-and-twenty years have seen the question of a revision from time to time gaining fresh prominence. If men of second-rate power have sometimes thrown it back by meddling with it in wrong ways, others, able scholars and sound theologians, have admitted its necessity and helped it forward by their work. Dr. Conquest's Bible, with "20,000 emendations" (1841), has not commanded the respect of critics, and is almost self-condemned by the silly ostentation of its title. The motions which have from time to time been made in the House of Commons by Mr. Heywood, have borne little fruit beyond the display of feeble Liberalism and yet feebler Conservatism by which such debates are, for the most part, characterised; nor have the discussions in Convocation, though opened by a scholar of high repute (Professor Selwyn), been much more productive. Dr. Beard's, *A revised English Bible the Want of the Church* (1857), though tending to overstate the defects of the A. V., is yet valuable as containing much information, and representing the opinions of the more learned Nonconformists. Far more important, every way, both as virtually an authority in favour of revision, and as contributing largely to it, are Professor Scholefield's *Hints for an Improved Translation of the N. T.* (1832). In his second edition, indeed, he disclaims any wish for a new translation, but the principle which he lays down clearly and truly in his preface, that if there is "any adventitious difficulty resulting from a defective translation, then it is at the same time an act of charity and of duty to clear away the difficulty as much as possible," leads legitimately to at least a revision; and this conclusion Mr. Selwyn in the last edition of the *Hints* (1857), has deliberately adopted. To Bishop Ellicott also belongs the credit of having spoken at once boldly and wisely on this matter. Putting the question whether it would be right to join those who oppose all revision, his answer is, "God forbid. . . . It is in vain to cheat our own souls with the thought that these errors (in A. V.) are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there *are* misconceptions, there *are* obscurities . . . . and that man who, after being in any degree satisfied of this, permits himself to lean to the counsels of a timid or popular obstructiveness, or who, intellectually unable to test the truth of these allegations, nevertheless permits himself to denounce or deny them, will . . . have to sustain the tremendous charge of having dealt deceitfully with the inviolable word of God" (*Pref. to Pastoral Epistles*). The translations appended by Dr. Ellicott to his editions of St. Paul's Epistles, proceed on the true principle of altering the A. V. "only where it appears to be incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obscure," uniting a profound reverence for the older translators with a bold truthfulness in judging of their work. The copious collation of all the earlier English versions makes this part of his book especially interesting and valuable. Dr. Trench (*On the A. V. of the N. T.*, 1858), in like manner, states his conviction that "a revision ought to come," though as yet, he thinks, "the Greek and the English necessary to bring it to a successful issue are alike wanting" (p. 3). The work itself, it need hardly be said, is the fullest contradiction possible of this somewhat despondent statement, and supplies a good store of materials for use when the revision actually comes. The *Revision of the A. V. by Five Clergymen* (Dr. Barrow, Dr. Moberly, Dean Alford, Mr. Humphry, and Dr. Ellicott), represents the same school of conservative progress, has the merit of adhering to the clear, pure English of the A. V., and does not deserve the censure which Dr. Beard passes on it as "promising little and performing less." As yet, this series includes only the Gospel of St. John, and the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. The publications of the American Bible Union are signs that there also the same want has been felt. The translations given respectively by Alford, Stanley, Jowett, and Conybeare and Howson, in their respective Commentaries, are in like manner, at once admissions of the necessity of the work, and contributions towards it. Mr. Sharpe (1840) and Mr. Highton (1862) have ventured on the wider work of translations of the entire N. T. Mr. Cookesley has published the Gospel of St. Matthew as Part I. of a like undertaking. It might almost seem as if at last there was something like a *consensus* of scholars and divines on this question. That assumption would, however, be too hasty. Partly the *vis inertiae*, which in a large body like the clergy of the English Church, is always great, partly the fear of ulterior consequences, partly also the indifference of the majority of the laity, would probably, at the present moment give at least a numerical majority to the opponents of a revision. Writers on this side are naturally less numerous, but the feeling of Conservatism, pure and simple, has found utterance in four men representing different sections, and of different calibre,—Mr. Scrivener (*Supp. to A. Eng. V. of N. T.*), Dr. M'Caul (*Reasons for holding fast the Authorized English Version*), Mr. C. S. Malan (*A Vindication*, &c.), and Dr. Cumming (*Revision and Translation*).[c]

XIII. PRESENT STATE OF THE QUESTION.—(1.) To take an accurate estimate of the extent to which the A. V. requires revision would call for nothing less than an examination of each single Book, and would therefore involve an amount of detail incompatible with our present limits. To give a few instances only, would practically fix attention on a part only of the evidence, and so would lead to a false rather than a true estimate. No attempt, therefore, will be made to bring together individual passages as needing correction. A few remarks on the chief questions which must necessarily come before those who undertake a revision will not,

[c] Mr. Malan's careful translation of the chief Oriental and other versions of the Gospel according to St. John, and Mr. Scrivener's notes on St. Matthew, deserve to be mentioned as valuable contributions towards the work which they depreciate. A high American authority, Mr. George P. Marsh, may also be referred to as throwing the weight of his judgment into the scale against any revision at the present moment (*Lectures on the English Language*, Lect. xxviii).

perhaps, be out of place. Examples, classified under corresponding heads, will be found in the book by Dr. Trench already mentioned, and, scattered in the form of annotations, in that of Professor Scholefield.

(2.) The translation of the N. T. is from a Text confessedly imperfect. What editions were used is a matter of conjecture; most probably, one of those published with a Latin version by Beza between 1565 and 1598, and agreeing substantially with the *Textus receptus* of 1633. It is clear, on principle, that no revision ought to ignore the results of the textual criticism of the last hundred years. To shrink from noticing any variation, to go on printing as the inspired Word that which there is a preponderant reason for believing to be an interpolation or a mistake, is neither honest nor reverential. To do so for the sake of greater edification is simply to offer to God the unclean sacrifice of a lie. The authority of the A. V. is at any rate in favour of the practice of not suppressing facts. In Matt. i. 11, xxvi. 26; Luke xvii. 36; John viii. 6; Acts xiii. 18; Eph. vi. 9; Heb. ii. 4; James ii. 18; 1 John ii. 23; 1 Pet. ii. 21; 2 Pet. ii. 11, 18; 2 John 8, different readings are given in the margin, or, as in 1 John ii. 23, indicated by a different type. In earlier versions, as has been mentioned, 1 John v. 7 was printed in smaller letters. The degree to which this should be done will, of course, require discernment. An apparatus like that in Tischendorf or Alford would obviously be out of place. Probably the useful Greek Testament edited by Mr. Scrivener might serve as an example of a middle course.

(3.) Still less had been done at the commencement of the 17th century for the text of the O. T. The Jewish teachers, from whom Protestant divines derived their knowledge, had given currency to the belief that in the Masoretic text were contained the *ipsissima verba* of Revelation, free from all risks of error, from all casualties of transcription. The conventional phrases, "the authentic Hebrew," "the Hebrew verity," were the expression of this undiscerning reverence.[d] They refused to apply the same rules of judgment here which they applied to the text of the N. T. They assumed that the Masoretes were infallible, and were reluctant to acknowledge that there had been any variations since. Even Walton did not escape being attacked as unsound by the great Puritan divine, Dr. John Owen, for having called attention to the fact of discrepancies (*Proleg.* cap. vi.). The materials for a revised text are, of course, scantier than with the N. T.; but the labours of Kennicott, De Rossi, J. H. Michaelis, and Davidson have not been fruitless, and here as there, the older versions must be admitted as at least evidence of variations which once existed, but which were suppressed by the rigorous uniformity of the later Rabbis. Conjectural emendations, such as Newcome, Lowth and Ewald have so freely suggested, ought to be ventured on in such places only as are quite unintelligible without them.

(4.) All scholars worthy of the name are now agreed that as little change as possible should be made in the language of the A. V. Happily there is little risk of an emasculated elegance such as might have infected a new version in the last century. The very fact of the admiration felt for the A. V., and the general revival of a taste for the literature of the Elizabethan period, are safeguards against any like tampering now. Some words, however, absolutely need change, as being altogether obsolete; others, more numerous, have been slowly passing into a different, often into a lower or a narrower meaning, and are therefore no longer what they once were, adequate renderings of the original.

(5.) The self-imposed law of fairness which led the A. V. translators to admit as many English words as possible to the honour of representing one in the Hebrew or Greek text has, as might be expected, marred the perfection of their work. Sometimes the effect is simply the loss of the solemn emphasis of the repetition of the same word. Sometimes it is more serious, and affects the meaning. While it would be simple pedantry to lay down unconditionally that but one and the same word should be used throughout for one in the original, there can be no doubt that such a limitation is the true principle to start with, and that instances to the contrary should be dealt with as exceptional necessities. Side by side with this fault, there is another just the opposite of it. One English word appears for several Greek or Hebrew words, and thus shades of meaning, often of importance to the right understanding of a passage, are lost sight of. Taken together, the two forms of error, which meet us in well-nigh every chapter, make the use of an English Concordance absolutely misleading.[e]

(6.) Grammatical inaccuracy must be noted as a defect pervading, more or less, the whole extent of the present version of the N. T. Instances will be found in abundance in Trench and Scholefield (*passim*), and in any of the better Commentaries. The true force of tenses, cases, prepositions, articles, is continually lost, sometimes at the cost of the finer shades which give vividness and emphasis, but sometimes also entailing more serious errors. In justice to the translators of the N. T., it must be said that, situated as they were, such errors were almost inevitable. They learnt Greek through the medium of Latin. Lexicons[f] and grammars were alike in the universal language of scholars; and that language was poorer and less inflected than the Greek, and failed utterly to represent, *e. g.* the force of its article, or the difference of its aorist and perfect tenses. Such books of this nature as were used by the translators were necessarily based upon a far scantier induction, and were therefore more meagre and inaccurate than those which have been the fruits of the labours of later scholars. Recent scholarship may in many things fall short of that of an earlier time, but the introduction of Greek lexicons and grammars in English has been beyond all doubt a change for the better.

(7.) The field of the O. T. has been far less adequately worked than that of the N. T., and Hebrew scholarship has made far less progress than

---

[d] The Judaising spirit on this matter culminated in the *Formula Helvetici Consensus*, which pronounces the existing O. T. Text to be "tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum potestatem, tum quoad res, tum quoad verba, θεόπνευστος.

[e] The *Englishman's Hebrew Concordance* and the *Englishman's Greek Concordance*, published by Walton and Maberly, deserve mention as useful helps for the student of the A. V. in overcoming this difficulty.

[f] Constantine's and Scapula's were the two principally used. During the half century that preceded the A. V. the study of Greek had made great progress, was taught at all the great schools in 1586, and made part of the system of new ones then founded. Nowell, Dean of St Paul's, published a Greek version of the Catechism. The Grammar chiefly in use was probably Colet's (?).

Greek. Relatively, indeed, there seems good ground for believing that Hebrew was more studied in the early part of the 17th century than it is now. It was newer and more popular. The reverence which men felt for the perfection of the "Hebrew verity" made them willing to labour to learn a language which they looked upon as half-divine. But here also there was the same source of error. The early Hebrew lexicons represented partly, it is true, a Jewish tradition; but partly also were based upon the Vulgate (Bishop Marsh, *Lectures*, ii. App. 61). The forms of cognate Shemitic languages had not been applied as a means for ascertaining the precise value of Hebrew words. The grammars, also in Latin, were defective. Little as Hebrew professors have, for the most part, done in the way of exegesis, any good commentary on the O. T. will show that here also there are errors as serious as in the N. T. In one memorable case, the inattention, real or apparent, of the translators to the force of the *Hiphil* form of the verb (Lev. iv. 12) has led to a serious attack on the truthfulness of the whole narrative of the Pentateuch (Colenso, *Pentateuch Critically Examined*, Part I. ch. vii.).

(8.) The division into chapters and verses is a matter that ought not to be passed over in any future revision. The former, it must be remembered, does not go further back than the 13th century. The latter, though answering, as far as the O. T. is concerned, to a long-standing Jewish arrangement, depends, in the N. T., upon the work of Robert Stephens. [BIBLE.] Neither in the O. T. nor in the N. T. did the verse-division appear in any earlier English edition than that of Geneva. The inconveniences of changing both are probably too great to be risked. The habit of referring to chapter and verse is too deeply rooted to be got rid of. Yet the division, as it is, is not seldom artificial, and sometimes is absolutely misleading. No one would think of printing any other book, in prose or poetry, in short clauses like the verses of our Bibles, and the tendency of such a division is to give a broken and discontinuous knowledge, to make men good textuaries but bad divines. An arrangement like that of the Paragraph Bibles of our own time, with the verse and chapter divisions relegated to the margin, ought to form part of any authoritative revision.[g]

(9.) Other points of detail remain to be noticed briefly: (1) The chapter headings of the A. V. often go beyond their proper province. If it is intended to give an authoritative commentary to the lay reader, let it be done thoroughly. But if that attempt is abandoned, as it was deliberately in 1611, then for the chapter-headings to enter, as they do, upon the work of interpretation, giving, as in Canticles, Psalms, and Prophets, *passim*, mystical meanings, is simply an inconsistency. What should be a mere table of contents becomes a gloss upon the text. (2) The use of italics in printing the A. V. is at least open to some risks. At first they seem an honest confession on the part of the translators of what is or is not in the original. On the other hand, they tempt to a looseness translation. Few writers would think it necessary to use them in translating other books. If the words do not do more than represent the sense of the original, then there is no reason for treating them as if they were added at the discretion of the translators. If they go beyond that, they are of the nature of a gloss, altering the force of the original, and have no right to be there at all, while the fact that they appear as additions frees the translator from the sense of responsibility. (3) Good as the principle of marginal references is, the margins of the A. V., as now printed, are somewhat inconveniently crowded, and the references, being often merely verbal, tend to defeat their own purpose, and to make the reader weary of referring. They need, accordingly, a careful sifting; and though it would not be desirable to go back to the scanty number of the original edition of 1611, something intermediate between that and the present over-abundance would be an improvement. (4) Marginal readings, on the other hand, indicating variations in the text, or differences in the judgment of translators, might be profitably increased in number. The results of the labours of scholars would thus be placed within the reach of all intelligent readers, and so many difficulties and stumbling-blocks might be removed.[h]

(10.) What has been said will serve to show at once to what extent a new revision is required, and what are the chief difficulties to be encountered. And the work, it is believed, ought not to be delayed much longer. Names will occur to every one of men competent to undertake the work as far as the N. T. is concerned; and if such alterations only were to be introduced as commanded the assent of at least two-thirds of a chosen body of twenty or thirty scholars, while a place in the margin was given to such renderings only as were adopted by at least one-third, there would be, it is believed, at once a great change for the better, and without any shock to the feelings or even the prejudices of the great mass of readers. Men fit to undertake the work of revising the translation of the O. T. are confessedly fewer, and, for the most part, occupied in other things. The knowledge and the power, however, are there, though in less measure, and even though the will be for the time absent, a summons to enter on the task from those whose authority they are bound to respect, would, we cannot doubt, be listened to. It might have the result of directing to their proper task and to a fruitful issue energies which are too often with-

---

[g] As examples of what may be said on both sides on this point, the reader may be referred to an article on *Paragraph Bibles* in No. 208 of the *Edinburgh Review* (subsequently reprinted by the Rev. W. Harness, 1855) and the Pamphlet by Dr. M'Caul (*Reasons for holding fast*) already mentioned. Reeves's Bibles and Testaments (1802) and Boothroyd's translation (1824) should be mentioned as having set the example followed by the Religious Tract Society in their *Paragraph Bible*.

[h] In all these points there has been, to a much larger extent than is commonly known, a work of unauthorized revision. Neither italics, nor references, nor readings, nor chapter-headings, nor, it may be added, punctuation, are the same now as they were in the A. V. of 1611. The chief alterations appear to have been made first in 1683, and afterwards in 1769, by Dr. Blayney, under the sanction of the Oxford Delegates of the Press (*Gentleman's Magazine*, Nov. 1789). A like work was done about the same time by Dr. Paris at Cambridge. There had, however, been some changes previously. The edition of 1638, in particular, shews considerable augmentations in the italics (Turton, *Text of the English Bible*, 1833, pp. 91, 126). To Blayney also we owe most of the notes on weights and measures, and coins, and the explanation, where the text seems to require it, of Hebrew proper names. The whole question of the use of Italics is discussed elaborately by Turton in the work just mentioned.

drawn to ephemeral and unprofitable controversies. As the revised Bible would be for the use of the English people, the men appointed for the purpose ought not to be taken exclusively from the English Church, and the learning of Nonconformists should, at least, be fairly represented. The changes recommended by such a body of men, under conditions such as those suggested, might safely be allowed to circulate experimentally for two or three years. When they had stood that trial, they might without risk be printed in the new Authorized Version. Such a work would unite reverence for the past with duty towards the future. In undertaking it we should be, not slighting the translators on whose labours we have entered, but following in their footsteps. It is the wisdom of the Church to bring out of its treasures things new and old. [E. H. P.]

VILLAGES.[a] It is evident that *chatser*, "a village," lit., an enclosure, a collection of huts, is often used, especially in the enumeration of towns in Josh. xiii., xv., xix., to imply unwalled suburbs outside the walled towns. And so it appears to mean when we compare Lev. xxv. 31 with v. 34. *Migrash*,[b] A. V. "suburbs," *i. e.* a place thrust out from the city (see also Gen. xli. 48). Arab villages, as found in Arabia, are often mere collections of stone huts, "long, low, rude hovels, roofed only with the stalks of palm-leaves," or covered for a time with tent-cloths, which are removed when the tribe change their quarters. Others are more solidly built, as are most of the modern villages of Palestine, though in some the dwellings are mere mud-huts (Robinson, i. 167, ii. 13, 14, 44, 387; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 155; Stanley, *S. & P.* p. 233, App. §83, p. 525). Arab villages of the Hedjâz and Yemen often consist of huts with circular roofs of leaves or grass, resembling the description given by Sallust of the Numidian *mapalia*, viz. ships with the keel uppermost (Sallust, *Jug.* 18; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 220; Niebuhr, *Descr. de l'Ar.* p. 54).

There is little in the O. T. to enable us more precisely to define a village of Palestine, beyond the fact that it was destitute of walls or external defences. Persian villages are spoken of in similar terms (Ez. xxxviii. 11; Esth. ix. 19).

By the Talmudists a village was defined as a place destitute of a synagogue (Lightfoot, *Chorogr. Century*, ch. xcviii.). Galilee, in our Lord's time, contained many villages and village-towns,[c] and Josephus says that in his time there were in Galilee 204 towns and villages,[d] some of which last had walls (Joseph. *Vit.* § 45). At present the country is almost depopulated (Raumer, *Pal.* p. 105; Stanley, *S. & P.* p. 384). Most modern Turkish and Persian villages have a *Menzil* or *Medhâfeh*, a house for travellers (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 295; Robinson, ii. 19; Martyn, *Life*, p. 437).

The places to which in the O. T. the term *chatser* is applied were mostly in the outskirts of the country (Stanley, p. 526). In the N. T. the term κώμη is applied to Bethphage (Matt. xxi. 2), Bethany (Luke x. 38; John xi. 1), Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 13), Bethlehem (John vii. 42). A distinction between city or town (πόλις) and village (κώμη) is pointed out (Luke viii. 1). On the other hand, Bethsaida is called πόλις (John i. 45; Luke ix. 10), and also κώμη (Mark viii. 23, 26), unless by the latter word we are to understand the suburbs of the town, which meaning seems to belong to "country"[e] (Mark vi. 56). The relation of dependence on a chief town of a district appears to be denoted by the phrase "villages of Caesarea Philippi" (Mark viii. 27).

In the Hebrew language the prefix *Caphar* implied a regular village, as Capernaum, which place, however, had in later times outgrown the limits implied by its original designation (Lightfoot, *l c.*; Stanley, pp. 521-527; 1 Macc. vii. 31). [H. W. P.]

VINE. The well-known valuable plant (*Vitis vinifera*), very frequently referred to in the Old and New Testaments, and cultivated from the earliest times. The first mention of this plant occurs in Gen. ix. 20, 21, where Noah is represented as having been its first cultivator. The Egyptians say that Osiris first taught men the use of the vine. That it was abundantly cultivated in Egypt is evident from the frequent representations on the monuments, as well as from the Scriptural allusions. See Gen. xl. 9-11, Pharaoh's dream; and Num. xx. 5, where the Israelites complain that the wilderness was "no place of figs or of vines," evidently regretting that they had left the vines of Egypt. Comp. also Ps. lxxviii. 47: "He destroyed their vines with hail" (see on this subject Celsius, *Hierob.* ii. p. 412).

The vines of Palestine were celebrated both for luxuriant growth and for the immense clusters of grapes which they produced. When the spies were sent forth to view the promised land, we are told that on their arrival at the valley of Eshcol they cut down a branch with one cluster of grapes, and bare it between two on a staff (Num. xiii. 23). This they did no doubt for convenience of carriage, and in order that the grapes on that splendid cluster might not be bruised. Travellers have frequently testified to the large size of the grape-clusters of Palestine. Schulz (*Leitungen des Höchsten*, v. p. 285, quoted by Rosenmüller, *Bib. Bot.* p. 223) speaks of supping at Beitshin, a village near Ptolemais, under a vine whose stem was about a foot and a half in diameter, and whose

---

[a] 1. *Bath.* See DAUGHTER.

2. חָצֵר; ἔπαυλις, κώμη; *villa, castellum, oppidum*, especially described as unwalled, Lev. xxv. 31. (Stanley, *S. & P.* App. §87.)

3. (*a*) כְּפַר, from כָּפַר, "cover" (Ges. 706); κώμη; *villa*. (*b*) כְּפִיר, only once, Neh. vi. 2; κωμη; *viculus*. (*c*) כְּפַר, only once, 1 Sam. vi. 18; κώμη; *villa*.

4. (*a*) פְּרָז, from פָּרַז (Ges. 1125, "to separate," also "to judge," like κρίνω; once "village," *i. e.* a place of separated dwellings, Hab. iii. 14); δυνάστης; *bellator*. See PERIZZITE. (*b*) פְּרָזוֹן, Judg. v. 7, 11; A. V. following Targ. "villages;" lit., rulers or warriors. (*c*) פְּרָזוֹת, πόλις (unwalled), Ez. xxxviii. 11. (*d*) פְּרָזִי, properly a dweller in the country, *paganus*; φερεζαῖος; *oppidum*.

5. חַוֹּת; ἔπαυλις; *vicus*; Num. xxxii. 41, Deut. iii. 14, Judg. x. 4: a word applied by modern Bedouins to their own villages (Stanley, p. 527). See HAVOTH-JAIR.

6. מִגְרָשִׁים; περισπόρια; *suburbana*; Lat., pastures for flocks (Ges. pp. 306-7).

In N. T. the word κώμη is also rendered "town."

[b] מִגְרָשׁ, from גָּרַשׁ, "drive out."

[c] κωμοπόλεις, *vicos et civitates*, Mark i. 38.

[d] πόλεις καὶ κῶμαι.

[e] ἀγροί.

height was about thirty feet, which by its branches formed a hut upwards of thirty feet broad and long. "The clusters of these extraordinary vines," he adds, "are so large that they weigh ten or twelve pounds, and the berries may be compared with our small plums." See also Belon, *Observat.* ii. p. 340: "Les seps des vignes sont fort gros et les rameaux fort spacieux. Les habitants entendent bien comme il la faut gouverner. Car ils la plantent si loing l'une de l'autre, qu'on pourroit mener une charrette entre deux. Ce n'est pas grande merveille si les raisins sont si beaux et le vin si puissant." Strabo states that it is recorded that there are vines in Margiana whose stems are such as would require two men to span round, and whose clusters are two cubits long (*Geograph.* i. p. 112, ed. Kramer). Now Margiana is the modern district of Ghilan in Persia, south-west of the Caspian Sea, and the very country on whose hills the vine is believed to be indigenous. Nothing would be easier than to multiply testimonies relative to the large size of the grapes of Palestine, from the published accounts of travellers such as Elliot, Laborde, Mariti, Dandini (who expresses his surprise at the extraordinary size of the grapes of Lebanon), Russell, &c. We must be content with quoting the following extract from Kitto's *Physical History of Palestine*, p. 330, which is strikingly illustrative of the spies' mode of carrying the grapes from Eshcol:—"Even in our own country a bunch of grapes was produced at Welbeck, and sent as a present from the Duke of Rutland to the Marquis of Rockingham, which weighed nineteen pounds. It was conveyed to its destination—more than twenty miles distant—on a staff by four labourers, two of whom bore it in rotation." The greatest diameter of this cluster was nineteen inches and a half, its circumference four feet and a half, and its length nearly twenty-three inches.

Especial mention is made in the Bible of the vines of Eshcol (Num. xiii. 24, xxxii. 9), of Sibmah, Heshbon, and Elealeh (Is. xvi. 8, 9, 10; Jer. xlviii. 32), and Engedi (Cant. i. 14). Prof. Stanley thus speaks of the vineyards of Judah, which he saw along the slopes of Bethlehem:—"Here, more than elsewhere in Palestine, are to be seen on the sides of the hills, the vineyards marked by their watchtowers and walls, seated on their ancient terraces—the earliest and latest symbol of Judah. The elevation of the hills and table-lands of Judah is the true climate of the vine. He 'bound his foal to the vine, and his ass's colt to the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes.' It was from the Judaean valley of Eshcol, 'the torrent of the cluster,' that the spies cut down the gigantic cluster of grapes. 'A vineyard on a hill of olives,' with the 'fence,' and 'the stones gathered out,' and 'the tower in the midst of it,' is the natural figure which, both in the prophetical and evangelical records, represents the kingdom of Judah" (*S. and P.* p. 164). From the abundance and excellence of the vines, it may readily be understood how frequently this plant is the subject of metaphor in the Holy Scriptures. Thus Israel is a vine brought from Egypt, and planted by the Lord's hand in the land of promise; room had been prepared for it (compare with this the passage from Belon quoted above); and where it took root it filled the land, it covered the hills with its shadow, its boughs were like the goodly cedar-trees (Ps. lxxx. 8 10). Comp. Gmelin (*Travels through Russia and N. Persia*, iii. p. 431), who thus speaks of the vines of Ghilan:—"It is found on forests, . . . and is frequently found about promontories, and their lower part is almost entirely covered with it. There, higher than the eye can reach, it winds itself about the loftiest trees; and its tendrils, which here have an arm's thickness, so spread and mutually entangle themselves far and wide, that in places where it grows in the most luxuriant wildness it is very difficult to find a passage." To dwell under the vine and fig-tree is an emblem of domestic happiness and peace (1 K. iv. 25; Mic. iv. 4; Ps. cxxviii. 3); the rebellious people of Israel are compared to "wild grapes," "an empty vine," "the degenerate plant of a strange vine," &c. (Is. v. 2, 4, but see COCKLE; Hos. x. 1; Jer. ii. 21). It is a vine which our Lord selects to show the spiritual union which subsists between Himself and his members (John xv. 1-6).

The following Hebrew words denote the vine:—

1. *Gephen* (גֶּפֶן), or, more definitely, *gephen hayyayîn* (גֶּפֶן הַיַּיִן), of frequent occurrence in the Bible, and used in a general sense. Indeed *gephen* sometimes is applied to a plant that resembles a vine in some particulars, as גֶּפֶן שָׂדֶה (*gephen sâdeh*), 2 K. iv. 39, *i. e.* probably the Colocynth plant [GOURD, App. A], or גֶּפֶן סְדֹם (*gephen sĕdôm*), the vine of Sodom, certainly not a vine. (See below.)

2. *Sôrêk* (שֹׂרֵק), or *sôrêkâh* (שֹׂרֵקָה), is a term expressive of some choice kind of vine (Jer. ii. 21; Is. v. 2; Gen. xlix. 11), supposed to be identical with that now called in Morocco *serki*, and in Persia *kishmish*, with small round dark berries, and soft stones. (See Niebuhr, *Descript. de l'Arabie*, p. 147; and Oedmann, *Sammlung*, ii. 97.) From the passage in Jeremiah, it is clear that the *sôrêk* denotes not another species of vine, but the common vine which by some process of cultivation attained a high state of excellence.

3. *Nâzîr* (נָזִיר), originally applied to a Nazarite who did not shave his hair, expresses an "undressed vine" (A. V.), *i. e.* one which every seventh and every fiftieth year was *not pruned*. (See Gesenius, *Thes.* s. v.)

Grapes are designated by various names: (1) *Eshcôl* (אֶשְׁכֹּל) is either "a cluster," ripe or unripe, like *racemus*, or a "single grape" (as in Is. lxv. 8, Mic. vii. 1). (2) *'Ênâb* (עֵנָב; Arab. عِنَب, "a cluster"). (3) *Bôser* (בֹּסֶר), sour, *i.e.* unripe grapes (Is. xviii. 5). (4) *Zemôrâh* (זְמוֹרָה), "a grape cut off." "The blossom" of the vine is called *semâdar* (סְמָדַר), Cant. ii. 13, 15. "Grape-stones" are probably meant by *chartsanîm* (חַרְצַנִּים); A. V. "kernel," Num. vi. 4. "The cuticle" of the grape is denominated *zag* (זָג), Num. *l. c.*; "the tendrils" by *sârîjîm* (שָׂרִיגִים), Joel i. 7.

The ancient Hebrews probably allowed the vine to grow trailing on the ground, or upon supports. This latter mode of cultivation appears to be alluded to by Ezekiel (xix. 11, 12): "her strong rods were broken and withered." Dr. Robinson

who has given us much information on the vines of Palestine, thus speaks of the manner in which he saw them trained near Hebron:—"They are planted singly in rows, eight or ten feet apart in each direction. The stock is suffered to grow up large to the height of six or eight feet, and is then fastened in a sloping position to a strong stake, and the shoots suffered to grow and extend from one plant to another, forming a line of festoons. Sometimes two rows are made to slant towards each other, and thus form by their shoots a sort of arch. These shoots are pruned away in autumn" (*Bib. Res.* ii. 80, 81).

The vintage, *bâtsîr* (בָּצִיר), which formerly was a season of general festivity, as is the case more or less in all vine-growing countries, commenced in September. The towns are deserted, and the people live among the vineyards (כֶּרֶם) in the lodges and tents (*Bib. Res.* l. c.; comp. Judg. ix. 27; Jer. xxv. 30; Is. xvi. 10). The grapes were gathered with shouts of joy by the "grape-gatherers" (בֹּצֵר) (Jer. xxv. 30), and put into baskets (see Jer. vi. 9). They were then carried on the head and shoulders, or slung upon a yoke, to the "wine-press" (גַּת). [WINE.] Those intended for eating were perhaps put into flat open baskets of wickerwork, as was the custom in Egypt (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt.* i. 43). In Palestine at present the finest grapes, says Dr. Robinson, are dried as raisins, *tsimmûk* (צִמּוּק), and the juice of the remainder, after having been trodden and pressed, "is boiled down to a syrup which, under the name of *dibs* (דִּבְשׁ), is much used by all classes, wherever vineyards are found, as a condiment with their food." For further remarks on the modes of making fermented drinks, &c., of the juice of the grape, see under WINE. The vineyard (כֶּרֶם), which was generally on a hill (Is. v. 1; Jer. xxxi. 5: Amos ix. 13), was surrounded by a wall or hedge in order to keep out the wild boars (Ps. lxxx. 13), jackals, and foxes (Num. xxii. 24; Cant. ii. 15; Neh. iv. 3; Ez. xiii. 4, 5; Matt. xxi. 33), which commit sad havoc amongst the vines, both by treading them down and by eating the grapes. Within the vineyard was one or more towers of stone in which the vine-dressers, *côrĕmîm* (כֹּרְמִים), lived (Is. i. 8, v. 2; Matt. xxi. 33; see also Robinson, *Bib. Res.* i. 213; ii. 81). The press, *gath* (גַּת), and vat, *yekeb* (יֶקֶב), which was dug (Matt. xxi. 33) or hewn out of the rocky soil, were part of the vineyard furniture (Is. v. 2). See WINE, p. 1774, for a figure of a large footpress with vat, represented in operation. The winepress of the Hebrews was probably of the form there depicted. [FAT, p. 614 *a*.]

The vine in the Mosaic ritual was subject to the usual restrictions of the "seventh year" (Ex. xxiii. 11), and the jubilee of the fiftieth year (Lev. xxv. 11). The gleanings, *ôlêlôth* (עֹלֵלוֹת), were to be left for the poor and stranger (Jer. xlix. 9; Deut. xxiv. 21). The vineyard was not to be sown "with divers seeds" (Deut. xxii. 9), but fig-trees were sometimes planted in vineyards (Luke xiii. 6). Comp. 1 K. iv. 25: "Every man under his vine and under his fig-tree." Persons passing through a vineyard were allowed to eat the grapes therein, but not to carry any away (Deut. xxiii. 24).

Besides wild-boars, jackals and foxes, other enemies, such as birds, locusts, and caterpillars, occasionally damaged the vines.

Beth-haccerem, "the house of the vine" (Jer. vi. 1; Neh. iii. 14), and Abel-ceramîm, "the plain of the vineyards," took their respective names from their vicinity to vineyards. Gophna (now *Jifna*), a few miles N. of Jerusalem, is stated by Eusebius (*Onom.* Φάραγξ Βότρυος) to have derived its name from its vines. But see OPHNI. [W. H.]

VINE OF SODOM (גֶּפֶן סְדֹם, *gephen Sĕdôm*: ἄμπελος Σοδόμων: *vinea Sodomorum*) occurs only in Deut. xxxii. 32, where of the wicked it is said—"their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah." It is generally supposed that this passage alludes to the celebrated apples of Sodom, of which Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* iv. 8, §4) speaks, and to which apparently Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 6) alludes. Much has been written on this curious subject, and various trees have been conjectured to be that which produced those

> "Dead Sea fruits that tempt the eye,
> But turn to ashes on the lips,"

of which Moore and Byron sing.

The following is the account of these fruits, as given by Josephus: speaking of Sodom, he says—"It was of old a happy land, both in respect of its fruits, and the abundance of its cities. But now it is all burnt up. Men say that, on account of the wickedness of its inhabitants, it was destroyed by lightning. At any rate, there are still to be seen remains of the divine fire and traces of fine cities, and moreover ashes produced in the fruits, which indeed resemble edible fruit in colour, but, on being plucked by the hand, are dissolved into smoke and ashes." Tacitus is more general, and speaks of *all* the herbs and flowers, whether growing wild or planted, turning black, and crumbling into ashes.

Some travellers, as Maundrell (*Early Trav. in Palestine*, p. 454, Bohn, 1848), regard the whole story as a fiction, being unable either to see or hear of any fruit that would answer the required description. Pococke supposed the apples of Sodom to be pomegranates, "which, having a tough, hard rind, and being left on the trees two or three years, may be dried to dust inside, and the outside may remain fair." Hasselquist (*Trav.* p. 287) seeks to identify the apples in question with the egg-shaped fruit of the *Solanum melongena* when attacked by some species of *tenthredo*, which converts the whole of the inside into dust, while the rind remains entire and keeps its colour. Seetzen in his letters to Baron Zach (*Monat. Correspond.* xviii. p. 442) thought he had discovered the apples of Sodom in the fruit of a kind of cotton-tree, which grew in the plain of El Ghor, and was known by the name of *Aôschar*. The cotton is contained in the fruit, which is like a pomegranate, but has no pulp. Chateaubriand concludes the long-sought fruit to be that of a thorny shrub with small taper leaves, which in size and colour is exactly like the little Egyptian lemon; when dried, this fruit yields a blackish seed, which may be compared to ashes, and which in taste resembles bitter pepper. Burckhardt (*Trav. in Syria*, p. 392) and Irby and Mangles believe that the tree which produces these celebrated apples is one which they saw abundantly in the Ghor to the east of the Dead Sea, known by the vernacular name of *asheyr* or *oshar*. This tree bears a fruit of a reddish-yellow colour, about three inches in diameter, which contains a white substance resembling the finest silk, and enveloping

some seeds. This silk is collected by the Arabs, and twisted into matches for their firelocks. Dr. Robinson (*Bib. Res.* i. 523), when at *'Ain Jidy*, without knowing at the moment whether it had been observed by former travellers or not, instantly pronounced in favour of the 'ösher fruit being the apples of Sodom. His account of this tree is minute, and may well be quoted:—"The *ösher* of the Arabs," which he identifies with the *Asclepias* (*Calotropis*) *procera* of botanists, "is found in abundance in Upper Egypt and Nubia, and also in Arabia Felix; but seems to be confined in Palestine to the borders of the Dead Sea. We saw it only at *'Ain Jidy*; Hasselquist found it in the desert between Jericho and the northern shore; and Irby and Mangles met with it of large size at the south end of the sea, and on the isthmus of the peninsula. We saw here several trees of the kind, the trunks of which were six or eight inches in diameter, and the whole height from ten to fifteen feet. It has a greyish cork-like bark, with long oval leaves . . . . it discharges copiously from its broken leaves and flowers a milky fluid. The fruit greatly resembles externally a large smooth apple or orange, hanging in clusters of three or four together, and when ripe is of a yellow colour. It was now fair and delicious to the eye, and soft to the touch; but, on being pressed or struck, it explodes with a puff, like a bladder or puff-ball, leaving in the hand only the shreds of the thin rind and a few fibres. It is indeed filled chiefly with air, which gives it the round form . . . . after a due allowance for the marvellous in all popular reports, I find nothing which does not apply almost literally to the fruit of the 'ösher, as we saw it. It must be plucked and handled with great care, in order to preserve it from bursting."

Mr. Walter Elliot, in an article "on the *Poma Sodomitica*, or Dead-Sea apples" (*Trans. of the Entomol. Soc.* ii. p. 14, 1837-1840), endeavours to show that the apples in question are oak galls, which he found growing plentifully on dwarf oaks (*Quercus infectoria*) in the country beyond the Jordan. He tells us that the Arabs asked him to bite one of these galls, and that they laughed when they saw his mouth full of dust. "That these galls are the true Dead-Sea apples," it is added, "there can no longer be a question: nothing can be more beautiful than their rich, glossy, purplish-red exterior: nothing more bitter than their porous and easily pulverized interior" (p. 16). The opinion of Pococke may, we think, be dismissed at once as being a most improbable conjecture. The objection to the *Solanum melongena* is that the plant is not peculiar to the shores or neighbourhood of the Sea of Sodom, but is generally distributed throughout Palestine, besides which it is not likely that the fruit of which Josephus speaks should be represented by occasional diseased specimens of the fruit of the egg-apple; we must look for some plant, the normal character of whose fruit comes somewhere nearer to the required conditions. Seetzen's plant is the same as that mentioned by Burckhardt, Irby and Mangles and Robinson, *i. e.* the 'ösher. Chateaubriand's thorny shrub, with fruit like small lemons, *may be* the *Zukkum* (*Balanites Aegyptiaca*), but it certainly cannot be the tree intended. It is not at all probable that the oak-galls of which Mr. Elliot speaks should be the fruit in question; because these being formed on a tree so generally known as an oak, and being common in all countries, would not have been a subject worthy of especial remark, or have been noticed as something peculiar to the district around the Sea of Sodom. The fruit of the *'ösher* appears to have the best claim to represent the apples of Sodom; the *Calotropis procera* is an Indian plant, and thrives in the warm valley of *'Ain Jidy*, but is scarcely to be found elsewhere in Palestine. The readiness with which its fruit, "fair to the eye," bursts when pressed, agrees well with Josephus's account; and although there is a want of suitableness between "the few fibres" of Robinson, and the "smoke and ashes" of the Jewish historian, yet, according to a note by the editor of Seetzen's Letters, the fruit of the Calotropis in winter contains a yellowish dust, in appearance resembling certain fungi, but of pungent quality.[a] [W. H.]

VINEGAR (חֹמֶץ: ὄξος: *acetum*). The Hebrew term *chomets* was applied to a beverage, consisting generally of wine or strong drink turned sour (whence its use was proscribed to the Nazarite, Num. vi. 3), but sometimes artificially made by an admixture of barley and wine, and thus liable to fermentation (Mishn. *Pes.* 3, §1). It was acid even to a proverb (Prov. x. 26), and by itself formed a nauseous draught (Ps. lxix. 21), but was serviceable for the purpose of sopping bread, as used by labourers (Ruth ii. 14). The degree of its acidity may be inferred from Prov. xxv. 20, where its effect on nitre is noticed. Similar to the *chomets* of the Hebrews was the *acetum* of the Romans,—a thin, sour wine, consumed by soldiers (Veget. *Re Mil.* iv. 7) either in a pure state, or, more usually, mixed with water, when it was termed *posca* (Plin. xix. 29; Spart. *Hadr.* 10). This was the beverage of which the Saviour partook in His dying moments (Matt. xxvii. 48; Mark xv. 36; John xix. 29, 30), and doubtless it was refreshing to His exhausted frame, though offered in derision either on that occasion or previously (Luke xxiii. 36). The same liquid, mingled with gall (as St. Matthew states, probably with the view of marking the fulfilment of the prediction in Ps. lxix. 21), or with myrrh (as St. Mark states with an eye to the exact historical fact[b]), was offered to the Saviour at an earlier stage

[a] "You do not mention the *Solanum Sodomaeum*, which I thought had been quoted as one apple of the Dead Sea, and which is the plant I always thought to be as probably the fruit in question as any other. The objection to *S. melongena* is, that it is a cultivated plant; to the oak gall, that it is wholly absent from the Dead Sea district, though it answers the description best, so far as its beautiful exterior and powdery bitter interior are concerned.

"The Vine of Sodom, again, I always thought might refer to *Cucumis colocynthis* [see GOURD, App. A], which is bitter and powdery inside; the term *vine* would scarcely be given to any but a trailing or other plant of the habit of a vine. The objection to the *Calotropis procera* (*Asclep. gigantea*, Lin.) is, that it is very scarce and not characteristic of the district, being found in one spot only. The beautiful silky cotton would never suggest the idea of anything but what is exquisitely lovely—it is impossible to imagine anything more beautiful: to assume that a diseased state of it was intended is arguing *ad ignotum ab ignoto*, and a very far-fetched idea." [J. D. HOOKER.]

Dr. Hooker's remark, that the term *vine* must refer to some plant of the habit of a vine, is conclusive against the claims of all the plants hitherto identified with the Vine of Sodom. The *C. colocynthis* alone possesses the required condition implied in the name. [W. H.]

[b] St. Mark τεσμὸς ἦν οἶνος ἐσμυρνισμένος. There is no

of His sufferings, in order to deaden the perception of pain (Matt. xxvii. 34; Mark xv. 23). [W. L. B.]

VINEYARDS, PLAIN OF THE (אָבֵל כְּרָמִים: Ἐβελχαρμείι; Alex. Αβελ αμπελωνων: *Abel quae est vineis consita*). This place, mentioned only in Judg. xi. 33, has been already noticed under ABEL (5: see vol. i. p. 4 *a*). To what he has there said, the writer has only to call attention to the fact that a ruin bearing the name of *Beit el Kerm*,—"house of the vine," was encountered by De Saulcy to the north of *Kerak* (*Narr.* i. 353). This may be the *Abel ceramim* of Jephthah, if the Aroer named in the same passage is the place of that name on the Arnon (*W. Mojeb*). It is however by no means certain; and indeed the probability is that the Ammonites, with the instinct of a nomadic or semi-nomadic people, betook themselves, when attacked, not to the civilized and cultivated country of Moab (where *Beit-el-Kerm* is situated), but to the spreading deserts towards the east, where they could disperse themselves after the usual tactics of such tribes. [G.]

VIOL. For an explanation of the Hebrew word translated "viol" see PSALTERY. The old English viol, like the Spanish *viguela*, was a six-stringed guitar. Mr. Chappell (*Pop. Mus.* i. 246) says "the position of the fingers was marked on the fingerboard by frets, as in guitars of the present day. The 'Chest of Viols' consisted of three, four, five, or six of different sizes; one for the treble, others for the mean, the counter-tenor, the tenor, and perhaps two for the bass." Etymologically *viol* is connected with the Dan. *Fiol* and the A. S. *fiðele*, through the Fr. *viole*, Old Fr. *vielle*, Med. Lat. *vitella*. In the *Promptorium Parvulorum* we find "Fyyele, viella, fidicina, vitella." Again, in North's Plutarch (*Antonius*, p. 980, ed. 1595) there is a description of Cleopatra's barge, "the poope whereof was of gold, the sailes of purple, and the owers of silver, which kept stroke in rowing after the sound of the musicke of flutes, howboyes, cytherns, *vyolls*, and such other instruments as they played vpon in the barge." [W. A. W.]

VIPER. [SERPENT.]

VOPH'SI (וָפְסִי: Σαβί; Alex. Ἰαβί: *Vapsi*). Father of Nahbi, the spy selected from the tribe of Naphtali (Num. xiii. 14).

VOWS.[a] The practice of making vows, *i. e.* incurring voluntary obligations to the Deity, on fulfilment of certain conditions, such as deliverance from death or danger, success in enterprises, and the like, is of extremely ancient date, and common in all systems of religion. The earliest mention of a vow is that of Jacob, who, after his vision at Beth-el, promised that in case of his safe return he would dedicate to Jehovah the tenth of his goods, and make the place in which he had set up the memorial stone a place of worship (Gen. xxviii. 18-22, xxxi. 13). Vows in general are also mentioned in the Book of Job (xxii. 27).

Among instances of heathen usage in this respect the following passages may be cited: Jer. xliv. 25, and Jonah i. 16; Hom. *Il.* i. 64, 93, vi. 93, 308; *Odyss.* iii. 382; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 2, §12; Virg. *Georg.* i. 436; *Aen.* v. 234; Hor. *Carm.* i. 5, 13, iii. 29, 59; Liv. xxii. 9, 10; Cic. *Att.* viii. 16; Justin xxi. 3; a passage which speaks of immoral vows; Vell. Pat. ii. 48.

The Law therefore did not introduce, but regulated the practice of vows. Three sorts are mentioned—I. Vows of devotion, *Neder*; II. Vows of abstinence, *Esar* or *Isar*; III. Vows of destruction, *Cherem*.

I. As to vows of devotion, the following rules are laid down: A man might devote to sacred uses possessions or persons, but not the first-born either of man or beast, which was devoted already (Lev. xxvii. 26.) [FIRST-BORN.]

a. If he vowed land, he might either redeem it or not. If he intended to redeem, two points were to be considered, 1. the rate of redemption; 2. the distance, prospectively and retrospectively, from the year of jubilee. The price of redemption was fixed at 50 shekels of silver for the quantity of land which a homer of barley (eight bushels) would suffice to sow (Lev. xxvii. 16; see Knobel). This payment might be abated under the direction of the priest according to the distance of time from the jubilee-year. But at whatever time it was redeemed, he was required to add to the redemption-price one-fifth (20 per cent.) of the estimated value. If he sold the land in the mean time, it might not then be redeemed at all, but was to go to the priests in the jubilee-year (ver. 20).

The purchaser of land, in case he devoted and also wished to redeem it, was required to pay a redemption-price according to the priestly valuation first mentioned, but without the additional fifth. In this case, however, the land was to revert in the jubilee to its original owner (Lev. xxvii. 16; 24, xxv. 27; Keil, *Hebr. Arch.* §66, 80).

The valuation here laid down is evidently based on the notion of annual value. Supposing land to require for seed about 3 bushels of barley per acre, the homer, at the rate of 32 pecks, or 8 bushels, would be sufficient for about 2½ or 3 acres. Fifty shekels, 25 ounces of silver, at five shillings the ounce, would give 6*l.* 5*s.*, and the yearly valuation would thus amount to about 2*l.* per acre.

The owner who wished to redeem, would thus be required to pay either an annual rent or a redemption-price answering to the number of years short of the jubilee, but deducting Sabbatical years (Lev. xxv. 3, 15, 16), and adding a fifth, or 20 per cent. in either case. Thus, if a man devoted an acre of land in the jubilee year, and redeemed it in the same year, he would pay a redemption price of 49 - 6 = 43 years' value, + 20 per cent. = 103*l.* 4*s.*, or an annual rent of 2*l.* 8*s.*; a rate by no means excessive when we consider, 1. the prospect of restoration in the jubilee; 2. the undoubted fertility of the soil, which even now, under all disadvantages, sometimes yields an hundredfold (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 297).

If he refused or was unable to redeem, either the next of kin (Goel) came forward, as he had liberty to do, or, if no redemption was effected, the land became the property of the priests (Lev. xxv. 25, xxvii. 21; Ruth iii. 12, iv. 1, &c.).

In the case of a house devoted, its value was to

---

difficulty in the application of οἶνος and ὄξος to the same substance; but whether the μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον of St. Matthew can in any way be identified with the ἐσμυρνισμένος of Mark is doubtful. The term χολή may well have been applied to some soporific substance.

[a] נְדָרִים, from נָדַר, "to make vow" (Ges. 855) See also ANATHEMA.

be assessed by the priest, and a fifth added to the redemption price in case it was redeemed (Lev. xxvii. 15). Whether the rule held good regarding houses in walled cities, viz., that the liberty of redemption lasted only for one year, is not certain; but as it does not appear, that houses devoted but not redeemed became the property of the priests, and as the Levites and priests had special towns assigned to them, it seems likely that the price only of the house, and not the house itself, was made over to sacred uses, and thus that the act of consecration of a house means, in fact, the consecration of its value. The Mishna, however, says, that if a devoted house fell down, the owner was not liable to payment, but that he was liable if he had devoted the value of the house (*Eracin*, v. 5).

b. Animals fit for sacrifice, if devoted, were not to be redeemed or changed, and if a man attempted to do so, he was required to bring both the devotee and the changeling (Lev. xxvii. 9, 10, 33). They were to be free from blemish (Mal. i. 14). An animal unfit for sacrifice might be redeemed, with the addition to the priest's valuation of a fifth, or it became the property of the priests, Lev. xxvii. 12, 13. [OFFERING.]

c. The case of persons devoted stood thus: A man might devote either himself, his child (not the first-born), or his slave. If no redemption took place, the devoted person became a slave of the sanctuary—see the case of Absalom (2 Sam. xv. 8; Michaelis, §124, ii. 166, ed. Smith). [NAZARITE.] Otherwise he might be redeemed at a valuation according to age and sex, on the following scale (Lev. xxvii. 1-7):

	£.	s.	d.
A. 1. A male from one month to 5 years old, 5 shekels	= 0	12	6
2. From 5 years to 20 years, 20 shekels	= 2	10	0
3. From 20 years to 60 years, 50 shekels	= 6	5	0
4. Above 60 years, 15 shekels	= 1	17	6
B. 1. Females from one month to 5 years, 3 shekels	= 0	7	6
2. From 5 years to 20 years, 10 shekels	= 1	5	0
3. From 20 years to 60 years, 30 shekels	= 3	15	0
4. Above 60 years, 10 shekels	= 1	5	0

If the person were too poor to pay the redemption price, his value was to be estimated by the priest, not, as Michaelis says, the civil magistrate (Lev. xxvii. 8; Deut. xxi. 5; Mich. §145, ii. 283).

Among general regulations affecting vows, the following may be mentioned:—

1. Vows were entirely voluntary, but once made were regarded as compulsory, and evasion of performance of them was held to be contrary to true religion (Num. xxx. 2; Deut. xxiii. 21; Eccl. v. 4).

2. If persons in a dependent condition made vows, as (*a*) an unmarried daughter living in her father's house, or (*b*) a wife, even if she afterwards became a widow, the vow, if (*a*) in the first case her father, or (*b*) in the second, her husband heard and disallowed it, was void; but if they heard without disallowance, it was to remain good (Num. xxx. 3-16). Whether this principle extended to all children and to slaves is wholly uncertain, as no mention is made of them in Scripture, nor by Philo when he discusses the question (*de Spec. Leg.* 6, ii. 274, ed. Mangey). Michaelis thinks the omission of sons implies absence of power to control them (§83, i. 447).

3. Votive offerings arising from the produce of any impure traffic were wholly forbidden (Deut. xxiii. 18). A question has risen on this part of the subject as to the meaning of the word *celeb*, dog, which is understood to refer either to immoral intercourse of the grossest kind, or literally and simply to the usual meaning of the word. The prohibition against dedication to sacred uses of gain obtained by female prostitution was doubtless directed against the practice which prevailed in Phoenicia, Babylonia, and Syria, of which mention is made in Lev. xix. 29; Baruch vi. 43; Herod. i. 199; Strabo, p. 561; August. *de civ. Dei*, iv. 10, and other authorities quoted by Spencer, (*de leg. Hebr.* ii. 35, p. 566). Following out this view, and bearing in mind the mention made in 2 K. xxiii. 7, of a practice evidently connected with idolatrous worship, the word *celeb* has been sometimes rendered *cinaedus*; some have understood it to refer to the first-born, but Spencer himself, ii. 35, p. 572; Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8, §9; Gesen. ii. 685, and the Mishna, *Tĕmurah*, vi. 3, all understand dog in the literal sense. [DOG.]

II., III. For vows of abstinence, see CORBAN; and for vows of extermination, ANATHEMA, and Ezr. x. 8; Mic. iv. 13.

Vows in general and their binding force as a test of religion are mentioned—Job xxii. 27; Prov. vii. 14; Ps. xxii. 25, l. 14, lvi. 12, lxvi. 13, cxvi. 14; Is. xix. 21; Nah. i. 15.

Certain refinements on votive consecrations are noticed in the Mishna, *e.g.*:

1. No evasion of a vow was to be allowed which substituted a part for the whole, as, "I vowed a sheep but not the bones" (*Nedar.* ii. 5).

2. A man devoting an ox or a house, was not liable if the ox was lost, or the house fell down; but otherwise, if he had devoted the value of the one or the other of these.

3. No devotions might be made within two years before the jubilee, nor redemptions within the year following it. If a son redeemed his father's land, he was to restore it to him in the jubilee (*Erac.* vii. 3).

4. A man might devote some of his flock, herd, and heathen slaves, but not all these (*ibid.* viii. 4).

5. Devotions by priests were not redeemable, but were transferred to other priests (*ib.* 6).

6. A man who vowed not to sleep on a bed, might sleep on a skin if he pleased (Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 673).

7. The sums of money arising from votive consecrations were divided into two parts, sacred (1) to the altar; (2) to the repairs of the Temple (Reland, *Ant.* c. x. §4).

It seems that the practice of shaving the head at the expiration of a votive period, was not limited to the Nazaritic vow (Acts xviii. 18, xxi. 24).

The practice of vows in the Christian Church, though evidently not forbidden, as the instance just quoted serves to show, does not come within the scope of the present article (see Bingham, *Antiq.* xvi. 7, 9, and Suicer, εὐχή). [H. W. P.

VULGATE, THE. (LATIN VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE.) The influence which the Latin Versions of the Bible have exercised upon Western Christianity is scarcely less than that of the LXX. upon the Greek Churches. But both the Greek and the Latin Vulgates have been long neglected. The revival of letters, bringing with it the study of the original texts of Holy Scripture, checked for a time the study of these two great bulwarks of the Greek and Latin Churches, for the LXX. in fact belongs rather to the history of Christianity than to the history of Judaism, and, in spite of recent labours, their importance is even now hardly recog-

aised. In the case of the Vulgate, ecclesiastical controversies have still further impeded all efforts of liberal criticism. The Romanist (till lately) regarded the Clementine text as fixed beyond appeal; the Protestant shrank from examining a subject which seemed to belong peculiarly to the Romanist. Yet, apart from all polemical questions, the Vulgate should have a very deep interest for all the Western Churches. For many centuries it was the only Bible generally used; and, directly or indirectly, it is the real parent of all the vernacular versions of Western Europe. The Gothic Version of Ulphilas alone is independent of it, for the Slavonic and modern Russian versions are necessarily not taken into account. With England it has a peculiarly close connexion. The earliest translations made from it were the (lost) books of Bede, and the Glosses on the Psalms and Gospels of the 8th and 9th centuries (ed. Thorpe, Lond. 1835, 1842). In the 10th century Aelfric translated considerable portions of the O. T. (*Heptateuchus*, &c., ed. Thwaites, Oxon. 1698). But the most important monument of its influence is the great English Version of Wiclif (1324-1384, ed. Forshall and Madden, Oxfd. 1850), which is a literal rendering of the current Vulgate text. In the age of the Reformation the Vulgate was rather the guide than the source of the popular versions. The Romanist translations into German (Michaelis, ed. Marsh, ii. 107), French, Italian, and Spanish, were naturally derived from the Vulgate (R. Simon, *Hist. Crit. N. T.* Cap. 28, 29, 40, 41). Of others, that of Luther (N. T. in 1523) was the most important, and in this the Vulgate had great weight, though it was made with such use of the originals as was possible. From Luther the influence of the Latin passed to our own Authorised Version. Tyndale had spent some time abroad, and was acquainted with Luther before he published his version of the N. T. in 1526. Tyndale's version of the O. T., which was unfinished at the time of his martyrdom (1536), was completed by Coverdale, and in this the influence of the Latin and German translations was predominant. A proof of this remains in the Psalter of the Prayer Book, which was taken from the "Great English Bible" (1539, 1540), which was merely a new edition of that called Matthew's, which was itself taken from Tyndale and Coverdale. This version of the Psalms follows the Gallican Psalter, a revision of the Old Latin, made by Jerome, and afterwards introduced into his new translation (comp. §22), and differs in many respects from the Hebrew text (*e. g.* Ps. xiv.). It would be out of place to follow this question into detail here. It is enough to remember that the first translators of our Bible had been familiarised with the Vulgate from their youth, and could not have cast off the influence of early association. But the claims of the Vulgate to the attention of scholars rest on wider grounds. It is not only the source of our current theological terminology, but it is, in one shape or other, the most important early witness to the text and interpretation of the whole Bible. The materials available for the accurate study of it are unfortunately at present as scanty as those yet unexamined are rich and varied (comp. § 30). The chief original works bearing on the Vulgate generally are—

R. Simon, *Histoire Critique du V. T.* 1678-85: *N. T.* 1689-93.

Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, Oxon 1705.

Martianay, *Hieron. Opp.* (Paris, 1693, with the prefaces and additions of Vallarsi, Verona, 1734, and Maffei, Venice, 1767).

Bianchini (*Blanchinus* not *Blanchini*), *Vindiciae Canon. SS. Vulg. Lat. Edit.* Romae, 1740.

Bukentop, *Lux de Luce* . . . Bruxellis, 1710.

Sabatier, *Bibl. SS. Lat. Vers. Ant.*, Remis, 1743.

Van Ess, *Pragmatisch-kritische Gesch. d. Vulg.* Tübingen, 1824.

Vercellone, *Variae Lectiones Vulg. Lat. Bibliorum*, tom. i., Romae, 1860; tom. ii., pars prior, 1862.

In addition to these there are the controversial works of Mariana, Bellarmin, Whitaker, Fulke, &c., and numerous essays by Calmet, D. Schulz, Fleck, Riegler, &c., and in the N. T. the labours of Bentley, Sanftl, Griesbach, Schulz, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorf, have collected a great amount of critical materials. But it is not too much to say that the noble work of Vercellone has made an epoch in the study of the Vulgate, and the chief results which follow from the first instalment of his collations are here for the first time incorporated in its history. The subject will be treated under the following heads:—

I. The Origin and History of the name Vulgate.—1. The name *Vulgate*, which is equivalent to *Vulgata editio* (the *current* text of Holy Scripture), has necessarily been used differently in various ages of the Church. There can be no doubt that the phrase originally answered to the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις of the Greek Scriptures. In this sense it is used constantly by Jerome in his Commentaries, and his language explains sufficiently the origin of the term: "Hoc juxta LXX. interpretes diximus, quorum *editio toto orbe vulgata est*" (Hieron. *Comm. in Is.* lxv. 20). "Multum in hoc loco LXX. editio Hebraicumque discordant. Primum ergo *de Vulgata editione* tractabimus et postea sequemur ordinem veritatis" (id. xxx. 22). In some places Jerome distinctly quotes the Greek

text: "Porro in editione Vulgata dupliciter legimus; quidam enim codices habent δῆλοί εἰσιν, hoc est *manifesti sunt*: alii δειλαῖοί εἰσιν, hoc est *meticulosi* sive *miseri sunt*" (*Comm. in Osee*, vii. 13; comp. 8-11, &c.). But generally he regards the Old Latin, which was rendered from the LXX., as substantially identical with it, and thus introduces Latin quotations under the name of the LXX. or *Vulgata editio*: "... miror quomodo *vulgata editio* ... testimonium alia interpretatione subverterit: *Congregabor et glorificabor coram Domino*. ... Illud autem quod in LXX. legitur: Congregabor et glorificabor coram Domino ..." (*Comm. in Is.* xlix. 5). So again: "Philisthaeos ... *alienigenas* Vulgata scribit editio" (ib. xiv. 29). "... Palaestinis, quos indifferenter LXX. *alienigenas* vocant" (*in Ezek.* xvi. 27). In this way the transference of the name from the current Greek text to the current Latin text became easy and natural; but there does not appear to be any instance in the age of Jerome of the application of the term to the Latin Version of the O. T. without regard to its derivation from the LXX., or to that of the N. T.

2. Yet more: as the phrase κοινὴ ἔκδοσις came to signify an uncorrected (and so corrupt) text, the same secondary meaning was attached to *vulgata editio*. Thus in some places the *vulgata editio* stands in contrast with the true Hexaplaric text of the LXX. One passage will place this in the clearest light: "... breviter admoneo aliam esse editionem quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebius, omnesque Graeciae translatores κοινὴν, id est, *communem* appellant, atque *vulgatam*, et a plerisque nunc Λουκιανὸς dicitur; aliam LXX. interpretum quae in ἑξαπλοῖς codicibus reperitur, et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est ... Κοινὴ autem ista, hoc est, *Communis editio*, ipsa est quae et LXX., sed hoc interest inter utramque, quod κοινὴ pro locis et temporibus et pro voluntate scriptorum vetus corrupta editio est; ea autem quae habetur in ἑξαπλοῖς et quam nos vertimus, ipsa est quae in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata LXX. interpretum translatio reservatur" (Ep. cvi. *ad Sun. et Fret.* § 2).

3. This use of the phrase *Vulgata editio* to describe the LXX. (and the Latin Version of the LXX.) was continued to later times. It is supported by the authority of Augustine, Ado of Vienne (A.D. 860), R. Bacon, &c.; and Bellarmin distinctly recognizes the application of the term, so that Van Ess is justified in saying that the Council of Trent erred in a point of history when they described Jerome's Version as "vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot saeculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est" (Van Ess, *Gesch.* 34). As a general rule, the Latin Fathers speak of Jerome's Version as "our" Version (*nostra editio*, *nostri codices*); but it was not unnatural that the Tridentine Fathers (as many later scholars) should be misled by the associations of their own time, and adapt to new circumstances terms which had grown obsolete in their original sense. And when the difference of the (Greek) "Vulgate" of the early Church, and the (Latin) "Vulgate" of the modern Roman Church has once been apprehended, no further difficulty need arise from the identity of name. (Compare Augustine, *Ed. Benedict.* Paris 1836, tom. V. p. xxxiii.; Sabatier, i. 792; Van Ess, *Gesch.* 24-42, who gives very full and conclusive references, though he fails to perceive that the *Old Latin* was practically identified with the LXX.)

II. THE OLD LATIN VERSIONS.—4. The history of the earliest Latin Version of the Bible is lost in complete obscurity. All that can be affirmed with certainty is that it was made in Africa.[a] During the first two centuries the Church of Rome, to which we naturally look for the source of the version now identified with it, was essentially Greek. The Roman bishops bear Greek names; the earliest Roman liturgy was Greek; the few remains of the Christian literature of Rome are Greek.[b] The same remark holds true of Gaul (comp. Westcott, *Hist. of Canon of N. T.* pp. 269, 270, and reff.); but the Church of N. Africa seems to have been Latin-speaking from the first. At what date this Church was founded is uncertain. A passage of Augustine (*c. Donat. Ep.* 37) seems to imply that Africa was converted late; but if so, the Gospel spread there with remarkable rapidity. At the end of the second century Christians were found in every rank, and in every place; and the master-spirit of Tertullian, the first of the Latin Fathers, was then raised up to give utterance to the passionate thoughts of his native Church. It is therefore from Tertullian that we must seek the earliest testimony to the existence and character of the *Old Latin* (*Vetus Latina*).

5. On the first point the evidence of TERTULLIAN, if candidly examined, is decisive. He distinctly recognizes the general currency of a Latin Version of the N. T., though not necessarily of every book at present included in the Canon, which even in his time had been able to mould the popular language (*adv. Prax.* 5: In usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis ... *De Monog.* 11: Sciamus plane non sic esse in Graeco authentico quomodo in usum exiit per duarum syllabarum aut callidam aut simplicem eversionem ...). This was characterized by a "rudeness" and "simplicity," which seems to point to the nature of its origin. In the words of Augustine (*De doctr. Christ.* ii. 16 (11)), "any one in the first ages of Christianity who gained possession of a Greek MS., and fancied that he had a fair knowledge of Greek and Latin, ventured to translate it." (Qui scripturas ex Hebraea lingua in Graecam verterunt numerari possunt; Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuivis primis fidei temporibus in manus venit Codex Graecus, et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari.)[c] Thus the revision of the N. T. appears to have arisen from individual and successive efforts; but it does not follow by any means that numerous versions were simultaneously circulated, or that the several parts of the version were made independently.[d] Even if it

[a] This has been established with the greatest fulness by Card. Wiseman, *Two Letters on* 1 *John* v. 7, addressed to the editor of the *Catholic Magazine*, 1832-3; republished with additions, Rome, 1835; and again in his collected *Essays*, vol. i. 1853. Eichhorn and Hug had maintained the same opinion; and Lachmann has further confirmed it (*N. T.* i. *Praef.*).

[b] In the absence of all evidence it is impossible to say how far the Christians of the Italian provinces used the Greek or Latin language habitually.

[c] Card. Wiseman has shown (*Essays*, i. 24, 25) that "interpretor" and "verto" *may* be used of a revision; but in connexion with *primis fidei temporibus* they seem certainly to describe the origin of the Version.

[d] It would be out of place here to point out minute differences in rendering which show that the translation was the work of different hands. Mill (*Prolegg.* 521 ff.) has made some interesting collections to establish this result, but he places too much reliance on the version of D_2 (Cod. Bezae).

had been so, the exigencies of the public service must soon have given definiteness and substantial unity to the fragmentary labours of individuals. The work of private hands would necessarily be subject to revision for ecclesiastical use. The separate books would be united in a volume; and thus a standard text of the whole collection would be established. With regard to the O. T. the case is less clear. It is probable that the Jews who were settled in N. Africa were confined to the Greek towns; otherwise it might be supposed that the Latin Version of the O. T. is in part anterior to the Christian era, and that (as in the case of Greek) a preparation for a Christian Latin dialect was already made when the Gospel was introduced into Africa. However this may have been, the substantial similarity of the different parts of the Old and New Testaments establishes a real connexion between them, and justifies the belief that there was one popular Latin version of the Bible current in Africa in the last quarter of the second century. Many words which are either Greek (machaera, sophia, perizoma, poderis, agonizo, &c.) or literal translations of Greek forms (vivifico, justifico, &c.) abound in both, and explain what Tertullian meant when he spoke of the "simplicity" of the translation (compare below § 43).

6. The exact literality of the Old Version was not confined to the most minute observance of order and the accurate reflection of the words of the original: in many cases the very forms of Greek construction were retained in violation of Latin usage. A few examples of these singular anomalies will convey a better idea of the absolute certainty with which the Latin commonly indicates the text which the translator had before him, than any general statements: Matt. iv. 13, habitavit in Capharnaum *maritimam*; *id.* 15, terra Neptalim *viam* maris; *id.* 25, ab Jerosolymis . . . et trans Jordanem; v. 22, reus erit *in gehennam* ignis; vi. 19, ubi tinea et *comestura* exterminat. Mark xii. 31, *majus horum praeceptorum* aliud non est. Luke x. 19, nihil *vos* nocebit. Acts xix. 26, non solum Ephesi sed paene *totius Asiae*. Rom. ii. 15, inter se *cogitationum accusantium* vel etiam defendentium. 1 Cor. vii. 32, sollicitus est quae sunt Domini. It is obvious that there was a continual tendency to alter expressions like these, and in the first age of the Version it is not improbable that the continual Graecism which marks the Latin texts of D_1 (*Cod. Bezae*), and E_2 (*Cod. Laud.*), had a wider currency than it could maintain afterwards.

7. With regard to the African Canon of the N. T. the old Version offers important evidence. From considerations of style and language it seems certain that the Epistle to the Hebrews, James, and 2 Peter, did not form part of the original African Version, a conclusion which falls in with that which is derived from historical testimony (comp. *The Hist. of the Canon of the N. T.* p. 282 ff.). In the O. T., on the other hand, the Old Latin erred by excess and not by defect; for as the Version was made from the current copies of the LXX., it included the Apocryphal books which are commonly contained in them, and to these 2 Esdras was early added.

8. After the translation once received a definite shape in Africa, which could not have been long after the middle of the second century, it was not publicly revised. The old text was jealously guarded by ecclesiastical use, and was retained there at a time when Jerome's version was elsewhere almost universally received. The well-known story of the disturbance caused by the attempt of an African bishop to introduce Jerome's "*cucurbita*" for the old "*hedera*" in the history of Jonah (August. *Ep.* civ. ap. Hieron. *Epp.*, quoted by Tregelles, *Introduction*, p. 242) shows how carefully intentional changes were avoided. But at the same time the text suffered by the natural corruptions of copying, especially by interpolations, a form of error to which the Gospels were particularly exposed (comp. § 15). In the O. T. the version was made from the unrevised edition of the LXX., and thus from the first included many false readings, of which Jerome often notices instances (*e. g.* Ep. cvi. *ad Sun. et Fret.*). In Table A two texts of the *Old Latin* are placed for comparison with the Vulgate of Jerome.

TABLE A. DAN. ix. 4-8.[a]

Cod. Wirceb.	August. *Ep.* cxl. *ad Victor.*	*Vulgata nova.*
Precatus sum Dominum Deum meum et dixi:	Precatus sum Dominum Deum meum, *et confessus sum* et dixi:	*Oravi* Dominum Deum meum,[1] et confessus sum[2] et dixi:
Domine Deus, magne et mirabilis,	Domine Deus, magne et mirabilis,	*Obsecro* Domine Deus, magne et *terribilis*,
qui servas testamentum tuum,	*et* qui servas testamentum tuum,	*custodiens pactum*,
et misericordiam diligentibus te,	et misericordiam diligentibus te,	et misericordiam diligentibus te,
et servantibus praecepta tua:	et servantibus praecepta tua:	et *custodientibus mandata* tua:
Peccavimus, fecimus *injurias*,	Peccavimus, *adversus legem* fecimus,	Peccavimus, *iniquitatem*[3] fecimus,
nociimus et declinavimus	*impie egimus et recessimus* et declinavimus	impie egimus, et recessimus et declinavimus
a praeceptis tuis et a judiciis tuis,	a praeceptis tuis et a judiciis tuis,	a *mandatis* tuis *ac* judiciis.
et non exaudivimus servos tuos prophetas,	et non exaudivimus servos tuos prophetas,	Non *obedivimus* servis tuis prophetis,
qui loquebantur *ad* reges nostros,	qui loquebantur *in nomine tuo* ad reges nostros,	qui *locuti sunt* in nomine tuo *regibus* nostris,
		principibus nostris, patribus nostris,
et ad omnes *populos* terrae.	et ad omnem *populum* terrae.	*omnique populo* terrae.
Tibi, Domine, justitia:	Tibi, Domine, justitia:	Tibi, Domine, justitia:
nobis autem, *et fratribus nostris*,	nobis autem	nobis autem[4]
confusio faciei;	confusio faciei;	confusio faciei;
Sicut dies hic viro *Judae*	Sicut dies hic viro *Juda*,	Sicut *est hodie* viro Juda[5]
et *inhabitantibus* Hierusalem,	et *habitantibus* Jerusalem,	et *habitatoribus* Jerusalem,
et omni Israel,	et omni Israel,	et omni Israel,
qui proximi sunt et qui longe sunt,	qui proximi sunt et qui longe sunt,	*his qui prope* sunt, et *his* qui *procul*,
in qua eos disseminasti ibi,	*in omni terra* in qua eos disseminasti ibi,	*in universis terris* ad quas ejecisti eos
contumacia eorum,	*propter* contumaciam eorum,	propter *iniquitates* eorum,
qua *exprobaverunt* tibi, Domine.	quia *improbaverunt* te, Domine.	*in quibus peccaverunt in* te.

[a] The differences in the two first columns are marked by italics. The italics in col. 3 mark where the text of Jerome differs from both the other texts.

[1] m. *om.* Tol. [2] et c. s. *om.* Tol. [3] inique, Tol. [4] a. *om.* Tol. [5] Judae. Tol.

9. The Latin translator of Irenaeus was probably contemporary with Tertullian,[f] and his renderings of the quotations from Scripture confirm the conclusions which have been already drawn as to the currency of (substantially) one Latin version. It does not appear that he had a Latin MS. before him during the execution of his work, but he was so familiar with the common translation that he reproduces continually characteristic phrases which he cannot be supposed to have derived from any other source (Lachmann, *N. T.* i. pp. x. xi.). CYPRIAN († A.D. 257) carries on the chain of testimony far through the next century; and he is followed by Lactantius, Juvencus, J. Firmicus Maternus, HILARY the deacon (Ambrosiaster), HILARY of Poitiers († A.D. 449), and LUCIFER of Cagliari († A.D. 370). Ambrose and Augustine exhibit a peculiar recension of the same text, and Jerome offers some traces of it. From this date MSS. of parts of the African text have been preserved (§12), and it is unnecessary to trace the history of its transmission to a later time.

10. But while the earliest Latin Version was preserved generally unchanged in N. Africa, it fared differently in Italy. There the provincial rudeness of the version was necessarily more offensive, and the comparative familiarity of the leading bishops with the Greek texts made a revision at once more feasible and less startling to their congregations. Thus in the fourth century a definite ecclesiastical recension (of the Gospels at least) appears to have been made in N. Italy by reference to the Greek, which was distinguished by the name of *Itala*. This Augustine recommends on the ground of its close accuracy and its perspicuity (Aug. *De Doctr. Christ.* 15, in ipsis interpretationibus Itala[g] caeteris praeferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae), and the text of the Gospels which he follows is marked by the latter characteristic when compared with the African. In the other books the difference cannot be traced with accuracy; and it has not yet been accurately determined whether other national recensions may not have existed (as seems certain from the evidence which the writer has collected) in Ireland (Britain), Gaul, and Spain.

11. The *Itala* appears to have been made in some degree with authority: other revisions were made for private use, in which such changes were introduced as suited the taste of scribe or critic. The next stage in the deterioration of the text was the intermixture of these various revisions; so that at the close of the fourth century the Gospels were in such a state as to call for that final recension which was made by Jerome. What was the nature of this confusion will be seen from the accompanying tables (B and C, on opposite page) more clearly than from a lengthened description.

12. The MSS. of the Old Latin which have been preserved exhibit the various forms of that version which have been already noticed. Those of the Gospels, for the reason which has been given, present the different types of text with unmistakeable clearness. In the O. T. the MS. remains are too scanty to allow of a satisfactory classification.

i. MSS. of the *Old Latin* Version of the O. T.

1. Fragments of Gen. (xxxvii., xxxviii., xli., xlvi., xlviii.–l., parts) and Ex. (x., xi., xvi., xvii., xxiii.–xxvii., parts) from Cod. E (§30) of the Vulgate: Vercellone, i. pp. 183-4, 307-10.
2. Fragments (scattered verses) of the Pentateuch: Münter, *Miscell. Hafn.* 1821, pp. 89-95.
3. Fragments (scattered verses of 1, 2 Sam. and 1, 2 Kings, and the Canticles), given by Sabatier.
4. Corbei. 7, Saec. xiii. (Sabatier), Esther.
5. Pechianus (Sabatier), Fragm. Esther.
6. Orat. (Sabatier), Esther i.–iii.
7. Majoris Monast. Saec. xii. (Martianay, Sabatier), Job.
8. Sangerm. Psalt. Saec. vii. (Sabatier).
9. Fragments of Jeremiah (xiv.–xli., detached verses), Ezekiel (xl.–xlviii., detached fragments), Daniel (iii. 15-23, 33-50, viii., xi., fragments), Hosea (ii.–vi., fragments), from a palimpsest MS. at Würzburg (Saec. vi., vii.): Münter, *Miscell. Hafn.* 1821.
11. Fragmenta Hos. Am. Mich. . . . . ed. E. Ranke, 1858, &c. (This book the writer has not seen.)
12. Bodl. *Auct.* F. 4, 32. Fragments of Deuteronomy and the Prophets, "Graece et Latine litteris Saxonicis," Sæc. viii. ix.[h]

ii. MSS. of the Apocryphal books.

1. Reg. 3564, Saec. ix. (Sabatier), Tob. and Jud.
2, 3. Sangerm. 4, 15, Saec. ix. (Sabatier), Tob. and Jud.
4. Vatic. (Reg. Suec.), Saec. vii., Tob.
5. Corbei. 7 (Sabatier), Jud.
6. Pechian. (Sabatier), Saec. x., Jud.

The text of the remaining books of the *Vetus Latina* not having been revised by Jerome is retained in MSS. of the Vulgate.

iii. MSS. of the N. T.

(1.) Of the Gospels.

African (*i. e.* unrevised) text.

a. Cod. Vercellensis, at Vercelli, written by Eusebius, bishop of Vercelli in the 4th cent. Published by Irici, 1748, and Bianchini, *Ev. Quadr.* 1749.

b. Cod. Veronensis, at Verona, of the 4th or 5th cent. Published by Bianchini (as above).

c. Cod. Colbertinus, in Bibl. Imp. at Paris, of the 11th cent. Published by Sabatier, *Versiones antiquae.*

---

[f] It should be added that Dodwell places him much later, at the close of the 4th cent. Comp. Grabe, *Prolegg. ad Iren.* ii. § 3.

[g] It is unnecessary now to examine the conjectures which have been proposed, *usitata-quae, illa-quae.* They were made at a time when the history of the Old Latin was unknown.

[h] To these must probably be added the MSS. of Genesis and the Psalter in the possession of Lord Ashburnham, said to be "of the fourth century."

The text of the Oxford MS. (No. 12) is extremely interesting, and offers many coincidences with the earliest African readings. The passages contained in it are (α) Deut. xxxi. 7; 24-30; xxxii. 1-4. (β) Hos. ii. 18*a*; iv. 1-3*a*; 9*a*; vi. 1*b*, 2; 16; x. 12*a*; xii. 6; viii. 3, 4. Amos iii. 8; v. 3; 14. Mich. iii. 2; iv. 1, 2; 5 (part); v. 2; vi. 8; vii. 6, 7. Joel iii. 18. Obad. 15. Jon. i. 8*b*, 9. Nah. iii. 13. Hab. ii. 4*b*; iii. 3. Zephan. i. 14-18; 18 (part). Agg. ii. 7, 8. Zech. i. 4 (part); viii. 16, 17, 19*b*; ix. 9; xiii. 5; 7. Mal. i. 6 (part), 10*b*, 11; ii. 7; iii. 1; Zech. ii. 8*b*; Mal. iv. 2, 13; 5, 6*a*. (γ) Gen. i. 1-ii. 3; Ex. xiv. 24-xv. 3; Is. iv. 1-v. 7; lv. 1-5; Ps. xii. 1-4; Gen. xxii. 1-19.

TABLE B. MARK ix. 44–49.

Cod. Vercell. (a).	*Cod. Veronen.* (b).	*Cod. Colbert.* (c).	*Cod. Brix.* (f.)	*Cod. Amiatinus* (Vulgate).	*Cod. Bobbiensis* (k).*
Et si pes tuus scandalizat *te*, *asputa illum*:	Et si pes tuus scandalizat *te*, *amputa illum*:	Et si pes tuus scandalizat *te*, *amputa illum a te*:	Et si pes tuus scandalizat *te*, *abscide eum*:	Et si pes tuus te scandalizat, *amputa illum*:	Et si pes et scandalizat te *putar eum*
bonum est tibi clodum introire in vitam *aeternam*,	bonum est tibi claudum introire in vitam *aeternam*,	bonum *enim* est tibi claudum introire in vitam *aeternam*,	bonum est tibi clodum introire in vitam	bonum est tibi claudum introire in vitam *aeternam*	bonum est tibi clodum ventra ad vitam
quam duos pedes habentem	quam duos pedes habentem	quam duos pedes habentem,	quam duos pedes habentem	quam duos pedes habentem	quam duos pedes habentem
mitti in gehennam,	mitti in gehennam,	mitti in gehennam	mitti in gehennam,	mitti in gehennam	mitti in gehennam.
ubi ignis est inextinctibilis,	[*entur*,	*ignis inextinguibilis*,	*in ignem inextinguibilem*;	*ignis inextinguibilis*,	
ubi *vermis* eorum non *morietur*,	ubi *vermes* eorum non *mori-*	ubi *vermis* eorum non *morietur*.	ubi *vermis* eorum non *moritur*,	ubi *vermis* eorum non *moritur*,	*Et* si oculus *te scandalizia*crit
et ignis *eorum* non *extinguetur*,	et ignis *eorum* non *extinguetur*,	et ignis *eorum* non *exstinguetur*,	et ignis non *extinguitur*.	et ignis non *extinguitur*.	
Et si oculus scandalizat te,	*Quod* si oculus *tuus* scandalizat	*Quod*si oculus *tuus* scandalizat	*Quod*si oculus *tuus* scandalizat	*Quod* si oculus *tuus* scandalizat	*exime* eum:
exime illum:	*exime illum*: [te,	*exime eum a te*: [te,	*eice eum*. [te	*eice eum*: [te	*melius* est tibi *quacumque parte*
bonum est tibi *luscum* introire in regnum Dei	bonum est tibi *luscum* introire in regnum Dei,	bonum *enim* est tibi *luscum* introire in regnum Dei,	Bonum est tibi *unum oculum habentem* introire in regnum Dei,	bonum est tibi *luscum* introire in regnum Dei,	*corporis debilem* introire in regnum Dei
quam duos oculos habentem	quam duos oculos habentem	quam duos oculos habentem	quam duos oculos habentem	quam duos oculos habentem	quam *integrum*
mitti in gehennam,	*mitti* in gehennam,	*introire* in gehennam,	*mitti* in gehennam *ignis*	*mitti* in gehennam *ignis*	in *gehenna incidere*
ubi *vermes eorum* non *morientur*,	ubi *vermes eorum* non *morientur*,	ubi ignis non *exstinguetur*,	ubi *vermis eorum* non *moritur*,	ubi *vermis eorum* non *moritur*	ubi *ubi*
et ignis non *extinguetur*.	et ignis *eorum* non *extinguetur*.	et *vermis* non *morietur*.	et ignis non *extinguitur*.	et ignis non *extinguitur*.	ignis non *extinguetur*
Omnis hostia insalabitur,	*Omnis enim victima sale sa-*	*Omnis enim victima salietur*;	*Omnis enim igne salietur*,	*Omnis enim igne sallietur*	et *verum in quo oritur*
et bonum est sal;	Bonum est sal: [*lietur*.	Bonum est sal:	*et omne sacrificium sale sali-*	*et omnis victima sallictur*.	*omnia autem substantia consu-*
quodsi sal *insulsum* fuerit,	quodsi sal *insulsum* fuerit,	quod si sal *infatuatum* fuerit,	Bonum est sal; [*etur*.	Bonum est sal:	Bonum est sal [*mitur*
in quo *illut condietis*?	in quo *illut condietis*?	in quo *illum condies*?	quodsi sal *insulum* fuerit,	quodsi sal *insulsum* fuerit,	*Set* si *sals fatum* fuer.
Habete in vobis *salem*,	Habete in vobis *salem*,	Habete in vobis *sal*,	in quo *condietur*?	in quo *illud condietis*?	in *quod* illut condistis?
et pacem habete *inter vos*.	et pacem habete *inter vos*.	et pacem habete *in vobis*.	Habete in vobis *salem*,	Habete in vobis *sal*,	*Habetis* in vobis *panem*.
			et pacem habete *inter vos*.	et pacem habete *inter vos*.	*Pacati estote in illa invicem*.

* Vienna *Jahrbuch*, 1847-8 Some of the grosser errors are corrected in the MS.; e. g. *habete* for *habetis*; *salem* for *panem*. *Condistis* is surely an error of the press for *condietis*.

TABLE C. JOHN v.

Harl. 1775.	*Egerton* 609 (mm).	*Harl.* 1023 (Irish).	*Cambr. Kk.* 1. 24.	*Cambr. Ii.* 6. 32.
Post haec erat dies festus Judaeorum	Post hac erat dies festus Judaeorum	Post haec *erat dies* festus Judaeorum	Post haec erat dies festus Judaeorum	Post haec erat dies festus Judeorum
et ascendit Ihs *Hierosolymis*	et ascendit Ihs *Hierusolemis*	et ascendit Ihs *Hierosolimis*	et ascendit Ihs *hierusolimis*	et ascendit Ihs *hierusolimis*
Est *autem* Hierosolymis	Est *autem* in Hierusolemis	Est *autem* Hierosolimis		est hierusolimis
probatica piscina	*super* probatica piscina	*super* probatica piscina	*super* probatica piscina	*super* probatica piscina
quae cognominatur *Hebraice Bethzeta**	*aquae* cognominatur *Hebreice Bethsaida*	*quae* cognominatur *Ebreice Bethsaida*	*quae* cognominatur† *Hebreicae Bethsaida*	quae cognominatur *Ebreice Bedsaida*
quinque porticus habens	v porticos habens	v porticos habens	quinque porticos habens	quinque porticus habens
In his jacebat multitudo magna	In his *enim* jacebat multitudo magna	In his jacebat *multitudo magna*	in his jacebat multitudo magna	in his jacebat multitudo magna
languentium caecorum claudorum	*languentium* caecorum claudorum	*langentium* caecorum claudorum	*lugentium* caecorum claudorum	*languentium* caecorum claudorum
aridorum expectantium	aridorum expectantium	aridorum *paraliticorum* expectan-	aridorum *paraliticorum* expectan-	aridorum expectantium
aquae motum	aquae motum	tium aquae motum	tium aquae motum	aquae motum
	Angelus autem *Dnī* secundum tempus	Angelus autem *Dnī* secundum tempus	Angelus autem secundum tempus	Angelus autem *Dnī* secundum tempus
	discendebat in piscinam	*lavabatur** *in natatoria*	*lavabatur in natatoria*	*discendebat in piscinam*
	et *movebat aquam*	et *movebatur aqua*	et *movebatur aqua*	et *movebat aquam*
	et quicumque prius discenderet	*quicumque ergo prior* discendisset	*Quicumque ergo prior* discendisset	*quique ergo prius* discendisset
	in natatoria post *motionem* aquae	*in natatoria* post *motiones* aquae	*in natatoria* post *motionem* aquae	post *motionem* aquae
	sanus fiebat *quacunque teneretur in-*	sanus fiebat *a longore quocumque*	sanus fiebat *a languore quocumque*	sanus fiebat *a languore quocumque*
	firmitate	*tenebatur*	*detenebatur* **hoc in graecis exempla-*	*tenebatur*.
			*ribus non habetur**	
Erat autem *quidam homo ibi*	Erat autem *ibi homo*	Erat autem *homo quidam ibi*	Erat autem *quidam homo ibi*	Erat autem *ibi homo quidam*
xxx octo annos habens	xxxta *et* viii annos habens	xxxviii annos habens	xxxviii annos habens	annos habens
in infirmitate sua	infirmitate sua	*in* infirmitate sua	*in* infirmitate sua	*in* infirmitate sua
hunc cum vidisset Ihs jacentem	Hunc cum vidisset Ihs jacentem	Hunc cum vidisset Ihs *jacebat**	Hunc cum vidisset Ihs jacentem	hunc cum vidisset Ihs jacentem
et cognovisset quia *multum jam tempus*	et cognovisset quia *jam multum* tem-	et cognovisset quia *multum jam* tem-	et cognovisset quia *multum jam* tem-	et cognovisset quia *multum jam* tem-
*haberet** dicit ei	pus *haberet* dicit ei	pus *habet* dicit ei *ihs*	pus *habet* dicit ei	pus *habet* dicit ei
Vis sanus fieri?[1]	Vis sanus fieri?	Vis sanus fieri?[2]	Vis sanus fieri?	Vis sanus fieri?

[1] Variations of B. M. *Addit.* 9381:—*Hierosolimam. aebraicae bethsaida.* Angelus autem Dnī secundum temp; descendebat in piscinam et movebatur aqua *et sanabatur unus.* Et qui prior descendisset in piscinam post motionem aquae sanus fiebat a quacumque tenebatur infirmitate. *triginta et octo. imf.*

Variations of Harl. 1802 (Irish):—*dies erat. Hierusolimis* (bis). *mult. langu. magna. discendebat in pisc. et movebat aquam. qui e. prius. natatoriam. sanus f. post motum aquae a quoc. t. ten. ibi h. quidam.* om. *in. jacentem. j. m. tempus.* Variations of *Hereford* Gospels (Anglo-Saxon): *Judeorum, in hirusolimis. e. a. in hirus. aebreicae Bethzaida. languentium. cec. ang. autem disc. et movebatur aqua* (om. *Dni*, etc.). *et quic. p. discendebat.* om. *post. mot. a. quac. teneb. infirm.* xxx. et viii. *hab. ann. audisset. iam m* om *ihs*

d. *Cod. Claromontanus*, in the Vatican Libr., of the 4th or 5th cent. It contains a great part of St. Matthew, and is mainly African in character. Published by Mai, *Script. vet. nov. Coll.* iii. 1828.

e. *Cod. Vindobonensis*, at Vienna, of 5th or 6th cent. It contains fragments of St. Mark and St. Luke. Edited by Alter in two German periodicals.

f. *Cod. Bobbiensis*, at Turin, of the 5th cent. It contains parts of St. Matthew and St. Mark. The chief parts published by Tischendorf in the *Jahrbücher d. Literatur*, Vienna, 1847 ff. The text is a remarkable revision of the African.

g. The readings of a *Speculum*, published by Mai, *Patrum nova collectio*, i. 2, 1852. Comp. Tregelles, *Introduction*, 240.

h. *Cod. Sangallensis*, of the 5th or 4th cent. It contains fragments of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Transcribed by Tischendorf.

i. *Cod. Palat.*, at Vienna, of the 5th cent. Published by Tischdf. 1847. A very important MS., containing St John, and St. Luke nearly entire, and considerable parts of the other Gospels.

To these must be added a very remarkable fragment of St. Luke published by A. M. Ceriani, from a MS. of the 6th cent. in the Ambrosian Libr. at Milan: *Monum. Sacra*, ... 1861; and a purple fragment at Dublin (Saec. v.) containing Matt. xiii. 13-23, published by Dr. Todd in *Proceedings of R. I. A.* iii. 374.

k. *Cod. Corbeiensis*, St. Matt. Edited by Martianay and Sabatier.

Italic revision.[j]

l. *Cod. Brixianus*, of the 6th cent. The best type of the *Italic* text. Published by Bianchini, *l. c.* Comp. Lachm. *N. T.* i. Praef. xiv.

m. *Cod. Monacensis*, of the 6th cent. Transcribed by Tischendorf.

Irish (British) revision.[k]

---

[j] The critical value of these revised ante-Hieronymian texts is unduly underrated. Each recension, as the representative of a revision of the oldest text by the help of old Greek MSS., is perhaps not inferior to the recension of Jerome; and the MSS. in which they are severally contained, though numerically inferior to Vulgate MSS., are scarcely inferior in real authority.

[k] It would be impossible to enter in detail in the present place into the peculiarities of the text presented by this group of MSS. It will be observed that copies are included in it which represent historically the Irish (η, ε), Scotch (β), Mercian (ζ), Northumbrian (δ), and—if we may trust the very uncertain tradition which represents the Gospels of St. Chad as written by Gildas (comp. *Lib. Landav.* p. 615, ed. 1840)—Welsh Churches. Bentley, who had collated more or less completely four of them, observed their coincidence in remarkable readings, but the individual differences of the copies no less than their wide range both in place and age exclude the idea that all were derived from one source. They stand out as a remarkable monument of the independence, the antiquity, and the influence of British (Irish) Christianity.

For the present it must suffice to give a few special readings which show the extent and character of the variations of this family from other families of MSS. The notation of the text is preserved for the sake of brevity.

Matt. viii. 24.—Fluctibus + *erat autem* (enim γ) *illis ventus contrarius* (contr. vent. ζ) (γ δ ε ζ).

Matt. x. 29.—*Sine voluntate Dei patris vestri qui in coelis est* (sine p. vol. q. e. in c. ε). Sine p. v. vol. qui in c. e. ζ**. Sine patre vestro voluntate, &c., ζ* (γ ε ζ).

Matt. xiv. 35.—*Loci illius venerunt et* [om. *ven. et.* δ ζ] *adoraverunt eum et* (δ ε ζ).

Matt. xxvii. 49.—*Alius autem accepta lancea pupugit* (pupungit) *latus ejus et exit* (-iit -ivit) *aqua et sanguis* (γ δ ε).

Mark xiii. 18.—Ut *hieme non fiat* (-et) *fuga vestra* (γ δ ε) *vel sabbato* (δ ε), ut *non fra* (sic) *fuga vestra hieme vel sabbato* (ζ).

Luke xxiii. 2.—Nostram + *et solventem legem* (+ nostram ζ) *et prophetas* (δ ε ζ).

Luke xxiv. 1.—Ad mon. + *Maria Magdalena et altera Maria et quaedam cum eis* (δ ε).

John xix. 30.—*Cum autem expiravit* (asp. ε trdiset spm (sic) ζ) *velamentum* (velum a ε ζ) *templi scissum est medium a summo usque* (ad a) *deorsum* (a γ ε ζ).

John xxi. 6.—Invenietis + *Dixerunt autem Per totam noctem laborantes nihil cepimus: in verbo autem tuo mittimus* (laxttemus [sic *i.e.* laxabimus] rete ε, mītemus (sic) ζ) (γ ε ζ).

Other readings more or less characteristic are Matt. ii. 14, matrem *om* ejus; ii. 15, est *om* a Domino; iv. 9, vade + *retro*; iv. 6, de te + *ut custodiant te in omnibus viis tuis*; v. 5, lugent + *nunc*; v. 48, sicut pater; vi. 13, *patiaris nos induci*, &c.

As a more continuous specimen the following readings occur in one chapter in the Hereford Gospels in which this Latin text, with a few others only, agrees closely with the Greek: Luke xxiv. 6, *esset in Gal.* 7, *tertia die*; 16, *agnoscerent eum*; 20, *tradiderunt eum*; 24, *viderunt*; 28, *finxit longius ire*; 38, *quare cogitationes*; 39, *pedes meos*; 44, *haec sunt verba mea quae locutus sum ad vos.* Other remarkable readings in the same passage are 8, *horum verborum*; 18, *Respondens unus* om. et; 21, *quo haec omnia*; 27, *et erat incipiens*; 29, *inclinata est dies jam.*

A comparison of the few readings from the Gospels given in the Epistle of GILDAS according to the Cambridge MS. (*Univ. Libr.* Dd. 1, 17), for the text in Stevenson's edition is by no means accurate, shows some interesting coincidences with these Irish (British) MSS. (For the explanation of the additional references see § 31.)

Matt. v. 15.—*Supra* γ δ ε ζ K W F (*b*); v. 16, *magnificent* δ (*a*, *b*); v. 19, qui *enim* γ ε P (*a b*); vii. 2, *judicabitur de vobis* ε (*a*, *b*); vii. 3, non *consideras* (*a*); vii. 4, *in oculo tuo est* γ; vii. 6, *miseritis* (*a*, *b*); vii. 15, attendite + *vobis* γ δ φ (*b*); vii. 17, *bonus fructus* δ O (*a*, *b*); *id et mala malos*; vii. 23, *operarii iniquitatis* (*a*); vii. 27, *impigerunt* O; x. 28, *et corpus et animam, e, c. et an.* γ δ; xv. 14, *caeci duces sunt*; xvi. 18, infirm γ δ ε ζ B H O Z K φ (*a*); xvi 19, *quaecunque*; id. *erunt ligata* δ (*b*); xxiii. 3, *vero opera* δ ζ φ; id., et ipsi non f. δ ε ζ (*b*); xxiii. 13, *qui* claud. D. id. vos *autem* δ ζ H O φ.

Thus of twenty-one readings which differ from *Cod. Am.* thirteen are given in one or other of those MSS. which have been supposed to present a typical British (Irish) text, and of these eleven are found in the *Rushworth* MS. alone. While on the other hand nine readings agree with *Cod. Veron.* and seven with *Cod. Vercell.*, and every reading is supported by some old authority. Thus, though the range of comparison is very limited, the evidence of these quotations, as far as it goes, supports the belief in a distinct British text.

In the Evangelic quotations in the printed text of St. PATRICK, out of seventeen variations, eight (as far as I can find) are supported by no known Latin authority the remainder are found in γ, δ, ε or φ. BACHIARIUS I have not been able to examine, though his writings are not unlikely to offer some illustrations of the early text.

SEDULIUS (*Opus Paschale*), as might have been ex-

(α.) Cambridge *Univ. Libr.* Kk. 1, 24. Saec. viii.? St. Luke, i. 15-end, and St. John, i. 18-xx. 17. Bentley's X. Capitula wanting in St. Luke; xiv. in St. John. No Ammonian Sections. (Plate ii. fig. 1.)

(β.) Cambridge *Univ. Libr.* Ti. 6, 32. Saec. viii.-x. *The Book of Deer.* St. Matt. i.-vii. 23. St. Mark, i. 1, v. 36. St. Luke, i. 1, iv. 2. St. John, entire. Very many old and peculiar readings. Nearer Vulg. than (α), but very carelessly written. No Ammonian Sections or Capitula. Belonged to monks of Deer in Aberdeenshire. Comp. Mr. H. Bradshaw in the *Printed Catalogue.*[l]

(γ.) Lichfield, *Book of St. Chad.* Saec. viii. St. Matt., St. Mark, and St. Luke, i.-iii. 9. Bentley's ξ_2.

(δ.) Oxford, *Bodl.* D. 24 (3946). Saec. viii. *The Gospels of Mac Regol.* or the *Rushworth* MS. Bentley's χ. No Capit., Sect., or Prefaces. A collation of the Latin text in the Lindisfarne text of St. Matt. and St. Mark (comp. p. 1711, note [g]), together with the Northumbrian gloss, has been published by Rev. J. Stevenson. Deficient Luke iv. 29-viii. 38.[m]

(ε.) Oxford, C. C. Coll. 122. Saec. x., xi? Bentley's C. Has Canons and Prefaces, but no Sect. or Capit.

(ζ.) Hereford (*Saxon*) *Gospels.* Saec. viii. (ix.). The four Gospels, with two small lacunae. Without Prefaces, Canons, Capitula, or Sections. A very important copy, and probably British in origin.[n] (Plate ii. fig. 5.)

(η.) *The Book of Armagh* (all N. T.), Trin. Coll. Dublin: written A.D. 807. Comp. *Proceedings of R. I. A.* iii. pp. 316, 356. Sir W. Betham, *Irish Antiq. Researches*, ii.[o]

(θ.) A copy found in the *Domhnach Airgid* (Royal I. Acad.), Saec. v. vi. Comp. Petrie, *Transactions of R. I. A.*, xviii., 1838. O'Curry's *Lectures*, Dublin, 1861, pp. 321 ff., where a facsimile is given.

(ι.) (κ.) Two copies in Trin. Coll. Dublin, said to be "ante-Hieronymian, Saec. vii."[p]

To these must be added a large number of Irish, including under this term North British MSS., which exhibit a text more nearly approaching the Vulgate, but yet with characteristic old readings. Such are:—

Brit. Mus., *Harl.* 1802. Saec. x.-xii. A.D. 1138? Prefaces all at the beginning. No *Capitula* or *Sections.* Bentley's W. (Plate ii. fig. 4.)

Brit. Mus., *Harl.* 1023. Saec. x.-xii? No *Capitula* or *Sections.* (Plate ii. fig. 3.)

Lambeth. *The Book of Mac Durnan.*[q] Saec. x. Has Sections, but no Prefaces or Canons.

Dublin, *T. C. C. The Book of Kells.* Saec. viii.

Dublin, *T. C. C. The Book of Durrow.* Saec. viii.

Dublin, *T. C. C. The Book of Dimma.* Saec. viii.

Dublin, *T. C. C. The Book of Moling.* Saec. viii.[r]

Gallican (?) revision.[s]

Brit. Mus., *Egerton*, 609, formerly *Majoris Monasterii*; iv. Gospp. deficient from Mark vi. 56 to Luke xi. 1. This MS. is called *mm*, and classified under Vulgate MSS. in the editions of the N. T., but it has been used only after Calmet's very imperfect collation, and offers a distinct type of text. *Praef. Can.* No *Capitula.*

(2.) Of the Acts and Epistles.

n. Cod. Bobbiensis, at Vienna. A few fragments of the Acts and Cath. Epp. Edited by Tischendorf, *Jahrbücher d. Lit.* l. c.

---

pected from his foreign training, gives in the main a pure Vulgate text in his quotations from the Vulgate. When he differs from it (*e. g.* Luke x. 19, 20; John xi. 43 *prodi*), he often appears to quote from memory, and differs from all MSS.

The quotations given at length in the British copy of Juvencus (Camb. *Univ. Libr.* Ff. 4, 42) would probably repay a careful examination.

[l] This MS., in common with many Irish MSS. (*e.g.* Brit. Mus. Harl. 1802, 2795, the Book of MacDurnan, and some others, as *Harl.* 1775, *Cotton.* Tib. A ii.), separates the genealogy in St. Matt. from the rest of the Gospel, closing v. 17 with the words *Finit Prologus*, and then adding *Incipit Evangelium.*

[m] The reading of this MS. in Matt. xxi. 28 ff. is very remarkable: Homo quidam habebat duos filios et accedens ad primum dixit fili vade operare in viam * meam. ille autem respondens dixit eo dne et non fit accedens autem ad alterum dixit similiter at ille respondens ait solo. postea autem pœnitentia motus abiit in viniam.* quis ex duob: fecit voluntatem patris. dicunt * novissimus.

[n] For the opportunity of examining this MS. the writer is indebted to the kindness of the Rev. J. Jebb, D.D., Canon of Hereford.

[o] This MS. contains the Ep. to the Laodicenes, with the note *Sed Hieronumus eam negat esse Pauli*: Betham

---

il. p. 263. The stichometry is as follows: *Matheus versus habet MMDCC, Marcus MDCC, Lucas MMDCCC, Johannis MMCCC. Id.* p. 318*

[p] Dr. Reeves undertook to publish the text of the Book of Armagh, with collations of ι, κ, and other MSS. in T. C. D., but the writer has been unable to learn whether he will carry out his design. The MSS. η–κ the writer knows only by description, and very imperfectly.

[q] Facsimiles of many of these "Irish" MSS. are given in Westwood's *Paleographia Sacra* and in O'Curry's *Lectures.* The text of most of them (even of those collated by Bentley) is very imperfectly known, and it passes by a very gradual transition into the ordinary type of Vulgate. The whole question of the general character and the specific varieties of these MSS. requires careful investigation. The Table (F) will give some idea of their variations from the common text. The Stow St. John, at present in Lord Ashburnham's collection, probably belongs to this family.

[r] These four MSS. I know only by Mr. Westwood's descriptions in his *Palaeographia Sacra*; and to Mr. Westwood belongs the credit of first directing attention to Irish MSS. after the time of Bentley.

[s] The text of this recension, which I believe to be contained also in g^1, and Bentley's ρ (comp. p. 1713, note [s]) is closely allied to the British type. As to the Spanish text I have no sufficient materials to form an estimate of its character.

o. *Cod. Corbei.*, a MS. of Ep. of St. James. Published by Martianay, 1695.

p. (Of St. Paul's Epp.) *Cod. Clarom.*, the Latin text of D_2. Published by Tischendorf.

q. (Of St. Paul's Epp.) *Cod. Sangerm.*, the Latin text of E_3, said to have an independent value, but imperfectly known.

r. (Of St. Paul's Epp.) *Cod. Boern.*, the Latin text of G_2, is in the main an old copy, adapted in some points to the Greek.

s. (See Gospels).

t Fragments of St. Paul's Epistles transcribed at Munich by Tischendorf.

u, *v*. (Acts) the Latin text of D_1 and E_2 (Cod. Bezae and Cod. Laud).

To these must be added, from the result of a partial collection:—

x_1. Oxford, *Bodl.* 3418 (Selden, 30). Acts. Saec. viii., vii. An uncial MS. of the highest interest. Deficient xiv. 26, *fidei*—xv. 32, *cum essent*. Bentl. χ_2. Among its characteristic readings may be noticed: v. 34, foras modicum apostolos secedere; ix. 40, surge in nomine Domini Ihu Xti.; xi. 17, ne daret illis Spiritum Sanctum credentibus in nomine Ihu Xti.; xiii. 14, Paulus et Barnabas; xvi. 1, et cum circuisset has nationes pervenit in Derben. (Plate i. fig. 4).

x_2. Oxford, *Bodl.* Laud. *Lat.* 108 (E, 67). Saec. ix. St. Paul's Epp. in Saxon letters. Ends Hebr. xi. 34, *aciem gladii*. Corrected apparently by three hands. The original text was a revision of the Old Latin, but it has been much erased. In many cases it agrees with *d* almost or quite alone: *e. g.* Rom. ii. 14, 16, iii. 22, 26, x. 20, xv. 13, 23, 27, 30. The Epistles to Thess. are placed before the Ep. to Coloss. This arrangement, which is given by Augustine (*De Doctr. Christ.* ii. 13), appears to have prevailed in early English MSS., and occurs in the Saxon Cambridge MS., and several other MSS. of the Bible quoted by Hody, p. 664. Comp. §31 (2) 8.[t]

The well-known *Harleian* MS. 1772 (§32, (2) 3) ought to be reckoned rather among the Old than the Vulgate texts. A good collection of its more striking variations is given in the Harleian Catalogue. In the Acts and Epistles (no less than in the Gospels) there are indications of an unrevised (African) and revised texts, but the materials are as yet too imperfect to allow of an exact determination of the different types.

(3.) In the Apocalypse the text depends on *m* and early quotations, especially in Primasius.

13. It will be seen that for the chief part of the O. T., and for considerable parts of the N. T. (*e. g.* Apoc. Acts), the old text rests upon early quotations (principally Tertullian, Cyprian, Lucifer of Cagliari, for the African text, Ambrose and Augustine for the Italic). These were collected by Sabatier with great diligence up to the date of his work; but more recent discoveries (*e. g.* of the Roman *Speculum*) have furnished a large store of new materials which have not yet been fully employed. (The great work of Sabatier, already often referred to, is still the standard work on the Latin Versions. His great fault is his neglect to distinguish the different types of text, African, Italic, British, Gallic; a task which yet remains to be done. The earliest work on the subject was by Flaminius Nobilius, *Vetus Test. sec. LXX. Latine redditum* . . . . Romae, 1588. The new collations made by Tischendorf, Mai, Münter, Ceriani, have been noticed separately.)

III. THE LABOURS OF JEROME.—14. It has been seen that at the close of the 4th century the Latin texts of the Bible current in the Western Church had fallen into the greatest corruption. The evil was yet greater in prospect than at the time; for the separation of the East and West, politically and ecclesiastically, was growing imminent, and the fear of the perpetuation of false and conflicting Latin copies proportionately greater. But in the crisis of danger the great scholar was raised up who probably alone for 1500 years possessed the qualifications necessary for producing an original version of the Scriptures for the use of the Latin Churches. Jerome—Eusebius Hieronymus—was born in 329 A.D. at Stridon in Dalmatia, and died at Bethlehem in 420 A.D. From his early youth he was a vigorous student, and age removed nothing from his zeal. He has been well called the Western Origen (Hody, p. 350), and if he wanted the largeness of heart and generous sympathies of the great Alexandrine, he had more chastened critical skill and closer concentration of power. After long and self-denying studies in the East and West, Jerome went to Rome A.D. 382, probably at the request of Damasus the Pope, to assist in an important synod (*Ep.* cviii. 6), where he seems to have been at once attached to the service of the Pope (*Ep.* cxxiii. 10). His active biblical labours date from this epoch, and in examining them it will be convenient to follow the order of time, noticing (1) the Revision of the Old Latin Version of the N. T.; (2) the Revision of the Old Latin Version (from the Greek) of the O. T.; (3) the New Version of the O. T. from the Hebrew.

(1.) *The Revision of the Old Latin Version of the N. T.*—15. Jerome had not been long at Rome (A.D. 383) when Damasus consulted him on points of Scriptural criticism (*Ep.* xix. "Dilectionis tuae est ut ardenti illo strenuitatis ingenio . . . . vivo sensu scribas"). The answers which he received (*Epp.* xx., xxi.) may well have encouraged him to seek for greater services; and apparently in the same year he applied to Jerome for a revision of the current Latin version of the N. T. by the help of the Greek original. Jerome was fully sensible of the prejudices which such a work would excite among those "who thought that ignorance

[t] A very interesting historical notice of the use of the Old Latin in the North of England is given by Bede, who says of Ceolfrid, a contemporary abbot, "Bibliothecam utriusque Monasterii [Wearmouth and Jarrow] magna geminasse industria. Ita ut tres Pandectas novae translationis, ad unum vetustae translationis, quem de Roma attulerat, ipse superadjungeret. . . . ." (*Hist. Abbat. Wirr. auth. et Girwiens.* Quoted by Hody, *De Text.* p. 199).

was holiness" (*Ep. ad Marc.* xxvii.), but the need of it was urgent. "There were," he says, "almost as many forms of text as copies" ("tot sunt exemplaria pene quot codices," *Praef. in Evv.*). Mistakes had been introduced "by false transcription, by clumsy corrections, and by careless interpolations" (*id.*), and in the confusion which had ensued the one remedy was to go back to the original source (Graeca veritas, Graeca origo). The Gospels had naturally suffered most. Thoughtless scribes inserted additional details in the narrative from the parallels, and changed the forms of expression to those with which they had been originally familiarized (*id.*). Jerome therefore applied himself to these first ("haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quatuor tantum Evangelia"). But his aim was to revise the Old Latin, and not to make a new version. When Augustine expressed to him his gratitude for "his *translation* of the Gospel" (*Ep.* civ. 6, "non parvas Deo gratias agimus de opere tuo quo Evangelium *ex Graeco interpretatus es*"), he tacitly corrected him by substituting for this phrase "the *correction* of the N. T." (*Ep.* cxii. 20, "Si me, ut dicis, in N. T. *emendatione* suscipis . . . ."). For this purpose he collated early Greek MSS., and preserved the current rendering wherever the sense was not injured by it ("... Evangelia ... codicum Graecorum emendata collatione sed veterum. Quae ne multum a lectionis Latinae consuetudine discreparent, ita calamo temperavimus (*all.* imperavimus) ut his tantum quae sensum videbantur mutare, correctis, reliqua manere pateremur ut fuerant:" *Praef. ad Dam.*). Yet although he proposed to himself this limited object, the various forms of corruption which had been introduced were, as he describes, so numerous that the difference of the Old and Revised (Hieronymian) text is throughout clear and striking. Thus in Matt. v. we have the following variations:—

Vetus Latina.[a]	*Vulgata nova* (Hieron.).
7 Ipsis *miserebitur Deus.*	7 ipsi *misericordiam consequentur.*
11 dixerint ...	11 dixerint ... *mentientes.*
— propter *justitiam.*	— propter *me.*
12 ante vos *patres eorum* (Luke vi. 26).	12 ante vos.
17 non veni solvere *legem aut prophetas.*	17 non veni solvere.
18 fiant: *coelum et terra transibunt, verba autem mea non praeteribunt.*	18. fiant.
22 fratri suo *sine causa.*	22 fratri suo.
25 es cum *illo* in ira.	25 es in via cum *eo* (and often).
29 *eat* in gehennam.	29 *mittatur* in gehennam.
37 quod autem *amplius.*	37 quod autem *his abundantius.*
41 *adhuc* alia duo.	41 *et* alia duo.
43 *odies.*	43 *odio habebis.*
44 vestros, *et benedicite qui maledicent vobis et* benefacite.	44 vestros benefacite.

Of these variations those in vers. 17, 44, are only partially supported by the old copies, but they illustrate the character of the interpolations from which the text suffered. In St. John, as might be expected, the variations are less frequent. The 6th chapter contains only the following:—

2 sequebatur *autem.*	2 *et* sequebatur.
21 (volebant).	21 (voluerunt).
23 (quem benedixerat Dominus (alii aliter)).	23 (gratias agente Domino).
39 haec est *enim.*	39 haec est *autem.*

[a] In giving the readings of *Vetus Latina* the writer has throughout confined himself to those which are supported by a combination of authorities, avoiding the peculiarities of single MSS., and (if possible) of a single family.

Vetus Latina.	*Vulgata nova* (Hieron.).
38 (Patris mei).	39 (Patris mei *qui misit me*).
53 (manducare).	53 (ad manducandum).
66 (a patre).	66 (a patre *meo*).
67 ex hoc *ergo.*	67 ex hoc.

16. Some of the changes which Jerome introduced were, as will be seen, made purely on linguistic grounds, but it is impossible to ascertain on what principle he proceeded in this respect (comp. §35). Others involved questions of interpretation (Matt. vi. 11, *supersubstantialis* for ἐπιούσιος). But the greater number consisted in the removal of the interpolations by which the synoptic Gospels especially were disfigured. These interpolations, unless his description is very much exaggerated, must have been far more numerous than are found in existing copies; but examples still occur which show the important service which he rendered to the Church by checking the perpetuation of apocryphal glosses: Matt. iii. 3, 15 (v. 12); (ix. 21), xx. 28; (xxiv. 36); Mark i. 3, 7, 8; iv. 19; xvi. 4; Luke (v. 10); viii. 48; ix. 43, 50; xi. 36; xii. 38; xxiii. 48; John vi. 56. As a check upon further interpolation he inserted in his text the notation of the Eusebian Canons [NEW TESTAMENT, §21]; but it is worthy of notice that he included in his revision the famous *pericope*, John vii. 53, viii. 11, which is not included in that analysis.

17. The preface to Damasus speaks only of a revision of the Gospels, and a question has been raised whether Jerome really revised the remaining books of the N. T. Augustine (A.D. 403) speaks only of "the Gospel" (*Ep.* civ. 6, quoted above), and there is no preface to any other books, such as is elsewhere found before all Jerome's versions or editions. But the omission is probably due to the comparatively pure state in which the text of the rest of the N. T. was preserved. Damasus had requested (*Praef. ad Dam.*) a revision of the whole, and when Jerome had faced the more invidious and difficult part of his work there is no reason to think that he would shrink from the completion of it. In accordance with this view he enumerates (A.D. 398) among his works "the restoration of the (Latin version of the) N. T. to harmony with the original Greek." (*Ep. ad Lucin.* lxxi. 5: "N. T. Graecae reddidi auctoritati, ut enim Veterum Librorum fides de Hebraeis voluminibus examinanda est, ita novorum Graecae (?) sermonis normam desiderat." *De Vir. Ill.* cxxxv.: "N. T. Graecae fidei reddidi. Vetus juxta Hebraicam transtuli.") It is yet more directly conclusive as to the fact of this revision, that in writing to Marcella (cir. A.D. 385) on the charges which had been brought against him for "introducing changes in the Gospels," he quotes three passages from the Epistles in which he asserts the superiority of the present Vulgate reading to that of the Old Latin (Rom. xii. 11, *Domino* servientes, for *tempori* servientes; 1 Tim. v. 19, add. nisi sub duobus aut tribus testibus; 1 Tim. i. 15, *fidelis* sermo, for *humanus* sermo). An examination of the Vulgate text, with the quotations of ante-Hieronymian fathers and the imperfect evidence of MSS., is itself sufficient to establish the reality and character of the revision. This will be apparent from a collation of a few chapters taken from several of the later books of the N. T.; but it will also be obvious that the revision was hasty and imperfect; and in later times the line between

the Hieronymian and Old texts became very indistinct. Old readings appear in MSS. of the Vulgate, and on the other hand no MS. represents a pure African text of the Acts and Epistles.

ACTS i. 4-25.

Versio Vetus.[x]	*Vulg.*
4 *cum conversaretur cum illis* . . . quod audistis	4 *convescens* . . . quam audistis *per os meum.*
5 *tingemini.* [*a me.*	5 *baptizabimini.*
6 *at illi* convenientes.	6 *Igitur qui* convenerant.
7 *at ille respondens* dixit.	7 Dixit *autem.*
8 *superveniente* S. S.	8 *supervenientis* S. S.
10 intenderent. Comp. iii. (4). 12; vi. 15; x. 4; (xiii. 9).	10 intuerentur.
13 ascenderunt *in superiora.*	13 *in coenaculum* ascenderunt.
— *erant habitantes.*	— *manebant.*
14 perseverantes *unanimes orationi.*	14 persev. *unanimiter in oratione.*
18 *Hic igitur adquisivit.*	18 *Et hic quidem possedit.*
21 qui *convenerunt* nobiscum viris.	21 viris qui nobiscum *sunt congregati.*
25 *ire.* Comp. xvii. 30.	25 *ut abiret.*

ACTS xvii. 16-34.

16 *circa simulacrum.*	16 *idololatriae deditam.*
17 Judaeis.	17 *cum* Judaeis.
18 *seminator.*	18 *seminiverbius.*
22 *superstitiosos*	22 *superstitiosiores.*
23 *perambulans.*	23 *praeteriens.*
— *culturas* vestras.	— *simulacra* vestra.
26 ex uno *sanguine.*	26 ex uno.

ROM. i. 13-15.

13 *Non* autem *arbitror.*	13 *nolo* autem.
15 quod in me *est promptus sum.*	15 quod in me *promptum est.*

1 COR. x. 4-29.

4 sequenti se (sequenti, q), (*Cod. Aug.* f)[y]	4 consequente eos.
6 in figuram.	6 in figura (f), (g).
7 idolorum cultores (g corr.) efficiamur.	7 idololatrae (idolatres, f) efficiamini (f).
12 putat (g corr.).	12 existimat (f).
15 sicut prudentes, vobis dico.	15 ut (sicut, f, g) prudentibus loquor (dico, f, g).
16 quem (f, g).	16 cui.
— communicatio (alt.)(f, g).	— participatio.
21 participare (f, g).	21 participes esse.
29 infideli (g).	29 (aliena); alia (f).

2 COR. iii. 11-18.

14 *dum* (*quod* g corr.) *non revelatur* (g corr.).	14 *non revelatum* (f).
18 *de* (*a* g) *gloria in gloriam* (g).	18 *a claritate in claritatem.*

GAL. iii. 14-25.

14 *benedictionem* (g).	14 *pollicitationem* (f).
15 *irritum facit* (*irritat*, g).	15 *spernit* (f).
25 *veniente autem fide* (g).	25 *At ubi venit fides* (f).

PHIL. ii. 2-30.

2 *unum* (g).	2 *idipsum* (f).
6 cum . . . *constitutus* (g).	6 cum . . . *esset* (f).
12 *dilectissimi* (g).	12 *carissimi* (f).
26 *sollicitus* (*taedebatur*, g).	26 *maestus* (f).
28 *sollicitus itaque.*	28 *festinantius ergo* (*fest. ego*, f: *fest. autem*, g).
30 *parabolatus de anima sua* (g).	30 *tradens animam suam* (f).

1 TIM. iii. 1-12.

1 *Humanus* (g corr.).	1 *fidelis* (f).
2 *docibilem* (g).	2 *doctorem* (f).
4 habentem *in obsequio.*	4 habentem *subditos* (f, g).
8 *turpilucros.*	3 *turpe lucrum sectantes* (f) (*turpil. s.* g).
12 *filios bene regentes* (g corr.).	12 *qui filiis suis bene praesint* (f).

[x] See note [n], p. 1695.

[y] The Latin readings of *Cod. Aug.* have been added, as offering an interesting example of the admixture of a few old readings with the revised text. Those of *Cod. Boern.* (g) differ, as will be seen, very widely from them.

(2.) *The Revision of the O. T. from the LXX.* —18. About the same time (cir. A.D. 383) at which he was engaged on the revision of the N. T., Jerome undertook also a first revision of the Psalter. This he made by the help of the Greek, but the work was not very complete or careful, and the words in which he describes it may, perhaps, be extended without injustice to the revision of the later books of the N. T.: "Psalterium Romae . . . emendaram et juxta LXX. interpretes, *licet cursim magna illud ex parte* correxeram" (*Praef. in Lib. Ps.*). This revision obtained the name of the *Roman* Psalter, probably because it was made for the use of the Roman Church at the request of Damasus, where it was retained till the pontificate of Pius V. (A.D. 1566), who introduced the Gallican Psalter generally, though the Roman Psalter was still retained in three Italian churches (Hody, p. 383, "in una Romae *Vaticana* ecclesia, et extra urbem in *Mediolanensi* et in ecclesia *S. Marci*, Venetiis"). In a short time "the old error prevailed over the new correction," and at the urgent request of Paula and Eustochium Jerome commenced a new and more thorough revision (*Gallican* Psalter).[z] The exact date at which this was made is not known, but it may be fixed with great probability very shortly after A.D. 387, when he retired to Bethlehem, and certainly before 391, when he had begun his new translations from the Hebrew. In the new revision Jerome attempted to represent as far as possible, by the help of the Greek versions, the real reading of the Hebrew. With this view he adopted the notation of Origen [SEPTUAGINT; compare *Praef. in Gen.*, &c.], and thus indicated all the additions and omissions of the LXX. text reproduced in the Latin. The additions were marked by an *obelus* (÷); the omissions, which he supplied, by an asterisk (*). The omitted passages he supplied by a version of the Greek of Theodotion, and not directly from the Hebrew ("unusquisque . . . ubicunque viderit virgulam praecedentem (÷) ab ea usque ad duo puncta (″) quae impressimus, sciat in LXX. interpretibus plus haberi. Ubi autem stellae (*) similitudinem perspexerit, de Hebraeis voluminibus additum noverit, aeque usque ad duo puncta, *juxta Theodotionis dumtaxat editionem, qui simplicitate sermonis a LXX. interpretibus non discordat*," *Praef. ad Ps.*; compare *Praeff. in Job, Paralip. Libr. Solom. juxta LXX. Intt. Ep. ad Sun. et Fret.*). This new edition soon obtained a wide popularity. Gregory of Tours is said to have introduced it from Rome into the public services in France, and from this it obtained the name of the *Gallican* Psalter. The comparison of one or two passages will show the extent and nature of the corrections which Jerome introduced into this second work, as compared with the Roman Psalter. (See Table D, opposite.)

How far he thought change really necessary will appear from a comparison of a few verses of his translation from the Hebrew with the earlier revised septuagintal translations. (See Table E.)

Numerous MSS. remain which contain the Latin Psalter in two or more forms. Thus *Bibl. Bodl.* Laud. 35 (Saec. x.?) contains a triple Psalter, Gallican, Roman, and Hebrew: *Coll. C. C. Oxon.* xii. (Saec. xv.) Gallican, Roman, Hebrew: *Id.* x.

[z] In one place Jerome seems to include these two revisions in one work: "Psalterium . . . certe emendatissimum juxta LXX. interpretes nostro labore dudum Roma sumpsit" . . . (*Apol. adv. Ruf.* ii. 30).

(Saec. xiv.) Gallican, Hebrew, Hebr. text with interlinear Latin: *Brit. Mus.* Harl. 634, a double Psalter, Gallican and Hebrew: *Brit. Mus.* Arund. 155 (Saec. xi.) a Roman Psalter with Gallican corrections: *Coll. SS. Trin. Cambr.*, R. 17, 1, a triple Psalter, Hebrew, Gallican, Roman (Saec. xii.): Id. R. 8, 6, a triple Psalter, the Hebrew text with a peculiar interlinear Latin version, Jerome's Hebrew, Gallican. An example of the unrevised Latin, which, indeed, is not very satisfactorily distinguished from the Roman, is found with an Anglo-Saxon interlinear version, *Univ. Libr.* Cambr., Ff., i. 23 (Saec. xi.). H. Stephens published a "*Quincuplex Psalterium, Gallicum, Rhomaicum, Hebraicum, Vetus, Conciliatum. . . .* Paris, 1513," but he does not mention the MSS. from which he derived his texts.

19. From the second (Gallican) revision of the Psalms Jerome appears to have proceeded to a revision of the other books of the O. T., restoring all, by the help of the Greek, to a general conformity with the Hebrew. In the Preface to the

TABLE D.

In Tables D, E, and F, the passages are taken from Martianay's and Sabatier's texts, without any reference to MSS., so that the variations cannot be regarded as more than approximately correct.

Ps. viii. 4-6.

Vetus Latina.	*Psalt. Romanum.*	*Psalt. Gallicanum.*
	Quoniam videbo coelos, opera digitorum tuorum:	Quoniam videbo coelos * tuos // opera digitorum tuorum;
	lunam et stellas quas tu fundasti.	lunam et stellas quae † tu // fundasti.
	Quid est homo, *quod* memor es ejus?	Quid est homo, *quod* memor es ejus?
(*Nisi quod*)	aut filius hominis, *quoniam* visitas eum?	aut filius hominis, *quoniam* visitas eum?
Nisi quia (quod)	*Minuisti* eum paulo minus ab angelis;	*Minuisti* eum paulo minus ab angelis;
Minorasti.	gloria et honore coronasti eum:	gloria et honore coronasti eum,
	et constituisti eum super opera manuum tuarum.	† et // constituisti eum super opera manuum tuarum.

Ps. xxxix. 1-4.

	Exspectans exspectavi Dominum:	Exspectans exspectavi Dominum:
respexit me.	et *respexit me*;	et *intendit mihi*;
deprecationem.	et exaudivit *deprecationem* meam;	et †ex//audivit *preces* meas;
	et eduxit me de lacu miseriae,	et eduxit me de lacu miseriae,
	et de luto faecis.	†et //de luto faecis.
	Et statuit super petram pedes meos;	Et statuit super petram pedes meos;
	et direxit gressus meos.	†et// direxit gressus meos.
hymnum.	Et immisit in os meum canticum novum: *hymnum* Deo nostro.	Et immisit in os meum canticum novum: *carmen* Deo nostro.

Ps. xvi. (xv.) 8-11 (Acts ii. 25-28).

(*Domino.*)	Providebam *Dominum* in conspectu meo semper,	Providebam *Dominum* in conspectu meo semper,
	quoniam a dextris est mihi, ne commovear.	quoniam a dextris est mihi, ne commovear.
jocundatum.	Propter hoc *delectatum* est cor meum,	Propter hoc *laetatum* est cor meum,
	et exsultavit lingua mea:	et exsultavit lingua mea:
	insuper et caro mea requiescet in spe.	† insuper //et caro mea requiescet in spe.
apud inferos.	Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in *inferno* (-um);	Quoniam non derelinques animam meam in *inferno*;
	nec dabis Sanctum tuum videre corruptionem.	nec dabis Sanctum tuum videre corruptionem.
	Notas mihi fecisti vias vitae:	Notas mihi fecisti vias vitae:
	adimplebis me laetitia cum vultu tuo:	adimplebis me laetitia cum vultu tuo:
	delectationes in dextra tua, usque in finem.	delectationes in dextera tua † usque // in finem.

TABLE E.

Ps. xxxiii. (xxxiv.) 12-16 (1 Pet. iii. 10-12).

Vetus Latina.	*Vulgata.*	*Jerome's transl. from the Hebr.*
Quis est homo qui vult vitam,	Quis est homo qui vult vitam,	Quis est *vir* qui velit vitam
et *cupit* videre dies bonos?	*diligit* dies videre bonos?	*diligens* dies videre bonos?
Cohibe linguam tuam a malo:	*Prohibe* linguam tuam a malo:	*Custodi* linguam tuam a malo,
et labia tua ne loquantur dolum.	et labia tua ne loquantur dolum.	et labia tua ne loquantur dolum.
Deverte a malo et fac bonum:	*Diverte* a malo et fac bonum:	*Recede* a malo et fac bonum:
inquire pacem et *sequere* eam.	inquire pacem, et *persequere* eam.	*quaere* pacem et persequere eam.
Oculi Domini super justos	Oculi Domini super justos	Oculi Domini *ad* justos
et aures ejus *ad* preces eorum.	et aures ejus *in* preces eorum.	et aures ejus *ad clamores* eorum.
Vultus Domini super facientes mala.	Vultus *autem* Domini super facientes mala.	Vultus Domini super facientes *malum.*

Ps. xxxix. (xl.) 6-8 (Hebr. x. 5-10).

Sacrificium et oblationem noluisti:	Sacrificium et oblationem noluisti:	*Victima et oblatione non indiges.*
aures autem perfecisti mihi.	aures autem perfecisti mihi.	aures *fodisti* mihi.
Holocausta etiam pro *delicto* non postulasti.	Holocaustum et pro *peccato* non postulasti:	Holocaustum et pro peccato non *petisti.*
Tunc dixi: Ecce venio.	Tunc dixi: Ecce venio.	Tunc dixi: Ecce venio.
In capite libri scriptum est de me	In capite libri scriptum est de me,	In *volumine* libri scriptum est de me
ut *faciam* voluntatem tuam.	ut *facerem* voluntatem tuam.	ut facerem *placitum tibi.*

Ps. xviii. (xix.) 5 (Rom. x. 18).

In omnem terram exiit sonus eorum:	In omnem terram exivit sonus eorum:	In *universam* terram exivit sonus eorum:
et in *finibus* orbis terrae verba eorum.	et in *fines* orbis terrae verba eorum.	et in *finem* orbis verba eorum.

Revision of Job, he notices the opposition which he had met with, and contrasts indignantly his own labours with the more mechanical occupations of monks which excited no reproaches ("Si aut fiscellam junco texerem aut palmarum folia complicarem . . nullus morderet, nemo reprehenderet. Nunc autem . . . corrector vitiorum falsarius vocor"). Similar complaints, but less strongly expressed, occur in the Preface to the Books of Chronicles, in which he had recourse to the Hebrew as well as to the Greek, in order to correct the innumerable errors in the names by which both texts were deformed. In the preface to the three Books of Solomon (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles) he notices no attacks, but excuses himself for neglecting to revise Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom, on the ground that "he wished only to amend the Canonical Scriptures" ("tantummodo Canonicas Scripturas vobis emendare desiderans"). No other prefaces remain, and the revised texts of the Psalter and Job have alone been preserved; but there is no reason to doubt that Jerome carried out his design of revising all the "Canonical Scriptures" (comp. *Ep.* cxii. *ad August.* (cir. A.D. 404), "Quod autem in aliis quaeris epistolis: cur prior mea *in libris Canonicis* interpretatio asteriscos habeat et virgulas praenotatas . . ."). He speaks of this work as a whole in several places (e. g. *adv. Ruf.* ii. 24, "Egone contra LXX. interpretes aliquid sum locutus, quos ante annos plurimos diligentissime emendatos meae linguae studiosis dedi . . .?" Comp. *Id.* iii. 25; *Ep.* lxxi. *ad Lucin.*, "Septuaginta interpretum editionem et te habere non dubito, et ante annos plurimos (he is writing A.D. 398) diligentissime emendatam studiosis tradidi"), and distinctly represents it as a Latin version of Origen's Hexaplar text (*Ep.* cvi. *ad Sun. et Fret.*, "Ea autem quae habetur in Ἑξαπλοῖς et quam non vertimus"), if, indeed, the reference is not to be confined to the Psalter, which was the immediate subject of discussion. But though it seems certain that the revision was made, there is very great difficulty in tracing its history, and it is remarkable that no allusion to the revision occurs in the Preface to the new translation of the Pentateuch, Joshua (Judges, Ruth), Kings, the Prophets, in which Jerome touches more or less plainly on the difficulties of his task, while he does refer to his former labours on Job, the Psalter, and the Books of Solomon in the parallel prefaces to those books, and also in his Apology against Rufinus (ii. 27, 29, 30, 31). It has, indeed, been supposed (Vallarsi, *Praef. in Hier.* x.) that these six books only were published by Jerome himself. The remainder may have been put into circulation surreptitiously. But this supposition is not without difficulties. Augustine, writing to Jerome (cir. A.D. 405), earnestly begs for a copy of the revision from the LXX., of the publication of which he was then only lately aware (*Ep.* xcvi. 34, "Deinde nobis mittas, obsecro, interpretationem tuam de Septuaginta, *quam te edidisse nesciebam*;" comp. §34). It does not appear whether the request was granted or not, but at a much later period (cir. A.D. 416) Jerome says that he cannot furnish him with "a copy of the LXX. (*i. e.* the Latin Version of it) furnished with asterisks and obeli, as he had lost the chief part of his former labour by some person's treachery" (*Ep.* cxxxiv., "Pleraque prioris laboris fraude cujusdam amisimus"). However this may have been, Jerome could not have spent more than four (or five) years on the work, and that too in the midst of other labours, for in 491 he was already engaged on the versions from the Hebrew which constitute his great claim on the lasting gratitude of the Church.

(3.) *The Translation of the O. T. from the Hebrew.*—20. Jerome commenced the study of Hebrew when he was already advanced in middle life (cir. A.D. 374), thinking that the difficulties of the language, as he quaintly paints them, would serve to subdue the temptations of passion to which he was exposed (*Ep.* cxxv. § 12; comp. *Praef. in Dan.*). From this time he continued the study with unabated zeal, and availed himself of every help to perfect his knowledge of the language. His first teacher had been a Jewish convert; but afterwards he did not scruple to seek the instruction of Jews, whose services he secured with great difficulty and expense. This excessive zeal (as it seemed) exposed him to the misrepresentations of his enemies, and Rufinus indulges in a silly pun on the name of one of his teachers, with the intention of showing that his work was not "supported by the authority of the Church, but only of a second Barabbas" (Ruf. *Apol.* ii. 12; Hieron. *Apol.* i. 13; comp. *Ep.* lxxxiv. §3, and *Praef. in Paral.*). Jerome, however, was not deterred by opposition from pursuing his object, and it were only to be wished that he had surpassed his critics as much in generous courtesy as he did in honest labour. He soon turned his knowledge of Hebrew to use. In some of his earliest critical letters he examines the force of Hebrew words (*Epp.* xviii., xx., A.D. 381, 383); and in A.D. 384, he had been engaged for some time in comparing the version of Aquila with Hebrew MSS. (*Ep.* xxxii. § 1), which a Jew had succeeded in obtaining for him from the synagogue (*Ep.* xxxvi. §1). After retiring to Bethlehem, he appears to have devoted himself with renewed ardour to the study of Hebrew, and he published several works on the subject (cir. A.D. 389; *Quaest. Hebr. in Gen.* &c.). These essays served as a prelude to his New Version, which he now commenced. This version was not undertaken with any ecclesiastical sanction, as the revision of the Gospels was, but at the urgent request of private friends, or from his own sense of the imperious necessity of the work. Its history is told in the main in the Prefaces to the several instalments which were successively published. The *Books of Samuel and Kings* were issued first, and to these he prefixed the famous *Prologus galeatus*, addressed to Paula and Eustochium, in which he gives an account of the Hebrew Canon. It is impossible to determine why he selected these books for his experiment, for it does not appear that he was requested by any one to do so. The work itself was executed with the greatest care. Jerome speaks of the translation as the result of constant revision (*Prol. Gal.*, "Lege ergo primum Samuel et Malachim meum: meum, inquam, meum. Quid enim crebrius vertendo et emendando sollicitius et didicimus et tenemus nostrum est"). At the time when this was published (cir. A.D. 391, 392) other books seem to have been already translated (*Prol. Gal.* "omnibus libris quos de Hebraeo vertimus"); and in 393 the sixteen prophets[a] were in

[a] A question has been raised whether Daniel was not translated at a later time (comp. *Vit. Hieron.* xxi.), as Jerome does not include him among the prophets in the *Prol. Gal.*; but in a letter written A.D. 394 (*Ep.* liii. *ad Paul.*) he places him distinctly among the four greater prophets. The Preface to Daniel contains no mark of time: it appears only that the translation was made after that of Tobit, when Jerome was not yet familiar with Chaldee.

circulation, and Job had lately been put into the hands of his most intimate friends (*Ep.* xlix. *ad Pammach.*). Indeed, it would appear that already in 392 he had in some sense completed a version of the O. T. (*De Vir. Ill.* cxxxv., "Vetus juxta Hebraicum transtuli." This treatise was written in that year); but many books were not completed and published till some years afterwards. The next books which he put into circulation, yet with the provision that they should be confined to friends (*Praef. in Ezr.*), were Ezra and Nehemiah, which he translated at the request of Dominica and Rogatianus, who had urged him to the task for three years. This was probably in the year 394 (*Vit. Hieron.* xxi. 4), for in the Preface he alludes to his intention of discussing a question which he treats in *Ep.* lvii., written in 395 (*De optimo Gen. interpret.*). In the Preface to the Chronicles (addressed to Chromatius), he alludes to the same Epistle as "lately written," and these books may therefore be set down to that year. The three Books of Solomon followed in 398,[c] having been "the work of three days" when he had just recovered from a severe illness, which he suffered in that year (*Praef.* "Itaque longa aegrotatione fractus . . . . tridui opus nomini vestro [Chromatio et Heliodoro] consecravi." Comp. *Ep.* lxxiii. 10). The *Octateuch* now alone remained (*Ep.* lxxi. 5, *i. e.* Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Esther, *Praef. in Jos.*). Of this the Pentateuch (inscribed to Desiderius) was published first, but it is uncertain in what year. The Preface, however, is not quoted in the Apology against Rufinus (A.D. 400), as those of all the other books which were then published, and it may therefore be set down to a later date (Hody, p. 357). The remaining books were completed at the request of Eustochium, shortly after the death of Paula, A.D. 404 (*Praef. in Jos.*). Thus the whole translation was spread over a period of about fourteen years, from the sixtieth to the seventy-sixth year of Jerome's life. But still parts of it were finished in great haste (*e. g.* the Books of Solomon). A single day was sufficient for the translation of Tobit (*Praef. in Tob.*); and "one short effort" (una lucubratiuncula) for the translation of Judith. Thus there are errors in the work which a more careful revision might have removed, and Jerome himself in many places gives renderings which he prefers to those which he had adopted, and admits from time to time that he had fallen into error (Hody, p. 362). Yet such defects are trifling when compared with what he accomplished successfully. The work remained for eight centuries the bulwark of Western Christianity; and as a monument of ancient linguistic power the translation of the O. T. stands unrivalled and unique. It was at least a direct rendering of the original, and not the Version of a version. The Septuagintal tradition was at length set aside, and a few passages will show the extent and character of the differences by which the new translation was distinguished from the *Old Latin* which it superseded

TABLE F.

Mic. v. 2 (Matt. ii. 6).

Vetus Latina.	*Vulgata nova.*
Et tu Bethlehem domus Ephrata	Et tu Bethlehem Ephrata,
nequaquam minima es ut sis in millibus Judae:	*parvulus es* in millibus Judae:
ex te mihi egredietur	ex te mihi egredietur
ut sit in principem Israel,	*qui sit dominator* in Israel,
et egressus ejus ab initio,	et egressus ejus ab initio,
ex diebus saeculi.	*a diebus aeternitatis.*

Jer. xxxviii. (xxxi.) 15 (Matt. ii. 18).

Vox in *Rhama* audita est,	Vox in *excelso* audita est
lamentatio et fletus et luctus,	lamentationis luctus et fletus,
Rachel plorantis filios suos,	Rachel plorantis filios suos;
et noluit conquiescere,	*et nolentis* [noluit] *consolari*
quia non sunt.	super eis [s. filiis suis], quia non sunt.

Is. ix. i. 2 (Matt. iv. 15, 16).

Hoc primum bibe velociter fac	*Primo tempore alleviata est*
regio Zabulon, terra Neptalim;	terra Zabulon et terra Nephthali:
et reliqui qui juxta mare estis	*et novissimo aggravata est via maris*
trans Jordanem Galilaeae gentium	trans Jordanem Galilaeae gentium.
Populus qui ambulabat in tenebris	Populus qui ambulabat in tenebris
vidit lucem magnam:	vidit lucem magnam;
qui habitatis in regione et umbra mortis	habitantibus in regione umbrae mortis
lux *orietur* vobis.	lux *orta est* eis.

Is. liii. 4 (Matt. viii. 17).

Iste *peccata* nostra portat	Vere *languores* nostros ipse tulit
et *pro nobis dolet.*	et *dolores nostros ipse portavit.*

Zech. ix. 9 (Matt. xxi. 5).

Gaude *vehementer*, filia Sion,	Exsulta *satis*, filia Sion,
praedica filia Jerusalem:	*jubila* filia Jerusalem.
Ecce Rex tuus veniet tibi justus et salvans:	Ecce Rex tuus veniet tibi justus et salvator:
ipse *mansuetus* et ascendens super	ipse *pauper* et ascendens super
subjugalem et *pullum novum.*	*asinam* et *super pullum filium asinae.*

Is. lxi. 1, 2 (Luke iv. 18, 19).

Spiritus Domini super me,	Spiritus Domini (al. *add.* Dei) super me,
propter quod unxit me:	eo quod unxerit Dominus me:
evangelizare pauperibus misit me,	*ad annunciandum mansuetis* misit me,
sanare contritos corde,	ut mederer contritis corde,

[b] Sophronius (*De Vir. Ill.* cxxxiv.) had also then translated into Greek Jerome's version of the Psalms and Prophets.

[c] The date given by Hody (A.D. 388) rests on a false reference (p. 356).

Is. lxi. 1, 2 (LUKE iv. 18, 19).—*continued.*

Vetus Latina.	*Vulgata nova.*
praedicare captivis *remissionem*,	et praedicarem captivis *indulgentiam*,
et *caecis ut videant*:	et *clausis apertionem*:
vocare annum acceptabilem Domino	ut praedicarem (al. et annunciarem) annum placabilem Domino
et diem retributionis:	et diem ultionis Deo nostro:
consolari omnes lugentes.	ut consolarer omnes lugentes.

Hos. ii. 24 (ROM. ix. 25).

Et dicam non populo meo:	Et dicam non populo meo:
Populus meus es tu.	Populus meus es tu.
Et ipse dicet:	Et ipse dicet:
Dominus Deus meus es tu.	Deus meus es tu.

Hos. i. 10 (ROM. ix. 26).

Et erit in loco ubi *dictum est* eis:	Et erit in loco ubi *dicetur* eis:
Non populus meus vos:	Non populus meus vos:
Vocabuntur Filii Dei viventis.	*Dicetur eis*: Filii Dei viventis.

Is. xxviii. 16 (ROM. x. 11).

Ecce ego immittam in fundamenta Sion lapidem . . .	Ecce ego mittam in fundamentis Sion lapidem
et qui crediderit non *confundetur*.	qui crediderit non *festinet*.

Hos. xiii. 14 (1 COR. xv. 55).

De morte redimam illos:	De morte redimam eos:
ubi est causa tua mors?	*ero mors tua*, o mors,
ubi est aculeus tuus, Inferne?	*morsus tuus ero*, Inferne.

JOB iv. 15-21.

Et spiritus in faciem mihi occurrit,	Et cum spiritus me praesente transiret,
Horruerunt capilli mei et carnes.	inhorruerunt pili carnis meae.
Exsurrexi et non cognovi.	Stetit quidam, cujus non agnoscebam vultum
Inspexi, et non erat figura ante faciem meam:	imago coram oculis meis,
sed auram tantum et vocem audiebam.	et vocem quasi aurae lenis audivi.
Quid enim? Nunquid homo coram Domino mundus erit,	Nunquid homo Dei comparatione justificabitur
aut ab operibus suis sine macula vir?	aut factore suo purior erit vir?
Si contra servos suos non credit,	Ecce qui serviunt ei non sunt stabiles:
et adversus angelos suos pravum quid reperit.	et in angelis suis reperit pravitatem.
Habitantes autem domos luteas,	Quanto magis hi qui habitant domos luteas,
de quibus et nos ex eodem luto sumus,	qui terrenum habent fundamentum,
percussit illos tanquam tinea,	consumentur velut a tinea?
et a mane usque ad vesperam ultra non sunt;	De mane usque ad vesperam succidentur:
et quod non possent sibi ipsis subvenire perierunt.	et quia nullus intelligit in aeternum peribunt.
Afflavit enim eos et aruerunt,	Qui autem reliqui fuerint auferentur ex eis:
interierunt, quia non habebant sapientiam.	Morientur, et non in sapientia.

IV. THE HISTORY OF JEROME'S TRANSLATION TO THE INVENTION OF PRINTING.—21. The critical labours of Jerome were received, as such labours always are received by the multitude, with a loud outcry of reproach. He was accused of disturbing the repose of the Church and shaking the foundations of faith. Acknowledged errors, as he complains, were looked upon as hallowed by ancient usage (*Praef. in Job.* ii.); and few had the wisdom or candour to acknowledge the importance of seeking for the purest possible text of Holy Scripture. Even Augustine was carried away by the popular prejudice, and endeavoured to discourage Jerome from the task of a new translation (*Ep.* civ.), which seemed to him to be dangerous and almost profane. Jerome, indeed, did little to smooth the way for the reception of his work. The violence and bitterness of his language is more like that of the rival scholars of the 16th century than of a Christian Father; and there are few more touching instances of humility than that of the young Augustine bending himself in entire submission before the contemptuous and impatient reproof of the veteran scholar (*Ep.* cxii. *s. f.*). But even Augustine could not overcome the force of early habit. To the last he remained faithful to the Italic text which he had first used; and while he notices in his *Retractationes* several faulty readings which he had formerly embraced, he shows no tendency to substitute generally the New Version for the Old.[d] In such cases Time is the great reformer. Clamour based upon ignorance soon dies away; and the New translation gradually came into use equally with the Old, and at length supplanted it. In the 5th century it was adopted in Gaul by Eucherius of Lyons, Vincent of Lerins, Sedulius and Claudianus Mamertus (Hody, p. 398); but the Old Latin was still retained in Africa and Britain (id.). In the 6th century the use of Jerome's Version was universal among scholars except in Africa, where the other still lingered (Junilius); and at the close of it Gregory the Great, while commenting on Jerome's Version, acknowledged that it was admitted equally with the Old by the Apostolic See (*Praef. in Job. ad Leandrum*, "Novam translationem dissero, sed ut comprobationis causa exigit, nunc Novam, nunc Veterem, per testimonia assumo; ut quia sedes Apostolica (cui auctore Deo praesideo) utraque utitur mei quoque labor studii ex utraque fulciatur"). But the Old Version was not

[d] When he quotes it, he seems to consider an explanation necessary (*De doctr. Christ.* iv. 7, 15): "Ex illius prophetae libro potissimum hoc faciam . . . . . non autem secundum LXX. interpretes, *qui etiam ipsi divino spiritu interpretati, ob hoc aliter videntur nonnulla dixisse, ut ad spiritualem sensum magis admoneretur lectoris intentic . . . .* sed sicut ex Hebraeo in Latinum eloquium presbytero Hieronymo utriusque linguae perito interpretante, translata sunt." In his *Retractationes* there is no definite reference, as far as I have observed, to Jerome's critical labours. He notices, however, some false readings: *Lib.* i. vii.; Ps. xliii. 22 (Rom. viii. 36); Wisd. viii. 7, Eccles. i. 2; *id.* xix. 4; Matt. v. 22. *om* sine causa; *Lib* ii. xii.; Matt. xx. 17 (*duodecim* for *duo*).

authoritatively displaced, though the custom of the Roman Church prevailed also in the other churches of the West. Thus Isidore of Seville, (*De Offic. Eccles.* i. 12), after affirming the inspiration of the LXX., goes on to recommend the Version of Jerome, "which," he says, "is used universally, as being more truthful in substance and more perspicuous in language." "[Hieronymi] editione generaliter omnes ecclesiae usquequaque utuntur, pro eo quod veracior sit in sententiis et clarior in verbis:" (Hody, p. 402). In the 7th century the traces of the Old Version grow rare. Julianus of Toledo (A.D. 676) affirms with a special polemical purpose the authority of the LXX., and so of the Old Latin; but still he himself follows Jerome when not influenced by the requirements of controversy (Hody, pp. 405, 406). In the 8th century Bede speaks of Jerome's Version as "*our* edition" (Hody, p. 408); and from this time it is needless to trace its history, though the Old Latin was not wholly forgotten.[e] Yet throughout, the New Version made its way without any direct ecclesiastical authority. It was adopted in the different Churches gradually, or at least without any formal command. (Compare Hody, pp. 411 ff. for detailed quotations.)

22. But the Latin Bible which thus passed gradually into use under the name of Jerome was a strangely composite work. The books of the O. T., with one exception, were certainly taken from his Version from the Hebrew; but this had not only been variously corrupted, but was itself in many particulars (especially in the Pentateuch) at variance with his later judgment. Long use, however, made it impossible to substitute his Psalter from the Hebrew for the Gallican Psalter; and thus this book was retained from the Old Version, as Jerome had corrected it from the LXX. Of the Apocryphal books Jerome hastily revised or translated two only, Judith and Tobit. The remainder were retained from the Old Version against his judgment; and the Apocryphal additions to Daniel and Esther, which he had carefully marked as apocryphal in his own Version, were treated as integral parts of the books. A few MSS. of the Bible faithfully preserved the "Hebrew Canon," but the great mass, according to the general custom of copyists to omit nothing, included everything which had held a place in the Old Latin. In the N. T. the only important addition which was frequently interpolated was the apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans. The text of the Gospels was in the main Jerome's revised edition; that of the remaining books his very incomplete revision of the Old Latin. Thus the present Vulgate contains elements which belong to every period and form of the Latin Version—(1.) *Unrevised Old Latin*: Wisdom, Ecclus., 1, 2 Macc., Baruch. (2.) *Old Latin revised from the LXX.*: Psalter. (3.) *Jerome's free translation from the original text*: Judith, Tobit. (4.) *Jerome's translation from the Original*: O. T. except Psalter. (5.) *Old Latin revised from Greek MSS.*: Gospels. (6.) *Old Latin cursorily revised*: the remainder of N. T.

The Revision of Alcuin.—23. Meanwhile the text of the different parts of the Latin Bible was rapidly deteriorating. The simultaneous use of the Old and New Versions necessarily led to great corruptions of both texts. Mixed texts were formed according to the taste or judgment of scribes, and the confusion was further increased by the changes which were sometimes introduced by those who had some knowledge of Greek.[f] From this cause scarcely any Anglo-Saxon Vulgate MS. of the 8th or 9th centuries which the writer has examined is wholly free from an admixture of old readings. Several remarkable examples are noticed below (§ 32); and in rare instances it is difficult to decide whether the text is not rather a revised *Vetus* than a corrupted *Vulgata nova* (*e.g.* Brit. Mus. *Reg.* i. E. vi.; *Addit.* 5463). As early as the 6th century, Cassiodorus attempted a partial revision of the text (Psalter, Prophets, Epistles) by a collation of old MSS. But private labour was unable to check the growing corruption; and in the 8th century this had arrived at such a height, that it attracted the attention of Charlemagne. Charlemagne at once sought a remedy, and entrusted to Alcuin (cir. A.D. 802) the task of revising the Latin text for public use. This Alcuin appears to have done simply by the use of MSS. of the Vulgate, and not by reference to the original texts (Porson, *Letter* vi. *to Travis*, p. 145). The passages which are adduced by Hody to prove his familiarity with Hebrew, are in fact only quotations from Jerome, and he certainly left the text unaltered, at least in one place where Jerome points out its inaccuracy (Gen. xxv. 8).[g] The patronage of Charlemagne gave a wide currency to the revision of Alcuin, and several MSS. remain which claim to date immediately from his time.[h] According to a very remarkable statement, Charlemagne was more than a patron of sacred criticism, and himself devoted the last year of his life to the correction of the Gospels "with the help of Greeks and Syrians" (Van Ess, p. 159, quoting Theganus, Script. Hist. Franc. ii. p. 277).[i]

24. However this may be, it is probable that Alcuin's revision contributed much towards preserving a good Vulgate text. The best MSS. of his recension do not differ widely from the pure Hieronymian text, and his authority must have done much to check the spread of the interpolations which reappear afterwards, and which were derived from the intermixture of the Old and New Versions. Examples of readings which seem to be due to him occur: Deut. i. 9, add. *solitudinem*; *venissemus*, for *-etis*; id. 4, *ascendimus*, for *ascendemus*; ii. 24, *in manu tua*, for *in manus tuas*; iv. 33, *vidisti*, for *vixisti*; vi. 13, *ipsi*, add. *soli*; xv. 9, *oculos*, om

[e] Thus Bede, speaking of a contemporary abbot, says that he increased the library of two monasteries with great zeal, "ita ut tres *Pandectas*" (the name for the collection of the Holy Scriptures adopted by Alcuin, in place of *Bibliotheca*) "novae translationis ad unum vetustae translationis, quam de Roma attulerat, ipse superadjungeret... (Hody, p. 409).

[f] Jerome notices this fruitful source of error: "Si quid pro studio ex latere additum est non debet poni in corpore, ne priorem translationem pro scribentium voluntate conturbat" (*Ep.* cvi. *ad Sun. et Fret.*). Bede, Walafrid Strabo, and others, complain of the same custom.

[g] Hieron. *Quaest. in Gen.* xxv. 8; *Comm. in Eccles.* ix. 166; *id.* xii. 490

[h] Among these is that known as Charlemagne's Bible, *Brit. Mus.* Add. 10,546, which has been described by Hug, *Einl.* §123. Another is in the library of the Oratory at Rome (comp. §30, Cod. D). A third is in the Imperial Library at Paris. All of these, however, are later than the age of Charlemagne, and date probably from the time of Charles the Bald, A.D. 875.

[i] Mr. H. Bradshaw suggests that this statement derives some confirmation from the Preface which Charlemagne added to the collection of Homilies arranged by Paulus Diaconus, in which he speaks "of the pains which he had taken to set the church books to rights." A copy of this collection, with the Preface (xi.th cent.), is preserved in the Library of St. Peter's Coll. Cambr.

tuos; xvii. 20, *filius*, for *filii*; xxi. 6, add. *venient*; xxvi. 16, *at*, for *et*. But the new revision was gradually deformed, though later attempts at correction were made by Lanfranc of Canterbury (A.D. 1089, Hody, p. 416), Card. Nicolaus (A.D. 1150), and the Cistercian Abbot Stephanus (cir. A.D. 1150). In the 13th century *Correctoria* were drawn up, especially in France, in which varieties of reading were discussed;[k] and Roger Bacon complains loudly of the confusion which was introduced into the

[k] Vercellone has given the readings of three Vatican *Corrcctoria*, and refers to his own essay upon them in *Atti della Pontif. Acad. Rom. di Archeologia*, xiv. There is a *Correctorium* in *Brit. Mus.* Reg. 1 A, viii.

[m] The divisions of the Latin Versions into *capitula* were very various. Cassiodorus († 560 A.D.) mentions an ancient division of some books existing in his time ("Octateuchi [*i. e.* Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth] titulos .... credidimus imprimendos a majoribus nostris ordine currente descriptos." *De Inst. Div. Litt.* i.), and in other books (1, 2 Chron., the Books of Solomon), he himself made a corresponding division. Jerome mentions *capitula*, but the sections which he indicates do not seem to establish the existence of any generally received arrangement; and the variety of the capitulation in the best existing MSS. of his Version proves that no one method of subdivision could claim his authority. The divisions which are given in MSS. correspond with the summary of contents by which the several books are prefaced, and vary considerably in length. They are called indiscriminately *capitula*, *breves*, *tituli*. Martianay, in his edition of the *Bibliotheca*, gives a threefold arrangement, and assigns the different terms to the three several divisions; thus Genesis has xxxviii *tituli*, xlvi *breves*, lxxxii (or cliv) *capitula*. But while Jerome does not appear to have fixed any division of the Bible into chapters, he arranged the text in lines (*versus*, στίχοι) for convenience in reading and interpretation; and the lines were combined in marked groups (*membra*, κῶλα). In the poetical books a further arrangement marked the parallelism of the answering clauses (Martianay, *Prolegg.* iv. *Ad Div. Bibl.*). The number of lines (*versus*) is variously given in different MSS. (Comp. Vercellone, *Var. Lect. App. ad Jos.*) For the origin of the present division of the Vulgate, see BIBLE, i. 213.

An abstract of the *capitula* and *versus* given in the Alcuin MS., known as "Charlemagne's Bible" (Brit. Mus. Addit. 10,546), will give a satisfactory idea of the contents, nomenclature, and arrangement of the best copies of the Latin Bible.

Epistola ad Paulinum. Praefatio.
Bresit, i. e. *Genesis*, capp. lxxxii. habet versos iii. dcc.
Ellesmoth, i. e. *Exodus*. capp. cxxxviiii. v. iii.
Leviticus, Hebraice
Vaiecra. . . . capp. lxxxviiii. v. ii. ccc.
Numeri . . . capp. lxxviiii. hab. vers. numr. iii.
Addabarim, Grece
Deuteronomium . . capp. clv. habet vers. ii. dc.
Praefatio Jesu Naue et Judicum.
Josue Ben Nun . . capp. xxxiii. habet vers. i. dccl.
Softim, i. e. *Judicum*,
(liber) . . . . capp. xviii. habet vers. numr. i. dccl.
Ruth . . . . . none. habet ver. num. ccl.
Praefatio (Prologus galeatus).
Samuhel (*Regum*), lib.
prim. . . . . capp. xxvi. habet versus, ii. ccc.
Samuhel (*Regum*), lib.
sec. . . . . capp. xviii. habet versus, ii. cc.
Malachim, i. e. *Regam*,
lib. tert. . capp. xviiii. (for xviii.) habet vers. ii. d.
Malachim, i. e. *Regum*,
lib. quart. . . . . capp. xvii. habet versus ii. ccl.
Prologus.
Isaias . . . . . none. habet vers. iii. dlxxx.
Prologus.

"Common, that is the Parisian copy," and quotes a false reading from Mark viii. 38, where the correctors had substituted *confessus* for *confusus* (Hody, pp. 419 ff.). Little more was done for the text of the Vulgate till the invention of printing; and the name of Laurentius Valla (cir. 1450) alone deserves mention, as of one who devoted the highest powers to the criticism of Holy Scripture, at a time when such studies were little esteemed.[m]

Hieremias (with Lam. and Prayer) . . . . . none. habet versus iiii. cccl.
Prologus.
Hiezecheel (*-iel*) . . . . none. none.
Danihel . . . . . none. habet versus i. dccl.
Osee, Johel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Michas, Naum, Abacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias . none. none.
Prologus.
Job . . . . . none. v. i. dcc.
Origo Proph. David . . Praefatio.
Liber *Psalmorum* (Gallican) none. habet vr. v.
Epist. ad Chroni. et Heliod.
Liber *Proverbiorum* . capp. lx. habet versus i. dccxl.
Ecclesiastes . . . capp. xxxi. none.
Cantica Canticorum . . none. habet versus cclxxx.
Liber *Sapientiae* . capp. xlviii. habet versus i. dcc.
Ecclesiasticus . . capp. cxxvii. habet versus ii. dccc.
Praefatio.
Dabreiamin, lib. prim. . none. hab. (sic)
Paralypominon (lib. sec.) . none. none.
Praefatio.
Liber *Ezrae* . . . . . —— ——
Prologus.
Hester (with add.) . . . none. habet versus v. dcc.
Praefatio.
Tobias . . . . . none. none.
Prologus.
Judith . . . . . —— habet versus i. c.
Liber *Machabr.* prim. . . . lxi. none.
Machabr. liber sec. . . . . lv. ——
Praef. ad Damasum.
Argumentum.
Canones.
Prologus.
Mattheus . . . capp. lxxxi. habet vers. ii. dcc
Marcus . . . . capp. xlvi. hab. v. i. dcc.
Lucas . . . . capp. lxxiii. vers. iii. dccc.
Johannes . . . capp. xxxv. vers. i. dccc.
Lib. *Actuum Apost.* capp. lxxiiii. habet vers. iii dc.
Prologus septem Epistolarum Can.
Epistl. *Scī. Jacobi* . . capp. xx. none.
Epistl. *Scī. Petri prim.* capp. xx. ——
Epistl. *Scī. Petri sec.* . capp. xl. ——
Epistl. *Scī. Joh. prim.* . capp. xx. ——
Epistl. *Scī. Joh. sec.* . capp. v. ——
Epistl. *Scī. Joh. tert.* . capp. v. ——
Epistl. *Scī. Jud.* . . . capp. vii. ——
Epla. *ad Romanos* . . capp. li. habet versus dcxxcxi
Epla. *ad Cor. prim.* . capp. lxxii. none.
Epla. *ad Cor. sec.* . capp. xxviii. hab. vers. ccxcii.
Epla. *ad Galathas* . capp. xxxvii. habet versus ccxiii.
Epla. *ad Ephesios* . . capp. xxxi. habet versus cccxvii
Epla. *ad Philippenses* . capp. xviiii. none.
Epla. *ad Thess. prim.* . capp. xxv. habet versus ccxiii.
Epla. *ad Thess. sec.* . capp. viiii. none.
Epla. *ad Colosenses* . capp. xxxi. none.
Epla. *ad Tim. prim.* . capp. xxx. vers. ccxxx.
Epla. *ad Tim. sec.* . . capp. xxv. none.
Epla. *ad Tit.* . . . . capp. x. none.
Epla. *ad Philem.* . . capp. iiii. none
Epla. *ad Hebr.* . . capp. xxxviiii. none.
Epla. *ad Laodicenses* . . none. none.
Apocalypsis . . . . capp. xxv. habet versus i. dccc

An *argumentum* is given before each of the books of

V. THE HISTORY OF THE PRINTED TEXT.—25. It was a noble omen for the future progress of printing that the first book which issued from the press was the Bible; and the splendid pages of the Mazarin Vulgate (Mainz, Gutenburg and Fust) stand yet unsurpassed by the latest efforts of typography. This work is referred to about the year 1455, and presents the common text of the 15th century. Other editions followed in rapid succession (the first with a date, Mainz, 1462, Fust and Schoiffer), but they offer nothing of critical interest. The first collection of various readings appears in a Paris edition of 1504, and others followed at Venice and Lyons in 1511, 1513; but Cardinal Ximenes (1502-1517) was the first who seriously revised the Latin text (" . . . . contulimus cum quamplurimis exemplaribus venerandae vetustatis; sed his maxime, quae in publica Complutensis nostrae Universitatis bibliotheca reconduntur, quae supra octingentesimum abhinc annum litteris Gothicis conscripta, ea sunt sinceritate ut nec apicis lapsus possit in eis deprehendi," *Praef.*)[n], to which he assigned the middle place of honour in his Polyglott between the Hebrew and Greek texts [comp. NEW TESTAMENT, p. 521]. The Complutensian text is said to be more correct than those which preceded it, but still it is very far from being pure. This was followed in 1528 (2nd edition 1532) by an edition of R. Stephens, who had bestowed great pains upon the work, consulting three MSS. of high character and the earlier editions, but as yet the best materials were not open for use. About the same time various attempts were made to correct the Latin from the original texts (Erasmus, 1516;[o] Pagninus, 1518-28; Card. Cajetanus; Steuchius, 1529; Clarius, 1542), or even to make a new Latin version (Jo. Campensis, 1533). A more important edition of R. Stephens followed in 1540, in which he made use of twenty MSS. and introduced considerable alterations into his former text. In 1541 another edition was published by Jo. Benedictus at Paris, which was based on the collation of MSS. and editions, and was often reprinted afterwards. Vercellone speaks much more highly of the *Biblia Ordinaria*, with glosses, &c., published at Lyons, 1545, as giving readings in accordance with the oldest MSS., though the sources from which they are derived are not given (*Variae Lect.* xcix.). The course of controversy in the 16th century exaggerated the importance of the differences in the text and interpretation of the Vulgate, and the confusion called for some remedy. An authorized edition became a necessity for the Romish Church, and, however gravely later theologians may have erred in explaining the policy or intentions of the Tridentine Fathers on this point, there can be no doubt that (setting aside all reference to the *original* texts) the principle of their decision—the preference, that is, of the oldest Latin text to any later Latin version—was substantially right.[p]

The Sixtine and Clementine Vulgates.—26. The first session of the Council of Trent was held on Dec. 13th, 1545. After some preliminary arrangements the Nicene Creed was formally promulgated as the foundation of the Christian faith on Feb. 4th, 1546, and then the Council proceeded to the question of the authority, text, and interpretation of Holy Scripture. A committee was appointed to report upon the subject, which held private meetings from Feb. 20th to March 17th. Considerable varieties of opinion existed as to the relative value of the original and Latin texts, and the final decree was intended to serve as a compromise.[q] This was made on April 8th, 1546, and consisted of two parts, the first of which contains the list of the canonical books, with the usual anathema on those who refuse to receive it; while the second, " On the Edition and Use of the Sacred Books," contains no anathema, so that its contents are not articles of faith.[r] The wording of the decree itself contains

---

the N. T. except the Catholic Epistles and the Ep. to the Laodiceans, and the whole MS. closes with sixty-eight hexameter Latin verses.

The divisions agree generally with *Brit. Mus.* Harl. 2805, and *Lambeth* 3, 4. In the Vallicellian Alcuin MS. (comp. p. 1710 D) the apocryphal *Ep. to the Laodiceans* is not found; but it occurs in the same position in the great Bible in the King's Library (1 E. vii. viii.), with four *capitula*.

Many examples of the various divisions into *capitula* are given at length by Thomasius, *Opera*, i. ed. Vezzosi, *Romae*, 1747. The divisions of the principal MSS. which the writer has examined are given below, §30.

Bentley gives the following stichometry from *Cod. Sangerm.* (g):—

Ep. ad Rom., *Scribta de Chorintho.* *Versos* DCCCC. (so two other of B.'s MSS.).
ad Cor. i., *Scribta de Philipis.* *Versus* DCCCLXX.
ad Cor. ii., *Scribta de Macedoniâ.* *Versus* DLXX. (sic).
ad Galat., *Scribta de urbe Roma.* *Versi* CCLXIIIXC. (sic).
ad Ephes., *Scribta de urbe Roma.* *Versus* CCCXII.
ad Philip., *Scribta de urbe Roma.* *Versi* CCCL.
ad Coloss., *Scribta de urbe Roma.* *Versi* CCVIII.
ad Thess. i., *Scripta de Athenis.* *Versi* CLXIIII.
ad Thess. ii., *Scripta de urbe Roma.* *Versus* CVIII.
ad Tim. i., *Scribta de Lauditia.* *Versus* CCXXX.
ad Tim. ii., *Scripta a Roma.* *Versus* CLXXII.
ad Tit., *Scripta de Nicopolin.* *Versus* LXVII.
ad Philem., *Scribta de urbe Roma.* *Versus* XXXIIII.
ad Hebr., *Scribta de Roma.* *Versus* DCC.

No verses are given from this MS. for the other books.

[n] The copy which is here alluded to is still in the library at Alcala, but the writer is not aware that it has been re-examined by any scholar. There is also a second copy of the Vulgate of the 12th cent. A list of Biblical MSS. at Alcala is given in Dr. Tregelles' *Printed Text of N. T.*, pp. 15-18.

[o] Erasmus himself wished to publish the Latin text as he found it in MSS.; but he was dissuaded by the advice of a friend, " urgent rather than wise " (" amici consiliis improbis verius quam felicibus ").

[p] Bellarmin justly insists on this fact, which has been strangely overlooked in later controversies (*De Verbo Dei*, x. ap. Van Ess, §27): " Nec enim Patres [Tridentini] fontium ullam mentionem fecerunt. Sed solum ex tot latinis versionibus, quae nunc circumferuntur, unam delegerunt, quam ceteris anteponerent . . . . . antiquam novis, probatam longo usu recentibus adhuc, ac ut sic loquar, crudis . . . . "

[q] The original authorities are collected and given at length by Van Ess. §17.

[r] Insuper eadem Sacrosancta Synodus considerans non parum *utilitatis* accedere posse ecclesiæ Dei, si ex omnibus *latinis* editionibus, quæ circumferuntur sacrorum librorum, quaenam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat, statuit et declarat, ut hæc ipsa vetus et vulgata editio, quae longo tot seculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata est, in *publicis* lectionibus, disputationibus, prædicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat. . . . Sed et impressoribus modum. . . . imponere volens. . . . . decrevit et statuit ut posthac sacra scriptura *potissimum* vero haec ipsa vetus et vulgata editio quam emendatissime imprimatur.

several marks of the controversy from which it arose, and admits of a far more liberal construction than later glosses have affixed to it. In affirming the authority of the 'Old Vulgate' it contains no estimate of the value of the original texts. The question decided is simply the relative merits of the current *Latin* versions ("si ex omnibus Latinis versionibus quae circumferuntur . . . . "), and this only in reference to *public* exercises. The object contemplated is the advantage (utili as) of the Church, and not anything essential to its constitution. It was further enacted, as a check to the licence of printers, that "Holy Scripture, but *especially* the old and common (Vulgate) edition (evidently without excluding the original texts), should be printed as correctly as possible." In spite, however, of the comparative caution of the decree, and the interpretation which was affixed to it by the highest authorities, it was received with little favour, and the want of a standard text of the Vulgate practically left the question as unsettled as before. The decree itself was made by men little fitted to anticipate the difficulties of textual criticism, but afterwards these were found to be so great that for some time it seemed that no authorized edition would appear. The theologians of Belgium did something to meet the want. In 1547 the first edition of Hentenius appeared at Louvain, which had very considerable influence upon later copies. It was based upon the collation of Latin MSS. and the Stephanic edition of 1540. In the Antwerp Polyglott of 1568-72 the Vulgate was borrowed from the Complutensian (Vercellone, *Var. Lect.* ci.); but in the Antwerp edition of the Vulgate of 1573-4 the text of Hentenius was adopted with copious additions of readings by Lucas Brugensis. This last was designed as the preparation and temporary substitute for the Papal edition: indeed it may be questioned whether it was not put forth as the "correct edition required by the Tridentine decree" (comp. Lucas Brug. ap. Vercellone, cii.). But a Papal board was already engaged, however desultorily, upon the work of revision. The earliest trace of an attempt to realise the recommendations of the Council is found fifteen years after it was made. In 1561 Paulus Manutius (son of Aldus Manutius) was invited to Rome to superintend the printing of Latin and Greek Bibles (Vercellone, *Var. Lect.* &c., i. Prol. xix. *n.*). During that year and the next several scholars (with Sirletus at their head) were engaged in the revision of the text. In the pontificate of Pius V. the work was continued, and Sirletus still took a chief part in it (1569, 1570, Vercellone, *l. c.* xx. *n.*), but it was currently reported that the difficulties of publishing

an authoritative edition were insuperable. Nothing further was done towards the revision of the Vulgate under Gregory XIII., but preparations were made for an edition of the LXX. This appeared in 1587, in the second year of the pontificate of Sixtus V., who had been one of the chief promoters of the work. After the publication of the LXX., Sixtus immediately devoted himself to the production of an edition of the Vulgate. He was himself a scholar, and his imperious genius led him to face a task from which others had shrunk. "He had felt," he says, "from his first accession to the papal throne (1585), great grief, or even indignation (indigne ferentes), that the Tridentine decree was still unsatisfied;" and a board was appointed, under the presidency of Card. Carafa, to arrange the materials and offer suggestions for an edition. Sixtus himself revised the text, rejecting or confirming the suggestions of the board by his absolute judgment; and when the work was printed he examined the sheets with the utmost care, and corrected the errors with his own hand.[s] The edition appeared in 1590, with the famous constitution *Aeternus ille* (dated March 1st, 1589) prefixed, in which Sixtus affirmed with characteristic decision the plenary authority of the edition for all future time. "By the fulness of Apostolical power" (such are his words) "we decree and declare that this edition . . . . approved by the authority delivered to us by the Lord, is to be received and held as true, lawful, authentic, and unquestioned, in all public *and private* discussion, reading, preaching, and explanation."[t] He further forbade expressly the publication of various readings in copies of the Vulgate, and pronounced that all readings in other editions and MSS. which vary from those of the revised text "are to have no credit or authority for the future" (ea in iis quae huic nostrae editioni non consenserint, nullam in posterum fidem, nullamque auctoritatem habitura esse decernimus). It was also enacted that the new revision should be introduced into all missals and service-books; and the greater excommunication was threatened against all who in any way contravened the constitution. Had the life of Sixtus been prolonged, there is no doubt but that his iron will would have enforced the changes which he thus peremptorily proclaimed; but he died in Aug. 1590, and those whom he had alarmed or offended took immediate measures to hinder the execution of his designs. Nor was this without good reason. He had changed the readings of those whom he had employed to report upon the text with the most arbitrary and unskilful hand; and it was scarcely an exaggeration to say that his precipitate "self-reliance had brought the Church into the most

---

[s] The original words are both interesting and important: "Nos . . . . ipsius Apostolorum Principis auctoritate confisi . . . . haudquaquam gravati sumus . . . . hunc quoque non mediocrem accuratae lucubrationis laborem suscipere, atque ea omnia perlegere quae alii collegerant aut senserant, diversarum lectionum rationes perpendere, sanctorum doctorum sententias recognoscere: quae quibus anteferenda essent dijudicare, adeo ut in hoc laboriosissimae emendationis curriculo, in quo operam quotidianam, eamque pluribus horis collocandam duximus, aliorum quidem labor fuerit in consulendo, noster autem in eo quod ex pluribus esset optimum deligendo: ita tamen ut veterem multis in Ecclesia abhinc saeculis receptam lectionem omnino retinuerimus. Novam interea Typographiam in Apostolico Vaticano Palatio nostro . . . . . exstruximus . . . . ut in ea emendatum jam Bibliorum volumen excuderetur: eaque res quo magis incorrupte perficeretur, nostra nos ipsi manu correximus, si qua praelo vitia obrepserant, et quae confusa aut facile confundi posse videbantur . . . . distinximus" (Hody, p. 496; Van Ess, p. 273).

[t] ". . . . . ex certa nostra scientia, deque Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine statuimus ac declaramus, eam Vulgatam sacrae, tam veteris, quam novi Testamenti paginae Latinam editionem, quae pro authentica a Concilio Tridentino recepta est, sine ulla dubitatione, aut controversia censendam esse hanc ipsam, quam nunc, prout optime fieri poterit, emendatam et in Vaticana Typographia impressam in universa Christiana Republica, atque in omnibus Christiani orbis Ecclesiis legendam evulgamus, decernentes eam . . . . pro vera, legitima authentica et indubitata, in omnibus publicis privatisque disputationibus, lectionibus, praedicationibus, et explanationibus recipiendam et tenendam esse."

serious peril."[a] During the brief pontificate of Urban VII. nothing could be done; but the reaction was not long delayed. On the accession of Gregory XIV. some went so far as to propose that the edition of Sixtus should be absolutely prohibited; but Bellarmin suggested a middle course. He proposed that the erroneous alterations of the text which had been made in it ("quae *male mutata* erant") should be corrected with all possible speed and the Bible reprinted under the name of Sixtus, with a prefatory note to the effect that errors (aliqua *errata*) had crept into the former edition by the carelessness of the printers."[x] This pious fraud, or rather daring falsehood,[y] for it can be called by no other name, found favour with those in power. A commission was appointed to revise the Sixtine text, under the presidency of the Cardinal Colonna (Columna). At first the commissioners made but slow progress, and it seemed likely that a year would elapse before the revision was completed (Ungarelli, in Vercellone, *Proleg.* lviii.). The mode of proceedings was therefore changed, and the commission moved to Zagarolo, the country seat of Colonna; and, if we may believe the inscription which still commemorates the event, and the current report of the time, the work was completed in *nineteen* days. But even if it can be shown that the work extended over six months, it is obvious that there was no time for the examination of new authorities, but only for making a rapid revision with the help of the materials already collected. The task was hardly finished when Gregory died (Oct. 1591), and the publication of the revised text was again delayed. His successor, Innocent IX., died within the same year, and at the beginning of 1592 Clement VIII. was raised to the popedom. Clement entrusted the final revision of the text to Toletus, and the whole was printed by Aldus Manutius (the grandson) before the end of 1592. The Preface, which is moulded upon that of Sixtus, was written by Bellarmin, and is favourably distinguished from that of Sixtus by its temperance and even modesty. The text, it is said, had been prepared with the greatest care, and though not absolutely perfect was at least (what is no idle boast) more correct than that of any former edition. Some readings indeed, it is allowed, had, though wrong, been left unchanged, to avoid popular offence.[z] But yet even here Bellarmin did not scruple to repeat the fiction of the intention of Sixtus to recal his edition, which still disgraces the front of the Roman Vulgate by an apology no less needless than untrue.[a] Another edition followed in 1593, and a third in 1598, with a triple list of errata, one for each of the three editions. Other editions were afterwards published at Rome (comp. Vercellone, civ.), but with these corrections the history of the authorized text properly concludes.

27. The respective merits of the Sixtine and Clementine editions have been often debated. In point of mechanical accuracy, the Sixtine seems to be clearly superior (Van Ess, 365 ff.), but Van Ess has allowed himself to be misled in the estimate which he gives of the critical value of the Sixtine readings. The collections lately published by Vercellone[b] place in the clearest light the strange and uncritical mode in which Sixtus dealt with the evidence and results submitted to him. The recommendations of the Sixtine correctors are marked by singular wisdom and critical tact, and in almost every case where Sixtus departs from them he is in error. This will be evident from a collation of the readings in a few chapters as given by Vercellone. Thus in the first four chapters of Genesis the Sixtine correctors are right against Sixtus: i. 2. 27, 31; ii. 18, 20; iii. 1, 11, 12, 17, 21, 22; iv.

---

[a] Bellarmin to Clement VIII.: "Novit beatitudo vestra cui se totamque ecclesiam discrimini commiserit Sixtus V. dum *juxta propriae doctrinae sensus* sacrorum bibliorum emendationem aggressus est; nec satis scio an gravius unquam periculum occurrerit" (Van Ess, p. 290).

[x] The following is the original passage quoted by Van Ess from the first edition of Bellarmin's *Autobiography* (p. 291), anno 1591: "Cum Gregorius XIV. cogitaret quid agendum esset de biblilis a Sixto V. editis, in quibus erant *permulta perperam mutata*, non deerant viri graves, qui censerent ea biblia esse publice prohibenda, sed N. (Bellarminus) coram pontifice demonstravit, biblia illa non esse prohibenda, sed esse ita corrigenda, ut salvo honore Sixti V. pontificis biblia illa emendata proderentur, quod fieret si quam celerrime tollerentur *quae male mutata erant*, et biblia recuderentur sub nomine ejusdem Sixti, et addita praefatione qua significaretur in prima editione Sixti *prae festinatione irrepsisse aliqua errata*, vel typographorum vel aliorum incuria, et sic N. reddidit Sixto pontifici bona pro malis." The last words refer to Sixtus' condemnation of a thesis of Bellarmin, in which he denied "Papam esse dominum directum totius orbis;" and it was this whole passage, and not the Preface to the Clementine Vulgate, which cost Bellarmin his canonization (Van Ess, from the original documents, pp. 291-318). It will be observed that Bellarmin first describes the errors of the Sixtine edition really as *deliberate alterations*, and then proposes to represent them as *errors*.

[y] The evidence collected by Van Ess (pp. 285 ff.), and even the cautious admissions of Ungarelli and Vercellone (pp. xxxix.-xliv.), will prove that this language is not too strong.

[z] This fact Bellarmin puts in stronger light when writing to Lucas Brugensis (1603) to acknowledge his critical collations on the text of the Vulgate: "De libello vel me misso gratias ago, sed scias velim biblia vulgata non esse a nobis accuratissime castigata, multa enim de industria justis de causis pertransivimus, quae correctione indigere videbantur."

[a] The original text of the passages here referred to is full of interest: "Sixtus V. . . . . opus tandem confectum typis mandari jussit. Quod cum jam esset excusum et ut in lucem emitteretur, idem Pontifex operam daret [implying that the edition was *not* published], animadvertens non pauca in Sacra Biblia preli vitia irrepsisse, quae iterata diligentia indigere viderentur, totum opus sub incudem revocandum censuit atque decrevit [of this there is not the faintest shadow of proof]. . . . . Accipe igitur, Christiane lector . . . . . ex Vaticana typographia veterem ac vulgatam sacrae scripturae editionem, quanta fieri potuit diligentia castigatam: quam quidem sicut omnibus numeris absolutam, pro humanâ imbecillitate affirmare difficile est, ita ceteris omnibus quae ad hanc usque diem prodierunt emendatiorem, purioremque esse, minime dubitandum. . . . . In hac tamen pervulgata lectione sicut nonnulla consulto mutata, ita etiam alia, quae mutanda videbantur, consulto immutata relicta sunt, tum quod ita faciendum esse ad offensionem populorum vitandam S. Hieronymus non semel admonuit tum quod . . . ." The candour of these words contrasts strangely with the folly of later champions of the edition.

In consequence of a very amusing mistranslation of a phrase of Hug, it has been commonly stated in England that this Preface *gained*, instead of *cost*, Bellarmin his canonization: (Hug, *Einl.* 1. 490, "Welche ihn um seine Heiligsprechung gebracht haben soll"). The real offence lay in the words quoted above (note [a]).

[b] The most important of these is the *Codex Carafianus*, a copy of the Antwerp edition of 1583, with the MS. corrections of the Sixtine board. This was found by Ungarelli in the Library of the Roman College of SS. Blaise and Charles. Comp. Vercellone, *Praef.* xi.