

## From Greek Authority to Hebrew Verity and Back: The Question of the Source Text of the Latin Old Testament in the Correspondence between Saints Augustine and Jerome

**Abstract:** In this paper, I would like to focus on one of the issues raised in the correspondence between Saints Augustine of Hippo and Jerome, with respect to the questioning by the first of the necessity or even the validity of translating the Old Testament into Latin from the Hebrew, as advocated by the latter, instead of continuing to give credit to the Greek translation of the Septuagint as the only textual authority for the Christians in both East and West. I shall discuss below the motives and the style of Augustine's criticism, as well as those of Jerome's refutation.

**Keywords:** Augustine; Jerome; Septuagint; Vulgate; Christian Scriptures; Biblical Canon

The sophisticated and scholarly epistolary dispute between two of the greatest Latin biblical exegetes of Late Antiquity, Jerome and Augustine, exhibits essentially the condition of the translator and/or interpreter of the Christian Scriptures. From the necessity of understanding and relaying the correct theological interpretation of difficult places such as the story of Apostle Paul's confrontation with Apostle Peter in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) to the crucial need of choosing the appropriate source text of the Old Testament to be translated into Latin, this dialogue, occasionally friendly and every so often excessively critical between these two rather dissimilar characters presents us with the opportunity to generally appreciate the interpreter's profession and disposition<sup>1</sup>.

\* \* \*

It might be useful to give first a brief presentation of Jerome's activity as a biblical translator before and around the time of his correspondence with Augustine (which took part in two phases: the first, from ca. 393/5 to 405 and the second, in 415-419), in order to offer some background to their dialogue and in particular to the problem in question<sup>2</sup>.

---

\* Independent researcher, Iași, Romania; email: dragos.mirsanu@gmail.com

Born of well-to-do Christian parents, about 346, at Stridon, on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannonia, Jerome was given a fine education most notably at Rome, where he studied under the grammarian and rhetorician Aelius Donatus. There he was baptized and started to learn Greek and, while on the move to Gaul and then to Aquileia, his interest in biblical and theological studies grew. In 374, we find him in Antioch, where he settled after setting out for the Greek-speaking East via Constantinople. Living for a few years among the hermits of Chalcis east of Antioch, following a major spiritual experience, he turned his back to classical literature – at least to a certain degree – in favour of deepening his knowledge of the Scriptures and particularly of acquiring some degree of proficiency in Hebrew – learning it from a converted Jew – as well as in Syriac (Sparks 1970, 511-512).

Of course, as far as the Old Testament was concerned, Jerome was studying the received version of the Septuagint, a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures made during the third century BC for the Greek-speaking Jews of the diaspora in Alexandria; this had been the version used by the Apostles<sup>3</sup> and was thus invested with supreme authority not only in the East, but also in the Western Church, which had their Latin Bible translated from it. As such, in the West, “the need of some Greek was recognized, if only to check the meaning of the Latin Bible against its original: but the need for Hebrew in order to test the LXX against its original was unimaginable – it seemed like assailing the Word of God” (SEMPLE 1965/6, 230). However, it is also important to note that there was more than one version of the LXX circulating at the time – all of them revisions of the Hexaplaric text of the LXX – not to mention there had been even before that alternative versions to the LXX: the second century new translations of the Hebrew Scriptures by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion<sup>4</sup>.

In the context of the schism in Antioch, Jerome found himself a supporter of Paulinus, with whom he went to Constantinople in 381 and then to Rome in 382. Pope Damasus, already an admirer of Jerome’s dedication to learning and to the Church, took him as his secretary and then, most importantly, commissioned him to revise the Latin Bible (or possibly just the New Testament) against the Greek for all the errors made by the original translators some two centuries earlier – most probably because of their imperfect command of the Greek language – and by various copyists since. It is clear that Damasus did not expect a new translation, but merely a revision.

Using a good many Latin manuscripts, he produced first the revised text of the Gospels, in agreement with “*Graeca veritas*”, which he presented to Pope Damasus. Next, he embarked on the revision of the Psalms and a few of the books of the Latin Old Testament against the Greek text of the LXX. After the death of his protector Damasus and the rise of the new Pope Siricius, who was less inclined to support him, Jerome decided to

leave Italy for good and move East. After a stay in Egypt he went to Palestine and settled in Bethlehem in 386. He continued his work on revising the Latin Bible against the LXX, but also against other Greek versions and the Hebrew original. Using Origen's *Hexapla*, he started to introduce the diacritical signs contained there in his new versions<sup>5</sup>. The editor started to gradually find his work more difficult and less satisfactory, being a version transposed not from one language only, but from two: not from the original, but from a translation. In spite of being perceived as authoritative or "sacred" in ecclesiastic circles, Jerome decided the LXX cannot function accurately as source text, both for being a translation itself and for having flaws (Sparks 1970, 530-531)<sup>6</sup>, and also for being practically useless in the discussions with the derisive Jews, who were not accepting it as valid. The only solution, as he saw it, was to leave aside the older renditions and produce fresh translations into Latin, directly from the "Hebraica veritas", or *iuxta hebraeos*. While he began to publish pieces of his Old Testament translations – meanwhile learning some more Hebrew from one or more Jews, such as one named Baraninas – he was to encounter a rather persistent opposition from the likes of Rufinus and Epiphanius of Salamis, and not least from Augustine, as we shall see next, but most commonly from critics with no proper training, yet willing to tarnish his name simply because he dared to change the text as it had been known, for instance by the omission/inclusion of passages and the alteration of familiar wording. It was of little consequence that he recommended that his translations be checked for accuracy with the help of Jews, as this had little chance to occur in practice, due to obvious reluctance on the part of the Christians. By 405/406, Jerome had managed to finish his translation of the Old Testament, with the exception of the apocryphal books, which were not part of the Hebrew canon. He dedicated the last years of his life, until his death in 420, to the composition of some major Old Testament commentaries, to the Minor Prophets, Daniel, Isaiah, and Ezekiel – by which he defended, one could say, his work of translating from the Hebrew.

Nowhere clearer than in the *Preface* to his translation of the Chronicles (Paralipomenon) does Jerome put together his main arguments to support his endeavor. First, he states that the original text of the LXX is impossible to recover and that, even if one would manage this, that source text would still be a translation:

"If the version of the Seventy translators is pure and has remained as it was rendered by them into Greek, you have urged me on superfluously, my Chromatius, most holy and most learned of bishops<sup>7</sup>, that I translated the Hebrew scrolls into the Latin language.... Now, in fact, when different versions are held by a variety of regions, and this genuine and ancient translation is corrupted and violated, you have considered our opinion, either to judge which

of the many is the true one, or to put together new work with old work..." (Jerome, *Preface to Paralipomenon* 1-8 Weber-Gryson, 546; trans. Edgecomb).

"Origen certainly not only put together the texts of four editions, writing the words in a single row so that one regularly differing may be compared to others agreeing among themselves, but what is more audacious, into the edition of the Seventy he mixed the edition of Theodotion, marking with asterisks those things which were missing, and placing virgules by those things which are seen to be superfluous. If, therefore, it was allowed to others not to hold what they once accepted, and after the seventy chambers, which are considered without a single author, individual chambers were opened, and thus is read in the churches what the Seventy did not know, why do my (fellow) Latins not accept me, who thus put together the new with the inviolate old edition so that I might make my work acceptable to the Hebrews and, what is greater than these, to the authors, the Apostles?" (*Ibidem* 12-21)

Jerome recommends his own "On the best kind of translating" (Hie. 57, to Pammachius) to those willing to learn that there are quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament that are not in LXX but can be found in the Hebrew text and finally remind his detractors of a precedent: Theodotion's translation of parts of Job and Daniel had been accepted in lieu of the LXX text:

"The Apostles and Evangelists were certainly acquainted with the Seventy interpreters, but from where are they (supposed) to say these things which are not found in the Seventy?" (*Ibidem* 24-25)

"Thus is the turning back to the Hebrew books, from which the Lord spoke and the disciples took forth texts. In peace I will say these things of the ancients, and I respond only to my detractors, who bite me with dogs' teeth, slandering me in public, speaking at corners, the same being both accusers and defenders, when approving for others what they reprove me for, as though virtue and error were not in conflict, but change with the author. I have recalled another edition of the Seventy translators corrected from the Greek to have been distributed by us, and me not to need to be considered their enemy, which things I always explain in the gatherings of the brothers" (*Ibidem* 31-37; cf. Jerome, *Preface to Joshua*, Weber-Gryson, 285-286; Müller 1989, 115).

\* \* \*

By the time he initiated the dialogue with Jerome, in 384/385, Augustine had apparently learned that he was now translating some books of the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew. While his more immediate interest and the main element that further ignited the correspondence was Jerome's intriguing interpretation of the episode of Paul's confrontation with Peter in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14), Augustine considered it important to first state the absolute authority of the Septuagint (by which he meant both the Greek original and the Latin translation made from it) already from his first letter

(Aug. 28), revisiting the topic in Aug. 71 and Aug. 82 (while Jerome had a chance to answer in Hic. 112, in reply to Aug. 71)<sup>8</sup>.

From his first letter, we learn that Augustine would have preferred that Jerome translate into Latin from the Greek text of the LXX and use signs to mark, when necessary, where does his translation differ from the text of the Septuagint (as he did in his translation of the Book of Job). Moreover, since the authority of the LXX translation is undisputable, the learning of the translators cannot be called into question and also the Hebrew bias and polemical purpose of the translations made by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion are evidently deplorable, Augustine would like to know what is Jerome hoping to achieve:

“I would be very surprised if anything could still be found in the Hebrew texts which had escaped the notice of all those translators who were such experts in that language. I say nothing of the Seventy, for I would not dare to any kind of decisive answer to the question of whether they possessed a greater harmony of wisdom or of inspiration that one man could have, but I do think that their work should without doubt be accorded preeminent authority in this field. I am more disturbed by those who, in making later versions, clung more tenaciously, as the saying goes, to the method and rules of Hebrew words and expressions and not only disagreed amongst themselves but also left out many things which had to be explained and elucidated much later. If these things are obscure, one must suppose that you, too, can be mistaken about them; if they are obvious, it is most unlikely that these translators could have been mistaken about them. I would therefore beg you to give me assurances with regard to this matter by kindly explaining your position on it.” (Aug. 28.2 FC 41: 100/102; trans. White 1990, 66-67)

For one reason or another, this first letter never reached its destination. However, Augustine decided to include a copy of it with another letter that he sent much later, in 403 (Aug. 71), so it was only at this time that Jerome actually learned anything about his concerns. By attaching his old Aug. 28 to Aug. 71, Augustine gave himself the opportunity to reopen the discussion and resume his criticism of Jerome’s translating principles, on account of recently learning of a new translation of the Book of Job, this time made from the Hebrew. He repeats his desire that Jerome translate from the Greek text of the Septuagint, for pastoral reasons, especially since it would otherwise create a rift between East and West:

“I feel that many problems would arise if your translation began to be read regularly in many churches, because the Latin churches would be out of step with the Greek ones, especially as anyone who puts forward objections will easily be proved wrong when the Greek text is produced, for Greek is a language almost universally known.” (Aug. 71.4 FC 41: 162; trans. White 1990, 92)

Conversely, if the faithful would have only a version translated from the Hebrew and a dispute should arise “it would be almost impossible to get

hold of the Hebrew texts” in order to settle it. Augustine’s pastoral concern is most evident when he offers Jerome an illustrative example of such misunderstanding. In the city of Oea (modern Tripoli), says Augustine, the reading of a passage from the Book of Jonah in Jerome’s translation, with the blessing of the local bishop, purportedly caused a disturbance, for it was at odds with the translation the faithful knew: “They came across a word in your version of the prophet Jonah which you had rendered very differently from the translation with which they were familiar and which, having been read by so many generations, was ingrained in their memories.” (*Ibidem*; Duval 1966, 10-14) Apparently, the bishop had been forced to call for some Jews who confirmed that the Greek and old Latin translations were right, while Jerome’s version was wrong and needed immediate correction: “This makes even us suspect that you, too, can be mistaken occasionally.” (Aug. 71.5 FC 41: 164; trans. White 1990, 93)

Trouble with the translation of Jonah 4:6 was hardly news. Jerome had used *hedera* (ivy), for the plant in the Hebrew text that is said to have grown fast upon God’s command in order to throw its shade over Jonah, instead of *cucurbita* (gourd), as in the Old Latin Bible (Rebenich 1993, 58). For that, a certain Canterius had accused him of sacrilege in Rome<sup>9</sup>. Explaining that the name of the plant cannot be rendered perfectly since it does not exist in the Latin world and language, Jerome defended his approximation of the plant by means of botanical considerations<sup>10</sup>.

Finally, Jerome has the chance to respond to Augustine’s concerns (Hie. 112, about 405). He emphasises that he did not mark the deviations from the LXX because he worked on the Hebrew text and was simply concerned with rendering the truth of the original into Latin. Jerome is wittingly surprised that Augustine would use a “corrupted” version of the Septuagint, that of Origen, incorporating the work of Jews like Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, but not a translation made by him, a Christian who made an effort to free the text from Judaizing influences:

“I am surprised that you are not reading the Septuagint in the original form as it was produced by the Seventy, but in an edition corrected, or corrupted, by Origen using daggers and asterisks... Do you wish to be a true admirer of the Septuagint? Then you should not read what is preceded by an asterisk – in fact you should delete such passages from your copy, to prove yourself to be a supporter of the ancient translators. But if you were to do this, you would be forced to condemn all church libraries for only one or two copies are to be found which do not contain these passages.” (Hie. 112.19-20 FC 41: 218; trans. White 1990, 133-134; cf. Jerome, *Preface to Job*, Weber-Gryson, 731-732; Jerome, *Preface to Isaiah*, Weber-Gryson, 1096).

The scholar from Bethlehem takes pains to pay it back to Augustine by using his own argument that his work had been already well done, so why

would he repeat what others did so perfectly? By the same token, says Jerome, how do you, Augustine the Exegete, dare to interpret the Scriptures where illustrious men have previously done it with splendid results:

“Please tell me why your opinion should differ from that of such distinguished commentators on the psalms. If the psalms are unintelligible you must admit that it is possible for you, too, to be mistaken about them, but if their meaning is clear, it is hardly likely that those commentators should have got them wrong. And so, either way your interpretation will be redundant.” (Hie. 112.20 FC 41: 222; trans White 1990, 134-135)

As far as the correspondence goes, Augustine’s reply included in Aug. 82 constitutes the final word on our topic. The doubt persists. After he acknowledges that it would be desirable to know whether the Jews might have left out or corrupted the original when translating into Greek, Augustine is puzzled as to which Jews Jerome is referring to: those who translated before the coming of the Lord, or the later ones? Evidently, the former cannot be thought as deceivers whatsoever, therefore the suspicion must lie with the more recent ones. The bishop of Hippo accentuates his deep interest in Jerome’s translation of the Septuagint that he was not aware existed and of which he would like to be sent a copy. While Augustine admits to the usefulness of knowing the variety of interpretations brought about by the obscurity of many passages, he nevertheless points out to the single most important aim of everything, i.e., to hold the unity of the faith. In a last statement, he claims that his opposition has never been due to his jealousy of Jerome’s useful labours, as some might have thought, but was fuelled purely by the need to follow his obligation to care for the faithful:

“The reason I was unwilling for your translation from the Hebrew Bible to be read in the churches was that I wanted to avoid introducing it as something new and as a rival to the authority of the Septuagint, in case it should confuse the Christian congregation when their ears and hearts are used to this translation which even the apostles approved of. That is why if that shrub in the Book of Jonah is neither an ivy nor a gourd in the Hebrew version, but something else which leans on its own stem and grows without being supported by any prop, I would still prefer that ‘gourd’ be read in all the Latin versions, for I do not think that the Septuagint used this word without good reason: these translators must have known that this is more or less what it meant.” (Aug. 82. 35 FC 41: 332; trans. White 1990, 174)

I believe these extracts have argued sufficiently in favour of Augustine’s pastoral concern<sup>11</sup> as probably the most important motive for him countering Jerome’s method and principles of translation. Simply said, while he would agree that a translation from the Hebrew would be helpful for the learned among the Christians, the Septuagint translation has to remain the only one authorized by, and to be used in, the Church.

However, while the aim of this paper was to concentrate on the issue of translating from the Greek or from the Hebrew in the correspondence, this cannot be done in total disconnection from the main element of discussion, lest we are to miss a very important side of things. Augustine's insistence on debating the correct manner of interpretation of the episode in Gal. 2:11-14 had serious consequences for defining the authority of the Scriptures and, in particular, the question of the useful lie, *mendacium officiosum*, as an exegetical precedent. The manner in which Paul's confrontation with Peter was understood during the first Christian centuries had created basically two traditions: one which supported the idea that the confrontation was real, in which therefore Peter humbly accepted Paul's correction (a position embraced also by Augustine) and one that saw the confrontation as a preplanned scene for the benefit of the faithful of both Gentile and Jewish provenance (that was Jerome's understanding, mostly following Origen). There is no need to go into the debate proper between Augustine and Jerome, which one can learn about elsewhere<sup>12</sup>. Suffice it to note that, for Augustine, the possibility that the Scriptures may lie, even for a 'blessed' reason, was disconcerting to say the least. If for Jerome most of everything Scripture told was to be investigated, broadly speaking, from a scholar's perspective, for Augustine it was chiefly a matter of pastoral concern and, furthermore – it must be said now – it certainly affected his anti-heretical stance (Cole-Turner 1980). The correspondence reveals that the implications of Jerome's interpretation of Paul's confrontation of Peter were embarrassing Augustine at the time of his fighting the Manicheans. It was, after all, hard to support the total authenticity and veracity of the corpus of the Scriptures if interpretations such as Jerome's would unsuspectingly open the door to all who were being inclined to proclaim the falsity of (parts of) the Bible. One cannot fail to observe here that Augustine's determined opposition to Jerome's work of translation from the Hebrew falls in a similar category: if the erudite priest is to point out by comparing the Septuagint version with the *Hebraic veritas* the potential inconsistencies, the errors, the additions or omissions, or perhaps the forgeries in the text, will this not encourage those who were dedicated to find the text faulty and unreliable?

\* \* \*

Lastly, there is evidence that the topic remained of interest to Augustine even after the correspondence was long over<sup>13</sup>. In his *City of God*, the African bishop takes his time to write down a few thoughts on the position of the Scriptures in the Church (esp. 18.41-43 CCSL). For Augustine, the Septuagint is certainly inspired and any divergence from the Hebrew original should not be considered an error (unless made by a scribe), but a



result of the Holy Spirit moving the translators to actually prophesy by rendering the text differently:

“But where the difference is not a mere copyist’s error, and where the sense is agreeable to truth and illustrative of truth, we must believe that the divine Spirit prompted them to give a varying version, not in their function of translators, but in the liberty of prophesying. And therefore we find that the apostles justly sanction the Septuagint, by quoting it as well as the Hebrew when they adduce proofs from the Scriptures.” (Augustine, *City of God* 15.14 CCSL; trans. Dods, 2: 75)

After giving an account on how the Septuagint was made in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus by the hand of the seventy-two, who “received so wonderful a gift of God, in order that the authority of these Scriptures might be commended not as human but divine” (*City of God* 18.42; trans. Dods [actually George Wilson]), Augustine proceeds to a lengthy affirmation of the authority of the Septuagint and that it has to be preferred to all other translations, that can be accepted only if agreeing to the Septuagint. As it refers explicitly to Jerome and his work and it offers his final word on this issue, it deserves to be quoted extensively, for I cannot think of a better conclusion than his own:

“For while there were other interpreters who translated... yet the Church has received this Septuagint translation just as if it were the only one; and it has been used by the Greek Christian people, most of whom are not aware that there is any other. From this translation there has also been made a translation in the Latin tongue, which the Latin churches use. *Our times, however, have enjoyed the advantage of the presbyter Jerome, a man most learned, and skilled in all three languages, who translated these same Scriptures into the Latin speech, not from the Greek, but from the Hebrew* [our italics, D.M.]. But although the Jews acknowledge this very learned labour of his to be faithful, while they contend that the Septuagint translators have erred in many places, still the churches of Christ judge that no one should be preferred to the authority of so many men, chosen for this very great work by Eleazar... but since so great a sign of divinity has appeared in them, certainly, *if any other translator of their Scriptures from the Hebrew into any other tongue is faithful, in that case he agrees with these seventy translators, and if he is not found to agree with them, then we ought to believe that the prophetic gift is with them. For the same Spirit who was in the prophets when they spoke these things was also in the seventy men when they translated them* [our italics, D.M.] ... Some, however, have thought that the Greek copies of the Septuagint version should be emended from the Hebrew copies; yet they did not dare to take away what the Hebrew lacked and the Septuagint had, but only added what was found in the Hebrew copies and was lacking in the Septuagint, and noted them... And those things which the Hebrew copies have not, but the Septuagint have, they have in like manner marked... and many copies having these marks are circulated even in Latin... if anything is in the Hebrew copies and is not in the version of the Seventy, the Spirit of God

did not choose to say it through them, but only through the prophets. But whatever is in the Septuagint and not in the Hebrew copies, the same Spirit chose rather to say through the latter, thus showing that both were prophets... Further, whatever is found in both editions, that one and the same Spirit willed to say through both, but so as that the former preceded in prophesying, and the latter followed in prophetically interpreting them.” (*City of God* 18.43 CCSL; trans. Dods, 2: 271-273)

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The letters which were sent to each other can be found in the critical editions of both Jerome and Augustine, as well as in separate editions that collect them together, such is the most recent one made for *Fontes Christiani* (= FC) by Alfons Fürst (Fürst 2002), which I use here, together with Carolinne White’s English translation (White 1990). For the other letters, I use the CSEL editions made by A. Goldbacher (Augustine) and I. Hilberg (Jerome).

<sup>2</sup> In general for Jerome, see Cavalerra 1922; Kelly 1975. For Jerome as an exegete and translator I found the following particularly useful: Semple 1965/66; Sparks 1970; Rebenich 1993.

<sup>3</sup> Hie. 57.11 CSEL 54: 523: “et tamen iure Septuaginta editio obtinuit in ecclesiis, uel quia prima est et ante Christi fertur aduentum uel quia ab apostolis, in quibus tamen ab Hebraico non discrepat, usurpata”.

<sup>4</sup> On the question of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible text, see Müller 1989, 115-116.

<sup>5</sup> *Preface to Job* [LXX version], to Paula and Eustochium, PL 29: 61.

<sup>6</sup> On the Septuagint before Jerome, see Müller 1989, 103-114.

<sup>7</sup> On Chromatius of Aquileia, see *PCBE, Italie*, 2: 432-436.

<sup>8</sup> In general on the correspondence, including the complicated problems of chronology, see Cavalerra 1922; De Bruyne 1932; Joussard, 1956; Hennings 1993; Fürst 1999; Ebeller 2012, esp. 101-150. For the chronological table of the letters, see now Fürst 2002, 14-15. I regret not having had access to Alfons Fürst, “*Veritas Latina*. Augustins Haltung gegenüber Hieronymus’ Bibelübersetzungen”, *Revue d’études augustiniennes et patristiques* 40 (1994): 105-126, reprinted in Idem, *Von Origenes und Hieronymus zu Augustinus. Studien zur antiken Theologiegeschichte*, Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2011.

<sup>9</sup> Rebenich 59: “It is also striking that the new translation *ivy* had obviously not been criticized for philological, but for theological reasons; that is to say, Jerome was accused of *sacrilegium* since his translation differed from the traditional and thus divinely inspired reading of the Bible.” Cf. Rufinus, *Apologia* 2.39 CCSL 20, 114.

<sup>10</sup> Jerome, *Commentary on Jonah* 4:6 SCh 43: 110-112; trans. Hegedus 1991, 63-64: “Instead of gourd, or ivy, in Hebrew we read *ciceion* which is also said *ciceia* in the Syriac and Punic languages. It is, however, a type of shrub or small tree, which has broad leaves in the manner of a vine, and supporting very thick shade. It grows profusely in Palestine, and especially in sandy places, and it is a wonder as a seedling. If you throw it in the earth it warms quickly and grows into a tree, and within a few days what you had seen as a herb you will suppose to be a small tree. Because of this also, at that time when we were interpreting the prophets, we wished to translate the very name itself from the Hebrew language, since Latin discourse does not have this type of tree. But we were afraid that the grammarians would not find leave for commenting on it, and would imagine them to be either beasts of India, or mountains of Boeotia, or certain other wonders of this kind; and so we followed the ancient translators, who also themselves translated as ‘ivy’ what is called *κισσός* in Greek, for they did not have another word which they could say.”

<sup>11</sup> Aug. 73.5 FC 41: 240-242; trans. White 1990, 104: “For I am not, and cannot be, as learned in the Holy Scriptures as I see you are; if I have some ability in this field, I devote it in one way or another to the people of God”).

<sup>12</sup> On the Galatians episode in the correspondence, see Aug. 28; Aug. 40; Aug. 82; Hie. 112 with Cole-Turner 1980; Sinapi 1993; Fürst 1999, 1-87.

<sup>13</sup> I will not concern myself with particulars as to Augustine’s actual use of Jerome’s translations from the Hebrew, for which see La Bonnardière 1986.

## References

- Antin, Dom Paul. 1956. *Jérôme, Sur Jonas: introduction, texte latin, traduction et notes*. Sources chrétiennes (= SCh), 43. Paris: Cerf.
- Augustine (Augustinus). 1895-1923. *Epistulae*. Edited by A. Goldbacher. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (=CSEL) 34/1-2; 44; 57; 58. Vienna.
- Augustine (Augustinus). 1955. *De civitate Dei*. Edited by B. Dombart/A. Kalb. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (CCSL) 47-48, 1 and 2. Turnhout: Brepols. [[http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost05/Augustinus/aug\\_cd00.html](http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost05/Augustinus/aug_cd00.html) – retrieved 15 December 2016]
- Augustine of Hippo. 1872. *The City of God. A New Translation*, 2 vols. Translated by Marcus Dods [and others]. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Cavallera, Ferd. 1922. *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*. 2 vols. Louvain; Paris.
- Cole-Turner, Ronald S. 1980. “Anti-heretical Issues and the Debate over Galatians 2:11-14 in the Letters of St. Augustine to St. Jerome”. *Augustinian Studies* 11: 155-166.
- De Bruyne, D. 1932. “La correspondance échangée entre Augustin et Jérôme”. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 31: 233–248.
- Duval, Yves-Marie. 1966. “Saint Augustin et le Commentaire sur Jonas de Saint Jérôme”. *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 12: 9-40.
- Ebbeler, Jennifer. 2012. *Disciplining Christians: Correction and Community in Augustine's Letters*. Oxford studies in Late Antiquity. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fürst, Alfons. 1999. *Augustins Briefwechsel mit Hieronymus*. In *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*. Ergänzungsband 29. Münster Westfalen: Aschendorff Verlag.
- Fürst, Alfons, 2002. *Augustinus-Hieronymus: Epistulae mutuae = Briefwechsel*, vols I-II. Übersetzt und Eingeleitet von Alfons Fürst. Fontes Christiani (= FC) 41. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Hegedus, Timothy Michael. 1991. “Jerome's commentary on Jonah: Translation with introduction and critical notes”. *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. Paper 115. Wilfrid Laurier University (<http://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/115/> – retrieved 15 December 2016)
- Hennings, R. 1993. “The Correspondence between Augustine and Jerome”. In *Studia Patristica XXVII*. Edited by E. A. Livingston. Papers presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1991, 303-310. Leuven.
- Jerome (Hieronymus). 1864. *Praefatio Hieronymi in Librum Job*, Patrologia Latina (= PL) 29: 61-62.
- Jerome (Hieronymus). 1910-1918. *Epistulae*. Edited by I. Hilberg. Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (=CSEL) 54-56. Vienna.
- Jerome (Hieronymus). 2007. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*, 5th Edition. Edited by Robert Weber and Roger Gryson. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Jerome. 2007. *Vulgate Prologues*. Translated by Kevin P. Edgecomb. (<http://www.bombaxo.com/prologues.html> – last updated 6 September 2007; retrieved 15 December 2016).

- Joussard, Georges. 1956. "Réflexions sur la position de saint Augustin relativement aux Septante dans sa discussion avec saint Jérôme". *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques* 2: 93–99.
- Kelly, John N. D. 1975. *Jerome. His life, writings and controversies*. London: Harper and Row.
- La Bonnardière, Anne-Marie. 1986. "Augustine a-t-il utilisé la 'Vulgate' de Jérôme?" In *Saint Augustin et la Bible*. Edited by A.-M. la Bonnardière, 303–312. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Lardet, Pierre. 1983. *Saint Jérôme: Apologie Contre Rufin: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Index*. Sources Chrétiennes, 303. Paris: Cerf.
- Müller, Mogens. 1989. "Graeca sive Hebraica Veritas? The Defence of the Septuagint in the Early Church". *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 1: 103–124.
- PCBE, *Italie = Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire. 2. Italie (313-604)*. 1999. Edited by Charles et Luce Pietri. Rome: École française de Rome.
- Rebenich, Stefan. 1993. "Jerome: The 'vir trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica veritas'". *Vigiliae Christianae* 47: 50–77.
- Rufinus. 1961. *Apologia contra Hieronymum*. Edited by M. Simonetti. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (= CCSL) 20: 29–123. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Semple, W.H. 1965/66. "St. Jerome as a Biblical Translator". *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 48: 227–243.
- Sinapi, Michèle. 1993. "La question du mensonge officieux dans la correspondance Jérôme-Augustin". *Rue Descartes*, no. 8/9, *Mensonge et image* (Novembre 1993): 63–83.
- Sparks, H.F.D. 1970. "Jerome as Biblical Scholar". In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1: From the Beginnings to Jerome. Edited by P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans, 510–541. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, Carolline. 1970. *The Correspondence (394-419) between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo*. Lampeter