DIVERGENT HEBREW READINGS IN JEROME'S ISAIAH
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I

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

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

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


Cp. M. Noth, Die Welt des A.T. (Berlin 1957) 275 and 284; and many others.
cordance or dictionary, *i.e.* as tools for elucidating a difficult word or passage.\(^2\)

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

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


\(^5\) A. Penna, *Biblica* 38 (1957) 381–395 has composed a very useful list of parallel readings in the Vulgate and the Qumran Isiah Manuscript A (Is-a). The list, however, contains too many instances and omits others: It is very precarious to draw conclusions as to the Hebrew text wherever the Vulgate has an additional “et”; Is. 28:21 V does not concur with Is-a: הנרי תְּפִלָּת... הנרי תְּפִלָּת...(Int: סומק... סומק...). On the other hand, Is. 2:20 V: “talpas”, Is-a: הלפרס, as against MT: הלפרס师范大学 should be included in any comparative list. (True, there is the difference in gender if we consult Jerome’s Com. *ad loc.*, ed. Vallarsi 1 iv, 43 where he transcribes “Pharpha r o t h”. But the relationship between the Vulgate and Jerome’s Com. deserves, as this paper hopes to prove, special consideration.)
Hebrew text. It is here, in this painstaking investigation, that we wish to benefit from Jerome's own remarks on the Biblical text, the VSS, and his own work.

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

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

II.

Deviating Vocalization

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


7 In the following textual comparison the Vulgate (V) as well as Jerome's Com. are quoted from Vallahri's first edition (1734–42) of Jerome's complete works. Volume 9 contains the OT Vulgate, vol. 4 the Com. on Isaiah. (Thus, e.g., iv, 215 stands for volume 4, Jerome's Commentarius, column 215.) The other texts and VSS quoted are:
Sometimes even the *scriptio plena* of the Qumran Scroll confirms it. The more remarkable it is, therefore, when in his Commentary Jerome departs from this tradition and comes closer to MT.

Is. 21:7 MT: וראתך כלmando כבש חמור כבש כלmando
   G: και εὔδομα ἀναβάτας Ἰσραήλ δέο ἀναβάτην θνοῦ καὶ ἀναβάτην καμήλου
   T: יזוחי דרכך את עפשתו וגו פרשך ירבי על זמר רכיב על גמל
   S: הזוח לא potràו דרכי פארשים י르יבו חמור ורכיב גמל
Is-a: רוא את רבך זכר פרשיך (קרב יריב חמור ורכיב גמל)
V: et vidit currum duorum equitum ascensorem asini et ascensorem cameli

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

Is. 13:20 MT: ורִיתָם לָא יִרְבְּצָן שֶם
   G: οὐδέ ποιμένας οὐ μή ἀναπαύονται ἐν αὐτῇ
Is-a: ורִיתָם לָא יִרְבְּצָן שֶם
   T: ורִיתָם לָא יִרְבְּצָן שֶם
   S: ורִיתָם לָא יִרְבְּצָן שֶם
V: nec pastores resquiescent ibi

MT = Massoretic Text.
Is-a = The Complete Isaiah MS From the First Qumran Cave, ed. M. Burrows (1950).
G = Septuagint, ed. J. Ziegler (Göttingen 1959).
T = Targum, ed. A. Sperber (Leiden 1962).
8 Rashi ad loc.: ולשון והרוכב הלשון. זוחה רוכב חמור ורוכב גמל. Cp. Y. Kutscher, "חמה רוכב חמור והרוכב גמל" (Jerusalem 1959) 245.
V reads, as the other VSS do, וָנָכִּיב (is this Is-a’s יָרְבִּיב or ובני). though not being blindly dependent on G ("ibi" against דֶּבֶּר). The Com. explains (iv, 174): "...deserta, ut ne ad pascua quidem armentorum et pecorum utilis sit. ...nec pastores post vestigia gregum fessi labore quiescent", referring to the flocks in whose track the shepherds take their rest. This seems to echo the conception of MT, and possibly of Is-a: יָרְבִּיב (؟), as well as the medieval Jewish interpretation (cp. Qimhi ad loc.: והם יָרְבִּיב אל יָרְבִּיב טַנַּא טַנַּא). The second Com. puts a stress on the same combination (iv, 245): "...nec pastores quiescent ibi, qui mansuetissimum Domini gregem in Jerusalem solent pascere."

Is. 21:13 MT: בָּקְעֵה בָּקְעֵה תְּלִינָנִין
G: (Luc.: τὸ οἴραμα τὸ ἐν τῇ αραβια) ἐν τῷ δρῦμῳ δισπέρας κομῆθησθῇ
S: מְשֶׁלָאָל דַּעְרִיכָא בְּרַמְשֶׁא בְּכֵמָא תַּבְהָּרָן
T: ἐν τῷ δρόμῳ τοῖς ἀκανθωτοῖς
V: onus in arabia in saltu ad vesperam dormietis

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

Is. 21:14 MT: בָּקְעֵה בָּקְעֵה דְּרִיד
G: ἀραβιας συναντάτε τοῖς φεὐγοοντι
T: מְשֶׁלָאָל דַּעְרִיכָא בְּרַמְשֶׁא בְּכֵמָא
S: מְשֶׁלָאָל דַּעְרִיכָא בְּרַמְשֶׁא בְּכֵמָא
V: cum panibus occurrite fugienti

V, like the other VSS, converted the past tense into an imperative. This is obviously based on the reading בָּקְעֵה. Again the relative independence of V from G should be noted: "fugienti" (sing.) against φεὐγοοσ (plur.). Jerome, however, became acquainted with our present reading בָּקְעֵה, and explains (iv, 219): "In quo nos transtulimus: 'Qui habitatis terram Austri, cum panibus"
occurrere fugienti et quasi ex persona Domini imperativo modo legimus, in Hebraeo sic legi posse affirmant: 'Qui habitant terram Austri, cum panibus occurrent fugienti'. In order to interpret this latter reading, which certainly impressed him as being preferable, he was obliged to introduce another change into his Latin wording: ‘habitant’ instead of ‘habitatis’. But this creates the problem how to explain the form רֵינָק in the first stichos. He had translated it as an imperative and still did consider this the only correct rendering. He ingeniously solved the problem by implying that the inhabitants of the country were ordered to carry (imperative!) water to the thirsty, after they had brought (past tense!) only food to them with the cruel intention of increasing their thirst (ib.): “ut quum Deus eis dixerit ‘occurrentes sitienti fertae aquam’, illi inimica mente panes tulerint absque aquis, ut cibo augerent sitim.” In his later Com. on this same verse he relies on his translation, apparently without checking it, and quotes freely (iv, 309): “...occurretum cum aqua et panibus...”, and (ib.): “...vos autem aquas et panes offerte fugientibus.”

Is. 6:10 MT: וַיִּמְרֶר רָדָא אֹמֵר
G: συνώθη καὶ επιστρέψωσαι καὶ λάσομαι αὐτοῦς
(cp. Mt. 13:15; Jn. 12:40; Acts 28:27)
Sym.: συνή καὶ επιστραφῇ καὶ λαθῆ
T: יַטַּכֶּל וֹרֶשֶׁנָה וֹיַשָּׁרָבְּךָ לֶזַּה
S: אתוכל וֹרֶשֶׁנָו וֹיַשָּׁרָבְּךָ הַל הָל
V: intelligat et convertatur et sanem eum (al.: et sanetur)

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

ad hoc translation

ne forte videat oculos suis
et auribus audiat
et corde intelligent
et convertatur
et sanetum

V

ne forte videat oculos suis
et auribus suis audiat
et corde suo intelligent
et convertatur
et sanemum

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

Is. 48:8  MT:  היה킨ך יקרא ב פסח מ القاهرة קלאון (Sym. ekληθείς)
          G:  καὶ ἀναμονή ἔτη ἐκ κολλίας κληθήσεται
          Is-a:  היהקיןך יקרא ב
          T:  היהקיןך יקרא ב
          S:  יהושע מ процן אחישי
          V:  et transgressorem ex utero vocavit

Whereas the other VSS prefer a pass. construction or an impersonal one, V renders the Heb. by means of the 1st pers. sing. One may safely assume an underlying reading אָרֶץ, and as in the previous example, the participle was referred to God. In the Com. we read (iv, 556): "Ab initio enim meorum praevacvaritor es mandatorum; et de ventre transgressorem vocavit e Deus, quando de Aegypto liberatus, quasi meo ventre conceptus es..."

In the context all the time the 1st pers. sing. is employed; the sudden switch to the 3rd pers., exactly where the V text would warrant the continued use of the 1st, gives the impression that we are dealing with another correction towards the MT reading עלש or, more probably, towards the reading מעל. 11

This impersonal form may underly Is-a and T.

Is. 1:7  MT:  יהושע אכלים את ה Caleb קיסקוק התמכסה יריחם
          G:  καὶ ἐφημορευτή καταστραμμένη ὑπὸ λαῶν ἀλλοτρίων
          Is-a:  יהושע אכלים את ה Caleb קיסקוק התמכסה יריחם
          T:  יהושע אכלים את ה Caleb קיסקוק התמכסה יריחם
          S:  יהושע אכלים את ה Caleb קיסקוק התמכסה יריחם
          V:  alieni devorant et desolabuntur sicut in vastitate hostili

11 In both cases, due to the conversion from pass. into act. or to the indefinite subj. respectively, a suitable subject had to be supplied.
V read a verbal form as did G, but the two VSS differ in many other details in this verse. Also Is-a gives evidence to fluctuations in the Heb. text. We may assume, then, that V read מְנַשֶּׁה. The translation of MT מְנַשֶּׁה, is found in the Com. ad loc. (iv, 16): "...et in tantam redacta est Terra repromissionis s o l i t u d i n e m , ut a leonisus vastaretur ...alieni devorant, et usque ad finem mundi perseverabit v a s t i t a s Judaeorum." 12 

Is. 2:22 MT: מְנַשֶּׁה
Aq.: εν τινι ελογισθη αυτος
T: דְּלֵכָּה יָרְשָׁה
S: מַסְלָא אָדָם נָגָר יִשְׂרָאֵל
V: excelsus reputatus est ipse

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

Different Word Division

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

12 מְנַשֶּׁה is generally rendered by a noun, such as "solitudo", "desolatio", "desertum".
Ez. 14:16 "desolabitur" stands for the combination: קַטְנָה + קַטְנָה. Is. 62:4 and 64:10 "desolata (est)" for מְנַשֶּׁה, but Is-a has in both instances: קַטְנָה.
13 Bab. Tal., Berakhot 14a; Sota 46 (מְנַשֶּׁה לָאו מַשָּׁה בְּבֵית אֲרָא מְנַשֶּׁה). The reading מְנַשֶּׁה is also possible (Ez. 16:31: קַטְנָה - "excelsum"), but less probable.
14 Another instance of a divergent vocalization, in the lemma, but not in the Commentary, corrected according to the MT, is the following: Is. 40:29 קַטְנָה אֲנָה נַעֲשֶׂה רַבָּה רַבָּה V: "et his qui non sunt fortitudinem et robust multipliçat". V is based on a reading קַטְנָה, אֲנָה (cp. v. 23); and so is the Com. (iv, 494): "Qui videntur in saeculo esse quasi nihil, virutem roburque multiplicat." But the lemma reads (ib.):
"his qui non habent fortitudinem, robur multiplicat." (Cp. Sym.: καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς).
15 Hier. Prologus Galeatus (ix, 455–456): "Porro quinque literæ duæ apud Hebraeos sunt, CAPH, MEM, NUN, PHE, SADE: aliter enim per has scribunt principia mediatесque verborum, aliter fines."
few cases his Vorlage divided words in a manner which differed from MT. The most famous of these is found in Is. 2:20 talpas — ח子どוה (cp. Is-a) as against MT: ח子どו . In two instances in Isaiah the Com. appears to reveal that Jerome had become conscious of the divergent word-division which underlies his translation.

Is. 44:24 MT: תִּשָּׁתְּרֵ י [Q: יִשָּׁתְּרֵ י]
G: τίς ἔστερος
Aq.: τίς συν εμοι
Is-a: תִּשָּׁתְּרֵ י
S: מְרוּ לֶ י
V: et nullus mecum

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

Is. 54:9 MT: בְּכֶרֶם הָאֲדָמָה לֹא אִשַּׁר נַעֲשָׂה יַעֲשָׂ בְּכֶרֶם הָאֲדָמָה
MS. C: כֶרֶם הָאֲדָמָה וְלֹא אִשַּׁר נַעֲשָׂה יַעֲשָׂ בְּכֶרֶם הָאֲדָמָה
G: ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑδάτος τοῦ ἑν Noe τοῦτο μοι ἑστὶ καθότι ὁμοσα αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἑκείνῳ τῷ γῇ
Aq.: ας ημεραι νοε... υόστα νοε [Sym., Th.]
Is-a: כֶרֶם ה... קֶרֶם ה...
T: כֶרֶם ה... קֶרֶם ה...
S: כֶרֶם ה... קֶרֶם ה...
V: sicut in diebus Noe istud mihi est cui juravi ne inducerem aquas Noe ultra super terram

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

16 E.g. Job 23:13: יוכי ה... קֶרֶם ה — “nemo avertere”.
further comment (iv, 633): “Quando Dei patientia expectabatur in diebus Noe, Diluvium impis inferens.” Here, under the influence of a NT quotation (1 Petr. 3:20)\textsuperscript{17}, he reverts to his earlier reading: יְהִי . . . יְהִי.

\textit{Interchange of Consonants}

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

Is. 3:12 \textbf{MT:} מַעַשְׂרִיָּה מָתֻּטִּים [ = Is-a]  
\textbf{G:} οἱ μακαρίζοντες ὑμᾶς πλανῶσιν ὑμᾶς  
\textbf{T:} מטעבך יאשפיץך  
\textbf{S:} מַמְאָכְוָךְ אַמְעָקָךְ  
\textbf{V:} qui te beatum dicunt ipsi te decipiunt

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

Is. 9:15 \textbf{MT:} מַעַשְׂרִיָּה תְמוֹנָה מַתֻּטִּים  
\textbf{V:} qui beatificant populum istum sedentenses  
\textbf{Com.:} qui enim beatum dicebant populum, seductores sunt (iv, 139).

Is. 22:3 \textbf{MT:} מַלְכָּא נַגְנְבִים [ = Is-a]  
\textbf{G:} καὶ οἱ ἱσχύοντες ἐν σοι  
\textbf{T:} יִלְךָ אֶתְשָמָה נָךְ  
\textbf{V:} omnes qui inventi sunt vincit sint

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

\textsuperscript{17} “...quando expectabant Dei patientiam in diebus Noe, cum fabricaret area: in qua pauci, id est octo animae salve factae sunt per aquam.”
in the Com. in fact makes this quite probable (iv, 312): “Quod autem dicit juxta Hebraicum: ‘Ommes qui inventi sunt in te...’”

Is. 26:11 MT: הקמא ננ (= Is-a)  
G: ζηλοῦν... λαὸν  
T: סמא עופר... רוחיתו עופר  
V: zelantes populi

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Is-a</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידונין</td>
<td>ἡλησθεὶς</td>
<td>ירובין</td>
<td>Dibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ἡλησθε columna) and otherwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידונין</td>
<td>ידונין</td>
<td>Dibon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידונין</td>
<td>ידונין</td>
<td>Dibon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sym.: διμον

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

---

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


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

Is. 14:19 MT: יידידי את אביך בור
G: el x αδου
Ag.; Th.: ἐπὶ λαθοῦν λακκου
Sym.: ἐπὶ θεμέλιον λακκου
Is-a: יידידי את אביך בור 20
T: לָמוּכ (เอกל) בָּיְת אֲבֶכֶדָא
V: ad fundamenta laci

Did Jerome read in his Hebrew text יידידי את אביך בור? The graphic confusion of
— מ is well attested. But also an interchange אבכי אַדָּא can be assumed in
view of their semantic relationship in Job 38:6: על המ אַדָּא אַבָּא אֶל מ יְהוָה
There V renders (אדני) “bases (illus)”, a synonym of “fundamenta”.
In the present verse Jerome was influenced by one of his Greek predecessors.
But would he have followed him if he had had in his text the simple word
? The lemma of his Com. brings the correction (iv, 255): “…qui descendunt
ad lapides laci.” Furtheron this diversity is explained (iv, 256): “Fundamenta
autem laci, pro lapidibus laci, interpretatus est Symmachus, ut aliis
verbis profundum et tartarum signifaret inferni.”

Is. 16:4 MT: [ 할 שד [ =Is-a]
G: (alter)
T: אָסִיִּיר בְּהוֹז אָבָא
S: בַּקָּר בָּמַח
V: consummatus est miser

“Miser” for שד is very strange indeed. The context by no means suggests
such a rendering. The preceding clause מפתי שד is translated “a facie vasta-
toria”; the following מפי רום מ אַדָּא “deficit qui concucabat terram”.
In both instances the Lat. terms stand for the oppressor and not for the victim of
oppression. This is also the line Jerome takes in his first Com. (iv, 189): “Pro
‘misero’ in Hebraico legitur SOD, quod potest et ‘vastator’ intelligi.” This
time he read שד, the rather loose rendition certainly suits the context. What,

20 Kutscher, op. cit., 438, explains the peculiar writing of the Scrolls as a lapus calami:
ירד + אבכי בור is a frequent expression, whereas יידידי את אביך בור occurs only in the present
verse.
then, had induced him to translate “miser” in the first instance? It appears that he found in his Vorlage the consonants דיד (דיד reflected in T and S?) and read it as ידר (ידר – “miserabilis”). An ingenious combination of the two readings and their translation is found in the later Com. (iv, 270): “Et consummatus est miser, qui multus fecit miserios.”

Is. 13:17 MT: אָזַר חֵךְ לֹא יֵשְׁמַר וּמַחְטָּב לֹא יֵשְׁמַר יב
G: oi oik λογίζοντει αὐργόριον οὐδὲ χρυσόν χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν
Aq.: οἱ αὐργόριον οὐ λογίζοντει καὶ χρυσόν οὐκ εὐδοκησούσιν
T: רֵדֵב מַכַּסְמוּי לֹא מַכַּסְמָי חֵךְ וְרָדָה לֹא מַרְעָר חֵךְ
V: qui argentum non quaerant nec aurum velit

It is difficult to explain “quaerant”. Is it that the Vorlage read in both stichoi שִׁחְרָר ? “Quaerere” and “velle” in this case, would constitute a Lat. variation on the same Heb. verb. However, also divergent readings, such as שֵׁסִיך’, שֵׁסִיך’ or, in accordance with the general use of “quaerere”, שִׁיחָרָה cannot be ruled out. For the translation of a verbal form of שִׁיְשָׁר Jerome probably would have employed “reputatur”. (Cp. Is. 2:22: רַבֵּשָׂנָה — reputatus est; 33:8 53:3; 2 Chr. 9:20: רַבֵּשׁ וְרָדָה...לְפָמֹות — pro nihilò reputabatur; and many others.) In fact, we do find a trace of this Latin word in Jerome's comments on our verse (iv, 173): “Tantam autem scribit Medorum Persarumque saevitiam, ut ardore sanguinis effundendi, aurum argentumque contennant, et oblatas ope pro luto reputent.”

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

Is. 17:10 MT: וְיִשְׁפַּר נְגָמָה יָנֵחַ [=Is-a]
G: φύτευμα ἔπιστον
Aq. Th.: φυτα ευπρεπη
Sym.: φυτα καλα
T: נֵבְעָה בַּדְּרָה
V: plantationem fidelem

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

22 Cp. Is. 17:8: יִשְׁפַּר — “inclinabitur” (based on יִשְׁפַּר, יָשַׁפַּר, יָשָׁפַר). In the Com.: “…convertetur...”.
Jerome probably read נוֹמָכָּנִים though his rendering may be explained as a protest against the Greek negative ἀπεστον which obviously had no roots in a Heb. Vorlage. In his Com. he feels compelled to defend his translation (iv, 283): “Miretor quispiam, cur pro plantationibus pulchris et bonis, quod Aquila, et Theodotio ac Symmachus interpretati sunt, nos ‘fidelem plantationem’ dixerimus. Verbum Hebraicum NEEMANIM, si per ALEPH litteram scribatur, πιστος id est ‘fides’ sonat; si vero per AIN, et dicatur NEAMENIM, pulchram significat.” But he does not state explicitly that he had employed a MS “per Aleph” while translating. The question remains if this indeed had been the case.

Is. 56:10 MT: יִדְרָא
G: δεικνυωνεινον
Aq.: φανταζομενον
Sym., Th.: ὁραματιστα
Is-a: יַרְדָא
T: יַרְדָא
S: יַרְדָא
V: videntes vana

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

Interchange of Plural and Singular

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

24 Perhaps also the explanation of ἡβοτ (Is. 30:33) in the Com. as “spatiosa et lata gehenna” rests on the double reading תָּנְבָּא (MT) and תָּנְבָּא (Is-a).
25 Thus “tenebras” (plur.) stands for נָמָחַר נָמָחַר as well as for נָמָחַר נָמָחַר (Ps. 143:3). Is. 42:16 V: “ponam tenebras” neither confirms nor refutes the Massoretic against Is-a: נָמָחַר נָמָחַר. Another instance: The plur. form of the Hebrew verb in expressions of reciprocity (e.g. Is. 13:7, 14) is always rendered by a Latin singular.
Jerome’s usage often enable us to distinguish between reading and rendering. When a corrective tendency in his Com. can be noted, it seems to prove that Jerome was dissatisfied with the discrepancy between his translation and the Heb. text-form he had before him at that time. His translation should, in this case, not be attributed to his working manner but to a deviant Vorlage.

Is. 8:18  
MT: נָחַת הַנְּאָה הָלְבָּמְפָּבָת  
G: ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός καὶ έσται εἰς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα  
Aqu.: εδωκεν μοι κυριος εις σημεια και εις τερατα [Sym., Th.]  
Is-a: נָחַת הַנְּאָה הָלְבָּמְפָּבָת  
T: שלמה ינהל הָלְבָּמְפָּבָת  
S: ירבע ילהלałem swathath  
V: dedit mihi Dominus in signum et in portentum

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

Is. 53:12 MT: וּלְזָהָה כְּהֶן רוּבִי נִצָּה  
G: καὶ αὐτῶς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε  
Sym.: αυτος δε αμαρτιας πολλων ανελαβη  
Is-a(b): וּלְזָהָה כְּהֶן רוּבִי נִצָּה  
T: וּלְזָהָה כְּהֶן רוּבִי נִצָּה  
S: וּלְזָהָה כְּהֶן רוּבִי נִצָּה  
V: et ipse peccata multorum tuli

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

26 In the fragmentary Qumran Scroll of Isaiah (Is-b) it is just the א of the word in question that is preserved: אֶת־נָאָה לְרֹבִי נִצָּה. Cp. אֶת־נָאָה לְרֹבִי נִצָּה (Jerusalem 1954) plate x.
Is. 22:18 MT: וְשַׁמֵּנָה מַמְרָקוֹת בָּבוֹר֔וֹד;
G: καὶ θησαύρι τὸ ἅρμα σου τὸ καλὸν
T: ולעמס רהיטי יקר
V: et ibi erit currus
Com.: et ibi erunt currus gloriae tuae (iv, 225)

Is. 26:19 MT: לְמָלֵא נְלֵכַל
G: (al.)
T: וְאֵי וַיְזֶהוּ נְלֵכַל
V: ros lucis ros tuus
Com. lemma: ros luminum ros tuum (iv, 356)
Com.: ros erit luminum plurimorum quod Hebraice dicitur
ORTH

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

Is. 19:20 MT: מִמַּה מִנְיִים [=Is-a]
G: διὰ τούτοις θλίβοντας αὐτούς
T: καὶ κύμα δύκασθήν
S: καὶ κύμα ἀλκάζειν
V: a facie tribulantis

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

Is. 3:10 MT: מִרְּי מֵעָלְלוֹת אֲבֵלֵל
G: τὰ γενήματα τῶν ἐργῶν αὐτῶν φάγονται
Ag.: καφροὺς επιπεδευμάτων αὐτῶν φαγοῦνται [Sym., Th.]
T: וְאֵי פְּרִיר מְבַדְּרִים יֵשֶׁתְּהוּ
S: פְּרִיר תְּבִיבְּרִים מָאֲכַלְּוֹן
V: fructum adinventionum suarum comedet

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

27 Jer. 30:20: לְמָלֵא נְלֵכַל — “qui tribulant” (plur.); Lam. 1:5: לְפָעְרִים אָדַר — ante faciem tribulantis (sing.); 1 Ki. 20:27: לְמָלֵא נְלֵכַל — pane tribulationis.
“comederunt” and “comedent” respectively: “Juxta Hebraicum et caeteros Interpretus hunc sensum habet: Vae illis quia sua scelerat receperunt... impii labores manuum suarum comederunt.” And then: “Juxta LXX autem interpretantes... fructus operum suorum comedant.” Where, then, does the sing.
“comedet”, to which all MSS of the V testify, come from? The Vorlage probably read יָּשָׁרֵבֶךְ, whether this be a scribal error or a variant based on the Midrashic interpretation: the “just man” would eat (sing.) the fruits of their (plur.), the “wicked ones”, deeds. In the Com. the variant is corrected.

Changes in the Grammatical Person

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

Is. 48:11 MT: לָמוּט יָּשָׁרֵבֶךְ בִּנְיָמִין
G: ἐπέστη ἐγώ ἐπὶ πόριον σοι ὅτι τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα βεβηλοῦται
Is-a: לָמוּט יָּשָׁרֵבֶךְ בִּנְיָמִין
T: בִּרְכָה שֶׁמֶר בִּרְכָה מִני מִנְיָמִין עֲבַדְךָ וַאֲבָדְךָ (אָשַׁר)
S: מְשֻׁלָּם עֲבַדְךָ עֲבַדְךָ אֱלֹהִים
V: propter me faciam ut non blasphemer

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

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

Here all VSS have the 3rd pers. sing. after the interrogative ו, thus avoiding the syntactical difficulty inherent in MT. Is-a proves that also some Heb. MSS preferred this easier reading. We may assume that on such a reading Jerome based his rendition. But in the Com. MT is echoed (iv, 597): “...vastitatem sequitur contritio: famem et gladium interitis... bonum est ei sua sentire supplicia, et audire Dominum dicentem: Quum ira furoris mei transferit, rursum curabo.” The opening “Dominus dicens” was introduced so that the verb could be quoted in the same grammatical pers. that is found in MT.
Is. 7:14  MT: וַיִּפְקָדֶה שָׁם שָׁם אִישָׁנוֹן אֶל
G: καὶ καλέστηκ... [= Aq., Sym., Th.]
GMS: καὶ καλέστη... καὶ καλεσσαυν...
Is-a: וַיִּפְקֶד אֶל שָׁם שָׁם אָדָם
T: וַיִּפְקֶד שָׁם שָׁם אָדָם
S: וַיִּפְקֶד שָׁם שָׁם אָדָם
V: et vocabitur nomen ejus Emmanuel [MSS: vocabitis; vocabitis]

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

Is. 26:3, 4  MT: יְכִי בְּךָ בְּךָ פָּעַמְתָּ חָוָה
Aq.: ητ χα εν αυτο πεποιθασαι [Th.: + ελπιδα]
Is-a: יְכִי בְּךָ בְּךָ פָּעַמְתָּ חָוָה
T: יְכִי בְּךָ בְּךָ פָּעַמְתָּ חָוָה
S: יְכִי בְּךָ בְּךָ פָּעַמְתָּ חָוָה
V: quia in te speravimus sperastis in Domino

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

30  It is not easy to decide what Hebrew word the transliteration CARATHI stands for. It might represent the 2nd pers. fem., as against CARATHA — masc. (Jer. 3:12). Cp. A. Sperber, “Hebrew Based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations”, HUCA 12-13 (1937-38) 124, 156, 256; K. Siegfried, “Die Aussprache des Hebräischen bei Hieronymus”, ZAW (1884). In his letter to Pammachus (I, 310), written ca. 395, Jerome writes: “Ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium, et vocabit nomen eius Emmanuel. ...vocabit, inquit, ipsa quae concipiet, ipsa virgo quae pariet.” —
to supply a person to the inf. absolute, as he often does;\textsuperscript{31} and perhaps had as the second verb \textit{אֵלָהּ כּוֹנֵן שָׁרַיַּר}. In the Com. he tried to smooth out the discrepancy (iv, 345): “Post populi verba et responsionem Domini, et rursum vocem populi Prophetae loquitur ad credentes: \textit{Sperastis vel sperate in Domino, in saeculis sempiternis, et caetera quae sequuntur.”}\textsuperscript{32}

Changes in the Grammatical Structure

\textit{Is. 42:2} MT: \textit{לִלֶּחֶר לַעְוַת מַחְצִית [=Is-a]}

G: \textit{אָדָם} \textit{אֵלָהּ כּוֹנֵן שָׁרַיַּר} V: \textit{nec audietur foris vox ejus}

\textit{Mt xii, 19}: \textit{אָדָם} \textit{אֵלָהּ כּוֹנֵן שָׁרַיַּר} \textit{tis en tais plasteiath tivn phonhiv auton} V (ib.): \textit{necesse audiet aliquis in plateis vocem ejus}

\textit{V} differs considerably from the Latin NT quotation (despite the christological connotation of this verse). It is similar, but not wholly dependent on \textit{G} to \textit{Is.} (cp. the rendering of the foregoing word \textit{אֵלָהּ} – “accipiet personam”\textsuperscript{33}, as against \textit{אֵלָהּ}). It appears that the defective writing of \textit{יְשֵׁעָּה} \textit{ישע} \textit{ימשע} (\textit{niphal}) or \textit{שֵׁעָן} \textit{שֶׁעָן} \textit{שען} (\textit{qal}, with indefinite subject) cannot be decided; both forms may be rendered by a Latin pass. form. Yet the Com. states (iv, 507): “‘Nec audietur foris vox ejus, neque enim extra Galilaeam atque Judæam in aliis gentibus Evangelium praedicavit.” This, undoubtedly, translates the MT \textit{שֹׁמֵעָה}.\textsuperscript{34}

\textit{Is. 26:10} MT: \textit{רָשָׁע קֶסֶו}

G: \textit{πέπαυται γὰρ ὁ σεβηθης}

Ag., Th.: \textit{παρέγει ἡ σεβηθης}

Sym.: \textit{εἰδορηθη ἡ σεβηθης}

T: \textit{יִרְבָּה לא הַרְבָּא לָיָרְשֻׁי}

V: \textit{misereamur impio}

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{E.g.} \textit{Is. 22:13} – \textit{אֵלָהּ כּוֹנֵן שָׁרַיַּרַי} \textit{אֵלָהּ כּוֹנֵן שָׁרַיַּר} – commodere carnes et bibere vinum comedamus et bibamus cras enim moriemur. Yet the additional evidence of some Greek MSS and MT points to a Hebrew \textit{בְּכַל} and permits us to assume the same \textit{Vorlage} for \textit{V}.

\textsuperscript{32} Also cp. \textit{Is. 59:4} MT: \textit{בְּכַל} (cp. \textit{G}) \textit{V}: \textit{confidunt}

\textsuperscript{33} Based on an equalization: \textit{אֲנִי בִּנְיָם אֲנִי בִּנְיָם} – “qui personam non accipit”. The Com. offers a different equalization: \textit{אֲנִי בִּנְיָם אֲנִי בִּנְיָם}, explaining (iv, 507): “non accipiet personam in judicio, sive non levabit, subauditor, in altum vocem suam.”

\textsuperscript{34} Cp. \textit{Is. 52:7} \textit{praedicanitis pacem...} – \textit{משמיעות שלו} \textit{praedicanitis salutem} – \textit{משמיעות שלו}
For the MT 3rd pers. sing. pass., Jerome found a perfect Latin translation in his Com. (iv, 349): “...magis impius misericordiam consequatur.” (Cp. Prov. 28:13 ייִהְדָּה - misericordiam consequatur.) We must explain, then, the divergence in V. It stands to reason that Jerome had in his Vorlageソフト, which actually stood for יִהְדָּה (niphal), a proper equivalent for יִהְדָּה. Yet he read יִהְדָּה (gal) and translated accordingly.

Is. 44:2 MT: שֶׁפֶל רוּצָר מַמְשֶׁל צוּרִי
Sym.: ἐκ κοιλιάς ετῶν βοηθῶν σοι
Is-a: שָׁוְאַב
T: טָמִידֵךְ
V: faciens et formans te ab utero auxiliator tuus

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

Translation of Pronominal Suffixes

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

Is. 1:31 MT: וַיִּהְיוּ תַּחַפְּסֵנִי מַעַשֶּׁר לְהָעָז וַיִּתְנַחְמֵנִי
G: καὶ ἔργασι ή τοῦ κόσμου αὐτῶν... καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτῶν...
Is-a: וַיֵּהָה תַּחַפְּסָנוּ מַעַשֶּׁר לְהָעָז וַיֵּתֵנָחָם
T: ויהי תַּחַפְּסֵנִי וְרֹשֶׁשֶׁת נַעֲבָה וְזֵשָׁה בֵּית נוּאָי
S: וַיהי חַפָּסְנִי וְרֹשֶׁשֶׁת נַעֲבָה וְזֵשָׁה בֵּית נוּאָי
V: fortitudo vestra ut favilla stippeae et opus vestrum quasi scintilla

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

35 Cp. Is. 41:12, 16; W. Nowack, op. cit., 19.
This is the background against which must be judged the textual tradition in v. 31. It appears that the Heb. MSS showed some fluctuation in the employment of the suffixed pers. pron., as may be learned from the reading of Is-a. G continues with the 3rd pers. plur., this reading being strengthened by T’s switching back from the 2nd (vv. 29–30) to the 3rd pers. plur. (as in v. 28). Also V exhibits the 2nd pers. plur. pron. suffix. Although this is in line with the preceding verse, it is reasonable to assume that the translation mirrors a Heb. Vorlage similar to Is-a. The Com. (iv, 29/30) avoids using the pers. pron. which appears in V, but is absent from MT: “Omnis igitur fortitudo et superbia peccatorum et sceleratorum Israel, qui dereliquerunt Dominum et idcirco consumti sunt...” It then continues: “Sequitur enim: ‘et opus ejus’, id est fortitudinis vestrae, sive idolatriae, in qua erraveratis, parvula scintilla consumet.” Thus the reading of MT is declared to mean the same as the translation of V. It appears that this rendering was made anew from a Heb. text, but Jerome omits to state whether this Vorlage differed from the one he had before him when he translated the first time. In the case discussed Is-a appears to contain a conflation of two alternative readings: הָמָּכִּים and תַּחְצִים. Instances of such a combined reading are found in the MT and tend to prove that determination by means of the def. art. was considered interchangeable with determination by means of a pron. suf.36 With regard to V, the problem is more complex: The Latin translator, who did not have at his disposal a def. art., occasionally used the pers. pron. attached to a Latin noun as an equivalent for a Heb. noun determined by an art. This, at least, is our impression. Yet in such cases, some doubt as to the underlying Heb. text remains, especially when the Com. corrects the text by omitting the pron.

Is. 8:18 MT: הָמָּכִּים ג-ה יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבְּלָבַעְתָּן הָיָה וְלָא מְלֹא יְהוָה
G: ∨ָמָּכִּים יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלָא מְלֹא יְהוָה וּבְּלָבַעְתָּן
οἱ λέγουσα και τὰ παιδιά μου αυτού μου37

36 According to Eusebius this is the text of ol λοίπον. Procopius Gazaetus gives it, omitting the poss. pronoun, as the rendering of Aq., Sym. and Th.
V: ecce ego et pueri mei quos dedit mihi Dominus
Com. (iv, 125): non solum ego, sed et pueri quos mihi dedit Dominus

Is. 18:5 MT: תְּהֹלְלֵי תֹּם מְנֵחָרָה
G: καὶ ἀφελεῖ τὰ βοτρύδια τὰ μικρὰ τοῖς δρέπανοις
Aq.: καὶ εκκοπεῖ τα ἐκβρασματα [αὐτῆς]...
Sym.: καὶ αποκοπησάται τα εὐτελή αὐτῆς...
V: et praecedentur ramusculi ejus falcibus
Com. (iv, 200): ...quasi rami inutiles falcibus praecedentur
(iv, 287): Ramusculi autem, qui inutiles sunt, falcibus praecedentur

Is. 40:26 MT: מַר בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל
G: ἀπὸ πολλῆς δόξης καὶ ἐν κράτει ἱσχύος
Sym., Th.: πληθοῦς δυναμεως καὶ κράτους ἱσχυος
Is-a: מִרְבַּי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל
T: מִרְבַּי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל (היתקף) יִשְׂרָאֵל
S: מִרְבַּי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל
V: prae multitudine fortitudinis et roboris virtutisque ejus

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

38 Some MSS, among them the famous Amiatinus, omit the poss. pron. “mei”. Yet this seems to be an attempt at harmonization with the Com. (or, possibly, with the Heb.).
39 One Greek MS (87 of the Catenae) and the Sahidic translation support Jerome’s addition of the poss. pron.
**Prefixed Prepositions**

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

Is. 40:17 MT: נחלו נใตים נטסיות ותור הרות

G: ...אַלֵּךְ [אַלֵּך] אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּךְ וּאֲלֵּךְ אוֹבֹאָנָּה אֲלֵּ�...

Is-a: כל מהות נメディ נמשת מכאן...

T: כלמה מ(lua) מִדרְדִיאַטְרַיא מַעַרְדַּר אֲרוֹן תַּבָּאֲרִים...

S: אֱלֹא לא מַזָּה רַבִּי לַאֲבֹדֶנֶא לַרַבִּי לַרַבִּי לַרַבִּי לַרַבִּי לַרַבִּי לַרַבִּי L:

V: quasi non sint sic sunt coram eo et quasi nihilum et inane reputatae sunt

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

Is. 57:15 MT: מִרְמָה קִדְרֵשׁ אֶשְׁכָּר

G: δύστοσις ἐν αἵσιοις ἀναπαυόμενος

Is-a: מִרְםָה קִדְרֵשׁ אֶשְׁכָּר

T: בַּרְכָּא שֵׁיִיר קִדְרְשֵׁה סְפֹּרָתָה

S: מִרְמָה קִדְרֵשׁ אֶשְׁכָּר

V: in excelsa et in sancto habitans

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

40 Both “pro” and “in” occasionally render the preposition יִשָּׂרַּא (Is. 28:7 - error verunt in ebrietate; 40:26 - כֶּרֶב אֲצֵית - “prae multitudine forituidinis”). Here they also may reflect, as does S, a prepositional י.
the elements ὁ ὑπόπτος ὁ ἐν ψυχαλίς and ἀγίος ἐν ἁγίοις. But Jerome did not base his homiletical remarks on the extremely repetitive Greek text, as might have been supposed. The opening words ("excelsus atque sublimis") are taken from his V rendering, based on the Heb. Why, then, does he switch to the "sancus in sanctis" formula of G? We are inclined to assume that he saw in it the harmonizing combination of בֵּיתוֹ and מִדְרֶשׁ and which reconciled MT with its Lat. rendering of a divergent Heb. text. The relative clause "dict Domini..., qui habitat etc." could be an attempt to smooth over the discrepancy.

Is. 21:3  
MT: נַחַטְיָה בִּכְלֵל הַמֵּרָא הָפָאָר [= Is-a]  
G: ἡ θύκτισσα τοῦ μὴ ἀκούσαν ἑπιασθείσα τὸ μὴ βλέψαιν  
T: יָנִקְסָפוּ מִלְסְמֶנֶת נָטָם מַלְפְדָה  
S: וְזֶה דַּלְּא אֲסַמְּנֵה אַזִּיתֵהוּ דַּלְּא הָאָזָת  
V: corru cum audirem conturbatus sum cum viderem

The prepositional ב before an infin. constr. is generally translated by the Lat. particle "ne..." (which here would parallel the G and S renderings). The form "cum + subjunctive", on the other hand, is the standard rendering of the prepositional ב. Thus one is inclined to assume the existence of a variant Heb. reading: בִּכְלֵל הָפָאָר. Indeed, in his earlier Com. Jerome hints at the reading with the negative particle (iv, 214): "sed conturbatus et trepidus, et in terram correunt, caligantibus oculis nesciat quid loquatur." In the later Com. he demonstrates how he would have translated the prepositional ב if it is not taken as a negative particle (iv, 303): "Præ auditu et visione durissima..." (cp. Eccl. 1:8; auditu fulmine bitum (רָאוֹל הַמַּלְאָךְ נִטֵם). A parallel interpretation is found in Qimhi’s commentary: מַטְסָנִים מִקְרָא תִּרְצוֹנִים. כָּל שְׁכֵן כָּשָרָאまとת.

Is. 48:10  
MT: יִפְרוֹפָךְ לָא בּכָכְךָ [= Is-a]  
G: πάρορσα κατὰ σὺν ἐνεκέν ἄργυρίῳ  
T: יַפְרָפְךָ לָא בּכָכְךָ  
S: יִפְרוֹפְךָ לָא בּכָכְךָ  
V: excexi te sed non quasi argentum

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

41 Some isolated exceptions are: Hag. 2:16: ... "cum acce-deretis...."; Is. 49:6: נְכַל מְתָי-ך. As to the prefixed ל of an inf. constr. cp. Is. 1:12, MT: רָכָּן, Is-a: רְכָּן, V: "ut ambularetis", points to the Is-a reading (cp. S, Sym.). In his Com. Jerome bases himself on the Greek πορεύεται and translates "calcare"; but this is also closer to MT.
In our verse, at first sight, this seems to be the case (cp. Rashi and Qimhi: לא מתרחק מצוקה). But on closer inspection it becomes clear that it would have been perfectly satisfactory, and in accord with Jerome’s practice, to translate, even in this context: “(in) argentum”. Psalt. gall. has (57:31): “...qui probati sunt argento.” The Com. at first paraphrases but then reverts to a Heb. reading, and demonstrates the elegant ease with which this can be interpreted (iv, 556): ‘Ecce excoxi te’, id est probavi, quomodo confatur argentum. Sive non in divitiis, sed in fornace paupertatis probare te volui.”

**Is. 55:13**

**MT:** ישיחholm לאשה שלמה

**G:** καὶ ἔσται κυρίος [κύριος] εἰς δενομα καὶ εἰς σημεῖον αἰώνιον

**Is-a:** ישיחholm לאשה שלמה

**T:** ירח קדש זה לשותה לאשה שלמה

**V:** et erit Dominus nominatus in signum aeternum

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

**Is. 14:17**

**MT:** שמש חלב כדבר

**G:** ὁ θεὸς τὴν οἰκουμένην δὴν ἔρημον

**T:** שמש חלב כדבר

**V:** qui posuit orbem desertum

Jerome was aware of the divergence between V and the Heb. text on which he relied while writing his Com. He perhaps considered this divergence to result from the influence of G on the former, stating (iv, 254): “Sequitur: ‘Qui
posuit orbem terrarum desertum’, sive ut juxta Hebraicum, praeter LXX omnes ali transtulerunt, ‘quasi desertum’.” However, it is obvious that he did not translate here the Greek text, since he gives no equivalent for διάλυσαι. Taking into account all the other instances where in contrast to the case under review, מפרך is pedantically rendered “sicut (or ‘velut’) desertum” we cannot help assuming that here the V rendition is based on a reading שמה נחל מפרך.

*Substitution of Words*

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

Is. 49:24 MT: אָמָן מְשֵׁב בְּרֵעֶיךָ יְמֵֽלָךְ "
G: καὶ ἐὰν αἰχμαλωτεύῃ τις ἀδίκος σωθῆσεται
Aq., Th.: καὶ εἰ αἰχμαλωτιζων δικαιον περισσοθησεται
Sym.: η ΑΙΧΜΑΛΩΣΙΑ ΘΕΟΥ ΔΙΑΣΩΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ
Is-a: אָמָן מְשֵׁב בְּרֵעֶיךָ יְמֵֽלָךְ
T: גַּם דָּבָר תְּרוּעָן שְׁחֵירָנָכָה
S: נַפְשֵׁי דָּבָר תְּרוּעָן מְשָׁרָנָהּ
V: aut quod captum fuerit a robusto salvum esse poterit

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

Is. 18:4 MT: כָּל הָמוֹן קָצִיר \[= Is-a; MSS: בִּי הָמוֹן קָצִיר\]
G: ημέρας διημένου
T: לְבִּיו מַזְּלַט
S: בְּרִימָא זַדְּגוּדָב
V: in die messis

42 As to the possible omission of the comparative ב cp. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *op. cit.* § 141d. Jerome’s customary faithfulness to the Heb. text of the Prophets as regards this detail can be demonstrated by Is. 27:10; Jer. 19:12; מָפרך – “quasi desertum”; Is. 33:9 מָפרך – “sicut desertum”; as against Is. 50:2; Jer. 22:6: מָפרך – “in siccum” resp. “soli-tudinem”.
It is hardly conceivable that Jerome would have followed G against his own Heb. text, since his rendition differs from theirs in many other details. This argument is strengthened by the direct evidence of some Heb. MSS and of S which support the reading underlying V: בימים קדומים...

In Jerome's commentaries, however, תור ה ש in MT shines through (iv, 200): “Sicut in toto die nihil est clarius meridie, quando sol de medio caelo rutilat, et omnem orbem pariter illustrat, et sicut in aestu et calore torrente, quando nudus messor excoquitur, et operis magnitudinem anhelitus probat, gratissima est reris temperies etc.” The later Com. combines the two readings (iv, 287): “Et quomodo nubes roris in die messis, et in fervente aestate gratissima est...”.

Is. 14:9  
MT: ככ מלכ כר... ככ מלכ ירמ [= Is-a]  
G: ου δραοντες της γης... πάντας βασιλεις έθνων  
Aq., Th.: παντας καιριμους γης...  
T: ככ מלכ יכר וכרו... ככ מלכ ימע  
V: omnes principes terrae... omnes principes nationum

The uniform Lat. translation of two different Heb. words is unusual, especially so, since בּומ does not have a standard Lat. equivalent. One cannot help assuming that Jerome’s Vorlage employed the same word in both members of the parallelism — בּומ תור or תור בּומ or תור בּומ or בּומ — for which no ready-made Lat. terms were available. In the Com. Jerome adheres to MT (iv, 177): “nisi forte animas regum quos interfecerat, insultantes regi Babylonio occurrisse credimus.” The second Com. reverts to the V wording.

Omission of Words

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

---

43 Cp. BH; Prophet. Postiores ed. C.D. Ginsburg (London 1911). MT has בּומ $||$ בּומ This may have invited attempts to variate (cp. Is. 13:17, p. 188). But also a graphic interchange $\nu < \eta$ may have taken place.

44 A similar case of lack of variation in a word pair we seem to have in Is. 26:18 תכלת $||$ תכלת — “terra... terra”. As Jerome is very consequent in his rendering through “orbis” we suspect that his Hebrew MS did indeed have twice תכלת. The Com. corrects this and Jerome explains (IV, 355-356): “inter ‘orbem’ qui Hebraice THEBEL et graece dicitur οἰκομένη, ac ‘terræ’ multa diversitas sit.”
The second clause, “...et increpabit eum...”, was not translated. This left the clause without a predicate. Thus the last word of the preceding clause, “...populi...”, was drawn to “populi...” The printed editions of V here follow Jerome’s own explanation of this rendition (iv, 283): “Sonabunt enim populi in spectaculis theatrales luxuriae, et amphitheatris crudelitate, et circi fororibus, sicut sonitus aquarum inundantium.” “Sonabunt”, then, opens the sentence, thus proving that the Heb. text underlying V had omitted the second clause. The lemma corrects according to the MT (ib.): “...sicut sonitus aquarum multarum sonabant. Populi sicut multitudo aquarum inundantium sonabant: et increpabit eum...”.

A plausible explanation of V would be that “exiguus” stands for כי, whatever might have been the reason for this equation (none of the other VSS offers a clue). However, the doubt remains whether “pulvis exiguus” is not an explanatory rendering of the one word כי. Jerome defines this word in his Com. (iv, 488 and 491) “significari tenuissimum pulverem”, adding the interesting remark (iv, 488): “Minutissima ergo frusta pulveris et pene invisibiliba, hoc verbo appellantur: quas forsitan Democritus cum Epicuro suo atomos vocat.” But in this case the following word, כי, was not translated. Had his Vorlage omitted it? Anyhow, in the Com. it is reflected (ib.): “...tenuissimum pulverem, qui vento raptante saepere in oculos mittitur.”
Is. 3:7

MT: יוש ביבים תחת הלומך
G: καὶ ἀποκριθῆς ἤρεν ἐν τῇ ἥμερᾳ ἔκεινη
V: respondebit in die illa dicens

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

Is. 14:19 MT: לברת הריבים אחרים הריב
G: μετὰ πολλῶν τεθνηκότων ἐκκεκεντημένων μαχαίρας
Aq.: ενδεδομένων ανθρωπομενως βεβαιημενως μαχαιρα
T: הער כמייל ממעני הרְבֵּה
V: et obvolutus cum his qui interfeci sunt gladio

V translates only one of the words הריבים. Later Jerome may have thought that in this he had followed the textual tradition of a Greek predecessor. He quotes Symmachus (iv, 179): “Etiam cum his qui occiduntur in bello”, and G (iv, 255): “Involutus cum interfectis gladio”. Yet, the first is a very free quotation, and the second abbreviated reading is not supported by our Greek MSS. Thus the question remains if his Vorlage did not omit one of the synonyms, thus proving, perhaps, that we have here a double reading:

a) והריבים or a gloss — הריבים — on the difficult ממעני הריב.

b) The lemma of the later Com. corrects according to the MT (iv, 255): “Involutus cum interfectis et confossis gladio.”

Inner-Latin Variants

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

45 Thus MSS Amiatinus, Cavensis, Toletanus; Vulgata ed. Vallarsi ix, 711. Similarly, “dicit” can be eliminated from the V text (Is. 5:9) on the base of the Com. (iv, 74): “...non juxta Hebraeos veritam ‘In auribus meis sunt haec Domini exercituum’”. Again, “surgunt” for אומרים (Is. 60:4) in the printed edition and very good MSS (Cavensis, Complutensis, Toletanus and others; Amiatinus has “surgunt”) can be corrected into “sugent” according to the Com. (iv, 720): “...in Christo lactantes...”
found in many MSS, and in the Clementine edition. True, in the Com. Jerome presents both these translations as legitimate (iv, 206 and 295); but then he
goes on to state the priority of the former (ib.): “In eo quod transtuli: ‘...in festivitatem’. ‘” However, he may have corrected it in later MSS edited by
him, and through this correction, or directly through his remarks in the Com.,
the variant arose.

Is. 3:16  MT: הלאך נשפך חלכון ובריליהם והכסותה
  V: ibant et plaudebant ambulabant pedibus suis et composito
      gradu incedebant46 [ed. Cl.]
  Com. iv, 59: ibant et plaudebant et ambulant et pedibus suis composito
            gradu incedebant [lemma]
  Amiat.: ibant et plaudebant ambulabant et in pedibus suis composito
        gradu incedebant [Vallarsi ix, 690]

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

Is. 9:2  MT: נאשך יאיל מבחקים שלל
       V: sicut exultant victores capta quando dividunt spolia
      Vallarsi ix, 997: sicut exultant victores quando dividunt spolia
      Amiat.: sicut exultant quando dividunt spolia

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

46 Cp. Sym.: κατεύθως βασιλεὺς. Another instance of a transposed waw:
Is. 22:1  MT: ומך אמר יכה עליך מלח לוזת
        V: quidnam quoque tibi est quia ascendisti et tu omnis in tecta
        (based on מלחכלך); however, in the Com. we have (iv, 220): “Quid haves, inquit; Sion,
        quod etiam tu ascendisti omnis in tecta.”
tions, sometimes were incorporated into MSS of V. But in the present case it seems obvious that the ample and good Lat. explanation “qui capta dividunt praedam” is a variation of the precise “capta praedia” motif (cp. V: “composito gradu incedebant” with the commentary: “composito incendant gradu” in the preceding example). The redundance in the original Lat. version could have resulted from a double interpretation, or even from a double reading in the Heb. text, i.e.: capta praedia and dividunt spolia. 47

III

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

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

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

47 Double translation may be observed in the following instances:

Ex. 39:14 MT: תמכיר רבד
V: qui sepeliat et requirant eos (מברק[ים] מברק[ים])
18:17 MT: ענה יד
G: και ἄνω δύνασαι ἄνω κάτω τὴν ἐμαρχα ἁλοῦ
V: a pauperis inuria avertit manum suam (ずっと/ずっと)
Is. 29:3 MT: תמקוה ירח נגזר
Is-a: תמקוה ירח מגד והנה
V: et munimenta ponam in obidionem tuam

48 For details cp. O. Bardenhewer, Hieronymus (München 1905); id., Geschichte der alt-christlichen Literatur 3 (Freiburg 1912); Stummer, op. cit.; H. Lietzmann, Kleine Schriften 1, 305 ff.; P. de Labriolle, Latin Christianity (London 1924) 334 ff.
reason for postulating that certain chapters of the Isaiah Commentary were written as late as the second half of 408.49
Accordingly a considerable length of time separates the Vulgate from the Commentarius, a period in which Jerome constantly deepened his knowledge of Hebrew and broadened his proficiency in the Bible text and Versions. Consequently, his translation, which had been made at a much earlier stage of his life, now would not always satisfy him. Therefore he introduced corrections into the Commentary some of which even found their way — with his consent or without it — into later copies of V. Jerome certainly was unable to remember exactly the thought-processes that had produced his Latin translation two decennaries earlier; but he tried to reconstruct them. Comparing his translation, whenever it diverged from the Hebrew, with the Greek versions, he discovered that apparently he had often followed the latter (“...secuti sumus...”). It stands to reason that in most cases he was successful in tracing the source of his deviations. However, the few instances in which he erred in the attribution of his deviant translation to the influence of one of the Greek versions positively prove that his explanatory remarks on his method of translation were made in retrospect.50
Of a major concern for our purpose here are the cases where Jerome was at a complete loss as how to possibly explain his rendering when it did not agree with the Hebrew text, neither could it be derived from a Greek version, nor could it be justified by stylistic considerations. He then would try to smooth out the discrepancy, to belittle its importance or to correct it tacitly in his remarks. Apparently it never occurred to him that a divergent Hebrew reading

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

50 Two instances out of many will illustrate Jerome’s failure to remember correctly how he had arrived at his translation:
1. Is. 26:3 MT: יְרֵעַ מֶסֶךְ V: vetus error abiit
   In the Com. he explains (iv, 345): “Hebraice JESER SAMUCH, quod Aquila et Symmachus similiter transulerunt, πᾶλημα ἐπιστημονέα, hoc est, error noster ablatus est, sive cogitatio nostra firmata est... Pro quo nos ut sensus manifestior fieret, transtulimus, ‘vetus error abiit’. A tour de force from an inaccurate rendering of the Greek to his own translation. At first he mentions only in passing another possible rendering, perhaps that of his Hebrew informant. But later he comes back to it, obviously deeming it the most correct (ib.): “…et quia cogitatio nostra firmata est...”.
The Com. declares (iv, 172): “CHISILE... Nos generaliter sequentes Symmachum, stellam diximus.” But “stellae” stands for (הכוכבים) (הכוכבים).
might have caused his rendering in the first instance. But it is exactly this conclusion to which we must incline now.

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

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

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

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

52 A second remark on Is. 38:11 (MT: בירק אל, MSS: יברק אל) “…sermo, enim, Hebraicus HOLED si legatur aut scribatur ELED ‘requiem’, si EDEL ‘occidentem’ sonat…” (iv, 472) is much too enigmatic to be adduced for textual criticism. As regards the OT quotations in the NT Jerome remarks (vit, 437): “Ex quo mihi videtur, aut veteres Hebraeorum libros aliter habuissent, quam nunc habuemus, aut Apostolum.”
It may be assumed that in a more advanced stage of his life, when the great Latin translator could afford to acquire less popular and more exact MSS, he approached the *textus receptus*; but traces of a previous and more challenging situation remain.