

International Organization for Vulgate Studies (IOVS)

509-40/1

Georg Fischer (University of Innsbruck)

Differences in Jerome's Translations of the Book of Jeremiah

Jerome translated the Book of Jeremiah twice. The first time was for what would become the "Vulgate". Having started this huge project around 390 CE with the Books of Samuel and Kings, he continued with the three major prophets. The second time was in connection with the commentary on Jeremiah, in the years 414–416. The distance in time of more than 20 years invites for a comparison between both renderings.

Jerome's intention, in both cases, was to translate accurately the Hebrew original, and at large they agree. However, there are also differences between the earlier and the later version. Many of them are formal and have little bearing on the meaning. Others display changes in the sense of a passage. Most surprisingly, the Vulgate translation of Jeremiah is more often closer to the Hebrew text than the rendering in the Jeremiah commentary, in both instances. How can one explain this?

As the high degree of correspondences indicates, Jerome probably used the earlier translation. On the other hand, the alterations show that he did not stick to it, but dealt with it freely. In a similar way, the Jeremian "doubles" (e.g. Jer 23:19–20 // 30:23–24) often receive different renderings. Sometimes this may occur because of concerns for style, but it is also a sign of "continuous" translation technique, influenced by the immediate context, too.

To make up for the minor literalness of the foregoing rendering in the commentary with regard to the Vulgate version, Jerome takes advantage of the different literary genre: He offers further possible translations later in his commenting, when explaining a word or a verse, thus showing a broader specter of meanings for expressions that may be debated. The Church Father, in his old age, displays so in his commentary a still wider horizon than before and an ongoing creativity.

509-40/2

Bernhard Klinger (University of Passau)

Reading Mal 3:19-24 as Mal 4:1-6 (VUL):

Jerome's Vulgate as Approach to a Textual Problem

Some scholars separate between Mal 3:19-21 (MT) and Mal 3:22-24 (MT), whereas Jerome translates these verses and combines them so that the Vulgate version states the section Mal 3:19-14 (MT) to be an unit as Mal 4:1-6 (VUL). The aim of this shortpaper is to outline both the textual problems within these verses and their solutions; furthermore this shortpaper especially wants to consider value and prospects of Jerome's Vulgate version.

509-40/3

Bernhard Lang (University of Paderborn)

The Vulgate Latin Bible Handbook:

A Comprehensive Research Bibliography

Especially in the humanities, scholars need – and appreciate – publications that Germans call “Forschungsbericht”, for which there is no adequate English term. Meant is an inventory of past publications relevant to a subject, carefully assessed or presented so that they can be assessed and used (or rejected) in further research. This kind of publication is needed to restart and reinvigorate research on the Vulgate Latin Bible. Bernhard Lang, who has edited the International Review of Biblical Studies (*Internationale Zeitschriftenschau für Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete*) for three decades and acted as its master bibliographer, has compiled a comprehensive Vulgate bibliography, soon to be available in print under the title *The Vulgate Latin Bible Handbook: Annotated Bibliography, Latin Glossary, Textual Notes (VLBH)*. More than 1000 bibliographical items are listed, arranged according to subject and year of publication, and often accompanied by an abstract. There are also three sections for quick reference: Jerome's biblical commentaries, a Latin glossary, and textual notes. The notes are canonically arranged from Genesis through the book of Revelation (and through the appended books, down to the letter to the Laodiceans, the final item of the Weber/Gryson Vulgate). The new VLBH will be a fundamental resource for Vulgate research, supplementing other reference works such as the forthcoming Oxford Handbook to the Latin Bible and *Sprache und Welt der Vulgata*.

509-40/4

*Jutta Krispenz (University of Marburg)***All that Stupidity: The Vocabulary of Intellectual Deficiency
in Jerome's Translation of the Book of Proverbs**

In the last decades collections II–V (Prov 10-29) in the Hebrew Book of Proverbs have again and again turned out to be more than just a min-gle-mangle of sayings. At least parts of it can be seen as consciously arranged compositions. The scribes used catchwords and sound-patterns to this effect.

In many of its sayings the Book of Proverbs features agents, which are characterized as “wise” or, in the contrary, as “stupid”, “ignorant”, or “foolish”. In the Hebrew text the words used in that context are often used to mark the structure of a composition of several sayings - as catchwords or as part of a sound pattern. The paper looks at the translation of the relevant words (e.g., אִוִּיל, כְּסִיל), asking whether or not the Latin translation shows signs of an awareness of the structures detectable in the Hebrew text.

509-40/5

*Benedikt J. Collinet (University of Innsbruck)***Atalyah on the Throne: Considerations on the Source
Problems in Early Latin History of Interpretation Using
the Example of IV Regum 11 (2 Kings 11)**

The aim of this paper is to examine a little commented text of the Bible and compare it with the Vulgate version. The focus is on Latin Church Fathers, but there are also annotations on four Greek Fathers in order to identify (dis-)continuities in interpretation and translation. This is to test how central Jerome and his full text are to the history of interpretation of I-IV Reges.

509-40/6

*Reinhart Ceulemans (University of Leuven)***The Vulgate Version of the Song of Songs and Hexaplaric Readings**

In this paper I wish to show which translational choices made by Jerome in his *iuxta Hebraeos* translation of the Song of Songs are likely to reflect readings of Aquila and (especially:) Symmachus. In arguing this point, I will take into consideration Hexaplaric evidence that was unknown to Frederick Field and that has come to light since 1875. I will also argue which choices in the Vulgate version that have in the past been identified as echoes of Hexaplaric readings might be explained in another way and do not necessarily reflect Aquila or Symmachus. These cases will bring me to reflect, referring to Jerome's Hexaplaric recension of the Song of Songs (ed. Vaccari 1955) and other Latin versions, on the methodological challenges and conceptual value of this kind of comparative research.

Daniel Schmitz (University of Wuppertal)

A trifaria varietate ad fontes: Jerome's Translation Project as a Further Development of Sacred Scripture

totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate conpugnat – “and the whole world is fighting each other because of the threefold variety”. Using these words in the prologus in libro paralipomenon, Jerome describes the issue with the existing editions of the Septuagint in his day. Following the Hexapla of Origen, up to three editions existed in the various locations: Hesychius in Alexandria and Egypt, Lucian of Antioch from there to Constantinople and the Palestinian codices that Jerome links to the work of Origen and the publication of Eusebius and Pamphilus. Jerome states that he wouldn't have had to initiate his translation project if it wasn't for this threefold variety and the corruption and violation of the original text.

During Jerome's lifetime, his work didn't get much recognition, as we can see in book 18, chapter 43 of Augustine's *de civitate dei*, where Augustine praises Jerome's philological competences and calls him “*homo doctissimus et omnium trium linguarum peritus*”, but also adheres to the legend of the origin of the Septuagint and therefore prefers the work of the 70 (or 72) translators over Jerome's, “*nullus eis unus interpres debuit anteponi.*”

Nowadays Jerome is seen as one of the *doctores ecclesiae* and a Great Church Father of the Western Church, praised for his translation work that resulted in the so-called Vulgate. The ambivalence of his work and its reception raises the question of his original motivation.

In my lecture, I'm investigating Jerome's translation work and trying to examine whether his text works as a new translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Bible or rather as an emendation of Sacred Scripture. For this purpose, I'm looking at the contemplation of Jerome's translation progress, which he shares with us in a few of his letters and prefaces, in order to retrace his way a *trifaria varietate ad fontes* – or as he states it: *ad Hebraeos igitur revertendum est*.

Martijn Jaspers (University of Leuven)

***Bis repetita placent*: Jerome's Translation of Psalm Quotations
in 1 Chronicles 16**

Saint Jerome (ca. 347-420) has made two translations of the Psalter that have come down to us: (1) the *Psalterium iuxta Septuaginta* (ca. 390), based on a Greek Vorlage, and the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* (ca. 392), based on a Hebrew Vorlage. When he was translating the Hebrew text of 1 Chronicles (ca. 396), however, Jerome was confronted with several lengthy Psalm quotations (from Ps 95, 104 and 105) in this book, so that he had to translate these Psalms for a third time. In this presentation, I will examine Jerome's translations of these Psalm quotations in 1 Chronicles 16, and compare these "late" renderings with the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* he translated earlier. Although Masoretic versions of these passages in the Psalter and 1 Chronicles are throughout very similar, they contain some important differences as well. I will examine to what extent Jerome has taken these differences and similarities into account when translating these texts. Moreover, it will appear that his Latin translations of Psalter verses in 1 Chronicles 16 sometimes differs, without any apparent reason motivated by the Vorlage, from the parallel verses in the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos*. I will delve deeper into the mechanisms that caused these deviations, and make some concluding remarks about what these different versions of two similar source texts can tell us about (the evolution of) Jerome's translation technique and its value for textual criticism of the (Hebrew) Bible.

Anna Kraml (University of Innsbruck)

***Tu laetitia Israhel* (Jdt 16,9 Vg): The Reception of Joy in the Vulgate
Translation of the Old Testament**

Das Shortpaper befasst sich mit besonderen Aspekten der Rezeption der hebräischen aber auch der griechischen Rede von Freude im Alten Testament durch die Vulgata. Freude gehört zu den grundlegenden Emotionen des menschlichen Lebens und erfasst nicht nur den einzelnen Menschen, sondern die gesamte Gemeinschaft. Das hebräische Begriffsfeld der Freude ist dementsprechend vielschichtig und plural. Das stellt Übersetzende vor Herausforderungen, so auch Hieronymus, der die hebräischen Begriffe der Freude meist mit *laet** oder *gaud** wiedergibt. Dabei setzt Hieronymus durch seine Übersetzung klare theologische Akzente im Verständnis und der Interpretation der Freude, die über die zugrunde liegenden Texte

hinausgehen. Insbesondere diese Neuakzentuierungen möchte der Beitrag beleuchten.

Im Fokus stehen jene Stellen, denen Hieronymus durch seine Übersetzung eine Bedeutungsverschiebung zukommen lässt, beispielsweise die Festfreude des Deuteronomiums oder Judit, die in der Vulgata zur Freude eines ganzen Volkes wird. Gleichzeitig begegnen biblische Belegstellen, in denen Hieronymus auf Lexeme der Freude zurückgreift, ohne dass im Originaltext explizit auf Freude verwiesen wird. Diese veränderte Akzentuierung biblischer Texte hat auch Folgen für ihre Rezeption, wie insbesondere anhand des Buches Deuteronomium festgestellt werden kann. Aufgezeigt werden soll, welche Veränderungen, Neuakzentuierungen und Interpretationen durch die Übersetzung der hebräischen bzw. griechischen Texte vorgenommen werden und wie aus theologischer Sicht damit umgegangen werden kann.

509-41/4

Wilhelm Tauwinkl (University of Bucharest)

**Alternative Translations of Difficult Original Terms
in Parallel Passages of the Vulgate**

The issue of the notable differences between many translation options of the Vulgate and the contemporary way of translating the Bible is well known. Jerome himself was sometimes suspected of having only little knowledge in the field of biblical Hebrew; if this were true, it could have been the cause of several unusual Latin translations.

A look at a number of parallel passages of the Vulgate which contain alternative translations of difficult Hebrew or Greek terms could contribute to clarify the principles of translations Jerome used and to confirm the very good level of knowledge in Hebrew and Greek he actually had.

Examples would be the alternative *supersubstantialis/cotidianum* in the Lord's prayer and also the divergent translations of passages in the Psalter *iuxta Hebraeos* and in the Gallican one, even when the Greek rendering is similar to the original Hebrew.

The biblical commentaries of Jerome explain number of translation difficulties and support the idea that the renowned ancient scholar deliberately translated the same term in diverse ways to illustrate its manifold signification.

509-41/5

Lucas Brum Teixeira (Ruhr University Bochum)

Accipies virginem cum timore Domini (Tob 6:22 Vg): Jerome's Translation Technique and Ascetic Ideals in the Vulgate of Tobit

Jerome's *Tobias* represents a rather unique version of the book of Tobit. Translated towards the end of Jerome's translating activity and only at the instance of his patron friends, the Vulgate of Tobit displays unique features that mirror both Jerome's translation techniques and main ascetic ideals. Such features constitute important discerning criteria regarding the use of the Vulgate for textual criticism and may account for the rapid diffusion of and high esteem for Jerome's *Tobias* down the centuries. A case in point in that regard is the 7th century *Responsoria de Tobia* of Pope Gregory the Great.

509-41/6

Brigitta Schmid Pfändler (Faculty of Theology Chur)

A Whole Profile in Just One Verse (Isaiah 53:3): The *novissimum virorum*

The verse Isaiah 53:3 in the middle of the fourth Servant Song (Isa 52:13-53:12) can hardly be surpassed in drama in the Hebrew version. Here the life situation of the maltreated and afflicted subject of the song is described. A look at Jerome's independent translation of the ambiguous Hebrew *nif'al* forms into a Latin superlative. A precise grammatical analysis makes it clear that these forms represent far more than reflexive or passive meanings and therefore they raise many grammatical and semantical questions, which not least determine how this key verse can be interpreted theologically. These are central motives for taking a closer look at the syntax and word choice of Isaiah 53:3 in the different text versions and thus obtaining a clue to the subject of the entire poem.

511-40/1

Matthew Kraus (University of Cincinnati)

The Vulgate and Jerome's Biblical Exegesis

In the recent annotated German translation of the Vulgate produced by the Vulgata Verein, (Hieronymus. Biblia Sacra vulgata: Lateinisch-deutsch, vols. I-V, Andreas Beriger, Widu-Wolfgang Ehlers and Michael Fieger, ed., Boston: De Gruyter, 2018), Manfred Niehoff's and Michael Margoni-Kögler's versions of Isaiah 1-11 and 12-22 respectively incorporate references to Jerome's Commentary on Isaiah. The rarity of such intertextual reading of the Vulgate and Jerome's biblical commentaries in this German translation

correlates with a general inattention to the topic in monographs on the commentaries (e.g., Braverman, Jay, Kamesar, Graves – Hayward is a notable exception) and the Latin translation (Reuschenbach, Kedar-Kopfstein, Cameron, and Weigert). Close comparison of the Vulgate and Jerome's biblical exegesis rarely happens. The lacuna is surprising because Jerome composed his commentaries and exegetical letters before, during and after his work on the biblical translation. Moreover, Hebrew Questions on Genesis, Book of Places, and Book of the Interpretation of Hebrew Names represent preliminary tools for the version according to the Hebrews and broadly outline his translation techniques. Likewise, numerous references to Latin grammatical technical terms in his writings strongly suggest that grammatical categories informed his translation. Through a consideration of select examples, this paper recommends intertextual reading of the biblical translation by demonstrating the value of comparing specific renderings of the Vulgate to Jerome's exegetical comments. Namely, such comparisons clarify noteworthy features of the translation and offer evidence of how readers may have interpreted his renderings.

511-40/2

Tobias Häner (Kölner Hochschule für Katholische Theologie)

Job, the *vir simplex* (Job 1:1, 8; 2:3):

Ambiguities in the Hebrew Book of Job and the Vulgate

Beside the semantic and syntactic difficulties, one of the characteristics of the Hebrew text of the Book of Job are its ambiguities, as e.g. the opening narrative artfully plays with the double (resp. triple) meaning of the verb בָּרַךְ (Job 1:5, 10, 11, 21; 2:5, 9), to cite a well-known example. In the book as a whole, this stylistic feature contributes to the ambiguity of the main characters, namely Job and God (יְהוָה). The ancient versions reveal different strategies how to deal with the ambiguities of the Hebrew Vorlage by maintaining or – more often – reducing them, what mirrors distinguished theological purposes. In my paper, I will show how the Vulgate in some cases preserves the ambiguity that is found in the Hebrew text, whereas in other cases it is eliminated. By some examples from both the narrative frame and the poetic dialogue, I will highlight the theological impact of the translation strategy of the Vulgate regarding ambiguities. As we will see, the Vulgate by reducing ambiguities accentuates Job's exemplary status as innocent sufferer, but upholds the theological bearing of his accusations of God. In this sense, Job in the Vulgate is not a simple (*simplex*), but a highly complex character. As a final step, I will evidence how the translation strategy of the Vulgate is reflected also in the early reception history of the Book of Job in the Latin west.

Konrad Kremser (*University of Vienna / University of Munich*)

**Der hebräische Text von Psalm 45 [Ps 44 LXX, Vg]
im Horizont der Version *iuxta Hebraicum***

Der Masoretentext von Psalm 45 (Ps 44 in der Zählung der Septuaginta und der Vulgata) enthält einige schwierige Stellen. Die Septuaginta behebt diese Schwierigkeiten elegant durch geringfügige Änderungen bei Vokalisierung und Verseinteilung, in einem besonders schwierigen Fall auch durch leichte Änderung des Konsonantentextes, was zu der Frage führt, ob aus der Septuaginta ein besserer hebräischer Text rekonstruiert werden kann als derjenige, der uns als Masoretentext vorliegt, oder die Septuaginta den Text nachträglich geglättet hat. In der Vulgata stehen beide Traditionsstränge jeweils in lateinischer Übersetzung nebeneinander. Die lateinische Version *iuxta Hebraicum* bezeugt dabei ein Verständnis des hebräischen Texts, wie es Ende des 4. Jh. n. Chr. gegeben war. Weiters kommentiert Hieronymus den Psalm in Ep. LXV (An Principia) und bespricht für einige Abschnitte auch die Übersetzung. Damit bietet sich die Möglichkeit, die prämasoretische Textvorlage des Hieronymus ansatzweise zu rekonstruieren und mit derjenigen (ebenfalls rekonstruierten) der Septuaginta sowie Textfragmenten aus Qumran zu vergleichen.

Michael Fieger (*Faculty of Theology Chur*)

Mother's Curse at the Court of King Samuel (1 Sam 20:30)

Jerome polarises or polemicises in verse 1 Sam 20:30 in two directions. He has King Saul superficially describe the relationship between his son Jonathan and the shepherd's son David as love using the vocabulary "diligere". A choice of words that is not compelling from the Hebrew or Greek original. At the same time, however, the mother is cursed in strong, unique formulations. Thus set in an inner tension, this verse raises the question: what impression of Jerome's image of man does his formulation leave here? The father curses the mother for the son's behaviour. This astonishing conclusion allows us to draw further conclusions about the Hebrew and Greek texts and thus to interpret these verses as well. An exegetical track is thus laid via the clarification of semantic image fields. The relationship between the two men is interpreted as love and the mother is cursed for it, and both situations remain in unresolved tension.

511-40/5

Matthias Ederer (University of Lucerne)

**Wondrous Things from the Banks of the Arnon River: Numbers 21:10-20
in the Vulgate (and in Rabbinic Traditions)**

Numbers 21:10-20 provides an itinerary that sketches Israel's journeys through the areas east of the Dead Sea on both sides of the Arnon river. In the course of this journey Israel witnessed a salvation miracle like the one at the Red Sea (cf. Num 21:14-15) and a miraculous well "appeared" (apparuit, cf. Num 21:16), the wider "context" of which is illuminated by the song in Num 21:17-18 – all this according to the text of the Vulgate. In the Hebrew text, the "Vorlage" of Jerome, however, none of this content is to be found, at least not at first sight. The short paper attempts to describe the interesting relationship between the Vulgate and the Hebrew text of Num 21:13-18. It will show that the translation of Jerome – although it might initially seem to be a very free paraphrase of the Hebrew text – is based on a careful perception of syntactical and lexical aspects of its "Vorlage". It is to be assessed as an attempt to gain a deeper (and "reasonable") meaning from a pretty cryptic and "questionable" text by exegetical means.

Furthermore it is observable that the translation and interpretation of Num 21:13-18 in the Vulgate has some striking similarities with "translations" or interpretations of the passage that can be found in rabbinical literature (e.g. in Sifre or in various Targumim). So it is to be investigated to what extent Hieronymus refers to (or even presupposes) Jewish (rabbinical) traditions in his translation of Numbers 21:13-18, and it will be shown that the Text of the Vulgate, both in v. 14-15 and in v. 16, is not understandable without the knowledge of traditions that are tangible for us in ancient Jewish literature (from Eretz Israel).

511-40/6

Andreas Vonach (University of Innsbruck)

Ist die Vergänglichkeit absurd?

Zur Wirkungsgeschichte der Wiedergabe von *hæbael* als *vanitas*

Das hebräische Lexem *hæbael*, das in seiner Grundbedeutung Windhauch, Verwehen, Vergänglichkeit, im übertragenen Sinn dann auch Nichts, Leere, Nichtigkeit bedeutet, kommt in der Hebräischen Bibel insgesamt 73 mal vor, wovon 40 Belege auf das Koheletbuch entfallen, wo der Begriff als Leitwort fungiert.

Die Vulgata gibt das Wort konsistent als *vanitas* wieder, das von seiner lateinischen Grundbedeutung her mit dem hebräischen Äquivalent durchaus weitestgehend kongruent ist. Hieronymus gibt über diese Kon-

gruenz in seinem Koheletkommentar auch deutliche Rechenschaft ab. Das aufgezeigte Bedeutungsspektrum von *hæbæl* / *vanitas* wird im Koheletbuch auch in seiner gesamten Breite ausgeschöpft, während alle anderen Vorkommen in der Grundbedeutung Verwehen / Vergänglichkeit verbleiben. In der Septuaginta wird der Begriff – ebenfalls durchgängig – als *mataiôtās* übersetzt, wodurch die hebräisch-lateinische Grundbedeutung in den Hintergrund tritt und das Spektrum Nichts, Leere, Nichtigkeit durch Sinnlosigkeit, Absurdität, Vergewöhnlichkeit, Unnutzen angereichert wird.

In der abendländisch-christlichen Wirkungsgeschichte wurde dann dem lateinischen Begriff der *vanitas* auf diesem Hintergrund zunehmend die griechische „Färbung“ aufgedrückt. Dies führte im Falle der Rezeption des Koheletbuches zu einer eher pessimistisch ausgerichteten Auslegungstradition, im Falle der meisten anderen entsprechenden Bibelstellen zu einer regelrechten Bedeutungsverschiebung. Diese Entwicklung hatte aber nicht nur Auswirkungen auf die Rezeption der betreffenden Bibelperikopen, sondern ganz grundsätzlich auf die Rezeptionsgeschichte des Vanitas-Motivs in Kunst, Kultur, Literatur und Philosophie der europäischen Neuzeit und Moderne.

Leider tradieren auch rezente Übersetzungen und Revisionen der einschlägigen alttestamentlichen Texte sowohl aus dem Hebräischen als auch aus dem Lateinischen diese Bedeutungsverschiebung unreflektiert weiter.