A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE

GRANNAN

VOL. I

A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE

BY

THE RT. REV. CHAS. P. GRANNAN, D.D., PH.D.
CONSULTOR TO THE PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOLUME I

Definition, Names, Divisions of the Bible;
History of the Original Languages;
History of the Original Texts;
History of the Ancient Versions

B. HERDER BOOK CO.
17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.
AND
68, GREAT RUSSELL ST., LONDON, W. C.
1921

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 7. Martii 1921

F. G. Holweck,
Censor Librorum.

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 8. *Martii* 1921

✠*Joannes J. Glennon,*
Archiepiscopus
Sti. Ludovici.

(A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE)

PREFACE

The insistent, watchful care which, in our day, the Church has been exercising over matters Biblical has had, happily, the effect of renewing interest in the Scriptures, as well as of properly directing the study of it. And, as a result, many notable additions to Catholic literature on the Bible have appeared during the last decades.

The latest contribution to Biblical science in our language comes from the able pen of Monsignor Grannan; and the work is sure to prove as valuable as it is timely. For, the volumes which he offers to the public, represent, in the main, the painstaking labor of many years as professor in the Catholic University of Washington. And the clearness of his diction, the exactness of his thought and the depth of his research give unusual value to such treatises as " The Vulgate," "Inspiration," " Tradition," etc. It is, however, the spirit of Catholic erudition permeating the series, which makes its publication so opportune at this time when the mind of the Church is profoundly impressed with the Encyclical " Spiritus Paraclitus " of Benedict XV. The burden of the Holy Father's message is the Catholic study of the Scriptures and, in presenting to the faithful the shining example of St. Jerome, the Sovereign Pontiff reaffirms the Catholic principles controlling the study of Holy Writ, which had been sol-

emnly laid down by his illustrious predecessors Leo XIII and Pius X.

This earnest concern for the Written Word of God, which the Church has evinced since the days of the " Providentissimus Deus," and which has held at strict attention the Catholic minds of all lands, reveals her in her office as Guardian of the Scriptures. From the very beginning, it is true, she has been constantly solicitous that " the celestial treasures of the Sacred Books so bountifully bestowed upon man by the Holy Spirit, should not lie neglected " (Conc. Trid., S. V., Decret. de Reform., c. 1). At all times, Holy Writ has been held up to the faithful as " profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice " (II Tim. iii, 16). Both clergy and laity have been ardently exhorted to meditate on the actions and words of Jesus Christ in the New Testament where He is portrayed, true to life and history in fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Testament.

But in these times, by reason of the perilous trend of modern scholarship, the Church has been constrained to stand forth firmly, as " the pillar and ground of the truth " (I Tim. iii, 15), in defence of her ancient beliefs concerning the Sciptures. For, rash and irreverent critics, ignoring the true testimony of Tradition, have applied to the Bible the methods and tests of " free science." They have sought thereby adroitly to pervert the real sense of Scripture and to divest it of its sacred and historical character. In effect, their attacks are aimed at Christ through the Bible.

In face of this dire menace, the Church has continued

to issue weighty pronouncements, as solemn as they are binding. False theories have been unmasked; erroneous opinions have been condemned; the authority, human and divine, of the Bible has been fully vindicated. As a consequence, a well defined method of defense for the Scriptures is found to have been evolved, when the fundamental principles contained in these official utterances are properly grouped and rightly applied in the various departments of Biblical science. What is important to remark here is that many of these principles serve as the only solid basis for certain treatises in General Introduction which embrace such subjects as Inspiration, Hermeneutics, etc. Accordingly, no Catholic scholar can be credited either with sincere zeal for the cause of Truth or with needed equipment for scientific work, who fails to be guided by these basic truths.

Probably, then, of all the reasons which urge me, at this time, to recommend strongly the books of Monsignor Grannan, the chief one is his keen insight into these Catholic principles which he states and explains in a masterly way. And it is precisely for this reason that his "General Introduction" will be of great service to those who may feel the need of a clear, orderly exposition of Catholic tenets concerning Scripture. His work goes forth in the year which marks the fifteen hundredth anniversary of St. Jerome's death. May the Great Doctor, whose life was consumed with zeal for the Holy Scriptures, bless this work with abundant fruitage. May a lively love for the Written Word be fostered and sustained so that all in reading it "may

believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." (John xx, 31.)

✠ PATRICK J. HAYES,
Archbishop of New York.

Feast of the Immaculate Conception, 1920.

PROLEGOMENON

Since the publication of Pope Leo's Encyclical "On the Study of Scripture" (Nov., 1893), there is noticeable everywhere among Catholics, and especially in America, a great revival of interest in Scriptural subjects. It was the desire of Pope Leo that his Encyclical should give to such studies a *new impulse* and a *right direction.*

To further this movement, it is the purpose of the writer to give to our students in seminaries, colleges, and academies, and to the intelligent Catholic public generally, a book in which they may find, in clear, simple language, and arranged in methodical order, a narrative of such *historical facts* and an exposition of such philosophical and *theological principles* as may guide them aright in their subsequent study of the "Good Book."

The method of the present writer is not contention, but exposition; not controversy, but explanation; not merely that the reader may believe, but, also, that he may understand. This is the first and most necessary step. For this purpose, orderliness, clearness, and systematic treatment are the first requisites; that is, to begin at the beginning and to end at the end (what is more natural?), not floundering about in any and every which way, but following a straight line of progressive development.

A few topics in this book are so complicated and so variable in outline and so fluctuating in extent that they do not easily lend themselves to definition. Apart from such exceptions, the chief topic of every important section is not only carefully defined, but is also further explained, either by an analysis of its component parts, or by equivalent and synonymous terms, or by obverse iteration, or by such other devices and contrivances as will compel the reader to understand.

Our great Catholic writers on scholastic philosophy and theology were trained to define what they are talking about, and their thought is luminous. But in many other branches of learning writers love to flounder about on limitless topics and forget to mark out, with any degree of precision, the proper limits of the subject under discussion. They seem to have heard that "to define is divine," and they have no ambitions. But the skill with which some of them steer clear of any effort at definition is proof conclusive of a high order of ability, and that they would succeed, if they only made an effort.

In a "General Introduction to the Study of the Bible" the topics to be treated are so numerous, so varied in character, and so complex that they must be carefully divided and sub-divided, and explicitly classified, in order that the reader may obtain and retain clear ideas, and secure an orderly and systematic treatment of the whole subject and of each branch thereof. One purpose of all this is that the student may see from the beginning to the end of the course and, at any moment, may know just where he stands. Accord-

ingly, in the "Synopsis" which follows this Prolegomenon we have endeavored to give a general survey of the whole field of Biblical studies, and to map out its principal divisions and subdivisions. We have endeavored also, in the course of the work, to define and to describe the nature, the properties, the specific purpose, and the utility of each branch of General Introduction, and to show not only wherein it consists, but also wherein each branch, in spite of close resemblances, essentially differs from the other branches of the same general department to which it belongs.

On a subject involving so many minute details it is too much to expect that no mistakes have been made, especially in matters of minor importance. Any slips, either of the head or of the hand, if brought to the writer's attention, will be corrected at the earliest opportunity. The writer is also equally ready to correct anything that may not be in strict accordance with the teachings of Holy Mother Church.

Complete originality of matter and contents, in a work of this sort, is neither possible nor desirable. If such were the case, some might say, "What is new is not true, and what is true is not new." Such topics as are here handled, have been discussed so often and by so many that, like the dictionaries of Walker and Webster, they are now "objects of legitimate plunder." They belong to the community. They are public property.

A General Introduction to the Bible is, in some respects, like an encyclopedia to the Bible, because it contains so many hundreds of distinct and separate topics,

each set forth with the utmost brevity and yet with an all-round completeness of exposition which is both necessary and sufficient to explain the essential idea of things.

As no one can be a specialist in everything (the limitations of human nature being opposed to such monopolies) the writer, for the sake of his readers and for their good, has wished to condense, within the limits of a few handy volumes, the best results of the life-long labors of specialists in each branch of the study that is discussed in his book, no matter how or where he got them.

In every such work, not only every short chapter, but almost every section and every paragraph contains, and should contain, the quintessence of learned volumes written by specialists, but reduced within the narrowest possible compass consistent with clearness.

The writer has, of course, been indebted to the labors of specialists at every turn; but to acknowledge this indebtedness on every page, to trace every statement to its original source, and, in every instance, to indicate its precise limits or extent, would be a worse than useless task; for it would overload the pages of a book intended for beginners, who, as a rule do not relish such an array of references, footnotes, and minute details of little or no interest to those who have neither time nor inclination to follow them up.

Instead of all this, the author wishes that the general method and contents of his book should stand forth in the clearest outline and in the boldest relief before the mental horizon of the reader, unencumbered by useless

details, which often only obscure the vision. There is such a thing as being "unable to see the forest for the trees."

The earliest chapters of the book happen to be the most elementary and well suited to beginners. But by the time the student has thoroughly mastered the three subsequent chapters on Higher Biblical Criticism, the Inspiration of Scripture, and Hermeneutics, he will no longer be a mere beginner. By that time he will have begun to understand the logic of it all; the theory, the philosophy, and the theology of the mutual relations of the Catholic Church, of Divine Tradition, and of Sacred Scripture to one another, both in general and in the interpretation of the doctrinal parts of Holy Writ.

In the beginning of the work, there is a "Synopsis" which gives a bird's-eye view of all its parts, so that, at any moment, the student may know just where he stands in his course.

An extensive bibliography, containing lists of general introductions, handbooks or "aids," biblical dictionaries, encyclopedias and reviews, as well as special treatises on topics belonging to General Introduction, will be found at the end of the first volume, followed by an alphabetical index.

The author is thankful to the many professors of theology and of Sacred Scripture who encouraged him and who, when asked, gave him wise counsel and useful suggestions how the work should be done. But not knowing where to draw the line and feeling that to mention some and not mention others might not be quite fair, he mentions none of them by name.

However, he feels specially grateful to the Rev. Joseph F. Smith, permanent rector of St. Bernard's Church, New York City, who was the first to suggest and to urge persistently that this work should be undertaken and who, during its progress, never ceased to contribute in many ways to its early completion.

MEANING
OF
GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE

In this prolegomenon we will discuss in order the following topics:

1) The Definition,
2) The Purpose,
3) The Extent,
4) The Character,
5) The Divisions,
6) The Necessity, and
7) The Place of General Biblical Introduction.

The word " Biblical Introduction " is used in a great variety of senses. The term itself is vague and, therefore, precision and uniformity in the use of it are not to be expected. We hope that the following exposition of it will be useful to the student.

1. Definition of General Biblical Introduction

By Biblical Introduction we understand that science, or that group of sciences, the knowledge of which serves as a *proximate* and *special* preparation for the intelligent study of Scripture in whole or in part. It is a summary or systematic collection of all the preliminary information which should precede the scientific and critical study of the sacred books.

It brings together, under suitable heads and in systematic order, the knowledge that we acquire about the Bible, so that the student, thus equipped, may be in a position to enter upon the task of interpreting intelligently the Sacred Volume. Briefly, in Introduction we study *about* the Bible; in Exegesis we study the Bible itself.

2. The Purpose of General Biblical Introduction

The purpose of Introduction is to discuss and to determine the origin and the authority of the sacred books and to help the student to realize the historical situation or environment out of which they have grown and from which alone they can be correctly understood and critically interpreted.

The purpose for which all Biblical studies are prosecuted, and the end to which all our efforts are directed, is to appropriate, or make our own, the truths contained in the Bible. This is done chiefly in Exegesis. Therefore, Exegesis, like every other end, is of primary intention and desirable for its own sake. But what is first in intention is last in execution. So, before proceeding to Exegesis, certain preliminary problems must be discussed, on the solution of which all subsequent progress depends.

This is done in Biblical Introduction. Therefore Biblical Introduction, like every other means, is of secondary intention, and is desirable for the sake of the end to which it leads,— Exegesis. But, being the

only means to that end, it is as *important* as the end itself, and should precede it.

3. Extent of General Biblical Introduction

All agree that Biblical Introduction introduces to the study of the Sacred Text. But not all agree as to its compass or extent,— just how many parts go to make it up, or just what constitutes it.

Formerly,— not so long ago,— the word Introduction meant all sorts of antiquarian odds and ends of information about Sacred Scripture, with little unity and no definite limits. Even yet there is much difficulty in fixing its boundaries; even yet the term is sometimes used in a very broad sense, almost as broad as the etymology of the word will permit, and is made to include all those various branches of knowledge which, more or less *proximately* and *specially,* prepare the way for the study of the Sacred Text; nothing more, and nothing less.

We say advisedly, "*proximately* and *specially* prepare the way." For there are many things that are absolutely necessary, as preliminaries, to the study of Sacred Scripture, and yet they never belonged, and never will belong, to Biblical Introduction. For instance, a knowledge of the alphabet, familiarity with the general principles of grammar and rhetoric, skill in the use of logic, proficiency in Latin and some of the modern languages,— though ever so necessary to the study of the Sacred Text, are just as important as a preparation to the study of philosophy, theology, civil and canon law and the natural sciences and, therefore,

have no claim to form a part of Biblical Introduction.

It suits our present purpose and the needs of the student to use the word Introduction in a rather broad sense, because this was formerly and is still the usual meaning of the word.

4. The Character of General Biblical Introduction

Some reduce Biblical Introduction to little else than history and make it almost equivalent to Higher Criticism. This is very unsatisfactory from a Catholic point of view, because the chapters on Inspiration, on the History of the Canon, and on Hermeneutics contain much belonging to dogmatic theology, and if they are not taught in General Introduction, the student may never see them.

a) Biblical Introduction is Critical in character. Criticism is a sifting or winnowing process, instituted for the purpose of separating the wheat from the chaff, truth from error, fact from fiction. Criticism is necessary for all true progress, and accordingly has its place, not only in Biblical studies, but also in all departments of science, and in every branch of human knowledge. In literature, as well as in history, to separate the genuine from the spurious, would be impossible without some fixed principles, without some solid criteria to guide the student and to direct the scholar in their examination of facts and in their search for the truth. Now, such criteria we possess in the department of General Biblical Introduction. Hence the name " Critical " Biblical Introduction.

b) Again, Biblical Introduction is HISTORICAL in character. It investigates all such topics as the Authorship, the date and place of composition, analysis of contents, preservation of the text, class of persons for whom written, scope of the writer, credibility of the contents of the Sacred Books, history of the text and versions, history of the canon and Biblical history. But these are all FACTS that belong, in some way, to the domain of history, or are even professedly history. Hence the name, Critico-"Historical" Introduction.

c) Again, Biblical Introduction is LITERARY in character. It deals with all that now remains of a once much more extensive literature produced by a remarkably gifted people, and consisting of prose and poetry,— of almost all kinds of prose and nearly every variety of poetry. Hence the name Critico-Historico-"Literary" Introduction.

d) Again, Biblical Introduction is THEOLOGICAL in character. Scripture is not a mere part of the general literature of the world. For, if it were so, it would form no part of a course of theological studies. It is a species by itself, and must have a special treatment. To study any literary work to advantage, it is necessary to consider all the motives that prompted the author to write, and to give due weight to all the influences brought to bear upon him, and resulting in the production of the book, such precisely as it is.

But in the composition of every book of Scripture the writer was prompted by a peculiar, supernatural influence called "Inspiration," which produced the book, gave it its distinctive character, and made it precisely

what it is,— SACRED Scripture. Hence the name *Critico-Historico-Literary-Theological* Introduction.

Any attempt, therefore, at a Biblical Introduction which would omit, or purposely ignore, as all Rationalists do, the Inspiration of the Sacred Books, would be an incomplete treatment of the subject. It would separate what God has joined together,— the divine and the human element in Holy Writ.

5. DIVISION OF BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION

Introduction is GENERAL when it treats questions common to all the Books of Scripture or to an entire Testament; such as Inspiration, Archæology, Hermeneutics.

Introduction is SPECIAL when it treats individual or separate books or classes of books; such as St. Matthew's Gospel, or the Synoptic Problem, or the Pauline Epistles. Most writers properly begin with General Introduction; some reverse the order.

Experience teaches that the Introduction to the Old Testament should be kept separate from that to the New Testament; because they are so unlike.

6. NECESSITY OF BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION

The need of an orderly, systematic, and thoroughgoing study of Biblical Introduction, both general and special, is evident from the many difficulties of the subject.

These difficulties arise, partly, from the *abundance of the materials* of all kinds, the *varied character,* and

the endless *multitude of topics* mentioned here and there in the Bible, and systematically discussed in Biblical Introduction and partly, also, from the general obscurity which accompanies all Bible Study.

Some causes of this *obscurity* are the remote antiquity of the Sacred Books and the scarcity, or total absence, of any contemporary writings that might help to explain them. Also the *sublimity* and the *profundity* of the teachings of the Bible, especially those about God, His existence, His providence, and his other attributes; many of which are impenetrable mysteries. Also the *language* in which most of the Sacred Books were written,— Hebrew, a language as unlike any of the Indo-European languages, with which we are familiar, as any language can well be.

7. Place of Biblical Introduction

Pope Leo XIII condemns as preposterous any serious attempt to exegete Sacred Scripture, before the student is sufficiently acquainted with the origin, history, peculiarities, special purpose and value of each book to be commented.

This means that any serious course of Exegesis should be preceded, not only by a General Introduction to Scripture as a whole, but also by a Prolegomenon or Special Introduction to each particular book, before any serious attempt is made to interpret it.

Such Special Introduction should contain, unless already given, a biographical sketch of the author to be commentated, showing who and what he was, when and where he lived, and how and why, for what spe-

cific purpose, on what occasion, on what topics, and for what class of readers he wrote, etc.

This Introduction should also show the general tenor and drift of the book, its principal doctrinal, ethical, and historical contents; also the author's favorite teachings, his peculiarities of style and diction, and any other facts or data that might be of special interest to the student.

It should also discuss, as is done in Higher Biblical Criticism, such important topics as the Integrity, the Genuineness, the Literary Form, and the Human Authority of the book to be commented.

All such information, if bunched together and placed before his mind in a luminous, orderly, systematic, and sufficiently, though not excessively, detailed analysis, will be of incalculable advantage to the student.

Such preliminary information, if disposed of once for all in the Introduction, will serve, like the headlight of a locomotive, to illumine the entire course to be covered. It will prevent loss of time, useless repetitions, groping and floundering about in the dark, endless confusion, hesitancy and uncertainty during the entire course.

In his Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus," Pope Leo XIII insists upon such a study when he says: "It is needless to insist upon the importance of making these preliminary studies in an orderly and thorough fashion, accompanied and assisted by theology; for the whole subsequent course will rest on the foundation thus laid, and will be luminous with the light thus

acquired." He calls them "preliminary studies," because they should precede Exegesis. (Cfr. F. E. Gigot, Article on "General Introduction" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia.*)

SYNOPSIS OF BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION

Vol. I

Definition, Names, Divisions, etc., of the Bible.
History of the Original Languages of the Bible.
History of the Original Texts of the Bible.
History of the Ancient Versions of the Bible.

Vol. II

Textual Biblical Criticism.
Higher Biblical Criticism.
Biblical Archaeology.

Vol. III

The Inspiration of the Bible.
The History of the Canon.

Vol. IV

Biblical Hermeneutics.

Appendix

Results of Exegesis.
Biblical Theology.
Biblical History.
Biblical Biography, etc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION, NAMES, AND DIVISIONS OF THE BIBLE

A GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BIBLE

CHAPTER I

(Preliminary)

DEFINITION, NAMES, AND DIVISIONS OF THE BIBLE

§ 1. Definition

The Bible, of which we are to treat in the following pages, is the collection of books which the Church has declared to be divinely inspired and which she regards as a partial and remote rule of faith and morals.

The other part of this remote rule is divine tradition. The Church is the proximate, active rule of faith and morals. But of this we shall speak more fully afterwards.

§ 2. Names of the Bible

The word "Bible" (Greek *Biblos, Biblion*), signifies simply a book. *Biblia,* the plural of *Biblion,* passing into the Latin, became, in time, a feminine singular noun and, as such, is found in nearly all the modern languages of Western Europe. This word is much used by the early Fathers, both Greek and Latin. The corresponding Hebrew word is found in Isaias (3, 10) and in Daniel (9, 2).

The Bible is also called "Scripture," "Sacred Scripture," "Holy Scripture," "Holy Writ," "The Writings," "The Other Writings," "The BOOK" *par excellence.* In the New Testament the Bible is called "ἡ γραφή," or "ἡ θεῖα γραφή" or "ἁγιαὶ γραφαί." Our Lord is frequently quoted as using this word in the Gospels, as in John 5, 39, Matt. 26, 55, Mark 15, 28, Luke 24, 27–34–35, John 19, 36–37; 20, 9; St. Paul uses the word in Romans 1, 2, I Cor. 15, 3, Gal. 3, 22, I Tim. 5, 18. Also, the early Fathers very frequently used the word. "Τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα" is used by St. Paul in the sense of "ἡ γραφή" in II Tim. 3, 15.

Another name for the Bible is "The Old and New Testaments" or "The Old and the New Testament." The Old Testament contains the inspired books written *before* the time of Christ; the New Testament contains the inspired books written *after* the time of Christ. St. Paul shows that "DIATHEKE" means more than "covenant," "alliance," or "pact"; that it means, in a juridical sense, the last will and testament, by which God bequeathed to us His "eternal inheritance," to go into effect after the death of the Divine Mediator and Testator, Jesus Christ. He says that the New Testament has abrogated the Old and will continue forever. "Now in saying the New [Testament], he has made the former Old." He calls the "New" the "Everlasting Testament." In these texts the Greek words corresponding to "Former" and "New" Testament are Παλαία Διαθήκη and Καίνη Διαθήκη, *i. e.*, "The Old and the New Testament." (II Cor. 3, 14, Heb. 9, 15–18, 8, 13, 13, 20).

§ 3. The Division of the Bible into Books

The Jews, by combining or by separating the books of the Old Testament on different principles, make them out to be either thirty-six (36), or twenty-seven (27), or twenty-four (24), or twenty-two (22). The last is the usual number,— the number of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet. Jews as well as Protestants omit the seven Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament, but Protestants retain the seven Deuterocanonical books of the New Testament.

Catholics, following the example of the Latin Vulgate, divide them in such a way as to make seventy-three (73) books in the Bible, *i. e.,* forty-six (46) in the Old Testament and twenty-seven (27) in the New.

The Jews divided the books of the Old Testament into three classes: "The Law," "The Prophets," and "The Other Writings."

1. The *Law* is the *Torah* or the *Nomos* or the Pentateuch, or The Five Books of Moses. The division of the Law into various sections, called *Parashoth,* and of the Prophets into sections called *Haphtaroth,* was either begun or at least fixed by the Massoretes. There are fifty-four (54) *Parashoth* and a corresponding number of *Haphtaroth* for reading in the religious services of the Synagogue, one for each Sabbath of the year.

2. The Prophets are divided into two classes: (A) The "Earlier Prophets," Josue, Judges, I–II Samuel and I–II Kings; (B) The "Later Prophets," also sub-

divided into two classes; (1) the "Greater Prophets," Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel; (2) the twelve "Minor Prophets," from Osee to Malachias.

The so-called Earlier Prophets are really *historical* books and give the history of the Chosen People from the death of Moses to the Babylonian Captivity. The contents of these books are historical, but they are called prophetical, because supposedly written by Prophets.

The titles "Greater" and "Minor" Prophets have reference merely to the larger or smaller *bulk* of the respective books. The titles "Earlier" and "Later" Prophets refer merely to the relative *local position* of the books in the canon, and not to their relative date of composition. The Jews counted the twelve Minor Prophets as one book.

3. The third class of books have no specific title and, for want of a better name, are called *"The Writings," "The Books," "The Other Books," "The Rest of the Books."* These are the vague names given to this third class of books in the Prologue or Preface to the Greek translation of Ecclesiasticus. They are sometimes called the "Hagiographa," and sometimes the "Psalms," perhaps because of their list beginning with the "Psalter."

The books of the Old Testament are logically divided into three classes,— Historical, Didactic, and Prophetical.

1. The *Historical* Books are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Josue, Judges, Ruth, I, II, III, and IV Kings, I and II Paralipomenon,

I and II Esdras, Tobias, Judith, Esther and I and II Maccabees; — in all twenty-one (21).

2. The *Didactic* (or Doctrinal) Books are: Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus; — in all seven (7).

3. The *Prophetical* Books are Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel, Lamentations, Baruch, Osee, Joel, Amos, Abdias, Jonas, Micheas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias; — in all eighteen (18).

Many recent writers find it convenient to divide the Old Testament books into four classes, (1) The Legal; (2) The Historical; (3) The Prophetical, and (4) The class variously and indifferently called the Moral, Doctrinal, or Sapiential, or the Wisdom Books, such as Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, etc.

The Books of the New Testament are also divided into three classes, the Historical, the Doctrinal, and the Prophetical.

1. The *Historical* Books are the four Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John) and the Acts of the Apostles; — in all five.

2. The *Doctrinal* Books are the Fourteen Epistles of St. Paul and the seven Catholic Epistles (Peter, John, Jude); — in all twenty-one.

3. Of *Prophetical* books in the New Testament there is but one, the Apocalypse of St. John.

§ 4. Importance and Beauty of Bible Study

Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus,* insists emphatically and in very beautiful lan-

guage on the urgent need of Holy Scripture for the study of theology, for preaching to the people, and for private devotion. His words are quoted in volume four of this work. We recommend them to the perusal of the student.

The materials best suited for the purposes above mentioned are found in great abundance, especially in the doctrinal and moral parts of the "Good Book."

But even in those other parts of Scripture which, at first sight, might seem to be so exclusively historical or scientific as to preclude all idea of Religion, as in the history of the six days' creation,[1] we are often surprised to see how much Theology lies either behind it all or even on the very surface.

Thus, much Theology is found in the history of the Six Days of Creation, which is a part of the first chapter of Genesis. For, whatever interpretation we may give to this chapter, one thing is certain, there have been incorporated into it some of the most fundamental truths of religion. The cosmogony of this opening chapter of Genesis, and of the whole Bible, is absolutely unique. It stands alone in its glory, incomparably superior to all other histories of Creation. One remarkable peculiarity of this narrative is that it represents God as standing out in sublimity, majesty, and solitary grandeur above all else, and teaches a most spiritual religion. Hence, whatever else it may be, this splendid exordium of Genesis is a religious composition. It is a primeval hymn. It is the inspired song of creation. It contains a rendering of praise to the Creator, expressed in the sublimest

1 Gen. I.

language. It contains the most profound theology and must have been placed at the head of the Book to teach the early Hebrews the most essential truths of natural and supernatural religion. Not of course in just so many words, but by implication, it teaches the existence of God, because it is He who created. It teaches the eternity of God, because He was before time began. It teaches the spirituality of God, because He created the first matter. It teaches the omnipotence of God, because He created all things out of nothing. It teaches the liberty or free will of God, because He inaugurated a new order of things. It teaches the wisdom of God, because He brought order out of chaos. It teaches the infinity of God, because it represents Him as existing beyond all limitations of time and space. In one word, this exordium is a composition so exquisite in its structure, so noble in its simplicity, so wondrous in its sublimity, so sound in its philosophy, so spiritual in its theology, so pure in its conception of God and its notions of the relations of man to God, to his fellow men, and to the material universe around him, that it must have been inspired, not so much, perhaps, for the purpose of teaching the sciences of history or cosmogony, as for the purpose of inculcating the doctrines of the purest monotheism on a people surrounded by heathen neighbors and in danger of being influenced by the doctrines and practices of heathenism.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES OF THE BIBLE

CHAPTER II

HISTORY OF THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGES OF THE BIBLE

The first step is to inquire how far we understand the original languages of the inspired books, and whether our acquaintance with the grammar and lexicon of the Biblical Greek and Hebrew is correct and extensive enough to warrant us in holding that we can translate those languages with sufficient accuracy to insure reliability of interpretation. This question is solved by acquiring sufficient knowledge of the preliminary science called "Biblical Philology."

Without any familiarity with the original Biblical languages, the student, with a good modern translation and such other helps as are common in recent times, may acquire not only a sufficient acquaintance with the Bible for all practical purposes, but also a very profound and very accurate and extensive knowledge of the contents of Holy Scripture. Of this we have many instances. The most highly esteemed exegetes among the Fathers are SS. Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom.

1. St. Jerome is remarkable for his archæological knowledge and his philological skill in interpreting Sacred Scripture. He had a thorough familiarity

with the three great languages of his day — Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. It should not be surprising that he was a great Biblical scholar.

2. St. Augustine is remarkable for his vigorous and capacious intellect, for his powerful grasp on the teachings of the Church, and, as a consequence, for his profound insight into the doctrinal contents of Sacred Scripture. He was the greatest pulpit orator among the Latins and one of the three greatest exegetes in the Church for 1500 years. Yet, he knew little Greek and no Hebrew.

3. St. John Chrysostom is remarkable for the abundance and excellence, for the quantity and for the quality of the homiletical materials in his works, especially in his Homilies on the Epistles of St. Paul. He is the Prince of Greek pulpit orators and one of the three greatest exegetes of Sacred Scripture down to modern times. Yet, he knew no Hebrew.

But for a rigorously critical commentary on Scripture, some knowledge of Hebrew or Greek is, of course, necessary, not indeed a complete and exhaustive knowledge, for that would be out of the question, unless in very rare cases, but an elementary knowledge, such as would enable the student, not indeed to make a new translation of the Bible, but to control or to verify one already made and ready at hand. Such elementary knowledge is not so difficult to acquire and, once acquired, it will increase with use and with time, and almost without conscious effort.

In fact, no translation, however good, can ever and always supply the place of the original text, when

critical accuracy is required. For this we must go to the original source, to the fountain-head, to what Jerome was accustomed to call "*Hebraica Veritas.*" No translation of the Bible is faultless; because, while God inspired the first writers, He did not see fit to inspire all those who took it upon themselves to translate the inspired books. "*Aliud est vatem, aliud esse interpretem,*" says Jerome of the translators of the Greek Septuagint. God did not make Himself responsible for the fidelity of their translation.

Yet it must not be supposed that any knowledge, however profound, of Biblical languages is of itself sufficient to make a man a good interpreter of Scripture. It is only one of many requirements. Pope Leo XIII says: "It [Bible study] must be accompanied and assisted by theology"; else many a Rationalist would be a consummate exegete. It is only in the light of the Christian faith, reinforced by all the aids of sound modern Biblical scholarship, that the Christian Scriptures can be rightly and critically understood.

But first and foremost, we must consider in what languages the Bible was written and how the original texts have been transmitted to us.

Of the Old Testament Books, (1) most were written in Hebrew, (2) some in Aramaic, and (3) some in Greek. Of the New Testament Books, all were written in Greek, except, perhaps, St. Matthew's Gospel, which a constant tradition among the Fathers says was written in Hebrew, the Aramaic of the day.

As to the first, the student must know something about Hebrew, because all the translations of the Old,

and even of the New Testament, have preserved many Hebraisms, both in individual words and in grammatical constructions, which can be explained only by the Hebrew.

We shall first locate the Hebrew, both in *nature, time* and *place,* so as to show its relation to the other great languages of the world.

Classes of Languages

The best known languages are divided by philologians into three general groups or classes, distinguished from one another, both in matter or vocabulary, and in form or grammatical construction.

They are, (1) The isolating, (2) The agglutinative, and (3) The inflected languages.

1. In the ISOLATING languages, every word is a root, and every root is a monosyllable, and every monosyllable is invariable in form, the same form being used to express the noun, the verb, the adverb, the adjective; also the same form being used to indicate the various conjugations, moods, tenses, persons, numbers, cases, genders, etc. Then, the different parts of speech are indicated, not by a *different form* of the word or root, but by the *context,* or by the *subject matter,* or by the *relative position* of the word in the sentence, or by *various modulations* of the voice.

The Anamite, the Siamese, the Chinese, and many others are isolating languages.

2. In the AGGLUTINATIVE languages many words are formed by *prefixing* or *suffixing* syllables to the roots; but this union is made so *loosely* and *superfi-*

cially that neither the form nor the meaning of the component parts is changed beyond easy recognition. Each element retains its separate identity. They are juxtaposed end-wise, but are not dove-tailed together; as steamboat, sandstone, railroad.

The Mongolian, the Hungarian, the Turkish, the Japanese, the Basque, and many others are agglutinative languages.

3. In the INFLECTED languages, the process of agglutination is carried so far that it is difficult to distinguish the original root from its now inseparable modifiers, that have been added to it and amalgamated with it, whether as prefixes or as suffixes. Sometimes the simple root has no longer a separate or independent existence in the language outside of compound words; it has fallen out of use. The same is true of many of the prefixes and suffixes. Sometimes the root is slightly modified; as *facio, deficio, confectionary.*

Families of Inflected Languages

The inflected languages are divided into two great families, the INDO-EUROPEAN, called also the Aryan or Japhetic, and the SEMITIC. It is sufficient for our purpose to consider these two families of languages. They are spoken, not by all, but by the great majority of the white race, by nations that have been, by far, the most influential in the history of religion and civilization. Yet they differ in many respects.

1. One difference is this:

(a) In the Indo-European languages, the words are formed and inflected by means of additions made *to*

the root and *outside* of the root. Such additions are either PREFIXES or SUFFIXES, or both.

(b) In the Semitic languages, the words are formed and inflected from within, by means of vowels and vowel changes usually made *inside* the root, *i. e.,* between the three consonants composing the root.

2. Another difference:

(a) In all Indo-European languages, the root consists of one *single syllable,* and this syllable may be, must be, a *vowel,* either a vowel alone or a vowel accompanied by consonants. The vowel, perhaps lightly modified, is an essential part of the root, as f*a*ction, def*e*ction, f*i*ction.

(b) In all the Semitic languages, the root consists exclusively of *consonants,* usually *three,* which express the broadest and most general meaning of the word. These consonants are the skeleton to which the vowels give life and animation and individuality and expression.

3. Another difference:

(a) In the Indo-European languages a root may consist of as many as *seven* letters, *i. e.,* one vowel and six consonants; but united in such a way as to form only one syllable; as, switch, strength; whereas

(b) In the Semitic languages, the roots consist regularly of *three* consonants, and are, therefore, triliteral. By way of exception, a very few roots consist of only two consonants. In the course of time, did these roots lose a third consonant? or did all other roots take on a third consonant, so as to increase the possibility of producing a greater variety of changes and modifica-

tions of form and so to express a greater variety of meanings? It is uncertain.

With three consonants and ten vowels (five long and five short vowels) to choose from, a great variety of forms and meanings may easily be obtained. Thus, from the root K–T–L which conveys the broadest and most general idea of kill, killing, we have the simple active, *katal,* to kill; passive, *niktal,* to be killed; the intensive active, *kittel,* to massacre; passive, *kuttal,* to be massacred; the causative active, *hiktal,* to cause to kill; passive, *hoktal,* to be caused to kill; the reflexive active, *hithkattel,* to kill one's self. The Indo-European has its causatives, frequentatives, inceptives, desideratives, etc., formed by significant syllables appended to the root, but these have no such prevalence and simplicity of structure as the Semitic system.

4. Another difference: (a) In the Indo-European languages there is a richness and an abundance of both *matter* and *form,* which can easily be made to satisfy all demands of people and scholar alike. By external additions to the root, forms may be greatly multiplied. Prefixes and suffixes may be added, the one to the other and to the root, and words may be compounded almost indefinitely. (b) In the Semitic languages it is not thus. The possibility of multiplying forms by internal inflection, on three consonants, is relatively limited. Even with ten vowels, five short and five long, the various possible combinations of sound will, after all, render only a short tune. Then, too, compound words are extremely rare in the Semitic, but abound in the Indo-European languages.

5. Still another difference: (a) In the Indo-European languages, the vocabulary is subject to *ceaseless changes.* (b) In the Semitic languages the vocabulary is remarkable for its *invariable stability* and permanency. The consonantal base of Semitic words cannot be changed by the attrition or wearing away either of the initial or of the final consonant without destroying the identity of the word, and without making it difficult and even impossible to recognize the meaning.

6. A final difference: (a) The Indo-European languages are more reflective and more *severely accurate* in the expression of the finer shades of thought, especially of *abstract thought,* and in making the more subtle distinctions of logic or metaphysics and of philosophy in general. (b) The Semitic languages are *more graphic, more poetic, more imaginative* and *more picturesque,* and indulge in the boldest figures of speech and of rhetoric. Dependent on this peculiarity of Semitic speech is the lack of precision and definiteness, the inexactness of expression which is so noticeable in Scripture, and which the educated European, trained in the severe methods of reasoning taught by Aristotle and the Medieval Scholastics, so much misses. The Semite, child of nature, expresses his thoughts in bold outlines and in general terms, leaving it to the imagination of the reader to fill it out. This peculiarity of the Semitic form of thought is noticeable in the conjunction "*vav*" (and), instead of the wealth of conjunctions found in our European languages, also in the possession of only two so-called Hebrew tenses instead of the nine tenses of the Greek.

The many other differences are of less interest to beginners.

Branches of the Indo-European Family of Languages

The Indo-European family of languages (sometimes called the Aryan and sometimes the Japhetic) is divided and subdivided into many groups, as follows:

(1) The SANSKRIT (the ancient classical language in which the sacred Hindoo books are written), including all the modern languages of India, as well as ancient and modern Persian.

(2) The GREEK, ancient and modern, with all its dialects.

(3) The LATIN, including several romance languages descended from it, such as Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Rumenian, and others.

(4) The TEUTONIC languages, including: (a) the Low German, spoken along the shores of the Baltic and in the Lowlands or Netherlands, such as the Frisian, Flemish, Dutch, and English; (b) the High German, which originated in Austria and Bavaria and is now the literary language of Germany; (c) the Scandinavian, including Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish.

(5) The CELTIC languages are the Welch, the Cornish, the Armoric of Brittany in northwest France, the Irish, and the Scotch Gaelic.

(6) The SLAVONIAN languages embrace the Russian, the Polish, the Lithuanian, and many others in Eastern Europe.

These principal groups include many other divisions and subdivisions too numerous to mention.

Geographical Position of the Aryan Family of Languages

The Indo-European family of languages extends from the southern extremity of Hindoostan up through Persia, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and Spain, to the Atlantic, and from the steppes of Asia and the Ural Mountains through Russia, Germany, Scandinavia, and Great Britain, to and across the Atlantic and, by means of French, Spanish, Portuguese, and English, covers the entire continent of the three Americas, and then away again to New Zealand, Australia, and many islands in the Pacific. Is this a fulfilment of the prayer or prophecy of Noe: "May God enlarge Japheth and may he dwell in the tents of Sem"? (Gen. 9, 27.) The word Japheth means "one who spreads himself ever more and more."

Branches of the Semitic Family of Languages

The Semitic family of languages, of which Hebrew is a member, consists chiefly of three general groups, as follows:

(1) The SOUTHERN Semitic, including the Arabic and Ethiopic or Abyssinian.

(2) The MIDDLE Semitic, including the Hebrew, the Moabite, the Phœnician, the Punic or Carthagenian and the Assyro-Babylonian, the language of the Cuneiform Inscriptions.

(3) The NORTHERN Semitic or Aramaic, including the Syriac, the Chaldee, the Samaritan, the Talmudic, and Targumic.[1]

1 These principal groups include many divisions and subdivisions of dialects too numerous to mention.

Geographical Position of the Semitic Family of Languages

To locate this famous family of languages on the map, we will say that its normal habitat for ages was the territory bounded roughly on the North by Asia Minor and the mountains of Armenia; on the East by Persia and the Persian Gulf; on the South by the Indian Ocean; and on the West by the Red Sea, the Isthmus of Suez, and the Mediterranean. It included, therefore, Syria, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Chaldea, Phenicia, Palestine, and Arabia.

Also, in a pre-historic period, Arabian Semites crossed the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb into Africa, and carried with them their Semitic civilization and language into Ethiopia or Abyssinia, where they settled and developed a rich Christian literature.

Again, centuries before the Christian era, Queen Dido and her followers set sail from Tyre in Phenicia, founded Carthage, in North Africa, and carried with them the Punic language (which is practically the same as Hebrew) to their colonies on the coast of Spain and Southern Gaul, to Malta, and to other islands of the Mediterranean.

Again, after the last Punic War, when the Latin of the Roman conquerors had taken the place of Hebrew in and around the city of Carthage and its colonies, the closely related Arabic soon absorbed what was left of the Hebrew in country places, after the invasion of the Mohammedan Arabs in the seventh century A. D.

It is the common opinion of scholars that the Semites originated either somewhere near the confluence of

the Tigris and the Euphrates and spread as above described, or came down from the table-lands of Aram around the sources of those rivers.

There is a very close resemblance, both in grammar and in lexicon, between all the members of this family, much closer than between the branches of the Indo-European family of languages, so that he who knows one, can easily learn the others.

We will describe them in order:

(1) The *Ethiopic* or Abyssinian language is a branch of the Southern Arabic that was carried into Ethiopia by Semitic colonists in a pre-Christian period. In lexicon, the Ethiopic is poorer, and in grammatical form it is simpler, than Arabic and more like Hebrew. It was either the spoken or the written language in Abyssinia till the 14th century of the Christian era.

The Ethiopic contains a very ancient version of the entire Bible, Old and New Testaments, besides many apocryphal works, such as Ethiopic translations of the IVth Book of Esdras, of the Ascension of Isaias, and of the famous Book of Henoch, which had entirely disappeared from both the East and the West ever since the first few centuries of the Church, till it was rediscovered in Abyssinia in the 18th century.

(2) The *Arabic* was first spoken in Northern Arabia. But it does not seem to have produced any literature till the 4th or 5th century of the Christian era.

The *Koran,* written in Arabic by the False Prophet, has helped to spread this language far and wide over great stretches of territory in Southwestern Asia and in Northeastern Africa.

Arabic is one of the richest of languages. It has about 6,000 roots and 60,000 words, while Hebrew has only about 2,000 roots and 6,000 words. The relatively small number of words in Hebrew is explained partly by the fact that so much ancient Hebrew literature, which was written on all manner of *secular* topics, has perished with the lapse of time, and only the thirty or forty books of the Bible, written on *religious* topics, have been preserved. Still, Hebrew was never so rich as Arabic.

Arabic is either the spoken or the liturgical language of more than 60,000,000 of people. It is by far the richest in vocabulary and grammatical forms, as well as the most widely spread, of all the Semitic dialects. In fact, if you except the little Syriac that is still spoken, in a degenerate form, in Urmiah, in Persia, and in certain mountainous regions of Kurdistan, Arabic is the only Semitic language spoken at the present day.

(3) The word *Aramaic* is derived from Aram, which is the proper name of the country, consisting largely of highlands or table-lands, bordering on Armenia and Asia Minor to the North, and extending down towards the South, between and on both sides of the Euphrates and the Tigris, as far as Palestine and Arabia. But the Aramaic language at one time had spread beyond the limits of this territory and had become the international commercial language of all that part of the world.

The Aramaic, or so-called *Syro-Chaldaic,* spoken by the Jewish people at the time of Our Lord, is, in the

New Testament, generally called Hebrew, because spoken by the Hebrew people, for centuries. (John 5, 2; 19, 13; 19, 20; Acts 21, 40; 22, 2; 26, 14; Apoc. 9, 11; 16, 16.)

Josephus uses the word Hebrew both for the ancient Hebrew, in which the Old Testament is written, and for the more modern Aramaic or Syro-Chaldaic, spoken by the Jews at the time of Christ. In both cases this language is so called to distinguish it, not from ancient Hebrew, but from the Greek, which was also widely spoken in Palestine at the time.

(4) The *Syriac* has become known to us chiefly through the famous old Syriac Peshitto version of the Old and New Testaments. The most flourishing period in the history of this language extended from the second to the twelfth century, and furnished a great abundance of nearly every variety of literature. The most flourishing seat of this intellectual activity was Edessa in Syria. A corrupt form of Syriac is still spoken by some Nestorian Christians in Urmiah, in Persia.

(5) The *Chaldean* language became known to us for the first time through certain portions of the Books of Daniel and Esdras, and through the Jewish Targums.

Scholars are not agreed as to the exact relationship existing between the closely related Syriac and Chaldee.

The Syriac is sometimes called the Western, sometimes the Northern, and sometimes the Christian Aramaic; while Chaldee is sometimes called the South-

ern, sometimes the Eastern, and sometimes the Jewish Aramaic. Now as to Hebrew in particular.[1]

Hebrew

It is the more common and, no doubt, the correct opinion that the word Hebrew is derived, not from Heber, one of the ancestors of Abraham, but from the appellative Heber, which means, "From over there," "from beyond," "from the other side," namely, of the River Euphrates (Gen. 14, 13).

It was once the common opinion that Hebrew was the primitive language of humanity, the language of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, and that it was brought by Abraham from Babylon to Palestine, and introduced there as the language of the country. But this first view is now almost entirely abandoned by the most expert philologists.[2] In any case, it cannot be proved that Hebrew is the original language of the human race. For, it is not at all certain that the Semitic is older than the Aryan or Indo-European, or than any other family of languages. And, even if it were so, it cannot be proved that the Hebrew is the oldest member of the Semitic family. Philologians, like Delitzsch and many others, ascribe greater antiquity to the Arabic, and still greater to the Assyro-Babylonian branch of the Semitic family.

Neither did Abraham bring Hebrew with him into Palestine. He found it already well established there. In the land of his birth, Abraham no doubt spoke

1 See Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. II, art. "Hebrew," pp. 325 ff.
2 See Gigot, *Gen. Introduction*, p. 178.

the language of the country, and the language of the country was Aramaic or Assyro-Babylonian, and not Hebrew.

Then, after he had settled among the numerous Canaanitish tribes that inhabited the country, Abraham, as a matter of course, adopted their language, which, slightly modified perhaps by contact with his native Babylonian, became the "Holy Hebrew Tongue,"—the renowned language of the Old Testament and of God's chosen people.

That Hebrew was already the prevalent language of Palestine when Abraham came to settle there, is evident from this fact, that the proper names of places in Palestine (such as the names of towns, cities, and districts) when analyzed etymologically, show that they are distinctly Hebrew, and not Aramaic or Babylonian in origin. Yet, long before Abraham's arrival in the country, such names had already been given and were well established. Hebrew, then, was the language of the heathen tribes in Palestine long before Abraham came among them.

Besides, we cannot well imagine that those numerous tribes would ever abandon their own mother tongue, whatever that was, and would adopt Hebrew from Abraham and his small family, who were mere strangers among them. Such things are not done in that way.

Hebrew, with very slight dialectical differences, was spoken by the twelve tribes of Israel, in the middle of Palestine; it was also spoken by the Phenicians to the North, by the Moabites to the East, and by the

Ammonites and Edomites to the South; that is, over a territory about 300 miles long and 200 miles wide. Also by the Carthagenians.

Origin of the Alphabet

The great majority of writers on this subject are convinced that the Phenician alphabet, as used by the early Hebrews, was derived, not from the Assyro-Babylonian cuneiform characters, but either from the hieroglyphic or from the hieratic characters of ancient Egypt. In any case, Semites, and more probably Phenician Semites, are the inventors of the alphabet which, with slight modifications, was carried first to Greece and then to Rome and finally spread over the civilized world.

It is difficult to know precisely when the Hebrews first became acquainted with the alphabet. But, that they were acquainted with the alphabet and with the art of writing at least as early as the days of Moses, is evident from the many words and phrases in the Pentateuch which mean "to write." (Exodus 18, 14; 24, 4, 7; 34, 28; Numb. 5, 25; 17, 17, 18; 33, 2; Deut. 6, 4; 5, 9; 11, 20; 31, 9; 22, 24.)

And long before Moses, in the days of Abraham, the art of writing must have been well known in Palestine. Abraham had come out of Chaldea, where writing in the cuneiform characters, if not also in an alphabet, had been in vogue for perhaps 2000 years before his birth. And we may well suppose that he was not the man to neglect a thing so essential to his getting on in the world, as the simple art of writing.

History of the Hebrew Language

Roughly speaking, the history of the Hebrew language may be divided into two distinct parts, (1) the period *before,* and (2) the period *after* the *Babylonian exile.*

1. The first period was the *golden age* of Hebrew literature and extended from the beginning, from the days of Moses, down to the captivity.

2. The second period begins with the exile. It may be called the *period of decadence* and extended from the close of the exile to the time of the Maccabees, to B. C. 150 or 100, when Hebrew was entirely supplanted by the so-called Syro-Chaldean, or, rather, by the Aramaic language.

During the first period, covering nearly 1,000 years, the Hebrew language preserved a most remarkable uniformity or identity with itself, both in grammar and in vocabulary. Among the causes of this stereotyped unchangeableness of the language may be mentioned: (1) The peculiarity of all the Semitic languages, their consonantal character; (2) the isolation of the Hebrews during that long period; (3) The general immutability of their customs and of the form of civilization under which they lived.

During the second period the Hebrew became gradually more and more corrupt, not by the infiltration of Chaldaisms from distant Babylonia, but by the constant adoption of Aramaisms from the Aramaic-speaking Syrian populations, by whom the Jews were surrounded on all sides, with many of whom they lived in the closest contact even in Palestine, and with

whom they maintained constant commercial relations.

Scholars are not agreed as to the precise time at which Hebrew ceased to be the living, spoken language of the Jews. Some think that it entirely ceased to be such during the captivity, and that when the exiles returned from Babylon to Jerusalem, they spoke the Aramaic exclusively. But this is a mistake. Others hold that many of the exiles retained, at least, the *partial* use of Hebrew after their return to Jerusalem, and that they afterwards lost it by slow degrees. And this is the fact.

It is probable that the importation of the Assyrian colonists, ancestors of the Samaritans, into the Northern Kingdom at Samaria, to take the place of "the ten lost tribes of Israel," who had just been carried away captives to Nineveh, B. C. 720, was the remote beginning of the decline of the Hebrew language. The Babylonian captivity contributed its share to the same general result, though less than is often supposed; for Hebrew, as a spoken language, survived the exile by a couple of centuries.

During the Babylonian captivity, many of the Jews lived together in Hebrew-speaking colonies and continued the use of their own language without let or hindrance; so that, on their return to Jerusalem, many of them still spoke Hebrew, though, of course, not in its pristine purity.

Then, again, on their return to Jerusalem, they there met many other Hebrew-speaking Jews, who, to escape the drag-net of Nabucco, had fled in time either to Egypt, whence they afterwards returned, or had taken

refuge in caves and forests in the mountains of Ephrem and Juda and, as soon as the Chaldean invaders had disappeared, returned to the Holy City, still speaking Hebrew.

Thus, a goodly number still spoke the old language and continued to speak it for perhaps 300 years longer.

"It is too commonly supposed that Neh. VIII, 8 indicates that, on the return from the captivity, the Hebrew language was lost to the common people. But when it is said that 'they read in the Book of the Law of God distinctly and plainly to be understood,' and 'they understood when it was read,' it seems clear that the Law was read to the people in Hebrew and that they understood the Hebrew language without the need of an interpreter. And when it is added that 'Nehemias and Esdras interpreted to all the people,' this can only mean that they made a running commentary, not that they translated it into Aramaic, as is often supposed." (Hugh Pope, O. P., *The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Bible,* Vol. II, p. 60.)

The Phenician and the Aramaic Alphabet

The old Phenician alphabet, in which all the books of the Old Testament, composed before the captivity, were written, has not been used for the last 2000 years, but has been replaced by another, generally called the Aramaic alphabet.

The Phenician alphabet, with slight variations of form, is still found on Carthaginean tablets, in Samaritan manuscripts of the Hebrew Pentateuch, on Jewish coins struck in the time of the Maccabees, in the in-

scriptions carved in the aqueduct at the fountain of Siloam, near Jerusalem, and on the famous Moabite Stone found at Dibon, beyond the Jordan.

These two alphabets are related, but how and in what degree, it is not easy to determine. However, it is generally thought that neither was formed out of the other, but that both are derived from one and the same primitive Semitic alphabet, which gradually grew into two varying forms, one in the Western and the other in the Eastern district inhabited by the Semitic race. This also explains how the Hebrews first got the Phenician form in the West, in Palestine, and how they later got the Aramaic form in the East, in the Babylonian captivity.

But at what precise period the Aramaic characters, now used in all our Hebrew Bibles, were first or finally substituted for the Phenician alphabet, it is impossible to say. Origen, Jerome, and the Talmud ascribe the change to Esdras. But this opinion is no longer held. Instead, we may safely say that the substitution of the Aramaic for the Hebrew language, and the substitution of the Aramaic for the Old Hebrew or Phenician alphabet, took place simultaneously and almost imperceptibly (as such things are wont to take place), over a period of two or three centuries and was practically completed, we may suppose, about B. C. 150 or 100. It is generally thought that the Hebrew alphabet did not assume its present "square" form for a few centuries after Christ.

In the Gospel Our Lord speaks of the "iota" as the smallest letter in the alphabet. It *is* the smallest

letter in the Aramaic, but it is not the smallest in the Phenician alphabet. By His time the change had already taken place.

The Hebrew alphabet, consisting of twenty-two letters, is composed entirely of consonants, by the use of which the fundamental idea was clearly enough expressed, so long as Hebrew was a living, spoken language. But sometime between the sixth and the tenth century of the Christian era, the Massoretic Doctors at Tiberias on the sea of Galilee invented and introduced into the text of the Hebrew Bible a complicated system of vowel points and punctuation marks, so as to fix and perpetuate both the meaning and the pronunciation of the language. Of this we shall see more elsewhere.

Biblical Greek

The Books of the Bible that were written originally in Greek are Wisdom and II Maccabees; perhaps also some of the Deuterocanonical books and fragments of the Old Testament; also all the New Testament books except the Gospel of St. Matthew, which may have been written in Aramaic, the Hebrew of those days. This Greek is not the literary, classical Attic which the great orators, poets, and historians of Athens spoke and wrote. It is post-classical. It is what, after the conquests of Alexander the Great, was called the common or popular language (*koiné*) of his empire. It was originally the Attic, but modified by the absorption of whatever was thought best in the other dialects and by infiltrations from other lan-

guages with which the successors of Alexander came in contact. Thus modified, it was cultivated at Alexandria as a literary language especially by the Jews, and, for this reason, was often called the Hellenistic dialect. This, again, was used later by the writers of the New Testament, but slightly modified so as to express the new ideas introduced by Christianity, and for this reason is often called the Judeo-Christian Greek.

The discovery in recent times of Greek inscriptions on papyrus rolls in Egypt, Greece, and Asia Minor, shows that the Greek of the New Testament is much more nearly related to the popular Greek universally used about the beginning of the Christian era than had generally been believed. Words and constructions, supposed to have been peculiar to the Greek of the New Testament, are now known to have been commonly used by the pagan world at large during the first and following centuries of the Christian era.[1]

The New Testament Greek differs from classical Greek by many peculiarities of pronunciation, construction, and vocabulary.

In the XVIIth century many writers, especially Protestants, maintained that the language and style of the Greek New Testament was perfectly classical. Their arguments were all *a priori; viz.:* The Holy Ghost, the Giver of the gift of tongues, could not have written or caused to be written any but a classical language, etc.

1 On Biblical Greek consult W. H. Simcox, *Language of the New Testament;* Gigot, *Gen. Introduction,* pp. 221 ff.; Ph. Schaff, *Companion to the Greek N. T.,* pp. 20–39.

It was useless to quote against them the differences between Plato and Demosthenes on the one side, and Luke and Paul on the other. It was equally useless to show that Origen, Chrysostom, and other Greek Fathers expressly admitted that the Greek of the New Testament is not classical.

On the other hand, many writers of that time (the XVIIth century) tried to show that the Greek of the New Testament is barbarous and full of solecisms and grammatical errors of all sorts. In this controversy, both sides were manifestly wrong.

It is being established more and more solidly, by Wiener, Moulton, and others, that the Greek of the New Testament is a language with a grammar and with regular and normal constructions and, in nearly all respects, is like that of the common or popular Greek, generally spoken in the Greco-Roman world at that day.

Some Semitic (Hebrew or Aramaic) Words in the New Testament

Abba, Mark XIV, 36; Rom. VIII, 15; Gal. IV, 6, "father";

Abaddon, Apoc. IX, 11; cf. Job XXVI, 6, "destroyer";

Armageddon, Apoc. XVI, 16;

Barabbas, Matt. XXVII, 16, etc., "son of the teacher";

Bar Jona, Matt. XVI, 17; cf. John I, 42, XXI, 15, 16, 17, "son of John";

Barnabas, Acts IV, 36, "son of consolation";
Bartholomew, Matt. X, 3, "son of Tolmai";
Bethesda (Bethsaida, Vg.), John V, 2, perhaps "house of the stream";
Boanerges, Mark III, 17, "sons of thunder";
Cephas, John I, 42, "rock";
Eli (Eloi, Mark XV, 34) *lamma sabacthani?* Matt. XXVII, 46, "My God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Ps. XXI, 1;
Ephpheta (Ephphata), Mark VII, 34, "be thou opened";
Gehenna, Matt. V, 22, "vale of Hinnom";
Golgotha, Matt. XXVII, 33, "skull";
Haceldama (Akeldama), Acts I, 19, "the field of blood";
Hosanna, Matt. XXI, 9, "Praise the Lord";
Mammon, Matt. VI, 24; Luke XVI, 9, 11, 13, "riches";
Maran-atha, I Cor. XVI, 22, "The Lord hath come," or "Our Lord hath come";
Messias, John IV, 25, "the anointed"; in Greek, "Christ";
Pasch, Matt. XXVI, 2, from the Hebrew word meaning "to pass over";
Pharisee, Matt. III, 7, "separated";
Rabbi, Matt. XXIII, 7, "my master";
Rabboni, Mark X, 51; John XX, 16, an Aramaic form of the preceding;
Satan, Matt. IV, 10, the "adversary";
Tabitha, Acts IX, 36, "a gazelle";

Talitha cumi, Mark V, 41, "Maiden (I say to thee), arise."

Some Latin Words (*transliterated or written in Greek letters*) Found in the Greek New Testament

Matt. 27, 25 (Vulgate 24), Κήνσος, tax, *tributum;* John 18, 28, πραιτώριον, *praetorium;* Mark 6, 27, σπεκουλάτωρ, spy; λεγίων, legion.

Other instances of Latin words or of Latin constructions are found in the following passages:

Matt. 5, 26; 10, 29; 17, 25; 18, 28; 26, 53; 27, 27–65. Mark, 15, 39; Luke, 19, 20; John 2, 15; Acts, 19, 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

If the student has time and inclination for collateral reading on the "Original Languages of the Bible," that is, on the Indo-European and the Semitic families of languages, on their intrinsic differences, their local habitat, their place of origin, their alphabets, their development and decadence, and especially when, where, and by whom Hebrew was spoken, and when it ceased to be spoken, on Biblical Greek (Attic, Common, Hellenistic, Judeo-Christian, etc., etc.), we refer him to the Bibliography at the end of this volume, that is,

1) to the General Introductions (pp. 221 sqq.).

2) to the Biblical Dictionaries, etc. (pp. 223 sq.).

3) to the Monographs (pp. 224 sq.), and,

4) still more particularly, for the beginner, to the following, which are neither too technical nor too voluminous for his purpose: —

Breen, A. E. *General Introduction;* pp. 379–393, and 411 ff.

Briggs, C. A. *Study of H. S.;* Chap. III, pp. 42–75.

Chauvin, C. *Introduction Générale;* Hebrew, pp. 199–216, and Greek, pp. 246–261.

Gigot, F. E. *General Introduction;* pp. 175–190.

GREEN, W. H. *General Introduction;* Text, Chap. I, II, III.
HARMAN, H. M. *Introduction to Holy Scripture;* pp. 41–48, and pp. 457–462.
HASTINGS, James. *Dictionary of the Bible;* Vol. III, Articles, "Language of the Old Testament," by D. S. Margoliouth, and "Language of the New Testament," by J. F. Thayer, pp. 25–43, and Article, "Hebrew," Vol. II, pp. 325 ff.
HODY, H. *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus;* Oxford, 1705.
KAULEN, F. *Einleitung,* etc.; pp. 51–70.
POPE, Hugh. *The Catholic Student's "Aids";* New Testament, Languages Spoken in Palestine at the Time of Christ, Vol. II, Chap. IV, pp. 60–63.
ROBERTS, A. *Old Testament Revision;* Language of the Old Testament, Chap. I, pp. 1–22.
SEISENBERGER, M. *Practical Handbook;* pp. 212–215.
SIMCOX, W. H. *The Language of the New Testament;* p. 1 ff.
SMITH. *Dictionary of the Bible;* Semitic Languages and Writings, Vol. IV, pp. 2971–2988.
SMITH. *Dictionary of the Bible;* Language of the New Testament, Volume II, pp. 1590 ff.
SMYTHE, J. P. *The Old Documents and the New Bible.*
VIGOUROUX-BRASSAC. *Manuel Biblique;* pp. 136–147.
VIGOUROUX, F. *Dictionnaire Biblique;* Column 1580.
ZERBE, A. S. *The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature.*

CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF THE ORIGINAL TEXTS OF THE BIBLE

CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF THE ORIGINAL TEXTS OF THE BIBLE

Here we deal with the original manuscripts of the Bible, their peculiarities, the art of writing among the ancient Hebrews, the form of their books, the means taken to preserve them from destruction or corruption, the vicissitudes through which they have passed during the last two or three thousand years, and the condition in which they have reached us.

Then, too, since we are sure to meet various readings in them, we are told the relative value of the originals, as compared with the translations; and of the translations, as compared with one another. We shall speak first of the Hebrew and then of the Greek text of the Old Testament.

§ 1. History of the Text of the Hebrew Old Testament

All the books of the Old Testament were written originally in Hebrew, except seven or eight chapters of Esdras and Daniel, which were written in Aramaic, and except the books of Wisdom and II Maccabees, which were written in Greek.

Though the primitive autographic copies of the

Hebrew Old Testament disappeared two or three thousand years ago, yet, from what we know about ancient books in general, and from the condition of the oldest Hebrew manuscripts still in existence, we can form an approximate idea of the outward appearance of the Hebrew Bible many centuries before the Christian era.

The three oldest apographic copies of the Hebrew Bible, it is claimed, are (1) a manuscript in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg, containing the entire Old Testament, and dated A. D. 1009; (2) another manuscript, also at St. Petersburg, and dated A. D. 916; (3) still another, containing the Prophets, preserved at Cairo in Egypt, and bearing the date A. D. 895.

All other Hebrew manuscripts are of much more recent date than these.

It is interesting to know that the number of MSS. of the Hebrew Old Testament, whether complete or incomplete, collated and preserved in the various libraries of the world, is about 1300.

Now if we compare with these a modern printed edition of the Hebrew Bible, we shall see that many changes have been introduced. Of these changes some concern,

(I) The external form, the outward appearance, whereas others concern

(II) the internal substance or thought of the books.

I. As to the first, it is admitted by all that the *external appearance* of the Hebrew Bible, as it presents itself to the eye on opening a copy of it, is very dif-

ferent now from what it was 2000 or 3000 years ago. It differs chiefly in the following four particulars:

(a) In the material make-up and outward form and shape of the books. Occasionally other writing materials were used, especially for public records; but in Egypt and neighboring countries, from time immemorial, pen, ink, and paper were in general use.

The pen was a sharpened reed (*calamus*). The ink was lamp-black and gum, dissolved in water. The paper was of Egyptian papyrus. The roll was the usual form of the book. About the beginning of the fourth century the codex came into use.

Parchment or vellum was also used, especially for ornament or durability, and for public reading in the synagogues.

Mr. Kenyon, of the British Museum, claims that papyrus was commonly used as writing material in Egypt and neighboring countries, from before the reign of King Assa, 2600 years B. C., down to the Arabian invasion.

One end of the paper or parchment was fastened to, and then rolled up on, a cylinder of wood. Isaias refers to this usage, where he says, "The Heavens shall be rolled up like a book" (34, 4). All this has given way to the superior methods of modern printing and book-binding.

(b) There is a second difference. Excepting the Ethiopic, all Semitic alphabets, including Hebrew, were exclusively consonantal; they contained no vowels. The vowel sounds were supplied while speaking or reading aloud. They were also supplied mentally

while reading to one's self. But they were *never written.* The Hebrews had *no signs* or characters to represent them. They also had neither accents nor punctuation marks.

To supply these defects in the alphabet, all that very complicated system of accents, breathings, aspirates, vowels, critical and diacritical points and punctuation marks, which you see in a printed Hebrew Bible, and which are written, some above and some below, and some between, and some within, the consonantal letters of the alphabet, was invented and slowly elaborated by the Jewish Massoretic Doctors, chiefly at Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee, and added to the text somewhere between the sixth and the tenth centuries of the Christian era. It is a purely human invention and forms no part of the inspired Word. It is generally well executed, but has none but a scholarly authority and in some cases may be, and should be, set aside for something better.

Before the time of the Massoretes, the pronunciation was fixed in the memory of the scribes, but not yet committed to writing. It was handed down by oral tradition.

(c) There is a third difference. The alphabet that is now in use and has been in use in the Hebrew Bible for the last 2000 years and more, is not the old Hebrew-Phenician alphabet, in which Moses wrote his laws, and David wrote the Psalms, and Isaias wrote his prophecies; but a more modern alphabet, called the Aramaic.

However, that old Hebrew-Phenician alphabet, in which all the books of the Old Testament were origin-

ally written, is still used among the Samaritans, especially in the Hebrew-Samaritan Pentateuch. It is also found in the famous Siloam inscription at Jerusalem, written about 800 B. C.; also on the Moabite stone, from about 900–840 B. C., and on Jewish coins struck in the wars of the Maccabees.

The old Hebrew-Phenician alphabet, through a long series of modifications, passed, in some parts of the Orient, insensibly into the Aramaic alphabet, which soon became almost international.

On the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity, both the Hebrew language and the old Hebrew alphabet slowly yielded to the encroachments of the Aramaic language and alphabet; first in business transactions with their Aramaic speaking neighbors and, later, though in a slightly modified and more elegant form called the "square" alphabet, it passed also into the Sacred Books.

This process of substitution went on slowly for a few centuries between the Babylonian captivity and the birth of Christ, during which time both alphabets existed side by side. The "square" alphabet is exclusively Hebrew and has been in use, among the Jews, from perhaps a few centuries before Christ to the present day.

(d) There is a fourth difference. In very early times a Hebrew, as well as a Greek, book consisted of one solid mass of paper and ink, from beginning to end. It was written continuously without break or interruption of any kind, except between the lines. There was no division into chapters, sections, or para-

graphs, or into sentences, verses, clauses, or words. A narrow space was sometimes left between the words to separate them and a wider space between the sentences. The separation of verses, if indicated at all, was made by a still wider space, or by points. This division of the text into verses was made much earlier in the poetical than in the prose books.

Earlier even than the division of the text into verses was the division into sections or paragraphs. These were felt to be necessary as a means to reading the Bible intelligibly in the services of the synagogues. The larger sections were indicated by leaving the remainder of their last line blank and beginning the next section with a new line.

The present system of dividing the books of the Bible into chapters was begun at Paris, about 1205, by Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1228).

The division of chapters into sections, or long verses, was first applied in his concordance of the Latin Vulgate by the Spanish Cardinal Hugo of St. Caro (d. 1263). He indicated the parts of each chapter by placing the first seven letters of the alphabet A, B, C, D, E, F, G, at intervals along the margin. Of this usage, which continued to the 16th century, and is found in the polyglot of Alcala, 1515, traces still survive in the Roman Missal.

The present division of chapters into short verses, much shorter than those indicated by Cardinal Hugo, was introduced chiefly by Robert Stephanus, a famous Parisian printer. He indicated the verses, not only

by numbers placed in the margin, but also by breaks or blanks in the line at the end of each verse.

This new feature was introduced into his Greco-Latin New Testament in 1551; into the Latin Vulgate in 1555; into the Hebrew Pentateuch in 1557; into the entire Hebrew Bible in 1661.

However, before the time of Stephanus, number-letters and even numbers had already been used, especially by Santes Pagnino, in 1528, to indicate various kinds of verses both in Latin and in Hebrew Bibles (in Hebrew Bibles at every fifth verse).

II. If we now consider the *internal* element, the thought contained in the Sacred Books, we may say that the addition of the vowel points, punctuation marks, and accents, the division of the text into chapters, verses, and words, and the substitution of one alphabet for another, did not in any way affect the substance or change the teachings of the consonantal text of the Sacred Volume.

In such cases, what was added can be subtracted; what was divided can be reunited; and what was substituted can be replaced without the slightest injury to the sense.

After all it is only the *consonantal* text that is inspired and is of prime importance, and that is easily distinguishable from all the rest. While the placing of the vowels and other points to the text was, in general, well executed, yet there are cases when we may, and should, reject them for something better.

As to the two alphabets, they are practically one. Both are descended from the same source. In both, the

number of letters is the same, the form of some of the corresponding letters is the same, and the force and phonetic value are the same. For some centuries the two alphabets were in use side by side among the same people, and the final substitution of the one for the other was so slowly and publicly made that no injury could have been done to the sense of the Sacred Text.

There are, of course, some wrong readings even in the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, but they were not caused by the changes mentioned above. This topic belongs to the treatise on textual criticism (Vol. II), to which we refer.

To the Catholic student of Sacred Scripture it is important to understand the proper value, both dogmatic and critical, of the Hebrew Bible.

Considered *dogmatically,* there can be no doubt that the Hebrew Old Testament is a reliable, credible, truthful, trustworthy, and authoritative source of faith and morals.

Considered *critically,* in spite of numerous alterations of more or less importance, our present Hebrew generally represents the primitive text of Scripture more faithfully than any of the existing versions, ancient or modern.

For a brief statement of the legal status of (1) the Hebrew, (2) the Greek, (3) the Latin, (4) the Syriac, (5) the Egyptian, (6) the Armenian and other ancient Bible texts in the Catholic Church, see the Vulgate at the Council of Trent, *infra,* pp. 138 sqq.

That the Jews intentionally changed passages of the Old Testament out of *doctrinal bias* against the Christians, has long since been abandoned as a baseless accusation. Origen and Jerome laugh at the absurdity of the charge.

History of the Original Text

In the history of the text we are dealing with the *external* history of the Bible, that is, with the preservation and transmission of the material text of the books as they came down to us.

With their *internal* history, that is, with their human origin or composition, we have nothing to do for the present. That belongs to higher criticism, of which we treat elsewhere (Vol. II).

The *external* history of the text, from Moses to our own day, is variously, but not very satisfactorily, divided into several periods; for the periods and the character of the work done in each period frequently overlap.

Still, it may be convenient to divide this long history roughly into the following five periods: —

1. The *early* period, which extends for a thousand years from Moses to Esdras.

2. The period of the *Scribes,* which extends from Esdras to A. D. 200, and later.

3. The Period of the *Talmudists,* from A. D. 200–600.

4. The Period of the *Massoretes,* from A. D. 600–1000.

5. The Period of *transmission,* or of quiescence in the results obtained, extending from A. D. 1000 to our own time.

1. *First Period — Early History*

In the *first* period, the history of the text is involved in great obscurity. We are simply told that Moses entrusted his book for safe-keeping "to the priests and to all the elders of Israel," etc. (Deut. 31, 9).

The same was done afterwards with the writings of Josue (Josue, 24, 26) and Samuel (I Kings, 10, 25).

From this we infer that the original autographic copies of the Sacred Books were regularly preserved by the priests in the Temple, while the apographic copies were scattered over the land and belonged to synagogues or to private individuals.

Centuries later, there were established schools of the Prophets, composed of men remarkable for their zeal and learning, and to them Samuel entrusted the Sacred Books to be copied and studied and explained to the people (I Kings, 19, 19; II Kings, 2, 4; 4, 38).

We infer that, for some time preceding the reigns of Ezechias and Josias, some of the Sacred Books were so neglected as to be almost forgotten, even by their custodians, kings, priests, prophets and scribes (IV Kings, 22, 8–12; II Paral., 34, 14). "Neglected and almost forgotten," therefore not corrupted, therefore not destroyed. No one thought or knew enough about them to take the trouble to injure them.

Besides, they had been hidden away in some secret hiding place in the Temple, and were rediscovered

quite accidentally and presumably in good condition while repairs were made in the building.

After the return from exile, Esdras, the Scribe, brought with him from Babylon the Hebrew Bible, and, standing on a wooden platform in the public square, near "the water gate," he read to all the people the law of Moses, with this result, that four score and four men, priests, levites, heads of families and chiefs of tribes, swore solemnly to observe the law of God and of Moses. (Nehem. 9, 32; 10, 27.) On that occasion, we are also told, Esdras had gathered around him a body of "men of understanding" to assist him in his work (Esdras, 8, 16). To act as scribes?

2. *Second Period — The Scribes*

Certain it is that, from that day, and for the next thousand years and more, there was in Israel "a school or college of Scribes," whose privilege and duty it was to copy out, study, and explain to the people the law of God.

About the same time we read that Nehemias formed a library in the Temple for the preservation of the Sacred Books. "And these things were written in the memoirs and commentaries of Nehemias; and how he made a library and gathered together, out of the countries, the books both of the Prophets and of David and the epistles of the Kings and concerning the holy gifts" (II Macc. 2, 13).

Later, after the defeat of the Syrians, we read that "Judas Maccabaeus also gathered together all such

things as were lost by the war we had; and they are in our possession. Wherefore, if you want these things, send some that may fetch them to you" (II Macc. 2, 14–15; cfr. Josephus, *Antiquities,* XII, 5, 4.) Here there is evidently question of the Sacred Books.

Again, in A. D. 70, the Romans under Titus destroyed the Holy City and carried away in triumph the official Temple manuscript to Rome (Josephus, *Jewish Wars,* VII, 5, 5).

In the war against the Romans under Hadrian, A. D. 135, at the time of Rabbi Akiba, both Scriptures and Scribes were thrown together into the flames and consumed. But some always escaped.

In the preceding sketch we have related, as an historical basis to work upon, some of the general means adopted for the preservation of the Sacred Text and some instances of the neglect of those precautions and of the dreadful national calamities through which the Sacred Books have passed; and now, as regards the integrity of the text, we ask: In what condition have the Sacred Books of the Hebrew Bible reached us?

As no extant Hebrew manuscript goes back beyond the Xth or IXth century of the Christian era, the earliest testimony that we possess to the condition of our present text is the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch, which goes back at least to the Vth century before Christ. But as that contains the Pentateuch only, and not the rest of the Bible, the earliest testimony that we actually have, as to the other books of the Old Testament, is the Greek Septuagint Version, many parts of which, however, may not have been translated be-

fore B. C. 150, or even later. Then, too, the Septuagint Version is often so freely translated that it is difficult, through it, to see just what was the reading of the Hebrew text, which the seventy translators had before them. One thing, however, is certain; they often translate a Hebrew text that differed considerably from our present recension.

Notwithstanding all this, we can obtain a pretty accurate idea of the manner in which copyists in those far-off days dealt with the text.

A comparison of our Hebrew Bible with the Greek Septuagint will show an abundance of textual alterations or corruptions by *omission,* or by *addition,* or by *substitution,* or by *transposition* of words and phrases, nay even of entire sections. On a careful examination, these defects seem to have been caused either by haste or by carelessness, or were made with the intention to mutilate the text.

The conclusion, therefore, is that we find no proof of that extremely scrupulous accuracy with which, as asserted by Philo and Josephus, the Sacred Books had been copied out in the centuries before Christ.

On the contrary, before our era there were in circulation many various readings and perhaps even *various recensions* or *different families of manuscripts* of the Hebrew text.

In the historical Books of Kings, and in the prophetical Books of Jeremias, Daniel, and Ezechiel, the additions, omissions, alterations, and transpositions are so remarkable, both in bulk and number, that experts generally admit that there were some very dif-

ferent recensions of the Hebrew text in circulation in those days, and that the Greek Septuagint used one of them and the Samaritan Pentateuch represents a second and our present Massoretic text a third family of manuscripts.

This excessive freedom in copying out the text may have ceased earlier, but it certainly had ceased by the middle of the second century of our era, by A. D. 150.

One proof of this is that, in the second century, three translations of the Hebrew Bible were made into Greek, one by Aquila, one by Symmachus, and one by Theodotion, and, in each case, it is clear that the text from which they translated was *identical* with our present Massoretic recension. Also the old Syriac Peshitto Version, the Aramaic translations commonly called Targums, and the famous Hexapla of Origen, were all made about the same time, and from the same standard text that we have today.

One consequence of this is that, ever since the first half of the second century, there has been only one form or recension of the Hebrew consonantal text. Another result is that, whether the Hebrew Bible is published by Jew, Catholic, Protestant, or pagan, it is always one and the same, almost word for word, syllable for syllable, and consonant for consonant. That is because all the manuscripts that have reached us are marvelously alike,— in fact, almost like copies of a stereotyped edition; — they are all members of one family.

This is not the place to describe in detail the almost super-human precautions adopted by the Jewish copy-

ists in transcribing the Hebrew manuscripts during the last 1800 years. But it was not always thus. For, as we have seen, there was a time, in the long centuries B. C., when there were in circulation many *various readings* and perhaps *various recensions* of the Hebrew text.

The Hebrew Samaritan Pentateuch (Pentateuch *only*), which reaches back to a source several centuries B. C., and the Greek Septuagint translation of the entire Old Testament, which was begun 285 years B. C., differ in hundreds of passages (mostly of little consequence) both from one another and from our present Hebrew text.

Now, if it is reasonable to suppose that the greater part of these divergent readings originated in the Greek, it surely is not unreasonable to suppose that some of them, at least, must have originated in the Hebrew, and that they existed, some in one copy and some in other copies or recensions of the Hebrew Bible. In other words, some Hebrew manuscripts differed from other Hebrew manuscripts in the wording of one and the same passage.

This is most natural and to be expected in copying out frequently, especially by hand, any book as large as the Old Testament, and still more to be expected in times of civil strife and political upheavals, which were so common in those days.

Thus various readings in the Hebrew text continued, and must have continued, down to the attempt made to restore the Jewish commonwealth, either some time after the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, A. D.

70, or perhaps shortly after the war under Hadrian, A. D. 135.

Though there is no documenatry evidence to prove the fact, yet the circumstantial evidence is such as to lead all writers on the subject to admit that, while engaged in the general work of restoration, it occurred to the Jewish rulers that it would be a favorable opportunity to put an end to the multiplicity of readings which were causing so much uncertainty and confusion. For this purpose they determined to adopt some one particular manuscript, having a good reputation for accuracy, and to declare that alone to be the standard text for future ages,— to the exclusion of all others.

Accordingly, some well known manuscript, once the property perhaps of some venerable rabbi who had died in the odor of sanctity, was chosen as the basis of the new text to be produced. A tradition in the Talmud tells us that it was compared with two other copies and that, in case of doubt, the majority of two out of three decided the reading.

The text thus established became the standard, or prototype, or "Textus Receptus," to which all future copies were made to conform, and any manuscript that differed from this official text was brought into conformity with it or destroyed or left to die a natural death and disappeared. Something analogous to this took place in the history of the Koran and of the Sacred Books of some other peoples.

It is well to remember that this text was adopted at a time when it was altogether impossible to give to

such a delicate task either the time or the leisure that its importance demanded; neither did anyone engaged in the work possess the text-critical skill needed to correct some of the most obvious mistakes in Hebrew grammar and lexicon.

On the one hand, for a long time before and for a short time after the birth of Christ, there were so many different readings of one and the same passage of the Hebrew Old Testament, whether translated into the Greek Septuagint, or quoted in some of the early apocryphal writings, or in the early Aramaic targums, or in the New Testament; and, on the other hand, there is such a fixedness and such a *dead uniformity* observable in the Hebrew text from that time down to the invention of the printing press, that it can be explained only by supposing that the present Hebrew text was adopted as official and almost stereotyped towards the close of the first century or in the first half of the second century of the Christian era.

The result is that this consonantal text, having few or no variant readings to choose from, or to work upon, offers little opportunity to practice textual criticism, unless conjectural, and this is extremely risky. There is, then, little or no hope of restoring the Hebrew text to that primitive condition which it once had long before the Christian era.

Centuries after the Jews had scattered over Europe, Asia, and Africa, they felt the need of transmitting to posterity the knowledge which they possessed, especially about their Sacred Books. This explains why the critical labors of the Scribes, the Talmudists, and

the Massoretes, from A. D. 200–1000, are so varied in kind and so vast in extent.

With the adoption of a standard text, a new era began in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible. The Scribes, whose guild had already been in existence since the time of Esdras, suddenly became more active and more influential than ever. For, as soon as the present text was declared official, at least in general, it became the double duty of the Scribes:

(1) To put it into some proper shape, even if it were necessary to change it in some of its details, and,

(2) To adopt suitable measures to transmit this received and corrected text, *talis qualis,* to future generations.

We will describe some of these changes and precautions.

Before the time of Christ, the Scribes had already divided the Law of Moses and the Psalter each into five books; and the five books of the Law they further divided into sections to be read in the services of the Synagogue.

While thus engaged, the Scribes also fixed or helped to fix the Hebrew canon, which, as we now know, was not definitively settled for perhaps a few centuries after Christ.

They also noted down "Various Readings," which were afterwards placed in the margin of the books and designated as *Keri* ("Read") and *Ketib* ("Write").

They made in the text some slight alterations which they thought were called for by the sense; *e. g.,* they removed a few grammatical particles which were sup-

posed to be superfluous; they substituted euphemisms for certain expressions which, in a more refined age, were considered indelicate, etc., etc.

Centuries after the adoption of the standard text, they further divided the books into chapters, and the chapters into sections, verses, phrases, and words. They separated words from words by a space as wide as a letter; they separated verses from verses by a space twice as wide as a letter; they separated sections from sections by an "alinea," or by a blank space left in the line after the end of the section.

The fact is, the Scribes were the authorized revisers, the accredited editors, the final redactors of the text; and, as such, they were allowed to modify it so as to bring it into proper shape.

In all this, their action was *final.* After them, no one dared, and no one was allowed, to change anything in the *consonantal text,* and thus it became the duty of the Talmudists to deliver this text to their successors, the Massoretes, precisely as they had received it from their predecessors, the Scribes. Even where the mistakes were manifest, the corrections were made, not in the text itself, but in the margin, outside the text.

For centuries the Scribes and Talmudists worked side by side on the Old Testament, though their work differed very considerably in kind or character.

(1) On the one hand, the Scribes worked chiefly on the *external* element, on the *material* words of the text, and on the text, not only of the Pentateuch, but of the *entire* Old Testament.

(2) On the other hand, it was the chief duty of the

Talmudists to codify, expand, and develop the *Law* of the Jewish People, the Pentateuch,— the *Pentateuch only,* and not the rest of the Bible. They busied themselves with the *internal* element of the Pentateuch, with the *thought* conveyed by its words, with the *meaning* and force of its legal enactments. This will appear more evident when we have explained the nature and purpose of the Talmud.

3. *Third Period — The Talmudists*

The Talmud (which means Learning or Instruction) is an enormous collection of writings containing Jewish thought, custom, tradition, legislation, and speculation on nearly every imaginable subject connected with the Hebrew Old Testament, especially with the *Pentateuch.* Some idea of the magnitude of this work may be gathered from the fact that, as generally published, it fills twelve folio volumes.

The Talmud consists of two general parts, (1) The Mishna and, (2) The Gemara.

1. The *Mishna* (which means Repetition) repeats, amplifies, and explains the *Pentateuch.* It is a commentary on the Pentateuch.

The Mishna was begun by the celebrated Rabbi Judah, surnamed the Holy, of Tiberias, on the Sea of Galilee, in the second half of the second century. It was completed by his disciples, about A. D. 200.

The Mishna is considered the most important of all extra-Biblical or rabbinical writings, and preserves to us many valuable interpretations of Scripture handed down from a very remote antiquity. In general, this

part of the Talmud is well done. It is written in *late Hebrew.*

The Mishna then consists of a collection of Decisions, Interpretations, and Traditions carefully made by Rabbi Judah and summarizing all previous Jewish rabbinical writings on the subject of the Pentateuch. It has exercised an incalculable influence on the Hebrew people and has molded all subsequent Jewish philosophical and theological thought.

2. The *Gemara* (which means Completion) completes and amplifies the explanation of the Pentateuch, as contained in the Mishna. It is a commentary on the Mishna; that is to say, it is a commentary on a commentary on the Pentateuch.

The Gemara is a vast repertory of all kinds of laws and regulations,— civil, canonical, and liturgical,— and of all sorts of customs, traditions, explanations, and interpretations of religious subjects, especially of the Pentateuch.

There is a *Jerusalem Talmud* (A. D. 200–450) and a *Babylonian Talmud* (A. D. 200–600). In both, the Mishna is the same. But the Gemara is different. The language of the Gemara is Aramaic. Much more than the Palestinian, the Babylonian Gemara abounds in fables, legends, anecdotes, proverbs, allegories, parables, fairy tales, moral lessons, some of them very extravagant, some of them extremely beautiful.

4. *Fourth Period — The Massoretes*

From the mass of information of all kinds, which they inherited from the Scribes and Talmudists, though

in a state of shapeless confusion, the *Massoretes* or "Possessors of Tradition," selected a vast amount of materials chiefly of an orthographical, grammatical, syntactical, lexical, and exegetical character, and all bearing on our present received text. These materials they analyzed, classified, committed to writing, and enriched with much of their own. They distributed it in the various margins, either above, or below, or beside, or between the columns of the Sacred Text, and some of it at the end of the chapter; thus forming the *Massora Magna,* the *Massora Parva,* and the *Massora Finalis.*

The Massoretes went still further. Not content to transmit the traditional text intact to the first generation following them, they determined to "surround the law with a hedge" on all sides and to make it practically impossible for those coming after them, *at any time* in the distant future, to alter the text without detection. For this purpose, they invented and introduced into the text itself that very ingenious and complicated system of *vocalization, punctuation,* and *accentuation* which we see in the ordinary printed Hebrew Bibles of to-day.

This work comprises three distinct systems: —

1. The first system fixes the *vocalization,* and with it, to a great extent, the *pronunciation,* and with it also the *meaning* of the words. This is done by introducing vowels, in the form of vowel-points, equivalent to our a-e-i-o-u, whether long or short, *into the consonantal text.*

2. The second system fixes the *pauses,* whether they

are long or short. This is done by *punctuation marks.*

3. The third system fixes the *tone* and *modulation* of the voice, whether in *reading* or *singing* in the Synagogue. This is done by *accents.*

These *vowel-points, punctuation marks,* and *accents* consist chiefly of small dots or points, like our periods, and of short straight lines, like our hyphens. They are written variously. As to number, some are single, some double, some treble; as to direction, some are vertical, some are horizontal; as to position, they are variously combined and are placed, some above and some below, and some between and some within the consonants of the text. Thus they indicate the exact vowel-sounds which accompany each consonant and show whether such vowel-sounds are long or short, and whether the consonants are to be pronounced single or double, rough or smooth, etc. Some of them regulate the pauses and are equivalent to our commas, semi-colons, and periods. Others show the intonation and modulation of the voice in reading and the musical cadences in singing in the services of the Synagogue.

It should be stated that the Massoretes did *not invent,* but *only inherited* from their predecessors, the *proper pronunciation* of Hebrew. They invented the *signs* which show how the words should be pronounced according to traditional usage.

It is not likely that the Massoretes gave us the classical pronunciation that prevailed in the days of Moses or of Solomon or Isaias, but rather that pronunciation which had prevailed for some time before and for a

longer time after the Christian era. We know for certain that the pronunciation of the Massoretes differs in certain respects from that followed by the seventy translators of Alexandria, B. C. 280–150. No doubt, the pronunciation inherited by the Massoretes had been transmitted to them by the Scribes and Talmudists, had been in use for the preceding thousand years, was respected for its antiquity, and for a long time in their history had been used and approved by the Jewish people. If not classical in the highest sense, still, it was a good and reputable pronunciation of the language.

The chief seat of Jewish Talmudic and Massoretic learning, and the place where most of their scholars, as a body, lived and labored for the space of a thousand years, is the town of Tiberias on the Western shore of the Sea of Galilee.

The Massora was written between the VIth and Xth centuries of our era, and in the Aramaic language. It was printed for the first time in Venice, in 1525.

Vowel-points

In the XVIIth century there was much controversy about the vowel-points, punctuation marks, and accents in our Hebrew Bible, in order to determine whether they were written by the authors of the respective books or were added at a later date, and if so, when and by whom.

1. Many Jewish and Christian writers hotly contended that the vowels and other points came from the authors of the books or, at the latest, from Esdras.

2. Against them Elias Levita, once a Jew, John Morinas, a Catholic, Louis Capellus, a Protestant, and many others ultimately proved to a demonstration that the entire punctuation system of our Hebrew Bibles is an elaborate invention of Jewish scholars, made between the VIth and Xth centuries of the Christian era.

The evidence, slowly gathered, is most conclusive. We shall rehearse it briefly.

The Septuagint Greek translation (made between B. C. 280 and B. C. 150) was translated from a Hebrew text without vowel-points. Of this there can be no doubt.

The same is true of the other ancient Greek Versions, such as those of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, and of the early Hebrew Targums or Chaldean paraphrases, and of the ancient pre-Christian inscriptions, *e. g.,* on the Moabite Stone, on the rock at the fountain of Siloam, on the Phenician and Carthagenian tablets, and on the coins struck in the days of the Maccabees. There are absolutely no vowel-points in any of these writings.

Also Philo, Josephus, Origen, Jerome, and the Talmud knew them not. Jerome is very emphatic. He bitterly laments the absence of vowels in the Hebrew language. He admits that the four consonants *aleph, yod, vav,* and *he* might sometimes help to discover the meaning of words left ambiguous by the absence of vowels; but of our present Hebrew vowels, or of any others, he says never a word. (Jer. 9, 21; Habac. 3, 5; Isaias 2, 22; 9, 7; 25; 14.)

In the *Talmud* there is not the remotest trace of our

vowel-points or of any other punctuation marks. This is all the more significant when we consider the bulk of this work, the number of writers engaged on it, and the length of time occupied by them in doing the work.

To this array of evidence as to the non-existence of vowels should be added that of the Synagogue rolls, which, from time immemorial, have invariably been written without vowels. More than that, it is strictly forbidden to write these rolls with vowels or with punctuation of any kind. The absence of vowels in these rolls is the *continuance of an old custom, not the introduction of a new custom.* Such a practice and such a prohibition as the omission of the vowels would be impossible if it had ever been the custom to write them.

Excepting perhaps the Ethiopic, all Semitic alphabets, including the Hebrew, were exclusively consonantal; they contained no vowels. Of course, the vowel sounds were actually supplied while speaking or reading aloud. They were also supplied mentally while reading to one's self. But they were never written. The Hebrews had no signs or characters to represent them, nor had they accents or punctuation marks of any kind.[1]

The Targums or Chaldean paraphrases, the Greek translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, the Syriac Peshitto, and Jerome's Latin version, all mentally and practically vocalized the Hebrew text just

1 The Assyro-Babylonian, the language of the cuneiform inscriptions, is not alphabetic, but syllabic, and, as such, must have and has vowel sounds.

about as the Massoretes have vocalized it professedly and in writing.

No doubt, the work of the Massoretes was very well done, considering the circumstances of the times and the great extent of the work and its countless details; yet, as is manifest, it possesses only a *scholarly* authority and if it is possible to make better sense without the vowel-points, it may be proper to neglect them. But this should be done only with the greatest caution. The presumption favors the accuracy of the Massoretic punctuation, pronunciation, or vocalization, for it is generally impossible to give the text any other pronunciation and yet make good sense of it.

After the Massoretes had accomplished the very useful and necessary task just described, having nothing else to do, they addressed themselves with astonishing thoroughness to the following work of supererrogation: —

They counted all the chapters, verses, words and letters in each separate book of the Bible and in the Bible as a whole.

They tell us how often the same word is found either at the beginning, or at the end, or in the middle of each verse of the whole Bible.

They tell us which is the middle chapter and the middle verse, and the middle word and the middle letter, of each book of the whole O. T.

Thus, they tell us that there are in the Hebrew Bible 23,206 verses; that the letter *Aleph* occurs 42,377 times; that the letter *Beth* occurs 35,218 times; that the "Breastplate" verse (Lev. 8, 8) is the middle

verse, that the word "Darasch" (Sought) is the middle word, and that the letter *vav* in the word "gahon" (Lev. 11, 42) is the middle letter of the Pentateuch.

They tell us that there are in the Law of Moses two verses in which every word begins and ends with the letter M; that there are eleven verses in which the first and the last letter of every word is N; that there are forty verses in which Lo is found three times; and that there are twenty-six verses, like Zach. 6, 11, each of which contains all the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, etc., etc.

5. *Fifth Period — Careful Transmission*

There are two kinds of Hebrew manuscripts: (1) Those destined for the use of the synagogues, and (2) Those employed by private individuals for personal use.

1. The synagogue manuscripts have the following peculiarities: (a) They never contain the entire Hebrew Bible, but only the Pentateuch and such other parts as are read in the synagogue; (b) They contain the received text, but are written without vowel-points, accents, punctuation marks, or any other kind of Massoretic notation; (c) They are placed on rolls and written on the inner side of the parchment.

2. The private manuscripts contain, (a) The Massoretic text with vowels, accents, and critical notes; (b) They are written on parchment or on paper, and in the form of codices, and open like modern books; (c) They are generally written in the square characters, or in rabbinical.

But one thing is certain; however numerous the textual errors in the Hebrew Bible may be, we know that they are all accidental and do not destroy the substantial reliability of the Bible as a channel of faith and morals. A comparison between the Hebrew on the one hand and the Septuagint, the Targums, the Peshitto, and the Latin Vulgate on the other, establishes this assertion without doubt. These versions are all reliable as to faith and morals, but the Hebrew text is still more reliable.

Printed Editions of the Hebrew Bible

The first Hebrew book ever printed was the Psalter, at Bologna, in 1477.

Then came the Pentateuch, in 1482.

Next appeared the Prophets and the Rolls, at Soncino, in 1485.

Then all the Hagiographa at Naples, in 1486–7.

The first complete edition of the whole Hebrew Bible was published at Soncino, in 1488, with vowel points and accents, and was divided into chapters and verses, like our Latin Bible.

They all reproduced the Massoretic recension.

The Samaritan (Hebrew) Pentateuch

The Samaritan Pentateuch was often mentioned by Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Procopius, and St. Cyril of Alexandria, but it soon disappeared both in the East and in the West and for 1000 years was supposed to have perished beyond hope of recovery. Finally, it was again discovered at Damascus by an Italian traveller

named Pietro Della Valle, and brought to Europe, in 1616. Fifteen other copies have since then been found in the Orient and are now in European libraries. The first printed edition of it was published in the Paris Polyglot Bible, in 1632, by the French Oratorian, John Morinus. This publication made it easy for scholars to compare it with our present Massoretic Hebrew text, to which many claimed it was superior, and others inferior.

The controversy was closed, at least temporarily, in 1815, when Gesenius, author of the famous "Thesaurus Linguae Hebraicae," carefully collated all the various readings in which these two Hebrew recensions differ from each other, and concluded that the Samaritan Pentateuch is inferior to the Massoretic in nearly every instance. This opinion was accepted by most scholars; but there is now a growing tendency to consider the verdict unjust.

The Samaritan differs from our Massoretic Pentateuch in about 6,000 places. Still, these many variations make but little difference, for they are mostly minute details of little or no moment, consisting, *e. g.*, in a newer for an older form of the personal pronoun, or in the addition or omission of the article, or in other trifling details of grammar or lexicon.

Dr. Kenyon says: "In many cases there may be two opinions as to whether the Samaritan or the Hebrew reading is preferable. The apparent deficiencies in the Hebrew may be real, the obscurities may be due to error, and the Samaritan text may be nearer to the original language. This probability is greatly in-

creased when we find that, in many passages, where the Samaritan differs from the Hebrew, the Greek Septuagint agrees with the Samaritan. For example, the Samaritan and Hebrew texts differ very frequently as to the ages of the patriarchs mentioned in the early chapters of Genesis. Gesenius classified these variations as alterations introduced (into the Samaritan) on grounds of suitability; but it is at least possible that they are not alterations at all, but are the original text, and that the numbers have become corrupt in the Hebrew; and the possibility is turned into a probability, when we find the Septuagint supporting the Samaritan readings."

"There is no satisfactory proof that either the Septuagint or the Samaritan text was ever corrected from the other, nor is it in itself likely; and their independent evidence is extremely difficult to explain away. Hence, scholars are now becoming more disposed to think favorably of the Samaritan readings. Many of them may be errors; many may be unimportant; but there remain several which are of real value. The editors of the 'Variorum Bible' give thirty-five variations of the Samaritan text as being either equal or superior to the Hebrew readings. Among these may be mentioned, for the sake of example, Gen. 4, 8; 47, 21; Exodus, 12, 40; (Gal. 3, 17); Num. 4, 14; and Deut. 32, 35. These are, perhaps, the most notable of the Samaritan variants, and it is observable that, in every case, the Septuagint confirms them." (*Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* pp. 46–47.)

The attention of the reader is called to the fact that

this Samaritan Pentateuch is *not* a translation at all. It is the *original* Hebrew text; or, if he choose, it is a *recension* of the original Hebrew, the same, in general, as our present Massoretic Hebrew Pentateuch. It is written in the same *old Hebrew language,* and in the same *old Hebrew* (or Phenician) *alphabet* that was used by Moses and the prophets from the beginning down to the Babylonian exile. The Samaritans have a translation of this Pentateuch in their Samaritan vernacular, also in Arabic; but we need say no more about them.

All this suggests the questions: Who and what were the Samaritans, and when and where did they obtain possession of this strange Pentateuch? Critics, while agreeing about the origin and identity of the Samaritans, differ very much as to the date and source of their Pentateuch.

It is necessary to give a preliminary sketch of the *origin and history of the kingdom of Israel,* whose fate prepared the way for the Samaritans.

Solomon, as we know, was king of the twelve tribes. So, too, his son, Roboam, at least for a short time. But, on account of the blunt refusal of Roboam to remit any part of the excessive taxes imposed upon the people, and on account of his insolent answer to their petition for redress, the ten tribes of Israel, under the leadership of Jeroboam, separated from the two tribes of Juda and Benjamin, and established the northern kingdom of Israel.

This last-mentioned kingdom, under various dynasties, continued for about 250 years, to B. C. 721, when

the inhabitants were carried away into the Assyrian captivity. Then came the Samaritans.

The earliest account of the origin of the Samaritans is contained in the IV Book of Kings, Ch. 17, where it is said that Shalmaneser and Sargon, his successor, having conquered and annexed the kingdom of Israel to the Assyrian empire, about B. C. 721, carried away the bulk of the able-bodied inhabitants, scattered them over parts of Assyria and Media, and replaced them with people from the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates.

But not *all* the inhabitants were carried away; so that the new-comers, intermarrying with the remnants of the ten tribes that were left behind by Sargon, became a mixed race, and were ultimately called Samaritans, from the name of the country or of the city which they occupied.

In the interval between the deportation of the Israelites and the importation of the new colonists who were to replace them, the country was infested by lions and other wild beasts, and the idolatrous colonists, believing that the "god of the land" was angry with them, begged Esarhaddon, then King of Assyria, to send them a priest of Jehova to teach them the worship of the "god of the land." The King (about B. C. 700) said: "Carry thither one of the priests, whom ye brought from thence, . . . and let him teach them the worship of the God of the land. . . . Then one of the priests, whom they had carried away from Samaria (not from Jerusalem), came and dwelt in Bethel and taught them to serve the Lord."

At first, and for perhaps 200 years, their religion was a strange medley of Mosaism and paganism, for we read: "They feared Jehova and they served their idols." (IV Kings 17; II Paral. 34, 6–7; II Esdras 4, 2; 5–6.) With time they abandoned idolatry, but still the animosity between the two peoples was most implacable. It was intensified still more by what followed.

In the meantime, about B. C. 588, the two tribes of Juda and Benjamin, forming the southern kingdom, had been carried away to Babylon and, after seventy years of captivity, had returned and were engaged in the restoration of their civil and religious commonwealth. Among other things they were making an effort to enforce the observance of the law of Moses against mixed marriages with pagan wives.

Most of the people complied with the law. But, rather than submit, Mannasses, a Jewish priest who had married a daughter of Sanballat, Governor of Samaria, fled to his father-in-law and induced him to build a temple on Mount Gerizim, near Samaria, where Mannasses introduced a rival ritual and sacrifices, resembling the worship at Jerusalem.

But the law of Moses is so definite and so complex that, to carry it out properly, Mannasses must have taken with him, or must have found there, a copy of the Pentateuch in written form. Ever since then, if not long before, as early as the reign of Esar-haddon, the Samaritans have based their faith and practice exclusively on the Pentateuch, and have rejected all the

other Sacred Books of the Jews. (I Esdras 2, 2; II Esdras 1, 1; 13, 28.)

Scholars vary much in opinion about the date at which the Samaritans received their Pentateuch.

The first opinion is that this Pentateuch came into their possession, for the first time, after the Jews had returned from the Babylonian captivity, when the priest Mannasses escaped to the Samaritans, presumably with a copy of the Pentateuch, and set up a rival worship on Mount Gerizim.

But, in refutation of this, it is evident from what follows that the Samaritans were in possession of the Pentateuch centuries earlier than this late date.

The second opinion is that the ten tribes carried this Pentateuch with them when, just after the reign of Solomon, they seceded from the two tribes of Juda and Benjamin, and (B. C. 975) formed the rival kingdom of Israel; also that some descendants of these Israelites carried this Pentateuch with them, about B. C. 720, into the Assyrian captivity; and that a copy of it was shortly afterwards brought back to Samaria by the priest whom Esar-haddon had sent to teach the people the religion of "the god of the land."

The third opinion is that, when the ancestors of the Samaritans took possession of Samaria, they found this Pentateuch among the scattered remnants of the ten tribes, who had escaped the captivity, and that it has remained in their possession ever since. This is the opinion of Kennicott and of many other critics since his day. If so, it must have been in possession

of the ten tribes by the time of Solomon, A. D. 975, or even earlier.

There is sufficient proof that this Pentateuch was in existence and was used by many of the loyal ones among the ten tribes who, either openly or stealthily, went up every year to Jerusalem to worship at the Temple. The natural supposition is that they had it in the reign of Solomon, before they seceded from Juda and Benjamin, and that from them or from their descendants it naturally passed into the hands of the Samaritans.

From IV Kings 17, 34 it is clear that the Israelites had written laws among them. Also in I Esdras 4, 2 the Samaritans assert that they had been offering sacrifices to the God of Israel ever since the days of Esarhaddon (about B. C. 700), that is, ever since the priest returned from Assyria to Samaria. "We have sacrificed to your God, ever since the days of Esar-haddon, who brought us hither." To perform properly such religious services, they must have had, in writing, a Pentateuch which antedated the days of Esdras by 250, and perhaps by 550, years.

From what precedes it is evident that the Samaritan and the Jewish Pentateuch have been transmitted from B. C. 975, or, at the latest, from B. C. 700, independently of each other, through separate parallel channels, without contact or collusion, and without mutually influencing each other.

The Samaritan Pentateuch, therefore, is an independent witness to the *existence* and the *substantial integrity* of our present Hebrew Pentateuch from the

time, or even before the time, when it came into the possession of the Samaritans and began its separate career, and was propagated from then till now, independently of the Massoretic text.

§ 2. HISTORY OF THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

All the books of the New Testament were written originally in Greek, except the Gospel of St. Matthew, which a very ancient and uniform tradition says was written in Aramaic, the so-called Hebrew of those times.

The original autographic copies of the New Testament Books disappeared at an early date. At this we need not be surprised. For, when we consider the perishable nature of the materials on which they were written, the frequency with which they were read both in public and in private, the custom of carrying them about from church to church to be copied out, the relatively greater importance attached to oral instruction than to writing, and the fact that so many early Christians heard the voice of the Apostles still ringing in their ears and were in almost daily expectation of the millennium,— we can easily understand how they should have attached much less importance than later generations to the preservation of the original copies.

But, though the originals have disappeared, yet, from what we know of ancient books in general, and from the condition of the oldest New Testament manuscripts still in existence, we can form a sufficiently accurate idea of the appearance of the autographs of the New Testament Books.

The two oldest manuscripts of the Greek New Testament probably date, the Vatican Codex from about 340 A. D., and the Sinaitic from a decade or so later. Now if, with these and many others, we compare a modern critical printed edition of the Greek New Testament, we shall see that many changes have been introduced into the text. These changes concern either

(1) The external form or outward appearance, or

(2) The internal substance or thought of the books.

As to the *external changes:* some of them regard the material make-up, the outward form, and the shape of the books.

In the early ages pen, ink, and paper were the cheapest and the most common writing materials. The pen was a sharpened reed or *calamus.* The paper was of Egyptian papyrus. The roll, or scroll, was the usual form of books. The ink was sometimes made of oak gall-nuts, but more usually of three parts lampblack and one part gum mixed with water. Because boiled during the process of making, the mixture was often called *" enkauston," inchiostro, encre,* ink. One old Syriac manuscript, preserved in the British Museum and dated A. D. 411, is written in ink of many colors, red, blue, green, and yellow,— all still quite fresh. Many manuscripts were dyed in purple and written in gold or silver letters. St. Boniface, apostle to the Germans, asked his friends to send him a manuscript of St. Paul's Epistles written in gold, to impress the natives more favorably.

Parchment or *vellum* was used from the fourth to

the tenth century. *Cotton* and *silk paper* came into use in the tenth, and *linen paper* in the twelfth century. Still, parchment or vellum continued to be used, especially where elegance or durability were intended. About the beginning of the fourth century, the roll gave way to the codex, or bound book, of about the same size and shape as the modern quarto or small folio volume.

In those early days books were generally written in *uncial* or *capital* letters and continuously, from beginning to end, without break or interruption, with no aspirates, no accents, no large initial letters, no punctuation marks, no divisions of books into chapters, or of chapters into sections, or of sections into verses, or of verses into words; or if any such things were found, they were inserted on no fixed principle, except that a dot, to mark the division of sentences, was occasionally used after the fifth century.

Uncial letters remained in use till the tenth century, when, losing their upright, rigid form, they gradually passed into a running, cursive hand. Uncials, however, continued to be used for ornament and for public reading in the churches.

Uncial letters are large and of nearly uniform size, resembling modern capitals, and are found in Biblical MSS. from the fourth to the tenth century; they are sometimes called *majuscules.*

Cursive letters are small, flowing characters, joined together as in the ordinary running hand, and used from the ninth century to the invention of printing; they are sometimes called *minuscules.*

As the rolls, so too the pages of the codex were written in columns, varying from one to four columns to the page. The Codex Ephraem has only one, the great majority have two, the Vatican has three, and the Sinaitic has four columns to the page.

1. Of *uncial manuscripts* of the Greek New Testament, written from the fourth to the tenth century, and designated by the letters of the Latin, Greek, or Hebrew alphabets, there are altogether 156, half of which are fragments, consisting of a few verses or, at most, of a few chapters. They are divided as follows:

The Gospels	101
The Acts and Catholic Epistles	22
The Pauline Epistles	27
The Apocalypse	6
	156

Of these only thirty (30) antedate the seventh century.

2. Of *cursive manuscripts* of the Greek New Testament, ranging from the tenth to the fifteenth century, that is, to the invention of printing, and designated by Arabic numbers, there are nearly 4,000, or for

The Gospels	about 1420
The Lectionaries	about 1250
The Epistles of St. Paul	about 520
The Acts and Catholic Epistles	about 450
The Apocalypse	about 194
	3834

Unicals	about 156
Total	3990

Between the fifth and the eighth century the text of the Gospels, as also of some other books of the New Testament, was variously, but not extensively, divided.

The *earliest punctuation,* introduced in the eighth century, was indicated by a short blank space and a simple dot or small cross, placed at the end of sentences and verses.

It is not necessary to mention the many other kinds of divisions, irregularly introduced, especially into the Gospels, the presence or the absence of which helps to determine the antiquity of manuscripts.

Our *present system of punctuation* was introduced in the sixteenth century by Aldus and Paulus Manutius, famous printers at Venice, and was applied for the first time to the New Testament by Erasmus and Stephanus.

Till the fall of the Western Empire, Rome remained the center of the book trade, and copyists formed a regular guild or profession. But from then to the invention of printing, MSS. were usually copied out in the *scriptoria* of the great monasteries, one monk often reading aloud the text from a desk or pulpit, while the others copied from his dictation. In this and other ways the Benedictine Order has preserved all we possess of classical and Christian Latin literature.

For greater clearness, let us explain more fully some of the terms just used.

1. *Parchment* is a writing material made of the skins of lambs, sheep, goats, calves, antelopes, or similar animals, tanned and polished with pumice stone, and prepared for writing. Parchment intended for rough treatment and long wear was often made of the skins of asses and swine. The word *pergamena,* the Latin equivalent, is derived from Pergamum, a city of Mysia, in Asia Minor, from which parchment was first brought. Parchment means not only the material, but also a book written on this material.

2. *Vellum* was originally a finer sort of parchment, usually of young calf-skin, made clear and white so as to serve as writing material. Later it came to mean fine parchment of any kind; also a book or manuscript written on fine parchment. The word is derived from the Latin *vitulus,* a calf, *vitellus,* a young calf, and *vitellinium,* a young calf-skin, shortened into *vellum.*

3. *Papyrus* was a writing material first made by the ancient Egyptians and afterwards much used by the Greeks and Romans. The papyrus plant once grew abundantly on the banks and even in the waters of the Nile. The fibers contained in the pithy interior of the plant were laid out in two thin layers, one layer running lengthwise, the other crosswise, or at right angles with the sheet to be made. They were then soaked in Nile water and pasted or glued, pressed compactly together and dried in the sun and smoothed, and thus made fit for writing on. By adding layer to layer in the same direction, papyrus sheets could be stretched to any extent. The average length of the

roll is about 20 feet, though one has been found which is 144 feet long. Papyrus is easily preserved in the dry climate of Egypt and thousands of papyri have recently been found in an excellent state of preservation. The oldest extant papyrus goes back to the remote reign of King Assa, B. C. 2,600. Most of the great classical works of Greece and Rome were first written on papyrus. The codex, or bound book, came into existence later,— about the beginning of the fourth century A. D.

4. The *roll,* or *scroll,* also called *volumen* (from *volvere,* to roll) is a writing material made of parchment, or papyrus, or other flexible material, and rolled around a cylinder of wood, so as to keep its shape and to be easily placed in a *scrinium,* or book-case, for future use or safe-keeping. The roll was written on only one side, the obverse, in short, narrow, perpendicular columns, across the sheet from edge to edge. The end of the book, when rolled up, was inside the roll, fastened to the wooden cylinder; or each end, *i. e.,* both the beginning and the end, was fastened to a cylinder, so that the book could be rolled off the one and on to the other cylinder in either direction, as the reader wished. All synagogue rolls are attached to two cylinders. Copies for private reading or study took the book form, as soon as it came into general use.

In reading, the roll was held in both hands in such a way that the left hand rolled up what had just been read and the right hand unrolled what was still to be read. The title of a book was added either at

the beginning or at the end of the roll, or occasionally in both places.

5. A *codex* (also written *caudex* and meaning originally the stock or trunk of a tree) is a smooth, flat, thin tablet of wood, smeared over with wax, on which the ancient Greeks, Romans, and others were accustomed to write with a metal instrument called the *stylus,* having one end sharpened and the other end flattened out for the purpose of smoothing out the wax and writing on the same surface again and again. From this usage is derived the word "style," as applied to literary composition.

At first, such tablets were strung together with a strong cord running through holes in their upper left hand corner, and were thus brought together and fastened in at the back, so as to open and close like an ordinary book. With time, parchment or papyrus or other flexible material took the place of the wooden tablets and thus formed the modern bound book. The leaves of the Codex were written on both sides, a great advantage over the roll, which could be written on only one, the obverse, side. Because such tablets were much used by members of the legal profession, a system of legislative enactments has come to be called a code of laws.

The narrow perpendicular columns invariably used in papyrus rolls and varying from two to three inches from edge to edge were retained in the earliest codices, the number of such columns being determined by the width of the page. The Codex Ephraem Rescriptus, and a few others, have but one column; most codices

have two; the Vatican has three; and the Sinaiticus has four columns to the page.

In Greek codices, four full sheets of vellum, laid the one upon the others, and all folded down across the middle from edge to edge, made eight leaves or sixteen pages and were called a quaternion, or quire. Such entire sheets were commonly numbered. Leaves were not numbered until the fifteenth century, and pages were not numbered till the sixteenth century, *i. e.,* till after the invention of the printing press.

The rule, which is almost never violated, is that each quire must begin with the flesh-side and end with the flesh-side of the leaves, and there must be two flesh-sides in the middle of the quire, and every two pages that open out or close on each other must both be flesh-sides or both be hair-sides, else the book will not look well nor fit well together. Briefly, the two pages that come together must both be alike. Also if the roll is made of parchment, the flesh-side must be the inside of the roll, the side to receive the writing. It is the most beautiful side and makes the best appearance, although it does not retain the ink so long.

Eusebius, in his Life of Constantine the Great, tells us that that Emperor, in A. D. 331, ordered him to prepare at Cæsarea in Palestine (which had a great bible factory), fifty superb copies of the Greek Bible, presumably for the principal churches in the new capital of the Empire. Eusebius says that these copies were made "by threes and by fours," or "three-wise and four-wise." The meaning of these words is obscure. If they mean that those bibles had, some three

and some four columns to the page, then it is very probable that we still have two of them, for the Codex Vaticanus has three and the Codex Sinaiticus has four columns to the page,— the only exceptions to the rule of no more than two columns.

The number of written lines to the page in any given book was uniform and never varied. Not with ink, but with some hard instrument, lines were drawn down the margins and across the sheets, to keep the written lines straight and of equal length.

Codices, if bound, were usually bound in boards. In the earlier centuries it was a task to put the entire Bible, or even the entire Old Testament, into one codex; but after the twelfth century, by which time contractions had become common in Greek, this was done more frequently.

A *palimpsest* (πάλιν, again, and ψάω, to scratch or rub) is a parchment, or tablet, or other writing material written twice or oftener on the same side, the earlier writing having been erased, wholly or in part, with a knife or pumice stone, or by washing, so as to make room for a second writing. This double use of the same writing material was due, in early times, chiefly to the scarcity and high cost of materials. Valuable fragments of ancient literature, especially of some of the Sacred Books, have recently been recovered from palimpsests by the use of chemical rëagents. Cardinal Mai, Vatican librarian, recovered a copy of Cicero's "De Republica," supposed to be irretrievably lost, from a palimpsest copy of St. Augustine's Commentary on the Psalms. A palimpsest is

often called "codex rescriptus," a notable instance of which is the "Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus" of the Gospels. Another instance is the Codex Palimpsestus of the Gospels in Syriac, discovered by Mrs. A. S. Lewis, in 1892, in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai.

Having already mentioned some of them, let us now explain more fully what is meant by *polyglots.*

A *polyglot* is a book containing versions of the same text (either of the Bible or other subject matter), in several different languages, generally arranged in parallel columns on the same page. The four principal Bible polyglots are the following:

1. The *Complutensian,* printed at the expense of Cardinal Ximenes, and published between 1514 and 1520, at Complútum (the modern Alcalà) in Spain. It contains the Hebrew, the Septuagint, the Vulgate, the Targum of Onkelos, etc.

2. The *Antwerp,* published in eight folio volumes, between 1568 and 1572, contains the Old Testament in Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, and the New Testament in Greek, Syriac, and Latin. It was printed at the expense of Philip II of Spain. Of this polyglot 960 ordinary copies were printed, besides 200 of a better quality, 30 fine copies, 10 superfine, and 13 on parchment, for which last 16,263 skins were used. Arias Montanus, a famous Hebrew scholar, was one of the editors.

The *Paris,* edited by Michael Le Jay at his own expense, and published between 1628 and 1645, in ten folio volumes (in addition to several other texts),

contains the Samaritan (Hebrew) Pentateuch, which for the first time was then published by the French Oratorian, John Morinus. The Paris polyglot fills ten huge folio volumes, prepared in every way most sumptuously, but not very critically. Volumes I–IV are merely reprints of the Antwerp Bible. Volume V–VI contain the New Testament from the same edition, augmented by some other things. Le Jay spent his entire fortune on the edition and, at last, felt obliged to sell much of it for waste paper. The famous John Morinus was one of the editors.

4. The *London* or *Walton* polyglot, the latest and best and most complete of the polyglots, was edited by Brian Walton, published in six folio volumes, between 1654 and 1657, and contains the Bible in Arabic, Aramaic, Ethiopic, Greek, Hebrew, Latin, Persian, Samaritan, Syriac, each with a very literal Latin translation. It also contains many valuable prolegomena, numerous variants, and the famous Heptaglot Lexicon of Castell, 1669, in two folio volumes, explaining every word in all the versions in the polyglot. Since 1900 this work is no longer on the index.

It is estimated that, since the time of Cardinal Ximenes, one thousand different printed editions of the Greek New Testament have been published. No public library and no private collection contains them all.

It may interest the curious reader to know that there are in the Greek New Testament 27 books, 260 chapters, and 7,960 verses.

The words also have been counted, with this result, that there are

in Matthew.....18,222 words
in Mark.....11,158 words
in Luke.....19,209 words, etc., etc.

And not only the words, but even the letters have been counted.

Matthew has 89,295 letters
Mark has 55,550 letters
Luke has 97,714 letters
John has 70,210 letters
Acts has 94,000 letters

and so forth.

Of course some of these numbers will vary a little according to the edition selected for the count.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

For further information about the "ORIGINAL TEXTS," that is, about the manuscripts, uncial and cursive, about papyrus, parchment, rolls, codices, columns, lines, punctuation, contents, size, sides of parchment, accents, chapters, verses, early uncial manuscripts, palimpsests, etc., etc., the student is requested to consult the Bibliography at the end of this volume, that is,

1) The General Introductions (pp. 221 sqq.).

2) The Biblical Dictionaries, etc. (pp. 223 sq.).

3) The Monographs or Special Works on General Introduction (pp. 224 sq.).

4) and, especially for beginners, the following: —

BREEN, A. E. *Introduction to Holy Scripture,* pp. 379 to 441.

CHAUVIN, C. *Introduction Générale,* pp. 217 to 245, and 262 to 283.

GIGOT, F. E. *General Introduction,* pp. 190 to 260.

GREEN, Wm. H. *Introduction to the Old Testament,* Vol. I on the Text.

GREGORY, C. R. *Canon and Text of the New Testament,* pp. 299–328.

HASTINGS. *Dictionary of the Bible;* Articles, "Text of the Old Testament," Vol. IV, pp. 726–732, by Herm. L. Strack; "Text of the New Testament," Vol. IV, pp. 732–741, by Eb. Nestle.

JACQUIER, E. *The New Testament in the Christian Church,* Vol. II, The Text.

KENYON, F. G. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* Chapters I, II, III, IV, pp. 1–42, and VI, VII, pp. 93–150.

LAKE, Kirsopp. *Text of the New Testament.*

KAULEN, F. *Einleitung,* etc., Vol. I, pp. 70 to 85.

LOISY, A. *Histoire Critique du Texte et des Versions de la Bible.*

NAVILLE, Ed. *The Text of the Old Testament.*

NESTLE, E. *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament,* pp. 1 ff.

POPE, H. *The Catholic Student's "Aids,"* Vol. II, Text of the Greek New Testament, Chap. VII, pp. 93–103.

ROBERTS, A. *Old Test. Revision;* Text of O. Test., Chap. VII, pp. 137–157.

SEISENBERGER, M. *Practical Handbook to the Bible,* pp. 216–235.

SIMCOX, W. H. *Language of the New Testament;* p. 1 ff.

SMYTH, J. P. *The Old Documents and the New Bible.*

SOUTER, A. *The Text and Canon of the N. T.,* pp. 3–33.

VIGOUROUX-BRASSAC. *Manuel Biblique,* Chapter III, pp. 147–170.

CHAPTER IV

HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE

CHAPTER IV

HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE

To the primitive condition of the Hebrew and of the Greek text, important evidence is furnished by the *early versions* of both Testaments, which indicate more or less precisely the state of the texts at the time when these versions were made.

The original autographic copies of the Hebrew Bible disappeared, many of them, 2,000 or 3,000 years ago. Also all the apographic copies that were written out before the tenth century of the Christian era, have disappeared.

This disappearance is due in large part to carelessness, to rough treatment, to wars, floods, and fire, to the frail materials on which most of the copies were written, and especially to the custom of the Jews, who, out of respect, were wont to bury out of sight or to destroy all copies that were no longer in good shape or presentable to the eye.

Yet, fortunately, to take the place of the lost autographs, we still have more than 1,300 apographs of the Hebrew Bible, either in whole or in part, all written since the tenth or ninth century. What is of still greater importance, we have many very *ancient trans-*

lations, some of which reproduce the original autographs of the Bible with more than substantial accuracy.

Among these, we shall discuss briefly the Aramaic, the Syriac, the Arabic, the Egyptian, the Ethiopian, the Armenian, the Gothic, the Slavonian, the Greek, and the Latin versions.

Most of these versions contain the New as well as the Old Testament. A few of them are too late to be of much service to the textual critic.

We have seen elsewhere that the value of a version to the textual critic depends on many circumstances. If the version is not late but ancient; if it was made directly from the original, and is not a translation of another translation; if the language from which, and the language into which, the version was made, belong to the same family or to the same branch of a family of languages, and are very similar in vocabulary and syntax, for instance, like Greek and Latin, or like Hebrew and Syriac; if the translator shows himself master of both languages; and if the version is not free, but literal and even slavishly literal; so much the better will it serve the purpose of the textual critic. Such a version is almost equivalent to a first-class MS. copy of the text and may be older by several centuries than any MS. that we now possess.

1. Oriental Versions

Among the ancient versions the first place belongs to the Aramaic Targums, as being the nearest in language to the original Hebrew.[1]

1 On the Targums see Buhl, *Canon and Text,* pp. 167–183.

a) *Aramaic Targums*

Targum, which is an Aramaic word, means either a *translation* into another language, or an *interpretation* in the same language. The word might mean a version into any language, but custom has restricted its use to the ancient Aramaic versions of the Hebrew Bible, sometimes called the Chaldean paraphrases.

Written translations of the Sacred Books into any other language were, for a long time, strictly forbidden among the Jews; but later, after Hebrew had ceased to be a spoken language, professional or even occasional Targumists translated the Sacred Text orally for the people, into Aramaic in the East, and into Greek in the West.

As the Targumist translated chiefly for the people and to be understood by the people, he was allowed and accustomed to add to his translation short explanations, or running commentaries, interwoven with the translation proper, thus making the whole thing a paraphrase.

Such explanations, or running commentaries, still remain; for the substance and even the very form of the old oral Targums have often been handed down and incorporated into the written or printed Targums.

The Targums are all written in occidental Aramaic, the language spoken and written by the Jewish people in the East for a few centuries before, and for many centuries after, the birth of Christ.

There are written Targums on all the books of the

Hebrew Bible, except Daniel, Esdras, and Nehemias.

The Targums are either Palestinian or Babylonian. The Palestinian Targums are of later date and of little value.

The Babylonian Targums are very useful, because they give us ancient interpretations of specially interesting passages of the Old Testament, and also because they show us the approved methods and the general principles of interpretation that prevailed among the Jews before the time of Christ.

They also serve to show that our present Hebrew text is the same as that in use at the beginning of the Christian era,— a strong argument for its integrity.

The most important of the Targums are those of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, and of Jonathan on the Prophets, dating probably, in their first draft, from a century before Christ, but revised and reedited some time after.

The *Targum of Onkelos* is the earliest of all the written Targums and seems to have originated, in some form, before the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus, but was retouched at a later date.

According to the Talmud, Onkelos was a proselyte, who lived at the time of the elder Gamaliel, the teacher of St. Paul. Others make him a disciple of Hillel and Schammai, and therefore a contemporary of Christ. Others identify him with Aquila, the famous Jewish proselyte, who translated the Hebrew Bible so slavishly into Greek. Others say that this name is here used, not to denote the *author,* but to indicate the *method of interpretation,* that is, literal. Others say

that this Targum does not seem to have been the work of a single author or editor, but the joint production of an entire school.

In any case, this Targum is a very plain, intelligible, and excellent translation, and written in a pure and simple style. It is very literal in its historical passages, but in the poetical parts it is often paraphrastic.

This Targum is very valuable as showing Jewish traditional methods of interpretation before the time of Christ. For instance, it applies literally to the Messiah the words of Genesis 49, 10 and Num. 24, 17.

The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Prophets, both earlier and later, is very literal in the historical parts, but freer in the others. It is a little later than the Targum of Onkelos and differs from it in style and dialect. The passages which it translates and applies to the Messiah are both positive and numerous. This fact alone shows that this Targum must have been made very early in the Christian era.

There are several other Targums, but they are inferior in value and of little interest to most students. We omit them.

b) *Syriac Versions*

We now proceed to glance at the many Syriac versions, some of which are complete and some are only fragmentary. By far the most important and the most famous of them, and one of the most accurate of all ancient versions that have come down to us, is the old *Syriac Peshitto*.

The name *Peshitto* is variously understood: (1)

Some make it mean the "Simple," or the "Literal," so called, they think, because this version adheres closely to the original text and avoids both allegorical and paraphrastical renderings; (2) Others (among whom are Strack and Nestle) make this name mean the "Usual" or the "Current," or the "Commonly Used," or the "Generally Received" text. Compare this with the meaning of the word "Vulgate" in the Latin Church and the word "Koiné" in the Greek Church.

Special interest attaches to this old Syriac version of the Old Testament, because it is probably the first version after Christ that was translated directly out of the Hebrew and Aramaic originals. The Old Latin was translated, not from the Hebrew, but from the Greek Septuagint.

Besides, all scholars admit that this is a very excellent translation. In all the qualities that go to make a good version the Peshitto, among ancient versions, ranks next to the Latin Vulgate and, in some respects, is even superior. It is generally exact and faithful in rendering the sense of the original without being servile or too literal. This is true especially in the New Testament. In the Old Testament the translation varies considerably from book to book, some being rendered literally, and some freely, and some even paraphrastically. The Pentateuch is translated the best of all.

This, together with differences in vocabulary and syntax and in the general qualities of style, would seem to show that this version was made by different

authors with different degrees of fitness for the work, at various intervals of time and, perhaps, in different places, such as Nisibis, Antioch, Edessa in Syria, etc. This version was made, not from the Greek Seventy, but from the *original Hebrew* and probably by Jewish converts to the Christian faith.

We do not know when, or where, or by whom, or by how many, this old version was made. Theodore of Mopsuestia finds time to write: "These books were translated into Syriac by somebody; but who he was no one knows to this day." (Com. on Zeph., 1–6.)

The history of the Peshitto is quite analogous to that of the Latin Vulgate. It is the opinion of many scholars that it is a *recension* of an *older* and *cruder* Syriac *version,* which passed through various transformations and through a series of revisions, such as the Curetonian and the Lewis-Gibson recensions, until in the third, or fourth, or fifth century (opinions differ) it reached the smooth, accurate, scholarly, polished shape in which we find it to-day. The work was probably begun about 150 A. D.

The New Testament part of the Peshitto, if we may judge by the general identity or resemblance of its style, and by the uniform excellence of its rendering, was made by one translator. Many textual critics call it "The Queen of New Testament Translations." "For perspicuity of style, for ease and freedom of rendering, combined with precision and correctness, it is quite without a rival."

Either the translators or subsequent revisers of the

Syriac Old Testament made considerable use of the Greek Septuagint.

The Peshitto is given in full in both the Paris and the London polyglot, accompanied by a Latin translation. It has often been published, but a thoroughly critical edition of it is a desideratum. It would be very useful for the correction of our present Hebrew recension. It survives in 177 copies, of which two are certainly of the Vth century, and a dozen or more are of the Vth or VIth century.

The Peshitto is the authentic and official text of Catholics and heretics alike of the Maronite, Syrian, and Chaldean rites, and is read as such in public services on the Malabar Coast in India, China, Kurdistan, Persia, Egypt, Palestine, Syria, and in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Tigris.

Other Syriac Versions

1. About A. D. 170, Tatian, the Assyrian, after the death of St. Justin Martyr, his master, returned from Rome to the Orient and published his *Diatessaron,* a Harmony of the four Gospels in Syriac. Scholars are uncertain whether he translated from Greek into Syriac or found a Syriac version already made at that early date. In any case, the Gospels existed in Syriac by the year 170.

The original of this *Diatessaron* is long since lost. However, Armenian and Arabic translations of it have been discovered in our own time and have been translated into Latin by Moesinger, Ciasca, and others.

2. William Cureton, in 1858, published in London

an old Syriac version of the four Gospels, discovered in the convent of "St. Mary, Mother of God," in the Nitrian Desert, in Egypt, and accompanied it with an English translation. It dates from the second century and is the only copy of that particular version that has survived.

3. In 1892, Mrs. A. S. Lewis and her sister, Mrs. M. Gibson, of Cambridge, England, discovered in the convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, a palimpsest manuscript containing the four Gospels in Syriac. It dates from the second century and is the only copy of that version that has survived. It differs both from the Curetonian and from the Peshitto. It is not easy to decide the relationship as to age and origin between these three versions. The question is too intricate and technical to interest any but specialists.

4. In 508, Philoxenos, a Monophysite bishop of Hierapolis in Syria, had the Old Testament translated literally from the Greek Septuagint into Syriac.

5. In 616, Paul, a Monophysite bishop of Tella, translated the Old Testament into Syriac from the Greek Hexaplar edition of Origen. What is left of it is very literal and, if we had a complete and critical edition of it, it would be of great service for the restoration of the Greek text.

c) *Arabic Versions*

Arabic versions, especially of the Old Testament, whether made by Jews or by Christians, are very numerous, but are not of much importance to the textual critic, either because they are made too late,

or because most, though not all, of them were made from other translations, such as Greek, Syriac, or Coptic, and only a few of them were made from the original Hebrew. One of the most useful of the latter is a version of the Pentateuch and Isaias, made by the celebrated grammarian, Rabbi Saadias Gaon, in the tenth century, and published in the Paris and London polyglots. Rabbi Saadias (b. 892, d. 942) was originally of the Fayoum in Egypt, and later became the Gaon or chief of the great Rabbinical School at Sora, in Babylonia. He was an excellent Hebrew and Arabic scholar. His translation is very good, though sometimes paraphrastic.

Erpenius, in 1622, published an Arabic version of the Pentateuch, made by an African Jew of the thirteenth century. It is highly esteemed and frequently quoted. There are many other Arabic translations, some of which have never been published. Most of them are too recent to be of great authority. For further information see F. C. Burkitt, "Arabic Versions," in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* Vol. I, pp. 136–138.

d) *Egyptian or Coptic Versions*

The Coptic is the old Egyptian language spoken by the Pharaohs and their subjects, thousands of years ago, but, after the beginning of our era, modified by considerable infiltrations of Greek words and constructions and by the adoption of the Greek alphabet plus five demotic characters. In the early ages, there were several Coptic dialects and several Coptic versions, at

least three of the Old and five of the New Testament, one for each of the principal dialects.

The two most important Coptic versions are the Memphitic, or Bohairic, current in Lower Egypt, and the Thebaic, or Sahidic, current in Upper Egypt. The Memphitic is the only complete version; the Thebaic is incomplete, and the others are all fragmentary.

The Memphitic and the Thebaic versions appear to have been made in the third or in the second century. The Memphitic is probably first in order of *time,* and also first in order of *merit.* It is very carefully made, so that it is easy to see what was the Greek word which the translator had before him in any particular passage.

Arabic is the *vernacular* of all Egyptians, but the Coptic-Memphitic dialect is the *liturgical language* used in the religious services of both the Catholic and the schismatical Christians of Egypt. Unfortunately, there is yet no critically edited text of these versions.

Both the Memphitic and the Thebaic versions of the Old Testament are founded on the Septuagint, probably on the Hesychian recension, and generally follow the readings peculiar to the Codex Alexandrinus or Aleph. In the N. T. the Memphitic is supposed to follow the neutral, and the Thebaic the western type of text. There is a growing impression that the Coptic versions, because so early and so literal, will yet play a very important rôle in the correction of the Sacred Text, especially of the New Testament. In the last quarter of a century great progress has been made in Egyptology, and especially in the study of the Egyptian

versions. Still, for all that, the ordinary student need lose no time on certain details of the subject, till specialists come to some agreement among themselves. This, of course, they are doing, but the end is not yet.

e) *Ethiopic Versions*

According to ecclesiastical history, the conversion of Ethiopia took place about the year 330, and the translation of the Bible into Ethiopic was made in the same or perhaps in the following century. It was probably made after the time of St. Frumentius, who, with others, was sent by St. Athanasius of Alexandria to convert the country.

The text of the Old Testament is based entirely upon the Greek Septuagint and follows the reading of the Codex Alexandrinus or Aleph. Of course, the New Testament was made from the original Greek.

The Ethiopic is a Semitic language, very closely related to the Arabic and the Hebrew. It was carried to Ethiopia, no one knows when, by colonists from Arabia Felix. Unfortunately, we have no critically edited text of this version.

f) *The Armenian Version*

Till the beginning of the fifth century, the Armenians had no alphabet and, of course, no version of the Bible in their own language, but used the Syriac Peshitto, which had been introduced among them by missionaries from Syria and Mesopotamia.

The famous monk, St. Mesrob, afterwards patriarch of the Armenians, about the year 406, invented an al-

phabet suited to the genius of their language, and translated or had the entire Bible translated into Armenian, by the year 410. Some writers maintain that this first version, made from the Syriac, was afterwards lost, and that a second version was made from the Greek Hexaplar text of Origen. Others hold that there was but one translation, which was made from the Syriac and afterwards revised in accordance with the Greek.

The New Testament was likewise translated, either from the Syriac or from the Greek, and later revised by reference to the other. It is said to be very literal and exact, clear, and even elegant. But we have no critically revised edition of this version.

2. Western Versions

a) *The Gothic Version*

A Gothic version of the whole Bible was made by Ulphilas (318–388), an Arian bishop of the Maeso-Goths, who had assisted at the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 360. These Goths were a German tribe, settled on the confines of the Greek Empire, in what is now known as Servia and Bulgaria.

The Old Testament was rendered from Lucian's recension of the Septuagint, and the New Testament was made from the original Greek. The Codex Argenteus, so called because written in letters of silver, is preserved in the library of the University of Upsala, Sweden. It may have been written in the fifth or sixth century. Of this version only fragments remain

b) *The Slavonic Version*

This version of the entire Bible was made, or begun, about the beginning of the ninth century, by the two brothers, SS. Cyril and Methodius, of Thessalonica, who had been sent as missionaries to what is now Bulgaria and Moravia. It is probable that they translated only the Gospels, or, at most, only the New Testament and the Psalms. The remainder of the Old Testament was made, or may have been made, by others at a later date. Many claim that the Old Testament was translated from the Greek Septuagint, though ancient testimony states that it was made from the Latin Vulgate and corrected later by the Greek. A recent collation of manuscripts seems to confirm this opinion. This version is very literal and accurate. The old Slavonian, in which it is made, though no longer spoken, is the liturgical language of the Russian and of its affiliated churches.

The whole Slavonic Bible was published in 1576 and 1581, and several editions of it have been issued from Moscow. It has never been critically edited.

c) *Greek Versions of the Old Testament*

" Hardly any event in the history of the world can be deemed more providential than the formation of the Greek version of the Old Testament. The Hebrew language was always confined within a very narrow territory; and, so long as divine revelation continued locked up in that tongue, it could become known only to comparatively few of the members of our race. But, under the wise government of the Almighty, pro-

vision had been made, long before the coming of Christ, for the easy and rapid spread of the Gospel message throughout the whole civilized world, as soon as the fulness of time arrived. The Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Scriptures had been gradually formed at Alexandria, between the third and first century before Christ, and was everywhere current among the Jews at the date of our Saviour's birth. The Old Testament Scriptures were thus thrown open to the whole world; and as the New Testament was throughout written in Greek, the whole of the sacred volume, so far as its contents were collected and circulated, thus became intelligible to almost every one within the vast bounds of the Roman Empire. It is well worth our while to pause here for a little, and consider how widely a knowledge of the Greek language had been spread throughout the world before the commencement of the apostolic age. We shall thus see how wonderfully the way had been prepared for the promulgation of divine truth among all nations, when the stream of spiritual blessings, hitherto confined, for the most part, to the land of Israel, was now to burst its barriers, and carry its life-giving waters even to the ends of the earth." (A. Roberts, *Old Testament Revision*, pp. 157–158.)

The Septuagint

The Greek Septuagint Version of the Old Testament is the earliest, the most venerable, the most important, and the most influential version ever made into any language.

This Greek version, and not the original Hebrew, was the Bible chiefly used by our Blessed Lord; for, of the thirty-seven quotations made by Him from the Old Testament in the Gospels, thirty-three agree almost word for word with the Greek translation, and not with the Hebrew original.

This Greek version, and not the original Hebrew, was the Bible chiefly used by the Apostles, and by Jews and Christians generally in the early centuries of the Church.

This Greek version was absolutely the only Bible that was, or could have been, used by Christians from the beginning down to about the year 150, at which time the Old Latin and the Old Syriac versions were made, and this Greek version continued to be almost the only Bible used for centuries afterwards,— that is, till these two versions, the Latin and the Syriac, had time to come into general use in their respective churches.

The Hebrew language, though once spoken somewhat beyond the confines of the Holy Land, was nevertheless always confined within very narrow territorial limits; for Palestine is only about 150 miles long, from Dan to Bersabee, and from 50 to 100 miles wide; whereas, especially after the conquests of Alexander the Great, the Greek language had become world-wide in extent.

This version is commonly called the "Septuagint," or "Bible of the Seventy," either because,

(1) It was approved by the seventy members of the Jewish Alexandrian Sanhedrin;

(2) Or because it was the principal treasure preserved in the famous Library at Alexandria, which had been founded by seventy elders or magnates of that city;

(3) Or because, as was generally believed until about 200 years ago, it was made by seventy (two) translators, six from each of the twelve tribes of Israel.

This name, Septuagint, belonged at first to the Pentateuch only, but it was afterwards extended to all the books of the Greek Old Testament, whether written originally in Hebrew or in Greek.

The early history of the Septuagint is involved in great obscurity. All the testimony available is either so scanty, or so contradictory, or so intrinsically incredible, or so marvelous, that it is useless to attempt to determine either the time when, or the place where, or the number of persons by whom, the several books of this famous version were made.

A curious letter, claiming to have been written by Aristeas, an officer at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus, 285 B. C., and pretending to give an authentic account of the origin of the Septuagint version, was accepted by early Jewish and Christian writers, such as Philo Judaeus, the famous Alexandrian philosopher, by Josephus Flavius, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, and many others down to very recent times. The story, with a few embellishments by early writers, reads thus: At the urgent request of King Ptolemy Philadelphus, B. C. 285, the High Priest Eleazer sent seventy-two learned Hebrews, six from each of the twelve tribes

of Israel, from Jerusalem to Alexandria, bearing with them a magnificent certified copy of the Pentateuch, written in letters of gold, with instructions to translate it into Greek for the famous library, just founded in that city. They had lodgings assigned them on the Island of Pharos. They were enclosed in seventy-two separate cells, without any means of communicating with one another. They all finished their task in seventy-two days and produced seventy-two copies, which, when compared, were found to agree with one another word for word and letter for letter, from beginning to end.

What wonder, if this be true, or if it were believed to be true, that this version is called the "Version of the Seventy," or Septuagint.

But there is no doubt among the learned that this pretended letter of the Pseudo-Aristeas is a forgery, an Oriental romance, invented for the purpose of upholding the authority of the Septuagint. At the same time, it probably rests on some basis in fact, but just how much foundation there is for it is very difficult to say.

All that can be known with any degree of probability is:

(a) That the Hebrew Pentateuch was translated into Greek at Alexandria under the joint reign of Ptolemy Lagus and Philadelphus, father and son, about the year 285 B. C.;

(b) That the remaining books of the Old Testament were translated at various intervals and by different authors, and that the work was finally com-

pleted some time before 130 B. C., as is evident from the Prologue to the Book of Ecclesiasticus;

(c) That there were many translators;

(d) That the translators were Alexandrian and not Palestinian Jews;

(e) That some of them were incompetent for the task, either because they did not know enough Hebrew, or because they did not know enough Greek.

These last conclusions are evident from an examination of the vocabulary and style of language, which are very different in the different books.

A comparison of the Septuagint with our present Hebrew text, with the Samaritan Hebrew Pentateuch, and with quotations from the Old Testament in the New, shows conclusively that numerous variants, consisting of additions or omissions or transpositions, some of them of a very striking character, existed in the Hebrew consonantal text of the Old Testament in the long centuries before the time of Christ. How shall we explain their origin? How, precisely, did they come into existence?

This problem is so complicated, and our information is so scanty, that it is not easy to decide, (1) whether our present Hebrew was corrupted at some time in its long history (consciously or unconsciously), or (2) whether the Septuagint was badly translated in the beginning, that is before the Christian era; or (3) whether the Septuagint, even though well translated in the beginning, was modified into its present condition (consciously or unconsciously, as the case may be), by subsequent copyists, editors, redactors, or re-

visors; or, (4) whether, at the time the Septuagint was made, there were two or more forms or recensions of the Hebrew text, an Egyptian or other, from which the Septuagint descended, and a Palestinian, from which our present Hebrew is derived; or (5) whether the Septuagint differentiated, as a newer form, from the Hebrew; or (6) whether our present Hebrew differentiated, as a newer form, from the primitive Hebrew text; or (7) whether they are two coordinate forms of one original, which diverged into their present forms by a slow process of differentiation; and if so, which is to be preferred as more conformable with the primitive text.

As to the greater or lesser conformity of the Septuagint and of our present Hebrew with the primitive or autographic copy, it is well to remember —

(a) That the Hebrew has all the advantage of being the original, whereas the Septuagint has all the disadvantage of being a translation. It is well known that mistakes are more readily committed in *translating* than in *transcribing*.

(b) This is all the more true in the case of the Septuagint, since some of the translators were not sufficiently acquainted with Hebrew to perform properly so delicate and so important a task.

(c) Then, too, the Greek also had to be transcribed as well as the Hebrew and, being in greater demand than the Hebrew, it would naturally be copied out more frequently and more hastily and incorrectly.

In the supposition that the present Hebrew is more

conformable than the Greek with the primitive text, the conclusion is that the Greek is generally free, but not literal; good, but not excellent; dogmatically, but not critically, correct.

It seems to have been the intention of the translators to make the Greek full and smooth, and easily intelligible to the reader. They were content to reproduce the meaning and not the strict letter of the text. Accordingly, in this version, figurative expressions are often replaced by literal language; active and passive voices are often interchanged; what is obscure is paraphrased into clearness; what is too condensed is amplified; the order of words and phrases is sometimes inverted; interrogations are often replaced by the declarative form; euphemisms are substituted for what was considered indelicate. But in all cases the sense remains substantially the same.

We can not compare the *primitive* text of the Septuagint with the *primitive* text of the Hebrew original, for both have long since disappeared. But we can compare the *actual* Septuagint with the *actual* Hebrew, and, in so doing, it becomes evident that the Greek is of very uneven value. The historical books are the best translated, and among these the Pentateuch is the best of all, being remarkable alike for its fidelity to the original and for grace and elegance of language.

Among the pre-Christian Jews the Greek version enjoyed a great reputation. It was the only form of Scripture read in the synagogues of Italy, Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria, and even in some parts of

Palestine. Philo used no other. Josephus, though acquainted with Hebrew, generally used the Greek version.

Among post-Christian Jews, the Septuagint continued, for some time, to enjoy the same high favor as formerly; but in the controversies which inevitably arose between them, Christians appealed with irresistable cogency to the remarkable Messianic prophecies contained in the Septuagint and fulfilled in Christ, and urged them with vigor to prove against the Jews the divinity of Christ and to establish the claims of Christianity. The Jews declared that the Septuagint was not conformable with the Hebrew; the Christians retorted by accusing the Jews of having corrupted the Hebrew after the coming of Christ.

In consequence of these divergences between the Septuagint and the Hebrew, some Jews, heretics and Catholics, between A. D. 140 and A. D. 300, prepared ten other Greek translations or revisions, in which the Hebrew was more closely followed and more faithfully rendered.

Ten Other Greek Translations or Revisions

The authors of *seven* of these versions are known to us by name; the other *three,* being anonymous, are indicated by numbers. They are Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Quinta, Sexta, Septima, Origen, Eusebius-Pamphilus, Lucian, and Hesychius.

1. *Aquila* was the first man, after the Seventy Elders of Alexandria, who had the courage to undertake a translation of the Old Testament into Greek. It is dif-

ficult to know for certain just who or what he was. But, if we must believe all we hear about him, Aquila was a Greek by birth, a native of Sinope in Pontus, a kinsman of the Emperor Hadrian, and superintendent of the work of re-building Jerusalem as "Aelia Capitolina." He was first a pagan, then a Christian, then a Jewish proselyte, then a zealous disciple of Rabbi Akiba, and perhaps identical with Onkelos, the translator of the famous Aramaic Targum on the Pentateuch. Certain it is that his Greek translation of the Pentateuch was even more literal than the Targum,—in fact, it was so slavishly literal as often to be quite unintelligible, unless to those familiar with the Hebrew.

Aquila's version was made about A. D. 130 or 140 and soon became the common Greek version among non-Christian Jews. The purpose of Aquila was to give to the Jewish Synagogue a version more conformable with the original than was the Septuagint, and thus to deprive Christians of certain advantages in the theological disputes of the day. It cannot be proved that he mistranslated out of religious bias against Christianity. Aquila had a very profound knowledge of Hebrew. Richard Simon says that the version of Aquila was more like a dictionary of the Hebrew language than like a translation of the Bible. Only fragments of this work have reached us.

2. *Theodotion* is said to have been a native either of Ephesus or of Pontus, and an Ebionite, or a Marcionite, or a Jewish proselyte. He was a contemporary of Aquila, though a little later. Nothing more is known about him. His work, which was made about

A. D. 150, is not an independent translation, but rather a revision, made for the purpose of bringing the Septuagint into greater conformity with the Massoretic Hebrew original. His work was much read and appreciated by Christians, but not by Jews. His knowledge of Hebrew was limited; he often follows the renderings of Aquila. His revision or version of the Book of Daniel was found to be so much superior to that of the Seventy, that the Church, at an early date, actually substituted it for that of the Seventy. Only one copy, and that as recent as the IXth century, has survived. Little else of his version remains.

3. *Symmachus* was a little later than Theodotion, a little nearer to the close of the IInd century. Eusebius and Jerome call him an Ebionite. Little else is known about him. His version, made about A. D. 175 or 180, differed from all the preceding ones by its elegance and clearness, and by the remarkable skill with which he turned difficult Hebrew constructions into idiomatic Greek. Because Symmachus rendered "sense for sense" and not "word for word," Jerome preferred him to all the others, even to Aquila, and made frequent use of him in his Latin translation. It may be said that Symmachus approached nearer than any other Greek of his day to the modern ideal of a translator. Only fragments of his version have come down to us.

4, 5, 6. Besides the three translations just described, Origen was acquainted with three others by unknown authors, which, from the order given them in his Hexapla, are called *Quinta, Sexta,* and *Septima.* We know but little more about them. It is uncertain

whether the authors were Jews or Christians. They covered only parts of the Old Testament. Nothing but fragments of these translations have reached us.

As the text of the Seventy had suffered so much from hasty and careless transcription, and as the six versions just mentioned offered no efficacious remedy to the evil, four other attempts were made in the third century to produce and to preserve a more correct text of the Septuagint. These attempts were made: (1) By Origen, (2) by Eusebius, (3) by Lucian, and (4) by Hesychius,— all Catholics.

7. *Origen* (A. D. 185–254), the greatest scholar of his age and a man of stupendous energy and capacity for work, undertook the task of comparing all the Greek versions then extant, and correcting the Septuagint by what he thought was best in them. In other words, to show Greek-speaking readers, whether Jews or Christians, just how the Greek Septuagint agreed or disagreed with the Hebrew, and how it should be corrected, Origen composed his famous *Hexapla.*

The work was arranged with six narrow parallel columns to the page. The first column had the original Hebrew in Hebrew letters; the second column had the same Hebrew text, but in Greek letters, to indicate the pronunciation of the Hebrew; the third column had the version of Aquila, as being nearest to the Hebrew in fidelity; the fourth column had the version of Symmachus; the fifth, the version of the Seventy (then and there corrected by comparison with the other versions); the sixth had the version of Theodotion, as being the farthest removed in style from the original.

Being arranged in six columns the work was called the Ἑξαπλα (sixfold). In some books, other columns were added for one or more of the three versions called *Quinta, Sexta,* or *Septima,* thus occasionally making 7, 8, or 9 columns, a Heptapla, an Octopla, and an Enneapla. This great work was completed A. D. 231.

Then, having them all in parallel columns, face to face with one another, Origen, by means of an elaborate system of diacritical marks in the margin, corrected the Septuagint by means of the other Greek versions, especially by the version of Theodotion.

A *Tetrapla,* consisting of the four Greek versions without the Hebrew, is also mentioned by ancient writers; but it is not known whether or not the Hexapla and the Tetrapla are two different names for the same work, or two names for two entirely different works.

Fifty years after the death of Origen, his great work, consisting of fifty volumes, was brought out of its obscurity by Eusebius and Pamphilus and placed in the library of Pamphilus, at Cæsarea in Palestine, where Jerome made frequent use of it for his Latin Vulgate version. It was never afterwards mentioned by any ancient writer. Such a colossal work was too bulky ever to be copied out in its entirety. It is supposed to have perished in the flames at Cæsarea, when that town was captured and destroyed by the Arabian followers of the false prophet, A. D. 653.

Origen endeavored, by alterations, to make the Septuagint conform, as closely as possible, with the Hebrew text, that is, with that recension of the Hebrew

text which was current in his day. Much better if he had endeavored to make the then Septuagint conform as closely as possible with the Septuagint as it was, and with the original Hebrew as it was, a few centuries before Christ. Did Origen or his contemporaries know that the Greek might differ from the Massoretic Hebrew text, everywhere current in their day, and still might be right; and that it might agree with the Hebrew, as it was before the time of Christ?

Dr. H. B. Swete, a thorough expert on this subject, and editor of the recent Cambridge edition of the Old Testament in Greek, writes: "At some time between the origin of the LXX and that of Aquila's [version] a thorough revision of the Hebrew Bible must have taken place, probably under official direction." Again: "It is sufficient to warn the beginner that, in the LXX, he has before him the version of an early text (B. C.) which often differed materially from the text of the printed Hebrew Bible and of all existing Hebrew MSS." Again: "We are driven to the conclusion that the transition from a fluctuating to a relatively fixed [Hebrew] text took effect during the interval between the fall of Jerusalem (under Titus, A. D. 70) and the completion of Aquila's Version (about A. D. 140)."

8. *Eusebius* (A. D. 270–340) assisted by Pamphilus, his wealthy friend and martyr to the faith (A. D. 309), copied out separately the Hexaplar text of the Septuagint from Origen's Hexapla, and published it in an independent form, or as a revision of the Septuagint, with many various readings gathered from

Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, placed in the margin. It was known as the *Hexaplar* edition, to distinguish it from the pre-Hexaplar or uncorrected common edition from which our Old Latin was made long before the days of Origen. This recension circulated in Palestine.

9. *Lucian,* a priest of Samosata, who died a martyr for the faith, A. D. 311, published a recension or revision of the "Koine Ekdosis," or pre-Hexaplar edition of the Seventy, corrected in accordance with the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion, and the original Hebrew. His revision seems to have been officially approved in the churches of Syria and Constantinople.

10. *Hesychius,* an Egyptian bishop and martyr for the faith (A. D. 312), revised the Septuagint according to the three versions above mentioned and in conformity with the Hebrew original. His revision seems to have been adopted in Egypt.

We do not read that any other revisions of the Septuagint were attempted from the IVth century down to modern times. The best editions of it now are those of *Pope Sixtus V* and of *Dr. H. B. Swete,* which was very carefully edited and was published between 1895 and 1899, in three volumes, at Cambridge.

Notwithstanding so many divergences from the Hebrew, the Septuagint is substantially conformable with the original. If some of its doctrinal passages are somewhat obscure, yet not one of them is made to say anything contrary to faith and morals.

We shou'd make many allowances for translators who wrote two or three centuries before the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled in Christ, and 1500 years before grammars or dictionaries were even imagined.

A version like the Septuagint, which was used by Christ and His Apostles, and which was read exclusively by the Universal Christian Church, both East and West, for some hundreds of years after the time of our Lord, and is still the official text in the Greek Church, both Roman Catholic and schismatical, must be an authentic source of faith and morals. In the Catholic Church, the Greek Old Testament is authentic both *de facto* and *de jure,* and is dogmatically on a level with the Latin Vulgate and with the Syriac Peshitto.

The edition of the Septuagint which was published by Pope Sixtus V, in 1587, and which has never been surpassed down to our own times, has a preface practically making it also *de jure* authentic. It is a reproduction of the Codex Vaticanus.

A modern non-Catholic writer says: "The Greek translation is not of equal merit throughout, and it is plain that different parts of the Bible were rendered into Greek by men of varying capacity; but in general . . . it is safe to say that the translators were men of competent scholarship, as scholarship then went, and that they did their work faithfully and in no arbitrary way."

d) *Latin Translations — The Itala*

The history of the *"Old Latin" version* is involved in such obscurity that it is impossible to know for cer-

tain, when, or where, or by whom, or by how many, it was made.

Some think it was made early, and some think it was made late, in the second century. However, the common opinion among scholars is that the Bible was first translated into Latin somewhere about 150 A. D., but no more precise date can be assigned. This, too, is the legitimate conclusion to be drawn from the words of Tertullian and Augustine.

It has been much questioned among the learned whether the "Old Latin" was made in Italy, at Rome, or in or near Carthage in Africa. Good reasons are alleged for both opinions. If there was only one Latin version, it would seem more probable that it was made in Africa, where it was most needed; but if there were several Latin versions, there is no reason why one or more of them may not have originated in Africa and the others in Rome.

It is also matter of debate whether there were several or only one Latin translation in the early Western Church. The language of Augustine would seem to imply that there were many, and from very early times. He says: "They who translated the Scriptures from Hebrew into Greek may be counted; but the Latin translators can in no way be counted. For, in the early ages of the faith, whoever got possession of a Greek manuscript and fancied he had a fair knowledge of Greek and Latin, ventured to translate it."

St. Jerome tells us there were as many various readings as codices, because "the text was either badly rendered by stupid translators, or awkwardly changed

by meddlesome but incompetent revisers, or either interpolated or twisted by sleepy copyists." (Preface to Damasus.) He specifies three classes of men who had ruined the Latin text,— translators, revisers, and copyists, and he puts the *translators* in the *plural number.*

Some scholars hold that the remains of the Old Latin, in their style of language, show identity of version, that is, one translation with many various readings, amounting almost to different revisions or recensions.

Other scholars discover in the extant copies of the Old Latin such differences of rendering as would indicate the existence of distinct translations.

Some recent scholars go so far as to say that they find traces of three very distinct forms of the Old Latin, an African, a European, and an Italic, or Roman.

If this be true, then the "African" was no doubt the earliest and crudest form, the "European" was a later and less primitive form, and the "Roman" or "Italic" was the latest and most polished form of the "Old Latin versions" then in circulation.

St. Augustine is the first and the last of the Fathers to call the "Itala" by that name. He preferred it to all the other Latin versions then in use (*"ceteris Itala praeferatur"*).

Recently there has been great curiosity to know precisely what is meant by the "Itala." Most scholars believe that the "Itala" was one of the many revisions of the "Old Latin" which was made by the Africans,

about A. D. 150, from the uncorrected pre-Hexaplar Greek text of the Old Testament.

Others think that the "Itala" was identical with that early Latin translation which Jerome is said to have made from Origen's corrected Hexaplar Greek text, but which soon disappeared.

Still others think that the "Itala" was the same as our present Latin Vulgate Bible, which was translated by Jerome, between 383 and 405, from the original Hebrew directly into Latin.

Fr. Walter Drum, S. J., explains all sides of the controversy and concludes that the arguments adduced to prove that Augustine's "Itala" is Jerome's Vulgate or any other version made by Jerome are not conclusive (*The Ecclesiastical Review,* Sept., 1918).

In any case it is a mistake to identify the "Itala" with the "Old Latin." The relationship between them is that of a part to the whole, or a species to its genus. The "Itala," at most, is only one of many revisions of the "Vetus Latina" or "Old Latin version."

In the early ages, the "Old Latin" was usually called the "Vulgate." It was so called because it was a literal translation of the common or pre-Hexaplar Greek version, current before the days of Origen. The "Old Latin" was simply the "Koine Ekdosis" or Greek Vulgate in a Latin dress. The name Vulgate has long since passed from the Old Latin, which has disappeared, to Jerome's version, which has taken both its place and its name.

Most of the Old Latin versions have perished: but we still have the Psalter, Esther, Job, the Pentateuch,

Josue, some Deuterocanonical books, and the entire New Testament.

The great importance of the Old Latin for the textual criticism of both Testaments is manifest. The Old Latin was made one hundred years before Origen produced his Hexapla, and two hundred years before the oldest manuscripts of the Greek Bible, now in existence, were copied out. It is, therefore, a very early witness to the condition of the Greek Bible at that very early period. All the more so, because the Old Latin was so extremely literal that it is easy, through it, to see the precise Greek words and the precise Greek construction of the original.

So far we have treated this subject very briefly and for two reasons:

1. Because the student can find such topics as the history of the Vulgate, the peculiarities of its Latinity, the condition of its text, and the successive, though not successful, efforts made during the Middle Ages to preserve its integrity, much more amply discussed in some of the larger General Introductions, in Biblical Encyclopedias, and in special works on the subject, and

2. That we may have more space for the discussion of another phase of the subject, which is not often treated, and which is not easily accessible to the student, and is difficult both to handle and to understand. It is the following:

As the question of the Vulgate has been much misunderstood by some Catholics, and much misrepresented by many non-Catholics, we think it very important to explain to students precisely what is the mean-

ing of the word "authentic" in this connection, and what is the legal value, the official position, the canonical standing, the extrinsic and intrinsic authority of the Vulgate in the Church in virtue of the Decree "*Insuper*" of Trent, which declares it authentic.

The Vulgate

"We here enter a region of the deepest interest. With the exception of the Septuagint, no version of the Old Testament can vie in importance with the Vulgate. Both the two great classical languages have been highly honored in connection with the sacred Scriptures. The Greek, as we have already seen, was the first language into which the Old Testament was translated, and furnished in the Septuagint version the Bible of the early Christians, of the inspired Apostles, yea, of the Divine Redeemer Himself. A peculiar and pre-eminent distinction has thus been conferred upon the Greek language in connection with the history of Christianity. But the Latin has hardly fallen short in glory. It was, for ages, the language of the whole Christian Church. It remains, far beyond any other tongue, the depository of sacred literature. Hymns and prayers and expositions and dissertations innumerable are enshrined in it. To this day it forms the medium through which the far-spreading Church of Rome presents her worship. It is therefore with peculiar interest that we approach the subject of the Latin versions, and inquire into the history of what is known as the Vulgate at the present day." (A. Roberts, *Old Testament Revision,* pp. 229–230.)

The Latin Vulgate will always be a theme of the deepest interest to Christians in general, and especially to Catholics, and still more especially to Catholics of the Latin rite, because of its venerable antiquity, for its intrinsic merits as a translation, and on account of the far reaching influence which, for the last fifteen hundred (1500) years, it has exercised on the Church and on the civilization of Western Europe.

Except the Greek version of the Old Testament, no other translation can equal in importance the Latin Vulgate and, except perhaps the Syriac Peshitto, which is the official version of the Syrian, Chaldean, and Maronite rites of the Roman Catholic Church, no other ancient version that has come down to us from the early ages of the Church, not even the Greek, can compare with the Latin Vulgate for possessing so many requisites of a good translation.

Towards the close of the fourth century, on account of what Jerome calls the "stupidity of translators, the meddlesomeness of revisers, and the sleepiness of copyists," there were so many various readings in the text of the "Old Latin" that the confusion was no longer bearable.

To remedy the evil, Pope Damasus, about 382 A. D., requested St. Jerome to revise and correct the Latin New Testament.

Jerome, who was born at Strido in Dalmatia, about A. D. 345, and died at Bethlehem, A. D. 420, was the only man for 1500 years who was able to do the work which ever since has been associated with his name,—the *revision* of the Latin New Testament according to

the original Greek and the *translation* of the Old Testament from the original Hebrew directly into Latin.

Jerome began with the Gospels, because, having been copied so often, they had suffered most at the hands of copyists. He then corrected the remaining books of the New Testament, but more hurriedly. All this was done at Rome, about A. D. 383–4.

His object was only a revision, not a new version, not a new translation. But, he says, " even a revision is a work both pious and perilous." Not to arouse useless opposition, he tells us that he " chose the oldest Greek manuscripts and corrected only such passages as gave a wrong meaning."

After retiring to Bethlehem (about A. D. 386), where he spent the remainder of his days, and where he died A. D. 420, Jerome devoted himself with intense ardor to the study of Hebrew and to the great work of his life,— the translation of all the protocanonical books of the Old Testament directly from Hebrew into Latin. This work, which was interrupted by frequent and long attacks of sickness, was spread out over a period of about fifteen years, or from the 45th to the 60th year of his life, and was completed by the year 405.

Jerome was excellently well equipped for his work; he lived more than thirty years in the land where the Bible was written; he was a close student of Hebrew, which he studied under Palestinian rabbis; he frequently consulted the teachers at the famous Jewish College at Tiberias; he had Hebrew manuscripts older, perhaps, by centuries than the time of Christ, etc.

Yet he labored under some disadvantages. In his day the Hebrew manuscripts were still written without vowel-points and punctuation marks; he was compelled to follow more or less closely the current versions of his day, so as not to arouse useless opposition to his work, and sometimes he worked too hastily.

By his familiarity with Bible lands, where he spent so much of his life, by his profound knowledge of Christian doctrine, by his thorough mastery of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin,— the three great languages of his day and the three languages most needed for his work,— and by his general classical education, Jerome surpassed all his predecessors and all his successors, and was the one man best equipped to accomplish such a delicate and gigantic undertaking, especially for those times and under those circumstances,— the translation of the entire Hebrew Bible into Latin.

Jerome's elegant language bears testimony to the enthusiasm with which he had studied the choicest models of classical Latinity; for his style is acknowledged by all to be pure, terse, incisive, almost poetic in its beauty, and manipulated with singular skill in rendering the intricacies of Hebrew grammar and lexicon into idiomatic Latin. We may easily allow Jerome the credit which he himself claims, of being "*Hebraeus, Graecus, Latinus, trilinguis,*" and which Augustine freely grants him, calling him "*Homo doctissimus et omnium trium linguarum peritus.*" (*De Civitate Dei,* I. 18, c. 43). If he does not equal Chrysostom in eloquence, nor Augustine in profound intellectual acumen, yet in positive knowledge, in learning and erudition, in

linguistic acquirements and in literary taste, Jerome has surpassed all other scholars, both in the East and in the West, from the days of Christ down to modern times, and was thus enabled to make his elegant translation of the Old Testament into Latin an "*opus classicum,*" unequalled for the last 1500 years.

Notwithstanding some defects, the Latin Vulgate ranks first among ancient versions, as the most remarkably correct, elegant, and faithful version of all antiquity, and for having exerted upon Western Christianity an influence analogous to that of the Greek Septuagint on Eastern Christianity.

In the parts translated by Jerome, the Latin Vulgate is remarkable for its fidelity to the original, for its freedom in the choice of Latin idioms, for its general accuracy both in matter and in form, and for the dignity, transparency, and gracefulness of its style.

A non-Catholic writer says: "Even when the Vulgate stands alone in a rendering, it agrees, no doubt, with older manuscripts than any now in existence." "Subsequent studies have vindicated the Vulgate in many passages, where it stands quite alone,— but, of course, this is not always the case."

Made directly from our present recension of the Hebrew Bible, "the Vulgate is remarkable alike for its union of fidelity to the original, and of freedom in the use of idiomatic Latin, as well as for the dignity, clearness, and elegance of its style."

Not the fanatics, but the most learned and soberminded among Protestant scholars agree in recognizing the many excellencies of the old Latin Vulgate

and in proclaiming its superiority. Hugo Grotius declares that he "always had a great esteem for the Vulgate, not only because it contains no unsound doctrine, but because it contains much erudition." (*Praef., Annot. in V. Test.,* Amst., 1679, Tom. I.) Michaelis affirms that "this version is the most perfect of all"; and he calls on all his readers, Protestant and Catholic alike, to bear witness to the authority he has always granted it. (*Supplem. ad Lex. Hebraic.,* P. III, p. 992; and *Biblioth. Orient.,* Vol. XXI, No. 311.) In the judgment of Girard, the best and most ancient manuscripts decide in favor of the Vulgate; it is generally well done, faithful, and often renders the sense of Scripture better than the greater number of the modern versions. (*Institutes of Biblical Criticism,* IV n. 269, 270.) Albert Schultens says that he "does not hesitate in general to award the palm to the Vulgate over the other versions, even the modern ones, to which it is often superior." (*Praef. in Job.*) The very learned Dr. George Campbell writes on this subject: "It must be taken into consideration that even the last part of this translation [the Vulgate] has been finished for about fourteen centuries. . . . There are in this circumstance two things which should recommend the work in question to the serious examination of the critic. The first is, that this version, having been made from manuscripts more ancient than the greater part, or even than the whole, of those which remain to us, it occupies, to a certain extent, the place of these manuscripts, and furnishes us with probable means for discovering what were the readings which

Jerome found in the copies which he had collected with so much care. The second is, that, having been completed long before the rise of those controversies which are the foundation of most of the sects at present existing, it is, we may rest assured, exempt from all party influence." (*Dissert.*, X, p. 394.)

We might quote the testimony also of Horne, Mill, L. Cappelus, and many others who freely acknowledge the merits of the Vulgate.

"If this decree ['*Insuper*'] meant no more than to give ecclesiastical sanction to the Vulgate in preference to any other Latin version, there would be little in it to object to. It is observable that no anathema is attached to disobedience, as in the decree concerning the canon. The Vulgate is not in explicit terms put on a par with the originals or exalted above them. There is no direct prohibition of versions in the languages of the people, or denunciation of Protestant versions, as some members of the Council desired. The Vulgate is simply pronounced authentic as opposed to other Latin editions then in circulation. And this is limited to public ecclesiastical use; no restraint is put upon private use of the Bible in any form whatever. It has accordingly been maintained that this was not a doctrinal, but a disciplinary, decree." (Wm. H. Green, *General Introduction to the Old Testament,* The Text, p. 124.)

For attempting to translate, not from the Greek Septuagint, but from the original Hebrew, Jerome exposed himself to all sorts of abuse. To many it seemed a piece of intolerable impertinence that he should pretend

to understand the Hebrew Bible better than the seventy elders of Alexandria, and even better than the inspired Apostles of the Lord, who had followed the Greek instead of the Hebrew Bible.

The opposition was so bitter and so persistent that it was some centuries before the New Vulgate had entirely supplanted the Old Latin. However, even in his own day, Jerome had the satisfaction of knowing that his version was steadily, though slowly, winning its way to public favor. By the XIIth century, the "Old Latin" was no longer copied, and Jerome's version ruled supreme.

During the Middle Ages the Vulgate was frequently revised, and many efforts were made to prevent further changes in its text. At last, in 1455, it appeared in printed form, the first book ever issued from the press.

Our Latin Vulgate is a strangely composite work. It contains parts from every period of the Old Latin versions.

1. It contains Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, I and II Maccabees from Theodotion through the Old Latin, unrevised by Jerome;

2. It contains the Old Latin or Gallican Psalter, revised by Jerome according to the Greek Septuagint;

3. It contains Judith and Tobias freely translated by Jerome from the Aramaic text;

4. It contains all the protocanonical Books of the Old Testament, except the Psalter, translated by Jerome directly from the original Hebrew into Latin;

5. It contains the entire New Testament revised by Jerome according to the original Greek.

Jerome's own excellent translation of the Psalter, made directly from Hebrew into Latin, sounded so strange to the people that it was never adopted into the Bible; but, it is said, it will be substituted in the forthcoming new typical edition of the Latin Vulgate and of the Roman Breviary instead of the present Gallican Psalter.

It is well to understand how it is that the great bulk of the various readings in the Latin Vulgate were, in reality, of little or no consequence. The "Old Latin Version," made by the Africans, about A. D. 150, and the "New Latin Version," made by Jerome between 385 and 405 A. D., existed side by side for several centuries. The inevitable result followed: each influenced the other. While copying out either version, the copyist, through sleepiness, weariness, lack of attention, or through mere force of habit, would, from one version into the other, introduce passages which were unconsciously running through his mind at the time. Thus the two versions got mixed up. Each insensibly ran into the other and got blended. What you read was all Bible, all Holy Writ; but how confusing!

Even after the "Old Latin Version" had ceased to be copied out any longer, Jerome's text still continued to suffer, especially from interpolations taken from other parts of Jerome's own text. Let us explain. A copyist familiar, for instance, with the Gospels, was always exposed to the danger of introducing into any one of the four Gospels passages familiar to him and ringing in his ears from any one of three Gospels: or

he would repeat passages from other parts of the same Gospel, which he was then copying. Thus Jerome's own four Gospels got mixed up. They insensibly ran into one another and got blended. Whatever you read there was all Sacred Scripture; it was all holy Gospel; but how confusing! Of course, this is not meant to deny that there were in the Vulgate at that time also non-Biblical interpolations.

In consequence of the general revival of learning and letters during the Renaissance, the Latin Vulgate received, perhaps, more than its share of attention. With the pen alone copies of it were multiplied by the thousand. Then came the invention of the printing press (Mayence, 1450), and in 1455 the Vulgate appeared in printed form, the first book ever issued from the press. After this, copies of it were multiplied by the hundreds of thousands, and during the first fifty years after the invention of printing, one hundred and fifty editions of the Vulgate were put into circulation.

The facility with which the printing press multiplied the copies of the Vulgate only brought into clearer light the many variant readings and other interpolations that disfigured its text. At the same time the printing press increased also the facility with which the various readings could be detected and corrected.

To this condition of things add the great number of rival and conflicting Latin versions that had appeared in the course of a few decades, and you will have some idea of the confusion and the state of anarchy than confronted the Council of Trent.

The Vulgate at Trent

The Fourth Session of the Council of Trent comprises only two decrees, both of which refer to Sacred Scripture.

The first decree, often quoted as "*Sacrosancta,*" from the first word with which it begins, is officially entitled, "Decree on the Canonical Scriptures."

The second, often quoted as "*Insuper,*" from its first word, is entitled, "Decree on the Editing and the Use of the Sacred Books."

It is evident from their titles and their contents that these decrees concern Sacred Scripture, but each regards it from a different point of view.

The *first decree* declares the Catholic rule of faith, that is, it asserts the value of divine tradition, defines the inspiration of Sacred Scripture, and then, that there be no mistake about which books it contains, gives an official list of them, enumerating them one by one from Genesis to the Apocalypse, and formally canonizing them for the first time.

As these are all truths or facts divinely revealed by God to the Church and, in turn, proposed by the Church to all the faithful, to be believed as a part of the original deposit of faith, it clearly follows that this first decree is a *formal dogmatic definition,* obliging all the faithful, under pain of heresy, to give to it the internal assent of the intellect. In other words, it is a dogmatic decree, a "*res credenda.*"

The *second decree* regards the "Editing and the Use of Sacred Scripture." Now to publish Scripture, to edit it, to print it, to bind it, to put it on the market

for sale, to use it, and to read it are mere human acts, which may concern the past, the present, or the future. They are not facts revealed by God ages ago to the Church, nor proposed by her to the belief of the faithful. It is clear, therefore, that this legislation is nothing, and can be nothing, but a *disciplinary decree,* obliging the faithful under pain of sin for disobedience, but not obliging them under pain of heresy for disbelieving. In other words, it is a "*res agenda.*"

After the terms of the first Decree, "*Sacrosancta,*" had been provisionally formulated, a special commission, consisting of cardinals, bishops, and theologians, was appointed to investigate and to report on certain abuses that prevailed in some parts of the Church in regard to the editing and the use of Sacred Scripture, and to propose suitable remedies for the same.

a) The *first abuse* consisted in the simultaneous existence and use of a *vast number of Latin translations* of Sacred Scripture, often containing discordant and conflicting renderings, even in doctrinal passages. Some were made by Catholics, some by heretics; some were without date of time or place of publication; many without name of publisher or translator, and all differed in origin, quality, tendency, style, and fidelity to the original; all claimed to be official, all demanded to be read in the liturgy of the Church, and all together produced endless confusion and uncertainty as to the sense of Sacred Scripture.

Even when the many translations agreed in giving the true sense of the text, still the wording and the grammatical construction, and the whole appearance or

physiognomy of any special passage would often seem so strange that the reader could hardly know of what particular text there was question; and this at a time when MS. copies of Sacred Scripture were still in common use, before the verses were numbered, nay, even before the chapters were divided into verses.

To make matters still worse, each translation, no matter by whom made or published, claimed to be the only official text and that it alone, of all translations, should be read in the liturgy of the Church.

This explains the deplorable lack of uniformity, at that time, in quoting Sacred Scripture in devotional and ascetical writings, in theological works, and in the liturgical books of the Church, such as the Missal and the Breviary.

To *remedy this abuse,* the Council decreed that only one version, and that the Old Latin, called the Vulgate, should be declared authentic and be read in public as the official text. The words of the Decree making the *Vulgate authentic* and *official* are the following:

"The Holy Council, considering that it would be of no small advantage to the Church of God if it were clearly made known which of all the Latin editions of the Sacred Books in circulation is to be held as authentic, hereby declares and enacts that the same well known Old Latin Vulgate edition, which has been approved by the long use of so many centuries in the Church, is to be held as authentic in public readings, disputations, preachings, and expositions, and that no one shall dare or presume to reject it under any pretense whatsoever." (Canons and Decrees; Session

IV, On the Editing and the Use of the Sacred Scripture.)

In Latin: "*Insuper eadem sacrosancta Synodus, considerans non parum utilitatis accedere posse Ecclesiae Dei, si ex omnibus latinis editionibus, quae circumferuntur, sacorum Librorum, quaenam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat; statuit et declarat, ut haec ipsa vetus et Vulgata editio, quae longo tot saeculorum usu in ipsa Ecclesia probata est, in publicis lectionibus, disputationibus, praedicationibus et expositionibus pro authentica habeatur; et ut nemo illam rejicere quovis praetextu audeat vel praesumat.*"

In the period between the Renaissance and the Council of Trent, it was quite the fashion for many of those who had nothing else to do, to translate the Bible into Latin. For a while these translations questioned the supremacy of the Old Latin Vulgate of St. Jerome; but, on its merits, and with the approval and support of the Council of Trent, this version eventually drove all rival translations out of use and out of the market, so that now one seldom or never hears them mentioned. They were *not condemned;* they were left where they were before the Council, and *soon died a natural death.*

One can easily imagine how many rival Latin translations we would now have, and what endless discord would consequently have existed in the Church by the year 1900, were it not for the wise and sober legislation of the Council of Trent, which declared the Old Latin Vulgate to be authentic, and ordered that it alone should be used in all public readings, disputations, dis-

cussions, preachings, and in the public liturgical books of the Church.

It was often said in the Council that it is a good thing to have many versions, for each helps the others to explain the text; but that *there should be only one used in the liturgy of the Church,* for the sake of *decorum* and *uniformity of worship.* Scholars may use as many others as they wish for private study.

It is worth remembering that the motive for this legislation is expressly stated in the very words of the decree itself. It is the *utility* or the *advantage* of such legislation to the Church (*"non parum utilitatis"*).

It is evident that this decree was intended to meet and to remedy the abuses arising (1) from the *multiplicity of Latin translations;* (2) from the *great variety of readings* in the Vulgate itself, and (3) from the *many interpretations* that prevailed for some time previous to the Council of Trent. The purpose of the decree was *practical,*— to produce and to maintain *uniformity.*

A similar regulation prevails in most religious denominations. For instance, in the Anglican Church and most English-speaking Protestant churches, the King James or Authorized Version is almost universally read in public worship. On its title page we see that it is "appointed to be read in the churches." The more modern, or Revised Version, is by many preferred to the Authorized for accuracy and fidelity to the original; yet, in church services, Protestants follow the older or authorized Version, simply or largely for the sake of *uniformity.*

Not only did confusion result from this diversity of translation, but it was feared that this Babelic disorder might do harm to the Church by the facility which it would give to change the doctrines of faith and morals that are contained in Sacred Scripture. The Council, therefore, rightly concluded that the Catholic Church would derive great advantage from declaring only one "of all the Latin versions then in circulation," to be authentic.

b) A *second abuse* consisted in the *number of various readings* that disfigured even the Latin Vulgate, as well as the original Greek and Hebrew texts.

To *remedy this abuse,* the Council decreed that "Sacred Scripture, and especially this well known Old Vulgate edition, shall be published as correctly as possible." The Holy Synod also requested the Holy See to take charge of the work of revising and correcting this edition.

Now this means, (1) That other texts, the *Hebrew* and the *Greek,* were to be brought out as well as the Latin. This is clear from the use of the words: "*Potissimum vero haec ipsa Vetus et Vulgata editio.*" This can be made still clearer from the words of some of the bishops in the Council.

It means also, (2) That the text of the Vulgate was not then considered absolutely correct. These two points are remarkable statements made by the Council itself against some modern theologians.

In the correspondence which ensued between Rome and Trent, the Council, through its Legates, said:

a. That the Vulgate, as a whole, is declared authen-

tic, "because it teaches no heresy"; individual copies of the Vulgate may be faulty, yet the Vulgate itself, *as a whole,* is all right.

β. That the Council left it to the wisdom of the Holy See to decide when, where, how, and by whom the text should be corrected and published.

As a preliminary step to the correction of the Vulgate, and as a book of reference, it was decided to get out a critical edition of the Greek Septuagint.

This Sixtine Edition of the Greek has never been surpassed. Its publication and strong approval by the Pope for liturgical purposes in the public services of the Oriental Church, are almost, if not quite, equivalent to a declaration of authenticity.

The correction of the Vulgate continued with frequent interruptions for forty years and was completed under Pope Clement VIII, in 1592.

The preface to this Clementine Edition was written by Bellarmine, and is distinguished by moderation. In this preface we read: "This text has been compared with the greatest care and, though not absolutely perfect, yet is more perfect than that of any previous edition. Some readings, though wrong, we have purposely left unchanged, to avoid popular offense." These mistakes were so trivial in nature that it was not thought worth while to change them.

The candor of these words contrasts strangely with the extravagant claims of some later champions of the edition. Yet the work of revision was done remarkably well, especially if we consider the scanty materials then at hand for doing such work. Since then many

very old and accurate Vulgate manuscripts have been discovered and will be utilized in the new edition.

After Constantinople had fallen under the dominion of the Turks, A. D. 1446, and many learned Greeks, with their stores of literature, had escaped to Western Europe, the intellectual awakening was rapid and extraordinary. One of the first objects of special study and attention was the Latin Vulgate. On account of the invention of printing, copies of it were multiplied by the hundreds of thousands. During the first fifty years one hundred and fifty (150) editions of the Vulgate were circulated. It was the first book ever printed.

The facility with which the printing press multiplied copies of the Vulgate only brought into clearer light the various readings that had insensibly crept into its text. The printing press also increased the facility with which the various readings could be compared with one another and corrected.

The Holy See has lately taken steps to secure an adequate revision of the Vulgate. In May, 1907, Pope Pius X announced his determination to have this revision made and, almost immediately afterwards, it was officially declared that the work was to be entrusted to the Benedictine Order which, owing to its long centuries of work on the text, was eminently fitted to carry out the task. Cardinal Gasquet, Abbot-President of the English Benedictines, was named President of the Commission appointed for the revision, and it is hoped that, before many decades have elapsed, we shall have an edition of the Vulgate worthy of the

great part which the Latin Bible has played in the history of the Church and of civilization.

c) A *third abuse* was the "carelessness of publishers," who exceeded all bounds of prudence in their choice of faulty manuscripts, in publishing Bibles without the name of the editor or printer, and often without any indication of either the time when, or the place where, the edition was published, nay even sometimes with false names and false dates.

To *remedy the third abuse,* the Council decreed that all Catholic publishers should simply reproduce the typical Latin edition, to be revised and corrected and brought out later by the Holy See. This, too, was done for the sake of *uniformity.*

d) A *fourth abuse* was the "unbridled license" of certain exegetes, who interpreted even dogmatic passages of Holy Writ most capriciously.

To *remedy the fourth abuse,* the Council decreed that Catholic exegetes should be obliged to expound all those parts of Scripture that concern faith and morals "according to the sense of the Church and the unanimous consent of the Fathers." This was done also for the sake of *uniformity.* However, this fourth abuse concerns Scripture in general, in any language whatsoever, and not the Latin Vulgate in particular.

In the decree "*Insuper*" there are many very different legislative enactments, such as declarations, prohibitions, commands, precepts, orders, regulations and what not; whether positive or negative. For instance, by this decree —

1. The Vulgate is declared authentic;

2. It is prescribed that the Vulgate be read "in public readings, disputations, preachings and expositions";

3. It is forbidden to reject the Latin Vulgate as a version "under any pretense whatsoever";

4. It is prescribed that all Catholic exegetes should explain dogmatic passages of Scripture according to the sense of the Church and the unanimous consent of the Fathers;

5. It is prescribed that thenceforth all Catholic publishers of the Vulgate shall simply reproduce the typical Latin edition to be brought out later by the Holy See;

6. It is forbidden to publish the Vulgate with false indications, or with no indications at all of the time when, or the place where, or the editor by whom, it was published;

7. It is forbidden to quote the words of Holy Scripture for profane purposes, for flattery, charms, incantations, and detractions.

Most of these enactments differ much from one another and are found in different parts of the decree. Not so with the first and second; because both are found in one and the same sentence, and are so mixed up that it has not been easy for most writers on the subject to discriminate nicely between them, and to show precisely wherein they differ and wherein they agree. Some writers find no difference between them, and identify them in every sense. All the above enact-

ments regard the Latin Vulgate, except the fourth and the seventh, which regard Sacred Scripture in general and in *any* language.

The decree on the "editing and the use of Scripture" raised a great commotion at the time among some Catholics and many non-Catholics. Though the error has been frequently and thoroughly refuted, yet almost down to our own day we find Protestants who maintain that the Council of Trent positively rejected the original Hebrew and Greek text for a mere translation abounding in errors of every sort. They tell us that the decree of Trent forbids us to have recourse to the originals even in case of doubtful readings, that we are not allowed to use the original Hebrew or Greek even in private, or for critical study, or for scientific research, that all our translations into any vernacular, even for Catholics of the Oriental rites, must be made from the Latin Vulgate, and that we must ever and always use the Latin Vulgate. We shall soon see how utterly false are these accusations.

From the wording of the decree "*Insuper,*" from the discussions that preceded its promulgation, and for other reasons, the following four propositions are manifestly true: —

1. The decree "*Insuper,*" as promulgated by the Council of Trent, and especially as regards the Latin Vulgate, is disciplinary and not dogmatic.

2. The Council of Trent, by declaring the Vulgate authentic, did not thereby prefer it to the original texts, nor to the ancient oriental versions; neither did the Council forbid the use of the original texts and ancient

versions, especially for private study and for critical purposes.

3. In declaring the Latin Vulgate authentic, the Council of Trent does not thereby exclude from it all minor errors as of translation or transcription, but supposes it to be exempt from any substantial errors, at least in matters pertaining to faith and morals.

4. The word "authentic" in the decree "*Insuper*" is to be taken, not in its modern critical, but in its ancient canonical or theological sense.

First Proposition

The decree "*Insuper,*" as promulgated by the Council of Trent, and especially as regards the Latin Vulgate, is disciplinary in form, and not dogmatic.

This proposition is evident from: (1) The title of the decree; (2) The motive for the decree; (3) The whole tenor of the decree; (4) The sanction for the decree.

1. The *official* title of the decree "*Insuper*" is: "On the Editing and on the Use of Sacred Scripture." But

a) To *edit,* that is, to print, bind, put on the market, and sell the Bible; and

b) *To use,* that is, to read, study, learn, comment, meditate Sacred Scripture, are all mere human acts that fall under the senses, and do not need to be revealed by God in order to be known. They are not *proposed* to the *intellect* to be *believed,* but are *imposed* on the *will* to be *obeyed.*

2. The *motive* for the decree is its advantage or

"utility to the Church" ("*non parum utilitatis Ecclesiae*"). It is a practical measure required by the circumstances of the times and, though not probably, yet possibly, might again change with the times. Until about the year 150 A. D., the Greek was the only authentic and official text in the Universal Church. The Latin Vulgate was not yet in existence.

3. The *whole tenor* of the decree shows that it is disciplinary. It prescribes what is to be *done,* not what is to be *believed.* It also declares that the Vulgate is authentic in public readings. Now, a dogmatic decree that would hold only in public readings, etc., and not also in private, would be a novelty in Catholic theology. How would it sound if the first decree ("*Sacrosancta*") read that the books of Scripture are divine and canonical in public readings, leaving us to conclude that in private readings they are not divine and canonical?

4. The *sanction* is different in the two decrees, "*Sacrosancta*" and "*Insuper.*" To the first there is attached an *anathema* for *denying;* to the second there is no anathema attached, but only a *punishment,* or "*poena canonica,*" to be inflicted for *disobeying.*

When the Council of the Vatican, 300 years after the Council of Trent, renewed the decree "*Insuper,*" it did so without attaching to it an anathema. And the reason is that this decree is not a dogma or an article of faith. It *presupposes* some articles of faith, but does not *define* them. For though in some of its parts this decree is reducible to Catholic principles, still the Council of Trent does not propose it in the form of a *doc-*

trinal definition, but merely as a *practical precept* for the guidance of the people and clergy.

If the decree "*Insuper*" were dogmatic in any of its parts it would be of obligation in all parts of the Catholic Church. But this is not the case; for that part of the decree which enjoins the reading of the Vulgate in public services (as in the Missal, the Breviary, the Pontifical), is of obligation only in the Latin portion of the Catholic Church. In the Oriental parts of the Church public readings are in Greek or Syriac or Coptic or Armenian or Slavonian (according to the circumstances), but not in Latin.

It is understood that the disciplinary decrees of recent ecumenical councils, which consist mostly of Latin bishops and are held in the Occident, do not apply to the Oriental rites, unless it is either expressly or implicitly so stated. The Holy See, through some of the Roman congregations, especially through the Congregation of the Propaganda, regulates the discipline of the Oriental rites.

Briefly, then, the first decree demands the *assent* of the *intellect;* the second decree demands the *consent* of the *will.* The first decree belongs to *dogmatic* theology; the second decree belongs to *Canon Law* and moral theology.

Both decrees belong to Sacred Scripture.

Second Proposition

The Council of Trent, by declaring the Vulgate authentic, did not thereby prefer it to the original texts, nor to the ancient Oriental versions, neither did the Council forbid the use of the original texts and

ancient versions, especially for private study and for critical purposes.

This proposition is evident from: —

(1) The words of the Decree itself; (2) The constant practice of scripturists at all times; (3) The express testimony of theologians who took part in the Council; (4) The very nature of the case; (5) The history of the Council.

1. This second proposition is evident from the very words of the decree itself. For in the decree the original Hebrew and Greek texts and the Oriental versions are never once mentioned; nor is the Latin Vulgate in any way either compared or contrasted with them. The Vulgate is compared, and expressly compared, with "all the other Latin versions then in circulation," and is preferred to them, and to them only, for public use, and for the sake of uniformity. The decree reads: "*Si ex omnibus Latinis versionibus, quae circumferuntur, quaenam pro authentica habenda sit, innotescat.*" "The Holy Council, considering that it would be of no small advantage to the Church of God, if it were clearly made known which, of all the Latin editions of the Sacred Books in circulation, is to be held as authentic," etc.

2. The proposition is evident from the constant practice of Catholic scripturists at all times, that is, before, during, and after the Council of Trent. At that very time Santes Pagninus translated the Old Testament from Hebrew into Latin, and Fourrerius translated Isaias from Hebrew into Latin and dedicated it to the Council of Trent, while the Council was still in

session and after it had made the decree in question, and no one ever condemned them or reprimanded them for so doing.

3. The proposition is evident from the express testimony of those theologians who were present at the Council and took part in its deliberations, or who wrote about that time and had every opportunity to know the mind of the Council as to the meaning of this decree. Let the testimony of Salmeron, who was the Pope's special theologian at the Council, suffice for all the others. He writes: "Nothing was done at Trent in regard to the Hebrew and Greek texts; only, among so many Latin translations which our age has produced, the question was, which of *them* should be preferred. The Council left it free to all who study Scripture profoundly, to consult, as much as is necessary, the Hebrew and Greek sources, in order that they may correct the Latin text, corrupted through the fault of transcribers or the destructiveness of time." (*Prol. 3 in S.*)

4. The proposition is evident from the very nature of the case, as explained by Rugerius, Papal Secretary at the Council, who said that "the Hebrew and Greek texts are the fountain sources from which are derived the versions and according to which the corrections are to be made and the interpolations are to be eliminated."

This shows that the original texts, in their original condition, can never be of less authority than the versions. Even in the condition in which the original texts are to-day, they can not be rejected, unless in some minor details; for the use which the Church

Universal has ever made of them was quite sufficient to preserve them from substantial corruption. A correct copy of the Hebrew Old Testament, or of the Greek New Testament, does not need to be declared intrinsically authentic. It is that from God, its author. The declaration of the Church would not *produce,* it would only *manifest,* its intrinsic authenticity. Hence, the decree declaring the Vulgate authentic, has in no way interfered with the authenticity of the Hebrew and Greek texts. Their authority remains precisely where and what it was before Trent.

5. The proposition is evident from the history of the Vulgate in the Council of Trent.

(a) On April 1st, the Bishop of Fano made the following important declaration in the name of the commission of which he was president, and which had been deputed to examine this question and to report on it to the Council: "According to our opinion it is not an abuse to have many editions or translations of the Bible; for this was always the case in the Church; but it is an abuse to have many *discordant* versions, and all of them claiming to be authentic in public readings, disputations, and sermons. We, therefore, accept this common Vulgate edition as authentic, but *without rejecting the other versions,* especially the Septuagint, which could not be rejected without scandal; nor do we reject indiscriminately all versions made by heretics; for the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion were never rejected in the ancient Church." (Theiner, *Acta Genuina Conc. Trident.,* p. 79.)

(b) On another similar occasion the Bishop of Fano, in the name of his commission, made the remarkable declaration that "other versions, by the mere fact that the Vulgate is declared authentic, are neither necessarily nor *de facto* rejected, because all of them may be good. The other versions are not rejected, because they also are good, but this [the Vulgate] is better." (Theiner, *Acta Genuina C. T.*, p. 70.)

(c) Fano again says: "We do not say that different and various translations of Sacred Scripture are an abuse; since this was always tolerated in ancient times and can be tolerated today. But we say it is an abuse that many translations should be quoted as authentic in disputations, preachings, etc., for we wish only one authentic version, the Latin Vulgate." (Le Plat, p. 398.)

(d) Campeggio, Bishop of Feltro, said: "I do not consider it an abuse to have so many translations of Scripture, for some of them render Scripture word for word,— literally; some of them render Scripture sense for sense,— freely; and some others render Scripture variously and help to get at the meaning of the text." (Theiner, *Acta Genuina*, p. 61.)

It is in this large, broad sense that the Council finally acted. It merely corrected the Vulgate and declared that the other versions could be useful in order to penetrate and discover the real sense of Scripture. It did *not condemn* the other translations, whether ancient or modern, *but left them all where it found them.*

(e) In the general Congregation held on the 17th of

March, the Archbishop of Aix, in the name of the special commission of bishops, said: "The remedy is to have only one edition, namely the Old Vulgate, which all are to use as authentic in public lectures, expositions, and preaching; and no one must be allowed to reject or contradict this [authentic text]; but this is not meant to detract from the authority due to the pure and true translation of the seventy or Septuagint, which the Apostles themselves sometimes used, *nor is it meant as a repudiation of the other versions* in so far as they further or promote the understanding or interpretation of the authentic Vulgate." (Theiner, *Acta Genuina,* p. 64.)

We feel that no one can reject the following self-evident axiom:

A law is not to be extended further than its words demand or permit, nor to things that are not mentioned, either explicitly or implicitly, in the wording of the law.

But, in this Decree of Trent, there is no mention made, explicitly or implicitly, either of the original texts or of the Oriental versions, but only of "the *Latin* versions then in circulation."

Therefore, the Vulgate is not preferred to the original texts and ancient versions; still less does it exclude them; still less does it forbid us to use them.

Therefore, they now have the same authority, both extrinsic and intrinsic, that they had before the Council of Trent.

Third Proposition

In declaring the Latin Vulgate authentic, the Council of Trent does not exclude from it all minor errors, as of translation or transcription, but supposes it to be exempt from any substantial errors, at least in matters pertaining to faith and morals.

This proposition is evident from: (1) The very nature of the case; (2) The testimony of theologians living during the Council; (3) The preface to the Clementine Edition; and (4) The statements made by the papal legates at Trent.

1. This proposition is evident from the very nature of the case. For an authentic document is one that demands and *secures credence,* one that *merits faith.* But for a document to merit faith depends on the *substance,* and not on the details, the apices or the iotas.

To this we should add the intrinsic difficulty of rendering accurately the thought of an author who uses a language belonging to another family of languages. As is well known, Latin belongs to the Indo-European family of languages; Hebrew belongs to the Semitic family. These two families have been separated in time and territory, and otherwise, for so many thousands of years, especially when in the early stages of development, that it is almost impossible to find any resemblance between them either in form or matter, either in syntax or lexicon. Their idioms and construction are so opposite in spirit that it is often impossible to find in the one language ways and means of conveying accurately a thought expressed in the other language. This holds both in syntax and in

lexicon. The consequence is that very often the translator meets a Hebrew word for which there is no exact Latin equivalent; for the Hebrew word expresses either a little more or a little less than the Latin or conveys the idea in such a way that it is very difficult to reproduce.

French and English are both Indo-European languages, being very closely related both in origin, history, and geography, and having thousands of words of the same form and of the same meaning. Yet it is often impossible to translate certain nuances of style from the one into the other language. The difficulty is incomparably greater when there is question of translating from Hebrew into Latin or into any modern language.

2. The proposition is evident from the testimony of theologians who took part in the deliberations of the Council, or who wrote shortly afterwards.

The Bishop of Fano, President of one of the Commissions, in his report to the Council, acknowledged that in the Vulgate there are mistakes, and this should be acknowledged in the beginning, in order not to scandalize the people later on, when they would be corrected, just as if the Council (through ignorance), had received a defective version, which afterwards had to be corrected. The task of correction should be left to the Holy See.

Andreas Vega, one of the most distinguished theologians at the Council of Trent, makes the following very explicit declaration in this regard: "*Synodus approbavit dumtaxat Vulgatam editionem repurgatam*

a mendis, quae vitio scriptorum vel calcographorum in ea obrepserunt. . . . Synodus Vulgatam tanquam e cœlo delapsam adorari noluit. Interpretem illius sciebat non esse prophetam. . . . Eatenus voluit eam authenticam habere, ut certum omnibus esset nullo eam defoedatam errore, ex quo perniciosum dogma aliquod in fide et moribus colligi posset." (*De Justif.*, XV, 9.) *Anglice:* "The Council approved of the Vulgate only as corrected of the mistakes which had crept into it through the carelessness, &c., of copyists." . . . "The Council did not wish the Vulgate to be adored as though it had fallen down from heaven. They knew that its translator was not a prophet. . . . They wished to declare it so far authentic that all might know that it contained no error from which any pernicious doctrine in faith and morals could be gathered."

Of the Cardinal of Santa Croce, who presided as Pontifical Legate at the Fourth Session of Trent, Vega says: "The Cardinal of Holy Cross told me the very day the decree was promulgated, that this was the meaning of the decree, and that the Fathers meant nothing else." (*L. cit.*)

Bellarmine acknowledges many slight errors in the Vulgate, but he takes care to add that, "in things pertaining to faith and morals, there are no errors of translation in the Vulgate": *"Ecclesia, . . . certos nos reddere voluit, in iis praesertim quae ad fidem et mores pertinent, nulla esse in hac versione interpretum errata."*

That some mistakes remain, even in the Clementine edition, Bellarmine, one of the pontifical cor-

rectors, clearly asserts in his letter to Lucas of Bruges, where we read: "I wish you should know that the Vulgate Bible has not been most accurately castigated; for we omitted many corrections on purpose, for good reasons, &c., &c." "*Scias velim Biblia Vulgata non esse a nobis accuratissime castigata; multa enim de industria, iustis de causis, pertransivimus, &c., &c.*" (See also *De Verbo Dei,* Ch. II.)

The same opinion is held by Salmeron (Prol., III), Pallavicini (*loc. cit.*), De Azevado (*Lib. pro Vulg. Edit.*), Calmet (*Dissertatio in Vulg.*), Mariana (*Pro Edit. Vulg.,* Ch. 21–23), R. Simon (*Hist. Crit.,* Ch. 14), and many other more recent critics and theologians.

3. The proposition is evident from the preface prefixed to the Clementine edition, which reads as follows: "Receive, therefore, Christian reader, the old Vulgate Edition purified from errors with as much diligence as possible; through human weakness it is difficult to affirm that it is absolutely perfect in all things, but there is no doubt that it is far more perfect than any other that has been published up to the present date. Still in this Old Vulgate Edition, as some things were purposely corrected, so also other things, which, it would seem, should have been corrected, were left purposely without correction. It seems that this was done partly to avoid offense to the people, as St. Jerome frequently admonishes us, and partly because, as we may believe, our predecessors, in translating from Hebrew and Greek into Latin, had an abundance of better and more correct manuscripts than

those which, after their time, have been handed down to us."

4. The proposition is evident from the statements made by the papal legates presiding at Trent. The learned Charles Vercellone gives us a part of the correspondence that passed between the legates and the Congregation of Cardinals and theologians at Rome. (*Autenticità,* p. 12). In answer to questions, the legates write: "The translation which the Roman Church has used is the safest, being the one that has never been accused of heresy. The Vulgate is known to be incorrect, but not in passages that would change the essentials of faith." (*"L'edizione quale ha usata la Chiesa Romana è la piu sicura, come quella che non fu mai imputata d'eresia."*)

On further enquiries made by Rome, the Cardinal legates reply that "The Council approved the Vulgate *because it had never been suspected of heresy,* which is the principal consideration in the Sacred Books." (*"La Volgata non fu mai sospetta d'eresia; la quale parte è la potissima nei libri sacri."*)

As a further acknowledgment that there are slight errors in the Vulgate, the Council, in the decree *"Insuper,"* prescribes that the Vulgate "be published as correctly as possible" (*"quam emendatissime imprimatur"*). Thus they recognized errors in the Vulgate, *but no heresy.* As a monument of occidental Christian literature, and as a document of tradition, the Vulgate is dogmatically irreproachable, even where it is imperfect as a translation.

The Cardinal legates, speaking of defective passages

in the Vulgate, continue: "The decree does not forbid anyone to elucidate them, whether by interpretation, or by annotation, or by new translations; and it would seem that anyone might be satisfied with this, without wishing explicitly to refute the Vulgate, and thereby cause scandal to the faithful whose fathers have read this Bible and ours." (*Autenticità*, p. 17.)

This passage may not possess force of law, but there can be nothing more useful to show to the exegete his duty in face of the errors in the Vulgate:

1. We should not imagine that the faith is in any way compromised by these imperfections;

2. We should respectfully apply a remedy by means of "annotations," "interpretations," or "new translations";

3. And, *a fortiori,* we should *not reject the Vulgate in toto* on account of these defects of detail, which common sense and proper recognition of the claims of this excellent ancient version should also forbid us to do.

As to the preceding, there can be no doubt; but it is quite otherwise with what follows. There are scholars who maintain that "the Vulgate is not declared authentic in such a sense as necessarily to exclude *all errors of every kind,* even in dogmatic passages," but *only such as are heretical.*

For, they say, provided we hold, as Trent evidently held, that the Vulgate contains no heresy, that is to say, nothing against faith or morals, we may admit errors of various kinds even in dogmatic passages,—errors which were committed:

1. By *mistranslation,* that is, by substituting one dogma that should not be there, for another dogma that should be there; or

2. By *interpolation,* that is, by inserting into a passage either a Biblical dogma, found elsewhere in Sacred Scripture, or a traditional dogma, found nowhere else in Sacred Scripture; or

3. By the *omission* of a Biblical dogma that should be found in the passage.

Under this head we may discuss the following questions:

1. *Were there any errors in the original autographic copies of the Sacred Books, as they passed from the hands of the inspired authors?*

The traditional doctrine of the Church, reiterated by Leo XIII, gives an emphatic denial to this question. We shall discuss the topic in Vol. II of this work, in the chapter on Inspiration.

2. *Were there any errors in the Latin Vulgate, as it came from the hands of its translator or corrector, St. Jerome?*

Some deny, though Jerome admits, the existence of some such errors.

3. *Are there any errors in the Latin Vulgate, as we now possess it?*

Yes; but there is much difference of opinion in answering certain phases of this question.

The learned Charles Vercellone admits in the Vulgate three classes of errors:

a) He admits many *grammatical, lexical,* and

linguistic errors, of which some were committed by the copyists and some by the translators of the Vulgate, Jerome and the Africans. But most of these errors are *very trivial.*

b) He admits in the Vulgate errors also of a *historical* and *scientific* kind; for instance, in chronology, geography, geology, astronomy and other natural sciences. But these errors *do not concern faith and morals.*

c) He admits certain kinds of errors even in *dogmatic passages,* but *no heresy.*

These errors in dogmatic passages, he says, originated in one of three ways:

α) Some resulted from *mistranslation,* that is, by substituting one dogma, which *should not be there,* for another which *should be there;* but they are *both dogmas* taught by the Church;

β) Some resulted from *interpolation,* that is, by substituting either a Biblical or a traditional dogma for what is not a dogma;

γ) Others resulted from the *omission* of a Biblical dogma from a passage where it should be found.

These are errors in dogmatic passages, but they are not dogmatic errors.

Whether true to fact or not, has been questioned.

Franzelin opposed these opinions. He says that in dogmatic passages the Vulgate is so conformable with the original that —

(a) The dogma found in the Vulgate must have been found originally in the original, and in the corresponding part of the original;

(b) No other dogma could have been found in that part of the original, than the dogma that is now found in that passage of the Vulgate;

(c) What is affirmed in the Vulgate could never have been denied in the original or vice versa;

(d) The dogma may be enunciated in the Vulgate in a different manner, provided it remains the same dogma;

(e) There may be some defect in the translation, provided it does not change the substance of the dogma in such a way that the dogma cannot be understood with the assistance of hermeneutics.

It would seem that Franzelin claims no more than a rather broad substantial identity of doctrine between the original text and the Vulgate.

It is admitted by all concerned in this discussion that the *Vulgate teaches no heresy*. For the use made of it in the Church for so many centuries, and the declaration of the Council of Trent making it *de jure* authentic, are a sufficient guarantee for its orthodoxy.

Fourth Proposition

The word "authentic" in the decree "*Insuper*" of the Council of Trent is taken, not in its critical, but in its canonical sense.

As the word authentic is one of the most important in this decree, we shall consider: (1) The various meanings of the word in general; and (2) The meaning which the word must have, and has, in this decree.

The word authentic, when speaking of books, may

be taken in either of two senses: (1) Critical; (2) Canonical.

1. The word "*authentic*" is sometimes taken in its modern *historico-critical* sense, as equivalent to *genuine,* that is, not spurious, not of doubtful origin, not of uncertain authorship. Thus understood, it means that the book in question was written by the man whose name it bears; or, if the book bears no name, that the book was written about the time it is generally supposed to have been written; or, if nothing is known about its date or place of composition, that the book was written *in good faith* by some *honest man,* who had no intention to palm it off as the work of another, of perhaps greater reputation, in order to give it a wider circulation than it otherwise might receive. The so-called Creed of Athanasius is *absolutely* authentic, though not authentic *relatively* to Athanasius.

2. The word "*authentic*" is sometimes taken in what is variously called its *juridical, canonical, theological,* or *dogmatic* sense. Thus understood, the word is equivalent to *worthy of belief, reliable, credible, truthful, trustworthy, authoritative,* no matter when, where, why, how, for whom, or by whom the book in question was written or translated. For instance, the so-called Creed of Athanasius is absolutely authentic.

A writing or document is legally and canonically authentic when it has been *officially acknowledged,* either explicitly or tacitly, that it will be accepted as *valid evidence* in public acts, or in the various courts

and tribunals of the land, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and *when its statements can not be rejected.*

The courts are *competent* to decide whether a writing complies with the conditions required by law; whether, for instance, as in the case of a last will and testament, it bears the correct date of time and place of execution, and whether it has been legally signed, sealed, and sworn to in the presence of a sufficient number of witnesses, before a notary public, etc.

All this, however, *is without prejudice to other documents,* which may be intrinsically better, but which have not yet been recognized or authenticated by competent public authority.

The sense of the word authentic is different in modern criticism and in ancient jurisprudence. In this decree, therefore, no one should think of giving to the word its modern, critical meaning, that is, of contending that the original Hebrew text is genuine, or that the Vulgate translation, as a translation, in whole or in part, is genuine, that is, the work of St. Jerome. The Council of Trent never occupied itself with determining the human origin of the Sacred Books, whether as originals or as translations.

That the canonical meaning of the word *authentic* is frequently used even in our own times, is clear from the following, and many other well-known authors: Ubaldi, Cornely, Van Ess, Hug, Kaulen, Pope, Trench and Horne,— six Catholics and two non-Catholics; we quote them all.

Ubaldi says: "A writing or a document is called

authentic, when it is declared to be trustworthy in civil or other [ecclesiastical] courts of law, and when its statements can not be repudiated or rejected." *"Authenticum vocatur documentum seu scriptum quod in judicio fidem facit, nec repudiari potest."* (Ubaldi, Vol. III, p. 581.)

Cornely says: "The Vulgate is declared authentic in this sense, that it can and should be considered a true and genuine source of revelation in such a way that, not only no false doctrine of faith and no erroneous rule of morals can be legitimately deduced from it, but that it also expresses faithfully all those things which belong to the substance of the divine writings." (*"Vulgata in eo sensu declarata est authentica, ut verus et genuinus Revelationis fons dici queat et debeat, ita quidem ut non tantum nulla falsa doctrina fidei vel morum erronea ex illa legitime deduci potest, sed ut etiam omnia illa, quae ad verbi divini substantiam pertinent, fideliter exprimat."*)

Van Ess, as quoted by S. Davidson, says: "What is meant by the term 'authentic' has been disputed. It probably signifies no more than that the Vulgate should be used as the authorized version of the Catholic [Latin] Church in all public lessons, disputations, preachings, and expositions. The most intelligent Catholics explain it to mean a 'faithful version,' containing nothing contrary to faith and morals, but not infallibly correct in other matters."

Hug says: "Great pains have been taken to explain this decree in such a way as not to depreciate

the study of the Oriental languages. The meaning of 'authentic' is plainly this: as in civil affairs an 'authentic' instrument (document) is valid evidence, so in public religious matters the Vulgate is a document from which valid arguments may be drawn, without prejudice, however, to other documents [to other versions]. But this is not a prescription of doctrine, and from its nature could not be. It is a decree on a point of discipline, having reference to the circumstances of the times in which it was issued." (*Introduction to the New Test.,* English trans., p. 279.)

Kaulen says: "The Septuagint, the Greek New Testament, the Old Latin, the Peshitto, the Armenian and Coptic translations have been or still are authentic." This learned historian of the Vulgate does not make authenticity consist in the intrinsic perfection of a version. It may be well to give his theory in his own words: "As different from genuineness, authenticity, in its dogmatic sense, is that quality of a Biblical text by which, in official ecclesiastical discussions (treating of faith and morals) the same is fit (or adapted or suited) to serve as material for proof. The basis of this trustworthiness is not its intrinsic quality of perfection, but merely the external recognition of the Church." "*Authenticität im dogmatischen Sinne heisst, zum Unterschiede von Authentie diejenige Eigenschaft eines biblischen Textes, wodurch derselbe geeignet wird, bei officiellen kirchlichen Verhandlungen (über Glauben und Sitten) als Beweismaterial zu dienen. Als Grund dieser Befähigung gelten*

nicht innere Merkmale, sondern lediglich die äussere Anerkennung der Kirche." (*Kirchenlexikon*, 2 edit., Vol. I, col. 1730.)

Pope says: "An 'authentic' document is defined as one which stands of itself, it needs no confirmation from without. Further, it is apparent that there is a distinction between the authenticity of an original document, *e. g.*, the original of one of St. Paul's Epistles, the authenticity of a copy of the same in the same language, and finally the authenticity of a translation of the same. The Vulgate clearly can claim only the last-named species of authenticity. Now an authentic translation of a will, for example, demands that it faithfully represents what was in the original; it must not mislead in essentials, it need not, indeed, render word for word, and accidentals may be differently presented, but the substance must be the same with that given in the original. This is absolutely all that is claimed for the Vulgate. The original inspired documents were a genuine source of knowledge of Revelation, so also is the Vulgate; no false doctrine could be legitimately deduced from the original, so neither from the Vulgate; and further, it faithfully expresses whatever belongs to the substance of the originally-written word. It should be noted, too, that the Vulgate is declared authentic because proved by long usage in the Church. If then any passage now standing in the Vulgate can be shown not to have been 'in long usage in the Church,' it will cease to fall under this decree; this is important, for, if it should ever be held as proved that 1 John V, 7, was not so read in the

Church throughout a long course of centuries, it would cease to form an authentic part of the Vulgate." (*"Aids" to the Study of the Bible,* Old Testament, p. 111.)

Trench says: "A 'genuine' work is one written by the author whose name it bears; and an 'authentic' work is one which relates truthfully the matter of which it treats. For example, the apocryphal Gospel of St. Thomas is neither genuine nor authentic. It is not genuine, for St. Thomas never wrote it; it is not authentic, for its contents are mainly fables, myths and legends." (Trench, *On the Study of Words,* Lect. VI, p. 189.)

Horne says: "In reference to the literary history of Scripture, authenticity is used in two senses: 1. In a broad and loose sense to mean the canonical books were really *written by the authors whose names they bear;* that those which were anonymous were written at the time in which they profess to have been written; and that their contents were credible. 2. In *careful* and *scientific* language, authenticity implies *authority.* An authentic account is truthful and therefore credible. A genuine book, on the other hand, is one written by the person whose name it bears, whether it be truthful or not. Thus, for instance, Alison's *History of Europe* is genuine, because it was written by Alison; but it is not authentic, because it looks at facts with partisan eyes." (Horne, *Introd.,* 2, 1.)

There are three principal grades of authenticity. Among jurists, authentic was said primarily, (1) Of the *autograph* written by the hand of the author him-

self; (2) Later, the word authentic was said of any faithful *apograph* or copy of the original in the *same language as the original,* if judged conformable with the original; (3) Still later, the word authentic was said of the copies of a *faithful version* or translation, if judged substantially conformable with the original.

This gives three grades of authenticity. Let us explain this a little further and determine the precise adjectives to be used with each grade.

1. The authenticity of the autograph of the original manuscript may be called original, primitive, autographic authenticity.

2. The authenticity of an apograph, that is to say, of a copy of the original in the very language of the original, is called apographic authenticity. This authenticity is based on what is called the *integrity* of the text.

3. The authenticity of a translation of the autograph into some other language may be called derived authenticity, or authenticity of conformity. In a version or translation it is the same as *fidelity.*

In the last two cases authenticity may exist if the *substance* of the document is preserved entire. Slight defects in the act of transcribing or translating need not prevent such document from being considered and declared "authentic." Even the third or lowest grade of authenticity, that of a translation, is sufficient guarantee to secure the credibility or reliability of a document.

The authenticity of a public document can be es-

tablished only by the *express or tacit declaration of the competent authority,* or of the society by which the document is to be used. For instance, it is for the public authority to decide upon the authenticity of "wills," or copies of wills and other evidence that is to be produced in court. In support of these distinctions, it will be sufficient to quote Cornely, who says: "Jurists, from whom theologians borrowed the word, call authentic any document that is declared trustworthy in a court or by a tribunal, and that does not need to be corroborated by any other evidence. In the *strict* sense this is true only of the autographs, if they still exist."

In a *wider* sense, all apographs also are called authentic, if conformable with their autographs. Since this conformity of an apograph with its original can be known in two ways, that is, either by *a declaration of the competent public authority,* or by *a critical examination made by private persons,* we have two kinds of authenticity,— public and private. The Hebrew is authentic in the *strict* and proper sense; the Latin is authentic in the *broader* sense of the word.

As Sacred Scripture is a public document for the instruction of a public society, it can be authentic in two ways: (1) Intrinsically; (2) Extrinsically.

If the authenticity is known to the learned and is based on historical or *critical grounds,* it is critical "authenticity," yet only intrinsic and private. But if the reliability of a document is made known by a *formal declaration* of the Church, or from the *practice*

of the Church in her liturgy, or in any way that would be equivalent to a formal verbal declaration, then the authenticity is public and extrinsic.

As is evident, when talking of the Vulgate, there can be question of authenticity only in the third degree, that is, of the authenticity of a version or translation which, from the very nature of the case, can never be absolutely and in all details and particulars conformable with the original, but only in substance, in essentials, especially in regard to faith and morals.

The word authentic was commonly used in this canonical sense for one thousand years before the Council of Trent.

In this sense the word originated in the schools of *civil law* at Rome and Constantinople, and was known to the jurisconsults in the days of Justinian.

Thence it passed into the *Canon Law* of the Church, thence into the language of *Theology,* and thence again into the language of *Scripture.*

The use of the word authentic to mean *genuine* is common enough in modern biblical criticism, but it was seldom or never used in this sense at the time of the Council of Trent, and still less in the long ages before Trent.

The *presumption,* then, is that Trent used the word in its canonical sense, which was then the traditional and long established meaning. Direct and positive proof to this effect is found in the acts of the Council.

1. On April 1st, the Bishop of Fano made the following important declaration in the name of the commission of bishops, of which he was president, and

which had been appointed to examine this question, and to report on it to the Council: —"According to our opinion, it is not an abuse to have many editions or translations of the Bible; for this was always the case in the Church; but it is an abuse to have many discordant versions, and all of them claiming to be authentic in public readings, disputations, and predications; for *we wish only one authentic version,* the Latin Vulgate." (*"Nam unam solam versionem authenticam esse volumus, Vulgatam editionem."*— Le Plat, p. 398.)

But if authentic means "conformable with the original," how could it be an abuse to have many authentic versions; that is, many versions conformable with the original? Would it not be a great advantage to all concerned to have many versions conformable with the original, and the more the better?

Fano says, "We wish to have only one authentic version." But what can his wishes have to do with its conformity? Does the conformity of a version with the original depend on the will of anyone, to make it or to unmake it at will?

2. Cardinal Pallavicini says that, for a translation of the Bible to deserve to be declared authentic, it is sufficient and required that such version be exempt from all substantial errors in things pertaining to faith and morals. (*Hist. of the Council of Trent,* L. 7, C. 17, § 4 and 5.)

Such exemption may have degrees. For instance, the "Old Latin" version was once authentic, made so by the tacit consent or approval of the Church and, "if

the Itala could again be recovered," he says, "it would still deserve to be called authentic, though less perfect than the Vulgate" (*"benche men buona che la Volgata"*).

The intrinsic value of such a text or version is not sufficient, of itself, to constitute authenticity; it requires, further, a more or less formal *declaration by the Church.*

Pallavicini describes the process of the formal authentication of a Bible text.

The first step is the tacit approbation of the text or version by the Church.

"The second step consists in the express or tacit declaration, not of the grammatical or lexical or literary or critical perfection of the text in question, but of its safety from a dogmatic and moral point of view; that is, of its exemption from all substantial error in things pertaining to faith and morals. Declared safe or exempt from such errors, it is authentic."

3. In the preface of the Sixtine Vulgate we read: "It is a great benefit to the Church that the Vulgate alone should have been *declared* authentic." Made authentic, therefore, by a *declaration* and not by conformity with the original. Therefore authentic in the canonical, and not in the critical, sense of the word.

Some theologians have thought that the word "authentic" in the decree *"Insuper"* should be taken in the sense of derived authenticity or authenticity of conformity, to distinguish it from the authenticity of the original. If this were so, it would mean that the Vulgate, as a translation, is conformable with the original.

But the Council never occupied itself with the conformity of the Vulgate to the original. It never made the remotest reference to such conformity; it never even hinted at it in the voluminous correspondence on the meaning of the decree that passed between the papal legates who presided over the Council at Trent, and the Congregation at Rome, published by Vercellone. (*Dissert.*, pp. 79 sq.)

No doubt the Council were convinced that the Vulgate is, not absolutely, but substantially conformable with the primitive text from which it was taken. But that is true of every version, *as far as it is a version.*

But such conformity was not the reason or the motive of their preference for the Vulgate, but only the condition *sine qua non.* Other versions may be more conformable with the original than the Vulgate, and yet they are not authentic.

The conformity of the Vulgate with the original was *presupposed, but not defined, nor even mentioned,* by the Council.

The acts of the Council tell us that the Vulgate was declared authentic, (1) because "it is ancient," (2) because it is "widespread," (3) because it is "approved by the use of so many centuries," and (4) "because it was never suspected of heresy."

Shortly before the Council of Trent the authenticity of the Vulgate was challenged and weakened by many rival Latin translations then in circulation, each of which claimed to be the only authentic text. The result was that many persons doubted whether the Vulgate still continued to be authentic. Its *de facto* au-

thenticity had been acquired by usage and could be lost again by a contrary usage.

To remedy this evil, the Council, as far as was needed, rehabilitated the Vulgate, declaring it authentic also by positive *legislation,* by an *explicit declaration,* and thus making it authentic also *de jure.*

The decree "*Insuper,*" it would seem, did not *make* the Vulgate authentic. It simply *declared* that the Vulgate *was already authentic* at the time, and supposes that it had been *de facto* authentic for the previous 800 years.

The decree says: "The old Latin Vulgate, which has been approved by its long use of so many centuries in the Church." "Approved"; that is, the Vulgate had been made *de facto* authentic by the informal approval implied in its long use for so many centuries in the Church.

If you choose, the decree changed a *de facto* authenticity into an authenticity *de jure;* nothing more. But as regards authenticity itself, the decree is *not effective,* but merely *declarative.* It does *not produce,* it *merely asserts* an already existing condition of things; that is, the Vulgate is and was and had all along been authentic.

However, it is quite otherwise with what follows, which is effective of something new, and not merely declarative of something old.

After having declared the Vulgate authentic, that is, reliable, credible, trustworthy, authoritative,— the Council orders that this same Vulgate *be read* in public lectures on theology, in preaching to the people, in dis-

cussions, in expositions, in synods and councils, and in the liturgical books of the Latin Church, such as the Breviary, the Missal, the Pontifical, the Ritual, etc.

This second enactment is an advance on what precedes. It is something new. Yet, strange to say, it is found in the same sentence with the declaration of the authenticity of the Vulgate, and it is so mixed up with it, that some writers on the subject have found it impossible to disentangle them, to discriminate nicely between them, or to show precisely wherein they agree and wherein they differ. In fact, some writers find no difference at all between them, and identify the two adjectives authentic and official, when applied to the Vulgate.

Yet they do differ. For, (1) To declare a version authentic is one thing; and (2) To command that that version be read in the public services of the Church, is another thing. To declare a version authentic is the same as to declare that it is reliable, credible, trustworthy, authoritative and nothing more. To command that version to be read in the public services of the Church is the same as to make it official. It is, by its very nature, a distinct legislative act and has a very different object in view and very different results. Thus, every official version is also authentic; but not every authentic version is also official. Another step in advance.

The Council also forbids anyone, under any pretense whatsoever, to reject the Vulgate as the official version, or to attempt to substitute for it any other version. To reject the Vulgate "under any pretense

whatsoever" would be to condemn it *en bloc* or in its entirety; it would be to refuse to hold it for authentic; it would be to give to another version the preference which the Council has given to the Vulgate.

But, in special cases, there is no prohibition to abandon a reading of the Vulgate for that of the original Hebrew or Greek, or of any version, ancient or modern, after it has been clearly proved that the Vulgate reading is wrong. Once we critically and prudently believe that the reading of a certain passage of the Vulgate is wrong, we may, of course, prefer the *right* reading to the *wrong* reading, and abandon the Vulgate *in that particular passage.*

We may reject a wrong *reading,* yes; but because of a wrong reading we must not reject the *Vulgate in its entirety,* from Genesis to Apocalypse. We must not reject an *entire volume* on account of *one verse.* If that were allowed, then, to be consistent, we would have to reject the entire original Hebrew and Greek text, as well as all the versions, both ancient and modern, for they all contain a few false readings.

It is not essential to an authentic version that it *should be read* in the public services of the Church. The Hebrew, the Greek, the Syriac, the Old Latin, the Coptic, the Armenian, and the Slavonian, are all authentic, that is, they are all credible, reliable, truthful, all right; but we are not obliged to read them all, or any one of them, in the public service of the Church. In fact, we of the Latin rite are not allowed to read any of them in our liturgy, neither are the Catholics of the Oriental rites allowed to read our Vulgate, or to

read any other Oriental version than the one prescribed for their own rite. The obligation to read it in our public services makes the Vulgate the *official* Bible text of the Latin portion of the Catholic Church.

Dr. Kaulen tells us: —

1. That the authenticity of the Vulgate is restricted to things pertaining to faith and morals, for the simple reason that the Vulgate is not always reliable — authentic — in other matters; and

2. That the word public in this decree is to be understood, not in the wide, general sense of the public at large, but in a very high and exclusive sense for lectures, expositions, religious services held in the name and by the special authority of the Church.

While in the very act of formulating the decree, the Fathers of Trent requested that steps be taken towards the correction of the Vulgate, showing thereby that authenticity, as understood and declared by the Council, was compatible with a translation imperfect in many respects and needing correction, and so far not conformable to the original.

No particular copy, recension, or edition of the Vulgate was ever declared authentic, not even the Sixtine or Clementine, which we now have, but which was not yet then in existence. The decree was not prospective. It refers to the Vulgate in general, either as it left the hands of Jerome or, rather, in the best form which it had for so many centuries in the Church, but prescinding from the mistakes which it had contracted in the course of time. The mistakes in the Vulgate, of course, are not declared authentic.

The Latin Vulgate has been authentic *de jure* ever since the Council of Trent, made so by an express declaration to that effect. It was authentic *de facto* for 800 or 1000 years before the Council, made so by the *usus* or praxis of the Church in her public services.

If this be so, then it follows that the Greek, the Syriac, the Coptic, the Armenian, and the Slavonian version are also authentic, *de facto* authentic, equally authentic, made so, as was the Vulgate, by their use for so many centuries in the liturgy of their respective rites, with the tacit approval of the Church Universal. Since none of those versions teach heresy, they could have been, and were, all approved or authenticated by the practice of the Church. The Church is always the Church, and is always identical with herself in authority, whether she acts by word or in deed, whether assembled in council or dispersed throughout the world.

The Hebrew original also is authentic, made so by God who inspired it and by the Church which approves it. It is also official in the Jewish Synagogue. But it is not official among Christians because it is not read in the public services of any rite in the Church.

It is not probable that the Hebrew Bible was ever officially used in the liturgy of the Christian Church, unless perhaps sporadically, in a few isolated cases and in the very beginning. At that time, Hebrew was long since a dead language, except to a few of the most learned. In the early days of the Apostles and even in Jerusalem, the Greek was the popular Bible.

Still, the Hebrew is *de facto* authentic in the Catholic Church. Rugerius, papal secretary at the Council of

Trent, gives the intrinsic reason for its authenticity. He says that "The Hebrew and Greek Texts are the fountain-sources from which are derived the versions, and according to which corrections are to be made and interpolations to be eliminated."

This shows that the original texts, in their pristine condition, can never be of less authority that the versions. Even in the condition in which the original texts are to-day, they can not be condemned, for the use which the Universal Church has ever made of them is sufficient to preserve them from substantial corruption, especially in things pertaining to faith and morals. A correct copy of the Hebrew or Greek Testament does not need to be declared intrinsically authentic; it is that from God, its author. The declaration of the Church would not affect, would not produce, would not cause, but would only manifest, its intrinsic authenticity and thus make it extrinsic also. Hence the decree declaring the authenticity of the Vulgate has in no way interfered with the authenticity of the Hebrew or Greek Text. Their extrinsic authority remains precisely the same as it always had been. Their authenticity can be established, not only critically and historically, but dogmatically also, at least as far as regards the substance of their contents.

It is true that none of the ancient Oriental versions have been declared authentic with so much formality as was the Vulgate; but, for all that, the use which has been made of them in the liturgy of the Church for so many centuries is an implicit recognition of their informal and *de facto* authenticity, and equivalent to an

express declaration that they contain nothing opposed to faith and morals. Such informal approval presupposes that they have preserved the inspired Word of God in its substantial integrity. There was special need for declaring explicitly that the Vulgate is authentic, because its authenticity had been challenged and called into doubt by so many rival Latin translations then in circulation.

Here the word "substantial" is used in a rather large sense; for these versions are far from being identical, either with the original, or with one another. They are only morally and practically conformable with one another; yet sufficiently so to be regarded as authentic in the Church Universal. They are also official, each in its own rite. They each and all have the same dogmatic value as the Latin Vulgate, and negatively the same as the Hebrew and Greek originals.

Vercellone says: "All the versions legitimately used in the Catholic Church are *equal from a dogmatic point of view.* They are also dogmatically *equal to the original* text, although they critically differ from it and from one another." (*Autenticità,* page 38.)

The Vulgate is of double value; it is both a Biblical and a traditional document. Its doctrinal readings have a traditional value, even if they are not really Biblical; for instance, to the Catholic it makes very little practical difference whether the passage of the "Three Heavenly Witnesses" is a part of the original text or not; the passage is theologically sound, even if it were not text-critically right.

The passage teaches good Catholic doctrine,— a doc-

trine taught elsewhere in Scripture, and taught even more explicitly in divine ecclesiastical tradition. The doctrine is perfectly orthodox, and the passage is authentic in the doctrinal, if it were not in the critical sense of the word, no matter when, where, how, why, for whom, or by whom it was written.

In talking to Catholics, and for practical purposes, we can always rest upon the Vulgate in all doctrinal matters, for the Vulgate is a reliable traditional as well as a Biblical document; so, if any doctrinal passage in the Vulgate is not Biblical, it is at least traditional, and should have and has as much weight as any doctrinal passage in any one of the Fathers, or even of nearly all the Latin Fathers, taken together.

When one bears in mind the importance of divine tradition in the Catholic Church, one need not be surprised at seeing so much weight attached to such passages *in* the Bible, even if not *of* the Bible. Their text-critical value may be nil, whereas their doctrinal or theological value may be very great. The divine tradition of the Church is, in general, on a level with the New Testament, and in some senses outranks it. We may say, at least in general, that the New Testament is just so much of the divine tradition of the Church, but committed to writing. For instance, what John wrote in the Fourth Gospel is perhaps little more and perhaps much less than what he had been preaching for the previous sixty years of his life.

The question is often asked: "Which is the authentic Bible text of the Catholic Church?"— to which you may answer, "*Nego suppositum,*" I deny the un-

derlying supposition. The nominative case "Bible text" and the verb "is," being both in the singular number, show that the questioner supposes or takes for granted that the Catholic Church has only *one* authentic Bible text; whereas in reality she has *many* authentic Bible texts,— the Hebrew, the Greek, the Latin, the Syriac, the Coptic, the Armenian, the Slavonian,— all authentic in the Catholic Church, and each except the Hebrew official and to be read in the public liturgy, etc., of its respective rite.

In the Catholic Church the Latin Vulgate is not *the* authentic Bible text; it is *an* authentic text; it is only one of the many authentic texts. It is also the official text of the Latin portion of the Catholic Church.

NOTE ON OTHER WESTERN VERSIONS

Western versions of the Bible are numerous enough, but not so ancient as the Oriental versions, and therefore, not so valuable for purposes of textual criticism. Of versions made in England, a few words:

a) *Anglo-Saxon Versions*

Caedmon, a monk of Whitby in Northumberland, about A. D. 670, made a metrical paraphrase of some books, or parts of books, of the Old and the New Testament, of which only fragments have survived.

Guthlac, a little later in the seventh century, made an interlinear translation of the Psalter.

Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, about the same time made an Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalter, 50 in verse and 100 in prose.

Venerable Bede (d. 735), is said to have translated the entire Bible.

King Alfred the Great (d. 901) is credited with a translation of parts of the Bible; but little of it has come down to us.

Farmen and *Owen,* of the tenth century, translated the Gospels into Anglo-Saxon.

Aelfric, also of the tenth century, Archbishop of Canterbury, translated into Anglo-Saxon the first seven historical books of the Old Testament and the book of Job, copies of which are at Oxford and in the British Museum.

All these versions were made from the Latin either of the Africans or of St. Jerome, and into Anglo-Saxon.

After the conquest of England by the Normans, translations of the Bible began to be made into early English, a mixture of Anglo-Saxon and of Norman French.

Orm, an English monk in the thirteenth century, translated parts of the Gospels and of the Acts of the Apostles, and sundry parts of the Old and New Testaments.

William Shoreham, about the year 1320, translated the Psalter into old English.

Richard Rolle, about the the same time translated the Psalter and added a running commentary between the verses of the Psalms.

John Wyclif (born 1320, died 1384) was chiefly instrumental in producing an English Bible, the exact history of which is, in many respects, very uncertain.

The New Testament part of it was finished in 1382, and soon afterwards the Old Testament part was added. The entire New Testament is ascribed to Wyclif, but it is probable that others contributed a share to the task. Certain it is that the greater part of the Old Testament was done into English by Nicholas Hereford, one of Wyclif's supporters. Made by so many, the style of this version varied much from part to part, and the entire work was revised by John Purvey, in 1388. This revision gradually supplanted the earlier form and is generally known as the Wyclif Bible.

"About 170 copies of the Wyclif Bible are now known to be in existence; and of these, five-sixths contain the edition revised by Purvey, while less than thirty have the original form of the translation." (Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts;* p. 202.)

"There is no sufficient reason for the opinion, which has sometimes been held, that a complete English Bible existed before Wyclif's time. This rests mainly on the statement of Sir Thomas More, that he had seen English Bibles of an earlier date than Wyclif's. No trace of such a Bible exists, and it is highly probable that More was not aware that there were *two* Wyclif translations, and had mistaken the date of the earlier one." (F. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Monuments,* pp. 198–199.)

This always has been the common opinion. But Abbot (now Cardinal) Gasquet, O. S. B., in *The Old English Bible and Other Essays* (London, 1897), main-

tains that " the Wyclif Bible is not Wyclif's Bible at all, but is the work of the bishops of the English Church." However interesting may be the subject, we have neither the time nor the space to discuss it. (See F. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* pp. 204–208.)

b) *English Versions*

William Tyndale (born 1484, d. 1536), translated the New Testament, and his version has exercised a greater influence than any other on the " Authorized " and on all subsequent English versions, chiefly because it was made from the Greek instead of the Vulgate, and because it is in a style of language perfectly understood by the people. Of the Old Testament he translated only the Pentateuch and Jonas.

Miles Coverdale (b. 1488), who knew neither Greek nor Hebrew, translated (1535) from the " Douche and Latyn." The " Douche," or Deutsch, was Luther's German Bible, and the " Latyn " was the Vulgate of St. Jerome. Though this version was undertaken at the request of Thomas Cromwell, and dedicated to Henry VIII, and though it circulated without let or hindrance throughout the realm, still it was never expressly authorized by any of the higher powers, whether civil or ecclesiastical. Also it can lay no claim to originality, but is the result of a skillful selection from the work of others. Coverdale restored to the text the ecclesiastical terms which had been banished by Tyndale.

John Rogers, in 1537, produced an edition taken

chiefly from Tyndale and Coverdale, but carefully revised and much improved. It was published under the assumed name of Thomas Matthew. It was encouraged by Cromwell and Cranmer, and was allowed by Henry VIII to be sold publicly.

Coverdale revised the Matthew Bible, published it in 1539 in a large and splendid form, whence the name "*Great Bible,*" and Cromwell ordered a copy of it to be put in a convenient place in every church. "Coverdale was a judicious editor, but not a translator." (F. G. Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* p. 221.)

Because he wrote a preface for the edition of 1540, this is often known as Cranmer's Bible. The Psalter used in the Anglican Common Prayer Book is taken from this Bible, that is, from the Latin Vulgate, and not directly from the Hebrew.

"*The Geneva Bible,*" so called from the place where it was made, was published from 1557–1560, with a Calvinistic or Presbyterian bias. It was the first entire English Bible to be printed, and was divided into verses instead of paragraphs.

"*The Bishops' Bible*" was published in 1568. Several of the revisers were bishops of the established Church of England, hence the name. The revisers worked independently of one another, one consequence of which is that much unevenness of style is noticeable. Besides, unlike the "Geneva Bible," it was more Episcopalian than Presbyterian or Puritan.

"The Bishops' Bible" soon displaced the "Geneva Bible" in the services of the Church, but the Geneva

Bible held its own among the people for private reading.

The *"Authorized"* or *"King James Bible"* was first suggested at a conference held in 1604, at Hampton Court, between Church of England men and Puritans or non-Conformists. King James I, who approved the project, declared that the notes to the Geneva Bible were untrue and seditious, and that the new version should be published without notes. He appointed fifty-four men to do the work. They were the professors of Hebrew and Greek at the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and many of the leading Biblical scholars of the day. They were divided into six groups, of which two sat at Westminster, two at Oxford, and two at Cambridge. The basis of the revision was the "Bishops' Bible," which was to be followed, except where changes were clearly demanded. The old ecclesiastical terms were retained, *e. g.,* Baptism instead of Washing, and no marginal notes were admitted, except where necessary to explain Hebrew or Greek words. The work took two years and nine months, the last nine months being devoted to a final revision by a committee consisting of two members from each of the six groups. The work issued from the press in 1611. Though the words "Appointed to be read in the Churches" appear on the title page, still there is no evidence to show that any authority, civil or ecclesiastical, ever formally approved the work for such a purpose.

In the public services of the churches, the new version immediately superseded the "Bishops' Bible,"

which was never reprinted after 1606. However, the struggle to replace the "Geneva Bible" lasted half a century or more, the two versions existing side by side in private use. At last the new version prevailed by common consent, and thus became the Bible of all non-Catholic English-speaking people.

In a translation made by so many scholars so variously qualified for the task, it is but natural to suppose that many mistakes were made. In the Old Testament part, the historical and prophetical books are the best translated; Job and Psalms are the worst. In the New Testament part, the Acts and the Gospels are the best translated; the Epistles are the worst. But the Deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament are the worst of all. (Mombert, *Handbook of the English Version of the Bible,* pp. 375–380.)

Many Protestant scholars of great learning and of the highest character, such as Lightfoot, Ellicott, Trench, etc., while singing its praises, have acknowledged the shortcomings of this version, have pointed them out one by one and shown in what respect they are wrong. (Angus-Green, *The Cyplopedic Handbook of the Bible,* pp. 160–170.)

Dr. Gell, chaplain to the then Archbishop of Canterbury, asserts that "Dogmatic interests were, in some cases, allowed to bias the translation; and the Calvinism of one party and the Episcopalianism of another party, were both represented at the expense of accuracy." (Smith's Bible Dictionary; Article, "Version, Authorized," p. 3437.)

Bishop Ellicott, one of the most careful and pene-

trating of British exegetes, writes as follows: "In spite of the very common assumption to the contrary, there are many passages [in the Authorized Version] from which erroneous doctrinal inferences have been drawn, but where the inference comes from the translation, and not from the original Hebrew or Greek." (*Consideration on the Revision of the English Version of the New Testament,* p. 88–89.) A few of many instances are Matt. 19, 11; I Corinth. 7, 9; 9, 5; Hebrews 10, 38;

Proposals for a revision of the Authorized Version were made shortly after its first appearance, and a committee for the purpose was appointed in the Long Parliament, in 1642, and again in 1655, but political disturbances interfered.

That there were many errors in the Authorized Version, became, with time, more and more evident to the best scholars of Great Britain and America, who acknowledged that the Greek "textus receptus," on which this version was based, was very far from perfect. This became evident, beyond possibility of doubt, after the publication of the Codex Vaticanus, the discovery and publication of the Codex Sinaiticus, and the critical labors and editions of such scholars as Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, Westcott, and Hort.

At length, in February, 1870, the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury decided to undertake the task of revision. Two committees, one for the Old and one for the New Testament, were appointed to do the work, with authority to add other scholars to their num-

ber if deemed advisable. They were not confined to members of the Church of England, so non-Conformists served among them. Also in America (1870) two committees were formed, whose corrections, when not adopted and embodied in the text, were placed apart in an appendix.

The instructions given to the revisers were:

1. To make as few alterations as possible, consistently with fidelity to the original;

2. To use, in such alterations, where possible, the language of the earlier versions;

3. To adopt no change, unless approved by a two-thirds vote of the members present. Thus, many good renderings were approved by a majority of the revisers, but, because not approved by a two-thirds vote, were not admitted into the text and never got beyond the margin.

The "Revised New Testament" was published alone May 17, 1881. Both Testaments, though without the books which Protestants call the Apocrypha, were published together May, 1885. The Apocryphal books of the Old Testament were revised, not by Convocation, but by the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In their preface the revisers say that the results of their labor regard, (1) the text, (2) the translation, (3) the language and (4) the marginal notes.

1. As to the *text:* (a) The New Testament part of the old Authorized Version was made from the so-called "textus receptus," which was formed by a comparison of very few manuscripts, all of late date and of little value. Whereas, the Revised Version

was made from the Greek text of the revisers, which itself was made by a comparison of all the best ancient manuscripts published in the last 200 years, and on the critical editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, Westcott, and Hort.

(b) With the Old Testament the case is different. We have seen that all extant manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible contain the Massoretic text and are so near alike as to seem almost stereotyped; so that the revisers had no choice but to translate that text just as it is found in any manuscript and just as the revisers found it in the days of King James. This explains why there are fewer changes in the Old than in the New Testament revision.

2. As to the *translation* it is otherwise. (a) Since 1611 much progress has been made in the right understanding of Hebrew, chiefly through the comparative study of the other Semetic languages,— Arabic, Aramaic, Assyrian. Thus the Hebrew text remaining always the same, was better translated in 1881 than in 1611.

(b) Less progress has been made in the right understanding of the Greek language, which has been well understood ever since the days of the Renaissance, so that the improvement in the New Testament of the Revised Version depends chiefly on the better text, and not on the better interpretation or translation of the text.

3. As to the *language:* In the choice of words to express the precise thought intended by the sacred writer, and in their construction, there are many dif-

ferences between the Authorized and the Revised versions. Unlike the revisers of 1611, the revisers of 1881 endeavored, in all cases, to translate the same Hebrew or Greek word by the same English word, unless the sense required a different word in a particular case.

4. As to the *marginal notes:* They are more critical and more numerous in the Revised than in the Authorized version.

The instruction given to the revisers was to correct the former version, and not to make a new translation. However, in the opinion of very many, the differences are so numerous, and sometimes so considerable, that the result is a new version, rather than a revision of the old version. Perhaps this conclusion is justified by the following facts. The critical Greek Testament underlying the revision of 1881 and the Greek "textus receptus" on which the Authorized Version is built, differ in no fewer than 5,788 places, and these corrections in the Greek text necessitated or produced more than 36,000 alterations in the English text of the revised New Testament alone. Of course, the greater part of these changes are of little or no consequence to belief or practice. (See Philip Schaff, *A Comparison of the Greek New Testament and the English Version,* p. 418.)

On its first appearance, the Revised New Testament was very unfavorably received. It was vigorously assailed by many critics of ability, with the result that there was a general unwillingness to adopt it as a substitute for the King James Version, especially in

the public services of the churches. The Liberals thought it was changed too little; the Conservatives thought it was changed too much; some would have modernized still more the language, others would have preferred the archaic, half-antiquated style of the older version; while many believed that the revisers have sacrificed the grace, the easy flow, the poetry, and the rhythm of the older version to pedantic fidelity, and to stiff and affected accuracy of rendering. Still there can be no doubt that, while somewhat inferior in style, the new revision, in accuracy and fidelity to the original and in many other respects, is superior to the older version. Though steadily gaining ground among scholars, still it can not be considered as a perfect or as the final translation either of the Old or of the New Testament. It has corrected some of the most glaring defects which were allowed to remain in the "Authorized Version" for nearly 300 years. For instance: In Acts 20, 28 the revisers have dismissed King James' "overseers" and replaced them by "bishops." In I Cor. 10, 18 they have restored the "altar" to the church. In Thess. 2, 14 they have repudiated the "ordinances" and adopted the "traditions" of the Apostles. In I Cor. 11, 27 they admit the lawfulness of Communion under one kind and, for the first time in 400 years (*i. e.,* ever since 1525) have translated properly the simple Greek particle η by "or" and no longer by *and,* a meaning which it never had. In Matt. 6, 13 they have dropped the "doxology" at the end of the Lord's Prayer, as being no part of the inspired text. (See H. J. Heuser, *Chapters of Bible*

Study, Ch. X, " The Vulgate and the Revised Version," pp. 115–130.)

In 1901 an American Edition of the Revised Version was published, embodying in the text the emendations which were preferred by the American members of the Committee, but which, for want of a two-thirds vote, were placed in various appendices by the British members.

c) *Catholic English Versions*

The many different renderings of one and the same passage in the successive Protestant versions gave a good opportunity to Catholic scholars to regard all previously existing versions as false, corrupt, heretical and, in many places, manifestly and intentionally mistranslated for dogmatic purposes. Many of these mistranslations have since been pointed out, both by Protestants and by Catholics, especially by Ward in his *Errata of the Protestant Bible.* Hence the need of a Catholic version, which we now proceed to describe.

The *Douay* or the *Rheims Bible* is the name generally given to the translation in use among English-speaking Catholics. The name Douay is, perhaps, a misnomer and slightly misleading, because no part of this version was made at Douay. It was all translated at Rheims in the fifteen years that elapsed between 1578 and 1593. Moreover, this version, as we now have it, has been changed so often and so much, that it can scarcely be called either the Douay or the Rheims Version.

This is how it came about: In 1562 a university was founded at Douay, and several of the principal chairs were given to Catholics, then in exile, but formerly Regius professors at Oxford. This and other circumstances suggested to Dr. William Allen that Douay would be a suitable place for the education of young men to the priesthood, for the Catholic missions in Protestant England. Pope Gregory XIII and Philip II of Spain supplied the funds, and the college, begun in 1568, flourished from the start and soon had 150 students.

On account of political disturbances, the college, in 1578, was transferred to Rheims, where it remained till 1593, when it was returned to Douay. By the year 1600, more than 300 young men had been educated in this college and sent to the English missions. Altogether more than 160 priests, educated and ordained at this college, suffered martyrdom, in prison, or at the stake, or on the scaffold.

It was during this stay at Rheims that the entire Bible was translated into English. The New Testament part was published at Rheims in 1582, nearly thirty years before the Authorized Protestant Version. The Old Testament part, though translated at Rheims, was published at Douay, nearly thirty years later, in 1609 and 1610. Its publication had been delayed, as the translators expressed it, by "lack of good means" and on account of "our poor estate in banishment."

The translators of our Douay Bible were all very learned men and in every way qualified for their delicate task.

1. Doctor, afterwards *Cardinal Allen,* had been principal of St. Mary's College, Oxford, canon of York Cathedral, and chiefly instrumental in establishing the English College at Douay.

2. Doctor *Gregory Martin* had been a fellow and professor at St. John's College, Oxford, and was considered one of the best Hebrew and Greek scholars of his day. Anthony Wood, a Protestant, author of the *Athenae Oxonienses,* says of him: "He was an excellent linguist, exactly read and versed in the Sacred Scriptures, and went beyond all of his time in humane literature."

3. Doctor *Richard Bristow,* under the reign of Queen Mary, had been professor at New College, Oxford.

4. *John Reynolds,* who had been of New College, Oxford, was professor of Hebrew at Rheims.

5. Doctor *Thomas Worthington,* afterwards president of the (English) College (at Rheims) was also a graduate of Oxford.

Many other capable men contributed their share, but the bulk of the work fell upon these five men, all of whom had been educated at the University of Oxford.

Their method of working was the following: Martin translated; Bristow and Allen wrote the annotations and marginal notes, some of which are polemical and very learned; Reynolds revised the work of the others.

In their preface the translators explain that their purpose in translating was "to oppose a Catholic version to the many heretical versions" then in circula-

tion. They also tell us why they give the preference to the Latin Vulgate over the common Greek text. They prefer the Vulgate, (1) because of its antiquity; (2) because of its long use in the liturgy of the Church; (3) because of its great fidelity to the originals, and (4) because it was declared authentic by the Council of Trent.

They also tell us that they endeavored to give a literal and faithful rendering, both of the thought and of the words of their original, as far as consistent with the idioms of the English language.

They also tell us, and tell us truly, that in their work there is a perfect sincerity of renderings, "nothing being done either untruly or obscurely on purpose in favor of the Roman Catholic religion, so that we cannot but complain and challenge English Protestants for corrupting the text . . . which they profess to translate."

As to the accuracy and fidelity of our Douay Bible, it is not easy to exaggerate its value and reliability; it is extremely literal and faithful to its original in all its parts. In their preface the translators themselves say that it was given "word for word and point for point." Now in any translation of the Bible, what is chiefly expected, and even demanded, is fidelity in giving the sense of the original. But this is precisely the most remarkably strong point in our Catholic Bible. And it is admitted, even by the most learned and most distinguished Protestant writers, that "the charge of theological bias or prejudice has never been proved against the Douay Version." This can not be said of

the Protestant King James Version, which, in places, was purposely mistranslated so as to give a sense not found in the original, a sense opposed to the teaching of the Catholic Church.

As some Protestants love to harp on the *literary defects* of the Douay Version, and forget both the *doctrinal* and the *literary* defects of their own versions, we quote the words of one of the most learned of English Protestant scholars of the century just ended. It is the learned Dr. Westcott, for many years professor at Oxford, one of the revisers of the Protestant Revised Version, one of the two editors of the most famous critical edition of the Greek New Testament, and Anglican Bishop of Durham. He says: "The scrupulous and even servile adherence of the Rheimists to the text of the Vulgate was not without its advantages. They frequently reproduced with force the original order of the Greek, which is preserved in the Latin; and even while many unpleasant roughnesses occur, there can be little doubt that this Version gained by the faithfulness with which they endeavored to keep the original form of the sacred writings. . . . The same spirit of anxious fidelity to the letter of their text often led the Rheimists to keep the phrase of the original when others had abandoned it. . . . When the Latin was capable of guiding them, the Rheimists followed out their principles honestly; but whenever the Latin was inadequate or ambiguous, they had the niceties of the Greek original text at their command. The Greek article cannot, as a rule, be expressed in Latin. Here, then, the Douay translators were free to follow

the Greek text, and the result is that this critical point of scholarship is dealt with more satisfactorily by them than by any other early translators. And it must be said that, in this respect also, the revisers of the King James Version were less accurate than the Rheimists, though they had the work of the Rheimists before them," and could have profited by it.

Dr. Westcott also remarks that the Douay Bible "furnished a large proportion of the Latin words which the King James' revisers adopted." (*History of the English Bible;* see also *Catholic Dictionary,* p. 287; 9th edition, revised 1917.)

"There is a very great deal of sound scholarship in the work [Douay Bible], and its influence upon the Authorized Version was, by no means, inconsiderable. . . . For example: in the translation of the Greek article this version stands very high. . . . It has also enriched the English language with many words that might not otherwise have found a place, such, for instance, as 'acquisition,' 'victim,' 'gratis,' 'allegory,' 'advent,' 'resuscitate,' 'expectation.' Comparatively little fault [which means no fault] can be found with the translation on doctrinal grounds." (Lovett, *The Printed English Bible,* pp. 122 and 132.)

Dr. Moulten says: "Only minute study can do justice to its [the Douay Bible's] faithfulness, and to the care with which the translators executed their work. . . . No other English version will prove more instructive to the student who will take pains to separate what is good and useful from what is ill-advised and wrong."

Dr. Scrivener, one of the greatest text-critics of the day, says: "In justice it must be admitted that no case of wilful perversion of Sacred Scripture has ever been brought home to the Rheimist translators."

Coming from such high sources, these are the most valuable words of praise that could be lavished on our Catholic version, especially the statement that it is so very faithful and so literal in rendering the sense of Sacred Scripture. We have every reason to be proud of it.

The Douay Version, with all its defects of mere style, has many remarkably good features.

1. It is much superior to the Authorized Version in the uniformity with which it renders the same word in the original by the same word in the version. The King James revisers seemed desirous of showing in how many different ways they could render one and the same word in the original, with a different English word in the Version.

2. The Douay is much superior to the Authorized Version in the happy use which it makes of the English definite and indefinite article.

3. The Douay is much superior to the Authorized Version in its desire to be strictly literal and ever and always rigorously faithful to the original, especially in things pertaining to belief and practice.

4. Their occasional preference for ponderous words of Latin origin, though sometimes objectionable, has resulted in the adoption and preservation of many words which, accepted later by the King James Re-

visers, now serve to enrich the English language with many theological and other terms.

5. At the same time the Rheimists coined many a good Anglo-Saxon phrase and even entire sentences which the Protestant revisers were glad to adopt and to incorporate into the Authorized Version. As an instance: All English versions, previous to the Douay, translated Philippians 1, 21: "Christ is to me life, and death is to me advantage." But all English versions, subsequent to the Douay, have copied its rendering of this passage: "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."

6. But of all the good qualities of the Douay Version, the very best and the most highly prized by Catholics is its scrupulous fidelity in rendering the sense of the original, especially in the doctrinal passages.

It is important to remember that the Rheims Version was made, not from the original Hebrew or Greek, but from the Latin Vulgate, after diligently comparing it with the original Hebrew and Greek texts. Dr. Kenyon says: "This was done deliberately on the ground that the Vulgate was the Bible of Jerome and Augustine; that it had ever since been used in the Church, and that its text was preferable to that of the Greek, wherever the two differed; and that the Greek texts had been corrupted by heretics." (*Our Bible and the Ancient Monuments,* p. 228.) There can be no doubt, as we have seen elsewhere, that the Latin is sometimes, though of course not always, better than

the Greek; for the Greek, though the original, has also shared much the same fate, as have the ancient versions, at the hands of copyists.

Many editions, especially of the Douay New Testament, appeared in the years following 1582.

There was a second edition of the Douay Old Testament in 1635; and a third edition of it in 1816–18. There was a second edition of the Douay New Testament in 1600; and a third edition of the New Testament in 1621; a fourth edition in 1683; a fifth edition in 1738; a sixth edition in 1788; a seventh edition in 1816–1818, and an eighth edition of the Douay New Testament, text and notes, published by Protestants in New York in 1834. Thus there have been three editions of the Old Testament and eight of the New Testament, all according to the *original Douay Version.*

Some of these editions gradually underwent corrections and modifications, partly to get rid of their Latinisms and other defects of grammar and style, and partly to modernize the quaint, old-fashioned way of spelling that was in common use and approved when this version was made. Such changes take place in all English books written two or three centuries ago. Similar changes in spelling, grammar, and lexicon have been made in the writings of Sir Thomas More, Shakespeare, and Milton, and especially in the King James Bible, which, however, still retains such solecisms as "Our Father, *which* art in Heaven."

In fact, all spoken, living languages change with time, just as all living organisms, like the human

body, undergo continual changes and modifications. It is only dead languages, like Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, that do not change. They are like mummies — always the same.

Doctor CHALLONER, coadjutor bishop of London, convinced that a thorough revision of the Douay Version was needed, undertook the task. In so doing he substituted modern spelling and modern words and constructions for such as were uncouth or antiquated, and replaced Latinisms with intelligible and familiar English expressions. He sometimes preferred the renderings of the Authorized Version for those of the older Douay. In fact, his alterations are so numerous and so considerable in extent and importance that Cardinal Newman considered his work "but little short of a new translation." (*Tracts, Theol. and Eccles.*, p. 416.)

The first part of Challoner's revision to appear was the New Testament in 12mo., in 1749, and the whole Bible in 1750. His revision is practically the only one in use today among English-speaking Catholics.

However, in the last 200 years there have been published many other editions of the English Catholic Bible, some of which were *revisions* of the Douay Version, some were *new translations* of the Latin Vulgate, made quite independently of the Douay, and some were new translations of the original Hebrew or Greek. We will mention them briefly in their order of time.

1. Dr. Cornelius NARY, a priest of the diocese of Dublin, and a doctor of the University of Paris, in

1718, *translated* into more modern English the Vulgate New Testament, compared with the original Greek. It never took.

2. Dr. Robert WITHAM, President of the College of Douay, published there, in 1730, a new English *translation* of the New Testament into modern English from the Vulgate, compared with the Greek. It never took.

3. The Rev. Bernard MCMAHON, priest of the diocese of Dublin, in 1783, published a new *revision* of the Douay New Testament in 12mo., and in 1791, a revision of the entire Bible in 4to., with the approval of Archbishop Troy. It never became popular.

4. Dr. LINGARD, author of a famous history of England, published, in 1836, a new and *independent translation* of the four Gospels from the *original Greek,* with occasional references to the Latin Vulgate and to the old Syriac Peshitto, and with marginal notes, "few in number but luminous." Though highly praised by Cardinals Wiseman and Newman, it never won favor.

5. The Mt. Rev. Francis P. KENRICK, Archbishop of Baltimore, published, 1849–1860, in modern English, the entire Douay Bible in large separate volumes with copious foot notes, mostly critical, sometimes slightly controversial in tone, and intended to explain the sense of the text. The Gospels alone reached a second edition.

6. The Rev. Fr. A. SPENCER, O. P., published, in 1898, a new translation of the four Gospels in elegant modern English, and taken directly from the *Greek original,* with reference to the Latin Vulgate and to

the old Syriac Peshitto versions. In his preface he tells us that he has not followed any one printed edition of the Greek Gospels, but rather "a consensus of such well known editors as Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, Westcott and Hort, and the Greek text adopted by the authors of the Revised Version."

This translation is *independent* of the Rheims edition and, therefore, regardless of its elegant language and its strict fidelity to the original Greek, like so many of its excellent predecessors, will have to struggle for existence. It is for the future historian, and not for the present-day prophet, to say whether or not "it took."

The decree "*Insuper*" of the Council of Trent, 4th session, requires that, for the sake of uniformity and to avoid confusion to the people, the old Latin Vulgate shall be read "in public readings, preachings, and expositions." This includes such books as the Breviary, the Ritual, the Pontifical, and the Missal. Accordingly, the Vulgate is read in the Mass proper in Latin, but to the people, the Gospel and Epistle of the day, of the Sunday, are read in an English or other vernacular translation; not in the Vulgate, but in the next best thing to the Vulgate, the Vulgate in an English or other vernacular dress. This partly explains why translations made directly from the Hebrew or Greek originals, however well made, gain but little favor. Also new translations or revisions of the Gospels or of the entire New Testament, though made from the Vulgate, have failed, chiefly, perhaps, because they are only a part and not the whole of the Bible.

It is very probable that we shall see no more independent translations from the Vulgate, or further revisions of the Rheims edition, which is based on the Vulgate, until the revision of the Vulgate itself, now in process by the Benedictines, has been completed and published by the Holy See.

The CRAMPON Version of the whole Bible, made directly from the Hebrew and Greek originals into a very modern French, satisfies a long felt need, and is much used by scholars for handy reference; but, for the reason given above, it is not used, and probably will never be used, in the public services of the Church.

Still more interesting is it to us to know that several Catholic scholars are now actually engaged in translating into modern English the entire Bible, not from the Latin Vulgate, but from the Hebrew and Greek originals (Westminster Version). If, to the satisfaction of all concerned, they succeed in their extremely delicate and complicated task, all the more credit to them.

At present there are current at least four types of the so-called Douay New Testament, all slightly different in wording, but not in meaning. They are:

1. That of Duffy, Dublin, a reprint of the text of Dr. Murray, of 1825;

2. That of Richardson, London, a reprint of the text approved by Dr. Wiseman in 1847;

3. That of Doleman, London, a reprint of a text approved by Bishop Denver in 1839;

4. That of Dunigan, New York, a reprint of the text of Dr. Haydock, published in 1811.

From the above it appears that, "at the present day, there is really no one received text of the Rheims New Testament among English speaking Catholics." (Gigot, *Gen. Introd.*, p. 353.)

Not one of our English Catholic Bibles has ever been either approved or disapproved by the Holy See.

As to the authority of the Douay Bible among Catholics, see an instructive article by Walter Drum, S. J., parts of which we reproduce. He says: "It would be against the decree *Insuper* of Trent to reject the Vulgate; to throw out any book which it canonizes; or to cast aside any . . . integral part of that time-honored version. But it would not be against the decision of Trent to depart from a particular reading of the Vulgate, and give preference to the original text, . . . nor to attempt to show that the inspired Word is better preserved in the 'Old Latin,' Syriac, Coptic, or other ancient translations, than it is in the Vulgate. Trent did not enter into the question of the original text of Scripture; it made no mention of the ancient Oriental versions, and selected the Vulgate as authoritative, 'among the other Latin editions which are in use.'"

Now, the Douay version is simply an attempt to give the Latin Vulgate to English speaking Catholics in an English dress.

The translation was made by Dr. Martin Gregory. It was repeatedly and so thoroughly revised by Bishop Challoner, that Cardinal Newman thought it was "almost a new translation," and Cardinal Wiseman said

it was an "abuse of terms" to call it the Douay version.

"There is current an opinion that . . . the Douay version, by particular legislation, is the exclusive and authoritative English translation of the Bible for the United States." Fr. Drum shows that this is not the case. The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore was, indeed, desirous of having one uniform English version for the use of the Catholic laity, and felt that the Douay version should be approved and retained for this purpose, but nothing further ever came of it. In reply to Archbishop M. J. Spalding, the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda wrote that, since the Holy See is not accustomed to give formal approval to modern versions (because modern languages change so rapidly, &c.), the whole question of the opportuneness of a uniform English translation of the Bible for the laity of the United States is not a matter which the Holy See cares directly to determine, but that it is left to the hierarchy of the country, to some future Plenary Council, to decide what should be done. At the same time, the Sacred Congregation suggested that theologians, skilled in Biblical science, be appointed to compare with one another, not only the various Douay versions, but also other English versions done in a Catholic spirit, and thus produce a correct and revised Douay version.

In the meantime, opinions changed. The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore avoided further discussion of the subject, and the proposed committee of experts was never appointed. However, the joint

Pastoral Letter of this Council has the following words, strongly recommending, but not commanding, to the laity the use of the Douay version: "We hope that no family can be found among us without a correct version of the Holy Scriptures. Among other versions, we recommend the Douay, which is venerable, as used by our forefathers for three centuries, comes down to us sanctioned by innumerable authorizations, and was suitably annotated by the learned Bishop Challoner, by Canon Haydock, and especially by the late Archbishop Kenrick."

Here the name Douay is, as usual, a blanket-name to cover the original Douay version and the revisions of Challoner and of Kenrick. These are really three different versions, and yet all are recommended. However, neither is recommended, still less imposed, to the exclusion of the others, but only to the exclusion of Protestant versions.

The conclusion is that there is no legislative act, either of Rome or of a plenary council, making the so-called Douay Bible the authoritative Bible text of the Catholic laity or clergy of the United States. Perhaps all this is providential. For if anything is to be done in the matter, it no doubt will now be deferred until after the publication, by the Holy See, of the revised, corrected, and typical edition of the Latin Vulgate in course of preparation. (W. Drum, S. J., "Authority of the Douai Version of the Bible"; *Ecclesiastical Review,* March, 1919, pp. 330–337.)

d) *French Versions*

Dr. Reuss, Protestant Professor of Scripture at the University of Strasbourg, writes: "No modern people can be compared with the French for antiquity and abundance of Biblical literature. The libraries of the City of Paris alone contain more French manuscripts of the Bible than all the libraries East of the Rhine contain of German Biblical manuscripts." (*Revue de Théologie,* Vol. II, p. 3.) Of these French Biblical manuscripts some are complete, some are mere fragments; some are in prose and some are in verse; some are literal and some are free. All the dialects and every province of France are represented in these versions: Normandy, Picardy, Lorraine, Burgundy, etc. We have neither time nor space even to mention them, but refer the reader to the following authors who have made a special study of the subject: Samuel Berger, *La Bible Française au Moyen Age,* Preface; C. Chauvin, *Leçons d'Introduction Gen.,* pp. 407–428.

e) *German Versions*

The earliest German version of any part of the Bible, of which we have any knowledge, is that of St. Matthew's Gospel, made in the VIIIth century and published, as a curiosity of literature, by Massemann, in 1841. In the IXth century the Psalms were translated. In the XIth century Job and the Psalms were translated by Notker Labeo, a monk of St. Gall. Other parts of the Bible were translated in the XIIth and XIIIth centuries, all from the Latin Vulgate.

(Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire de la Bible,* T. I., col. 373.) There were at least eighteen printed translations of the whole Bible before Luther's time. His had the advantage of popular style, but it contained many errors. A completely revised edition of Luther's translation appeared at Halle, in 1892.

Among recent Catholic versions that of *Allioli* is the most widely used. It was based on that of H. Braun, O. S. B. (1788–1797) and first appeared in 1830. The tenth edition (3 vols., 1899–1900) was thoroughly revised and in part rewritten by Aug. Arndt, S. J. Other popular editions are those by Loch and Reischl (1851–1856; 3rd ed., 1885), the New Testament by B. Weinhart (re-edited by S. Weber), Ecker's "Katholische Hausbibel" (1903). (Kaulen, *Einleitung,* Vol. I, 5th ed. by G. Hoberg, Freiburg, 1911, p. 260; *Kirchenlexikon,* Vol. II.)

Briefly, it should be said that, long before the Reformation, nearly every country in Europe, such as Italy, Spain, France, England, Ireland, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Hungary, Poland, possessed the Bible in translations, for the use of the common people.

NOTE ON READING SACRED SCRIPTURE

We know how much the Church has labored to place before her people, clergy and laity alike, the Sacred Writings in many languages. Buckingham gives the following summary: "From the invention of printing (1454) to the period of the Reformation, there appeared in the (1) ANCIENT languages (He-

brew and Greek) eighty-four editions of the Scriptures; *i. e.*, sixty-two in (a) HEBREW, of which twelve were of the Old Testament entire, and fifty of detached portions; and twenty-two in (b) GREEK, of which three were of the Old Testament, twelve of the New, and seven of separate portions of the Bible. In the (c) LATIN, which occupied an intermediate position, as being the universal language of the priesthood and a familiar tongue to all the learned men in the Christian world, there were published three hundred and forty-three editions, of which one hundred and forty-eight were of the whole Bible, sixty-two of the New Testament, and one hundred and thirty-three of separate books. In (2) MODERN languages, the dialects of the humblest and poorest among the people, there were issued one hundred and ninety-eight editions, of which one hundred and four were of the entire Bible, comprising twenty in Italian, twenty-six in French, nineteen in Flemish, two in Spanish, six in Bohemian, one in Slavonic, and thirty in German; and ninety-four of single portions of the Scriptures, consisting chiefly of copies of the New Testament and the Psalms. In all, including the polyglots, *six hundred and twenty editions* of the Bible and its parts, of which one hundred and ninety-eight were in the languages of the laity, had issued from the press with the sanction and at the instance of the Catholic Church, in the countries where she reigned supreme, *before the first Protestant version was sent forth into the world.*" (Buckingham, *The Bible in the Middle Ages,* pp. 64, 65.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADDIS & ARNOLD'S *Catholic Dictionary* (revised edition, 1917), Article "Vulgate," pp. 859–867.

ANGUS-GREEN. *Cyclopedic Handbook to the Bible;* "The Bible as Translated," Chap. VII, pp. 147–176.

BREEN, A. E. *General Introduction to Holy Scripture;* Versions, pp. 477–577.

CHAUVIN, C. *Introduction Générale;* Ancient Versions, Greek, pp. 285–319; Latin, pp. 321–377; Other Ancient Versions, pp. 378–406.

DIXON, Jos. *General Introduction to Sacred Scripture;* Ancient Versions, Dissertation VIII; Modern Versions, Dissertation IX.

GIGOT, F. E. *General Introduction;* Ancient Versions, Chapters XII, XIII, XIV, pp. 260–338; English Versions, Chapter XV, pp. 340–380.

HASTINGS. *Dictionary of the Bible;* On the Septuagint (by E. Nestle), Vol. IV, pp. 437–454; On the Vulgate (by H. J. White), Vol. IV, pp. 873–890; On Syriac Versions (by Nestle), Vol. IV, pp. 645–652; Utility of Ancient Versions to the Critic, Vol. IV, pp. 848–855; English and Other Versions, Vol. IV, pp. 855–886; The Targums, Vol. IV, pp. 678–683.

KAULEN, F. *Einleitung;* Vol. I, Versions, pp. 104–180; very thorough.

KENYON, F. G. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts;* Ancient Versions of Old Testament, Chap. V, pp. 43–93; Ancient Versions of New Testament, Chap. VIII, pp. 150–188; English Versions, Chapters X, XI, pp. 188–245.

NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG, *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge;* The Ancient Versions, by Dr. Nestle, Vol. II, pp. 115–134; English and other Versions, Vol. II, pp. 134–156.

POPE, H. *The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Bible;* Ancient Versions of Old Testament, Vol. I, Chapter III, pp. 80–114; Vol. II, Ancient Versions of N. Test., Chapter VIII, pp. 104–128; English Versions, pp. 114–125.

ROBERTS, A. *Old Testament Revision;* The Septuagint Version and the Samaritan Pentateuch, Chap. VIII, pp. 157–179; The Septuagint used by Christ and His Apostles, Chapter IX, pp. 179–201; The Talmud and the Targums, Chapter X, pp. 201–223; Versions of the Old Test. since the time of Christ, Chap. XI, pp. 223–245; English Versions, Chap. XII, pp. 245–273.

SEISENBERGER, M. *Practical Handbook;* Translations of the Bible, pp. 235–256.

SMITH. *Dictionary of the Bible;* The Septuagint, Vol. IV, pp. 2912–2926; the Latin Vulgate, Vol. IV, pp. 3451–3482; Syriac, Ethiopic, Targums, English, Vol. IV, pp. 3370–3445.

SOUTER, A. *Text and Canon of the N. Test.,* Ancient Versions, pp. 33–76.

VIGOUROUX-BRASSAC. *Manuel Biblique;* Vol. I, Ancient Versions, Chapter V, pp. 170–234.

APPENDIX

HINTS FOR THE BEGINNER

At first, the beginner may not wish to go much beyond his text-book; but every student should learn, as soon as may be, to help himself to the abundant and excellent literature that has been written on many of the important topics belonging to General Introduction. For this purpose, and as a beginning, we call his attention to the Bibliography at the end of each division of this work.

In the "General Introductions" mentioned below he will find a more or less *brief* discussion on nearly every topic that we have handled in the present work.

Also in the Biblical Dictionaries and Encyclopedias he will find the same topics, but often still *more thoroughly,* discussed. For instance, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, fourth volume, the article on the "Latin Vulgate," by B. F. Westcott, covers thirty huge 4to pages in double columns and in small print, which would probably make an ordinary octavo volume of about one hundred and twenty or one hundred and thirty pages. Much the same may be said of the articles on the same and other important subjects in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* in Herder's *Kirchenlexikon,* in Funk & Wagnalls' New Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,* and in Vigouroux's great *Dictionnaire de la Bible.*

Among the "Monographs," in the third part of this Bibliography, the student will find many excellent works containing still *more exhaustive* discussions on the same subjects, but so extensive that it is necessary to treat them in separate and often in large, volumes.

As many articles in the encyclopedias are so large that it has been found necessary to divide and subdivide them into chapters and sections, each with its appropriate title and subtitle, it should, with a little perseverance, be easy for the reader to find almost anything he wants.

No student is supposed to specialize very profoundly until he has studied, in a general way, the entire subject along with some of its various ramifications. He is then in a position to choose a specialty intelligently and definitely. But, long before it comes to this, the student may have time and inclination to devote himself to various phases of his work.

In a course of collateral reading, he may have occasion to study something, either more compendious, or more complete, or expressed in a different style of language, or set forth according to a different method of exposition; he may wish to verify references more carefully, or to find the theses more conclusively established, by a greater display of arguments than is found in his text-books. If so, then knowing beforehand just what he wants, he is more likely to find it, and with much less effort.

To facilitate this work of research, he should know that all, or nearly all, the topics discussed in any relatively complete General Introduction, are discussed also in all, or nearly all, the other complete General Introductions, as well as in all, or nearly all, the complete Biblical Encyclopedias and Dictionaries.

But how shall he find any given topic in the midst of such an abundance of all sorts of Biblical materials? We answer: To the man of good will, it is all easy, very, very easy, if he only knows how to do it. Merely let him consult the alphabetical index (if there is one), in the works to which he is referred; or still better, let him examine very carefully their table of contents; or let him follow the alphabetical order of the titles to the articles in the Biblical Encyclopedias and Dictionaries, making, of course, due allowance for the different wording in the titles to the same topics, and he will soon discover that, with a little good will, with not much initiative, with almost no experience, and with some slight persistence, it will be easy for him to find almost anything he wants, and much more of it than he can ever read.

If the student has time and inclination, he will find some very thorough and exhaustive articles on topics belonging to General Introduction in some of these Biblical Dictionaries and Encyclopedias and Reviews, written by such able Catholic writers as J. Bainvel, C. Chauvin, W. Drum, A. Durand, Fr. E. Gigot, G. Hoberg, N.-J. Lagrange, H. Lesêtre, E. Levêsque, A. J. Maas, E. Mangenot, P. Méchineau, Ferd. Prat, Ch. de Smedt, Van Hoonacker and, of course, many others.

In our chapter on the "Original Languages," "Original Texts," "Ancient Versions," "Textual Criticism," and on some other topics (which have little or nothing to do with faith or morals), we mention many non-Catholic writers, who have very successfully specialized in these subjects, such as F. C. Kenyon (*Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*), B. F. Westcott, and many others.

But in the chapters on "Biblical Inspiration" and "Hermeneutics," treated in Vol. III and IV, we mention few or none but Catholics, and very properly. For Protestants and Rationalists treat these subjects from a very different angle, in fact from an endless variety of angles, some acute and some obtuse, but nearly all useless, or worse than useless, to the Catholic student.

I. General Introductions

BAINVEL, J. *De Scriptura Sacra;* Paris, 1910.

BELSER, J. E. *Einleitung in das N. T.;* 2nd ed., Freiburg, 1906.

BRANDSCHEID, F. *Handbuch der Einleitung ins N. T.,* Freiburg, 1893.

BRASSAC, A. *Introduction to the New Testament;* English tr., St. Louis, 1913.

BREEN, A. *Introduction to the Study of S. Scripture;* 1 Vol., Rochester, 1897.

CAMERLYNCK, A. *Compendium Introductionis Generalis in S. Scripturam;* Bruxellis, 1911.

CELLINI, A. *Propaedeutica Biblica;* 3 vols., Ripatraensonis, 1908–1909.

CHAUVIN, C. *Leçons d'Introduction Générale au Divines Ecritures;* 1 Vol., Paris, 1897.

CORNELY, Rud. *Historica et Critica Introductio in utriusque Testamenti Libros Sacros;* 4 vols. First volume is the General Introduction. Also in *Compendium,* Paris, 2nd ed., 1894–1897.

CORNELY, Rud. *Manuel d'Introduction Hist. et Critique à Toutes les Ecritures;* 2 vols., Paris, 1908.

DIXON, Jos. *A General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures;* Dublin, 1852; several editions.

FELL, W. *Lehrbuch der Allgemeinen Einleitung in das Alte Testament;* Paderborn, 1906.

GIGOT, Fr. E. *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scrip-*

ture; One Vol. Also in *Compendium.* New York, 1910.

HUG, J. L. *Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T.;* 2 vols. Tübingen, 1808; 4th ed., 1847. Engl. tr., London, 1827.

JACQUIER, E. *Histoire des Livres du N. T.;* 4 vols., Paris, 1903–1908.

KAULEN, Franz. *Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift;* Freiburg; 2 vols. Also in Compendium, Freiburg; 5 editions. New editions edited by G. Hoberg.

LAMY, Th. I. *Introduction in S. Scripturam;* 2 vols. 6 edition. Mechliniae, 1901.

MADER, I. *Allgemeine Einleitung in das A. und N. T.,* Münster i. W., 1908.

MARTINETTI, F. *Manuale Introductionis in S. Scripturam;* 2 vols., Rome, 1906–1907.

PELT, J. *Histoire de l'Ancien Testament;* 2 vols., 3rd ed., Paris, 1901–1902.

PEPE. *Lectiones in S. Scripturam;* Aug. Taurin., 1902.

SCHNEEDORFER, A. *Compendium Historiae Librorum Sacrorum N. T.;* 2nd ed., Prague, 1893.

SCHOEPFER, Aem. *Geschichte des A. T.,* 4th ed., Brixen, 1906.

SELBST, J. and SCHÄFER, J. *Handbuch zur Biblischen Geschichte;* 2 vols., 7th ed., Freiburg, 1910.

TROCHON, C. *Introduction Générale;* 1 large vol. Also 2 vols. in 8vo. Paris, 1883. Also in Compendium.

TELCH, C. *Introductio Generalis in S. Scripturam;* 1 vol., Ratisbon; 1908.

TRENKLE, F. S. *Einleitung in das N. T.;* Freiburg, 1897.

UBALDI, Ubaldo. *Introductio in Sacram Scripturam;* 3 vols., 5th edition, Rome, 1907.

VIGOUROUX, Bacuez, and Brassac. *Manuel Biblique;* 4 vols., 13th ed., Paris, 1910.

BRIGGS, C. A. *A General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture;* New York, 1899.

HARMAN, H. M. *Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture;* 1 vol., New York; 1884.

HORNE, T. H. *General Introduction to Holy Scripture;* Many editions in from 1 to 6 vols.

II. General Handbooks and Aids

ANGUS, J. *The Cyclopedic Handbook to the Study of the Bible,*

Old and New Testaments. Revised by S. G. Green. 1 vol., New York, 1915.

BARRY, W. *The Tradition of Scripture;* London, 1 vol.

POPE, Hugh. *The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Study of the Old Testament;* 1 vol., New York, 1913.

POPE, Hugh. *The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Study of the New Testament;* The Gospels; New York, 1918.

SEISENBERGER, M. *Practical Handbook for the Study of the Bible;* 1 vol., New York, 1912.

ZSCHOKKE, H. *Historia Sacra Antiqui Testamenti,* 6th ed., Vienna, 1910.

III. DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPEDIAS, AND REVIEWS EITHER PARTLY OR ENTIRELY BIBLICAL

ADDIS and ARNOLD. *A Catholic Dictionary;* Revised with additions by T. B. Scannel, D.D., 1 vol., 4to, London, 1917.

Biblica. A quarterly review, entirely Biblical, established by the Jesuit professors of the Biblical Institute at Rome; begun Jan. 1920; Articles in Latin, French, German, English, Italian and Spanish.

Biblische Zeitschrift. A quarterly exclusively Biblical, begun in 1902; Freiburg and St. Louis, B. Herder.

Biblische Studien. (Exclusively Biblical.) Many volumes; Münster, i. W.

Catholic Encyclopedia; New York, 16 vols.

D'ALÈS, A. *Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique;* 4th edition, thoroughly revised, 15 vols., Paris.

FAIRBAIRN, P. *The Imperial Bible Dictionary;* 6 vols.

FUNK & WAGNALLS. *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge;* New York, 12 vols., 1908 to 1912.

HASTING, James. *A Dictionary of the Bible;* 5 vols., New York, 1898 to 1904.

HERDER, B. *Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon;* 2nd ed., Freiburg, 1882 sqq., 13 vols.

JACOBUS, M. W. *A Standard Bible Dictionary;* 1 vol., 1909.

KITTO, John. *A Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature;* Edited by W. L. Alexander; 3 vols.

La Revue Biblique. (A quarterly, exclusively Biblical); Jerusalem and Paris; established by the Dominicans in 1892.

ORR, James. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia;* 5 vols., Chicago, 1915.

SMITH, W. A. *Dictionary of the Bible;* Revised by H. B. Hackett; Boston, 4 vols.

VACANT, Alfred. *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique;* Many vols., Paris.

VIGOUROUX, F. *Dictionnaire de la Bible;* (exclusively Biblical); 5 huge volumes, Paris, 1891–1912.

IV. SPECIAL WORKS ON GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The following works discuss, not Special Introduction, but special parts of General Introduction, such as the languages, texts, versions, criticism, canon, etc., of Scripture; but often treat them more fully than can be done in the space allotted to a text-book such as the present.

AMANN, Fr. *Die Vulgata Sixtina von 1590, eine quellenmässige Darstellung ihrer Geschichte;* 1 vol., Freiburg and St. Louis, 1912.

BAUMGARTEN, P. M. *Die Vulgata Sixtina von 1590 und ihre Einführungsbulle;* Münster i. W., 1 vol., 1911.

BONACCORSI, G. *La Volgata al Concilio de Trento;* 1 vol, Bologna, 1904.

BUHL, F. *Text of the Old Testament;* Edinburgh, 1892.

CHARLES, R. H. *Ethiopic Version.* In Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible,* vol. I, pp. 791–793.

GREGORY, C. R. *Canon and Text of the N. T.,* 1 vol, New York, 1907.

GREEN, Wm. H. *General Introduction to the Old Testament;* 1 vol. on the Text; New York, 1913.

HEUSER, H. J. *Chapters of Bible Study;* New York, 1895.

HODY, H. *De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, Versionibus Graecis, et Latina Vulgata;* Oxford, 1707. (Still a standard work.)

HÖPFL, H. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sixto-Klementinischen Vulgata;* 1 vol., Freiburg and St. Louis, 1913.

JACQUIER, E. *The New Testament in the Christian Church;* vol. II, The Text of the New Testament.

JEANNOTTE, Henri. *La Récension de la Vulgate et la Commission Bénédictine;* 1 vol., 1914.

KAULEN, Fr. *Die Geschichte der Vulgata;* 1 vol., Mainz, 1868.

KENYON, F. G. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,* with 26 facsimiles; 4th edition, London, 1903.

LAKE, K. *The Text of the New Testament;* New York, 1911.

LOISY, A. *Histoire Critique du Texte et des Versions de la Bible;* Paris, 1892 sq.

LE BACHELET, P. X. M. *Bellarmin et la Bible Sixto-Clémentine; (Documents Inédits);* 1 vol., Paris, 1911.

MAICHLE, Albert. *Das Dekret "De Editione et Usu S. Librorum";* 1 vol., Freiburg and St. Louis, 1914.

NAVILLE, Ed. *The Text of the Old Testament.*

NESTLE, E. *Introduction to the Greek New Testament;* 3rd edition, 1909.

NEWMAN, Card. *Tracts, Theological and Ecclesiastical,* Part VII: The History of the Text of the Rheims and Douay Version of H. Scripture, pp. 403 ff.

NEWMAN, Card. *Nineteenth Century;* February, 1884, p. 188 ff.

PRAT, Fr. *La Bible de Sixte V* in the *Etudes;* t. L, p. 365 to 384: t. LI, p. 35–60, 205–224.

ROBERTS, A. *Companion to the Revised Version of the N. T.;* New York, 1881.

ROBINSON, F. *"Egyptian Versions,"* in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible; vol. 1, 1898, pp. 668–673.

SMITH, J. P. *The Old Documents and the New Bible.*

SIMCOX, W. H. *Language of New Testament,* New York, 1889.

SOUTER, A. *The Text of the New Testament;* 1 Vol., New York, 1913.

SWETE, B. *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek;* 1 vol., Cambridge, University Press, 1902.

ULFILAS. *The Dictionnaire de la Bible* has an abundant Bibliography on the Gothic Version of Ulfilas.

VERCELLONE, Carlo. *Sulla Autenticità delle Singole Parti della Bibbia Volgata;* Rome, 1866.

WESTCOTT, Bp. Article "Vulgate" in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

WHITE, H. J. Article "Vulgate," in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible, vol. 4, p. 886 ff.

WISEMAN, Card. *Essays on Various Subjects.*

ZERBE, A. S. *The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature.*

The above are only an infinitesimally small part of the literature on topics belonging exclusively to General Introduction. For

instance: NESTLE, Eb., On the "Greek Versions," gives about 300 works, and H. B. SWETE, in his Introduction, gives about 500 works on the Septuagint alone. Altogether there are thousands on that one topic, and many more on the Latin Vulgate, on the Pentateuch, the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul.

END OF VOLUME I

CORRIGENDA

Page 15, 5th line from bottom, omit the word "perhaps."

Page 34, change "may have been" to "was."

Page 92, omit lines 16 and 17.

Page 225, omit lines four and five.

NOTE

In the early chapters of this work, the author usually gives the names of the Old Testament books, etc., as they appear in our Douay Version, which is derived, through the Latin Vulgate, from the much older Septuagint Greek Translation; whereas, in subsequent parts of the work, he often gives the form of Old Testament proper names of persons and places, as we have received them by tansliteration from the original Hebrew. Thus the reader may become familiar with both modes of spelling.