

Dennis Brown's *Jerome*

Recently Dennis Brown has contributed the chapter on Jerome to P.F. Esler's very highly acclaimed *Early Christian World*¹. Brown's chapter is a general account of Jerome's life and achievement. A great deal of space is however devoted to his work on the Bible. Such disproportion is pardonable in an essay by the author of *Vir Trilinguis*², which has likewise been highly praised³. It is therefore unfortunate that what Brown says in both this book and in the recent contribution to Esler's survey should be marked by a close and unacknowledged resemblance to wording employed by earlier scholars. This phraseological affinity has hitherto escaped the notice of reviewers of both *Vir Trilinguis* and of *Early Christian World*.

¹ D. Brown, *Jerome*, in *The Early Christian World*, ed. P.F. Esler, II, London-New York 2000, 1151ff. This work is described by a scholar of late antiquity as eminent as R.M. Grant in the following terms («JR» LXXXII, 2002, 277ff.: 279): «Esler, his collaborators, and Routledge deserve enormous credit and praise for their achievement», while Brown's own chapter is a «valuable profile» (*ibid.* 278). Cf. also the reviews by A.M. Casiday («ThS» LXIII, 2002, 170ff.: 170f.: «Esler's book is a major accomplishment. It will surely become a standard reference») and D. Schmitz («Gymnasium» CX, 2003, 58f.: 59): «[Esler] gelingt es [...] einen interessanten Einblick in das frühe Christentum zu liefern, an den die zukünftige Forschung gut anzuknüpfen vermag»).

² D. Brown, *Vir Trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of St. Jerome*, Kampen 1992.

³ Cf. e.g. E. Nardoni, «Catholic Biblical Quarterly» LVI (1994) 323f.: 324 («a good contribution to the study of Jerome's biblical work»); P.-M. Bogaert, «RBen» CV (1995) 209 («ce livre nuancé»); L. Frizzell, «JECS» III (1995) 83ff.: 85 («[Brown] renders a laudable service for all in the field. The reviewer looks forward to other works in patristic exegesis that will build upon his familiarity with a wide range of persons and topics pertinent to the analysis of Jerome's contribution to the translation and interpretation of the Bible»); J. McGuckin, «NT» XXXVII (1995) 194ff.: 194 («the present study is an elegantly written survey of central aspects of Jerome's exegetical methodology, with an abundance of primary text illustrations, treated with sensitive attention to detail [...]. This study supersedes that of A. Penna written over forty years ago»); H.P. Mathys, «ZATW» CVIII (1996) 136 («das gut lesbare Buch, das Kirchenhistoriker wie Exegeten mit Gewinn zur Hand nehmen werden»). Especial praise has been accorded to chapter 4 (*Jerome as a Translator*), which is the section of the book at issue in the present article; cf. e.g. Nardoni, *o.c.* 323 («the exposition and discussion of Jerome's theory and practice of [...] translation are very informative»); Frizzell, *o.c.* 84 («"Jerome as a Translator" could be consulted with profit by all who recognize Jerome as the patron of translators»); J.-C. Haelewyck, «RHE» XC (1995) 121ff.: 122 («le chapitre 4 [...] constitue le coeur de l'ouvrage»).

The most substantial section of the chapter on Jerome in the latter work is entitled *The Vulgate Translation* (pp. 1161ff.)⁴. Jerome's *Vulgate* was intended to replace the *Old Latin*, which is here described as follows (p. 1162)⁵:

«The Old Latin version was begun in the second century, simultaneously in Africa and western Europe. By the fourth century, it existed in a bewildering number of forms [...]. This was partly because the task of translation had been undertaken by different scholars at different times in different areas⁶, and partly because of errors in translation and careless transcription. The Latin of these early versions was very odd, as the language was adapted to Christian usage, with special vocabulary created for the new translation (Brown 1993⁷: 98f.). The idiom of this form of Latin often recalled the Greek on which the Christian vocabulary was based, and, because it was written for uneducated people, it had a strongly colloquial feel (Metzger 1977⁸: 285-330)».

While the sources to which Brown himself refers for these statements are Metzger and his own *Vir Trilinguis*, the whole of this paragraph in fact reproduces a passage in Kelly's biography of Jerome⁹, which reads as follows:

«The Old Latin version [...] began being made in the second century, Africa and western Europe being simultaneously its cradle; and by the fourth century it existed in a bewildering variety of forms [...]. This was caused partly by the fact that the task of translation had been undertaken [...] by different hands in different areas; but the confusion had been made worse [...] by translation slips [...] and] careless transcription [...]. The Latin of these early versions [...] was highly peculiar [...]. It represented the adaptation of Latin to Christian usage, with the special vocabulary which the new religion required and in its idiom often recalling the Greek on which it was based; and being written for ordinary folk it had a strongly colloquial tang»¹⁰.

If the passage of *Vir Trilinguis* (98f.) to which the afore-cited paragraph refers turns out not to have been Brown's source after all, these same pages of his book can however be themselves shown to have likewise appropriated material from elsewhere¹¹: this time the debt is not to Kelly, but to Metzger. Here Brown states (pp. 98f.):

⁴ Significantly this section begins with the words «Jerome was [...] a *vir trilinguis*».

⁵ In the present article sublineation has been employed to indicate the portions in which Brown's wording mirrors that of his predecessors.

⁶ For the «“Übertrumpfung” einer Vorlage» in Brown's addition of the second element («at different times») cf. B. Axelson, *Das Prioritätsproblem Tertullian – Minucius Felix*, Lund 1941, 70.

⁷ I.e. *Vir Trilinguis*.

⁸ I.e. B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*, Oxford 1977.

⁹ J.N.D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*, London 1975, 86.

¹⁰ Here attention may be drawn to the lexical debasement which replaces the «folk» and «tang» of this last clause with Brown's feebler «people» and «feel» respectively.

¹¹ This and all the other passages of *Vir Trilinguis* to be discussed below form part of the highly commended chapter 4 (cf. n. 3 above).

«The biblical text would be read in Greek (LXX for O.T.) and then repeated in the vernacular. Originally, the vernacular rendering would have been oral, but [...] they¹² began to be written down [...]. Finally, the reading of the Bible in Greek died out and the only version used was the vernacular Latin translation».

The text of Metzger from which Brown has borrowed reads thus¹³:

«reading of holy Scripture [...] in the Greek text (the Septuagint for the Old Testament), then in the vernacular tongue [...]. At first the Latin translation would have been oral [...], but [...] it came to be written down [...]. The final stage came when the custom of reading the lesson in Greek died out, and thereafter copies would be made of the Latin texts alone».

Borrowings from Metzger are also to be found in the section on *The Vulgate Translation* of Brown's recent contribution to *Early Christian World*. The two paragraphs (pp. 1161f.) in question this time are the ones immediately preceding the above-cited passage that was appropriated from Kelly. In the first of these paragraphs, which is the opening one of this section, Brown discusses the commission which Jerome received from Pope Damasus to revise the biblical text:

«Although we do not have the actual words [...] we get a very clear idea [...] from Jerome's Preface to the Four Gospels. He says: [citation of *Praef. Vulg. evang.* p. 1,1-9 (Wordsworth-White)]».

Brown's second paragraph follows immediately¹⁴:

«Jerome, however, was prepared to risk castigation in this way for two reasons. First, he explains, is the pope's command. Second, was the great diversity of Old Latin manuscripts. He exclaims that there were "almost as many forms of text as there are manuscripts"»¹⁵.

Metzger had expressed himself as follows¹⁶:

«Although we do not have the original request [...] we can judge from Jerome's Preface to his revision of the four Gospels [...]. He writes: [citation of *Praef. Vulg. evang.* p. 1,1-9 (Wordsworth-White)]».

Like Brown, Metzger follows this citation with a new paragraph:

«There were two reasons, however, which prompted Jerome to incur such an amount of opprobrium. The first reason, as he goes on to say [...], was the command laid upon him by Damasus [...]. The second was the shocking diversity

¹² «They» is a *constructio ad sensum* for which a plural antecedent is lacking.

¹³ Metzger, *o.c.* (n. 8) 286.

¹⁴ Here it will be appropriate to intermit the sublineation for reasons to be explained below.

¹⁵ The whole of this passage («Although [...] manuscripts») had already occurred in *Vir Trilinguis* (97f.) in a form that differed in only two particulars from the text just cited. One of these differences is found in the first paragraph, where *Vir Trilinguis* had not italicized «Preface to the Four Gospels»: here Metzger likewise avoided italicization. The other difference will be discussed below.

¹⁶ Metzger, *o.c.* (n. 8) 333f.

among the Old Latin manuscripts. There were, in fact, as he says, “almost as many forms of text as there are manuscripts”».

It is true that after the direct citation of *Praef. Vulg. evang.* p. 1,1-9 Metzger is merely paraphrasing the next section of the same preface: *adversum quam invidiam duplex causa me consolatur: quod et tu qui summus sacerdos es fieri iubes, et verum non esse quod variat etiam maledicorum testimonio conprobatur. si enim latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant quibus: tot sunt paene quot codices* (*Praef. Vulg. evang.* pp. 1,9-2,3 [Wordsworth-White]). Brown nonetheless shares with Metzger several features which cannot be explained in this way: «however»; «first, he explains, is the [...] command» (= Metzger’s «first [...], as he goes on to say [...], was the command»); «second»; omission of *si enim ... quibus*; «forms of text»¹⁷. More important is Brown’s formulation of Jerome’s second reason: «Second, was the great diversity of Old Latin manuscripts». This particular wording has very little in common with Jerome’s: *et verum non esse quod variat etiam maledicorum testimonio conprobatur*. However it does match Metzger’s very closely: «The second was the shocking diversity among the Old Latin manuscripts». Instead of «great diversity» Brown’s *Vir Trilinguis* had moreover employed «terrible diversity»: here the epithet is exactly synonymous with Metzger’s «shocking».

The same page of Brown’s *Jerome* that contains his borrowings from Metzger and Kelly (p. 1162) also begins a summary of the arguments adduced by Chapman in support of his view that Jerome was responsible for the revision of the entire *New Testament*¹⁸. In this connection Brown writes: «[Jerome] often quotes readings with which he disagrees and he may have thought a certain reading to be a fairly good one, his own suggestion being meant only to explain the real force of the Greek, not to serve as a tolerable Latin rendering»¹⁹. The second half of this sentence has been taken almost word for word but without acknowledgment from Chapman’s text: «Yet he has frequently retained the reading he finds fault with. This is often because the reading is a fairly good one, and his own suggestion is only meant to explain the real force of the Greek, and not to serve as a tolerable Latin rendering»²⁰. It may also be noted that despite the nearly verbatim nature of the appropriation Brown has at the same time misrepresented Chapman’s argument: what in Chapman had been an objective statement by the author of the article («This is often because the reading is a fairly good one») becomes in Brown’s hands a hypothesized supposition of Jerome himself («[Jerome] may have thought a certain reading to be a fairly good one»).

¹⁷ «Form of text» is not a meaning given for *exemplar* by *ThLL* V/2 1320,36-1325,56 s.v.

¹⁸ J. Chapman, *St. Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament*, «JThS» XXIV (1922-1923) 33-51, 113-125, 282-299.

¹⁹ P. 1163. Exactly the same wording had been used in *Vir Trilinguis* (100).

²⁰ Chapman, *o.c.* (n. 18) 38.

Two sentences later, in the same chapter of *Early Christian World*, Brown states: «Those who argue that Jerome did not revise the text of the Pauline epistles because his quotations differ from the Vulgate, must also conclude that he did not revise the text of the gospels, which is absurd». The same statement had occurred in *Vir Trilinguis* (100f.) with the sole exception that the last three words were given in Latin: «quod est absurdum». Again the sentence has been appropriated from Chapman: «If we are to argue that St. Jerome did not revise the Epistles because he does not quote the Vulgate, it follows [...] that he did not revise the Gospels, quod est absurdum»²¹.

Brown then proceeds to offer counter-arguments to this hypothesis that Jerome revised the whole of the *New Testament*. He starts by mentioning Cavallera's study of the question²². What follows has however come from Kelly. Here Brown says²³:

«Sometimes Jerome employs a text which coincides more or less with the Vulgate, but more often he quotes one which differs. Sometimes he rejects readings which are found in the Vulgate. It is very important in this context that, in his commentaries on Galatians, Ephesians, Philemon and Titus, written c. 387, shortly after his supposed revision of these letters, he never attributes the Latin text he uses to himself, but, on the contrary, often uses the phrase "Latinus interpres"».

Kelly himself had written²⁴:

«Sometimes [Jerome] uses a text which more or less coincides with the Vulgate, but more often a divergent text; sometimes he [...] rejects readings admitted by the Vulgate. Equally striking is the fact that in his commentaries on four of the Epistles (Philemon, Galatians, Ephesians, Titus), which he completed in 387 or thereabouts, i.e. shortly after his supposed revision of them, he nowhere attributes the Latin text he is using to himself, but expressly ascribes it to other translators (cf. his repeated reference to the "Latinus interpres")».

Further reproduction of Kelly is found in the next paragraph, which deals with the recension of the *Psalms* made by Jerome before his departure from Rome. This time Brown's text reads²⁵:

«Jerome revised the Latin text of the Psalter according to the Septuagint. He says that he revised this book very quickly, but made substantial changes. This revision used to be identified as the "Roman Psalter", but recent work has indicated that, while the Roman Psalter is not the version which Jerome made at Rome in 384, it may well represent the text on which he worked and which he corrected».

²¹ Chapman, *o.c.* (n. 18) 117.

²² In this connection Brown refers erroneously to Cavallera's *S. Jérôme: Sa vie et son oeuvre*, Louvain-Paris 1922, instead of his *S. Jérôme et la Vulgate des Actes, des Épîtres et de l'Apocalypse*, «BLE» XXI (1920) 269-292. It may also be noted incidentally that Brown's *Bibliography* (p. 1174) gives Cavallera's Christian name as «Frederic». The correct spelling is of course «Frédéric»; however Cavallera was not a «Frédéric», but a «Ferdinand».

²³ P. 1163 (= *Vir Trilinguis* 101).

²⁴ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 88.

²⁵ P. 1163 (= *Vir Trilinguis* 101).

Kelly had said²⁶:

«This was the revision of the existing Latin text of the Psalter on the basis of the Septuagint translation [...]. According to his own report, he carried this out hastily, but introduced substantial corrections. Traditionally this work has been identified with [...] the “Roman Psalter” [...]. Since 1930, however, [...] there is [...] agreement [...] that, while the Roman Psalter is certainly not the version which Jerome produced at Rome in 384, [...] it probably represents the text on which he worked and which he corrected».

This particular case of borrowing invites a number of comments. In the first place it may be observed that Brown has modified the wording of the second sentence: Kelly's «According to his own report, he carried this out hastily, but introduced substantial corrections» has become «He says that he revised this book very quickly, but made substantial changes». The result is a less accurate rendering of Jerome's language (*licet cursim, magna illud ex parte correxeram*): *cursim* is «hastily» rather than «very quickly»²⁷, while *corrigere* denotes «corrections» instead of «changes»²⁸. Secondly for this Hieronymian text Brown's *Jerome* fails to provide a reference. The one given by Kelly had been wrong²⁹: Kelly's error is reproduced mechanically in *Vir Trilinguis* (101 n. 70). Thirdly Brown also refers in this book (p. 101 n. 71) to articles by de Bruyne and Vaccari in support of his afore-cited affirmations, which have in fact been taken directly from Kelly, whom he does not mention in this connection, but who had given the same two bibliographic references³⁰. This technique of naming only the sources named by one's actual source, which by contrast is not named, can be paralleled from Jerome himself³¹.

The next paragraph of Brown's contribution to *Early Christian World* evinces a similarly close resemblance to the phraseology of a different section of Kelly's book. Here Brown is dealing with Jerome's revision of the *Old Testament* according to the *Hexaplaric Septuagint*³²:

«The Psalter, Job (in two manuscripts) and (in only one manuscript) Song of Songs, are all that remain [...]. In 416, when Augustine asked to consult Jerome's

²⁶ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 89.

²⁷ Cf. *OLD* 476 *s.v.* One might also compare Jerome's use of the term at *C. Ioh.* 33: *cursimque perstringam* (cf. *OLD* 1358 *s.v. perstringo* 3 b: «to pass cursorily over [a subject]»).

²⁸ Cf. *OLD* 449 *s.v.*

²⁹ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 89 n. 40: «the preface to his later translation of the Psalms from the Hebrew». In fact Jerome's statement comes from the preface to his version from the *LXX* (p. 3,2 [ed. comm. pontif.]).

³⁰ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 89 nn. 41f., adducing D. de Bruyne, *Le problème du psautier romain*, «RBen» XLII (1930) 101-126, and A. Vaccari, *I salteri di s. Girolamo e di s. Agostino*, in Id., *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, I, Roma 1952, 207-255: 211-221.

³¹ Cf. H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Göteborg 1958, 309.

³² P. 1164 (= *Vir Trilinguis* 102).

revised Septuagint, the latter had to inform the African bishop that, due to someone's deceit, he no longer had a copy of the other books».

Kelly's original reads³³:

«The Psalter, Job (in two MSS), and Song of Songs (in a single MS)³⁴ have survived [...]; and in 416, when Augustine asked to see his revised Septuagint, Jerome was reduced to confessing that he had lost practically all of it [...] through someone's sharp practice».

Again this borrowing calls for comment. If in the previous instance Brown's manipulation of his source had led to a less correct paraphrase of Jerome's text, this time it produces one that is downright wrong. While Kelly translates Jerome's *pleraque* accurately as «practically all of it», this rendering is then altered by Brown to «the other books», which are *I-II Chronicles*, *Proverbs* and *Ecclesiastes* in contradistinction to *Psalms*, *Job* and *Song of Songs*. Such careful differentiation is however incompatible with Jerome's wholly undifferentiating *pleraque*.

The ensuing paragraph of Brown's *Jerome* is marked by a similar phraseological debt. In speaking of Jerome's decision to undertake a translation from the Hebrew, Brown employs the words «encouraged by friends and the desire to demolish the arguments of the Jews». This phrasing has again been taken from Kelly³⁵: «clear to [...] friends, that their only hope of demolishing the arguments of Jewish critics». The particular wording of Brown's *Jerome* is already to be found in his *Vir Trilinguis*, where a footnote is also appended (102 n. 75): «Augustine (*Civ. XVIII 43 p. 336,27*), whilst not in favour of Jerome's new translation, admitted that, although the Jews found the LXX to be full of errors, they acknowledged the accuracy of Jerome's revision». This phrasing has also been appropriated from a corresponding footnote in Kelly³⁶: «Augustine, who himself disapproved of Jerome's project [...], had to admit that, while the Jews found the LXX full of errors, they acknowledged the accuracy of Jerome's version (*Civ. XVIII 43 p. 336,27*)»³⁷.

The succeeding paragraph of Brown's essay in *Early Christian World* consists of just two sentences³⁸, which are both concerned with Jerome's prologue to his

³³ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 159.

³⁴ Here Kelly inserts a footnote (n. 26: «Its identification was made only in the early 1950's by A. Vaccari: see *o.c.* II 121-146»), which is duly repeated in *Vir Trilinguis* (102 n. 73: «Discovered by A. Vaccari in the early 1950's. See Vaccari: *o.c.* II 121-146»). While volume I of Vaccari's *Scritti* (cf. n. 30) had appeared as early as 1952, it may be noted that the second volume, which is the one at issue here, did not in fact appear until 1958.

³⁵ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 160.

³⁶ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 160 n. 31.

³⁷ Augustine's own words are somewhat different: *sed eius (scil. Hieronymi) tam litteratum laborem quamvis Iudaei fateantur esse veracem, septuaginta vero interpretes in multis errasse contendunt: tamen ecclesiae Christi tot hominum auctoritati ab Eleazaro tunc pontifice ad hoc tantum opus electorum neminem iudicant praefendum.*

³⁸ P. 1164 (= *Vir Trilinguis* 103).

translation of *Samuel* and *Kings*: each contains further instances of borrowed phrasing. The first describes this prologue as «discussing the contents and limits of the Old Testament canon». These words come from Kelly's description of the same prologue³⁹: «defining its (scil. the Old Testament's) contents and limits». Brown's second sentence reads: «[Jerome] refers to the preface as "helmeted" (galeatus) because he arms himself in advance to defend himself from the critics he knows will rise up against him». This statement has been appropriated from a footnote in Kelly⁴⁰: «[Jerome] describes it (scil. the preface) as "helmeted" (galeatus) because in it he is arming himself in advance against possible critics».

Still more similarities of phrasing are to be found in the next paragraph of Brown's chapter in *Early Christian World*. Here he continues his discussion of Jerome's scriptural translations⁴¹: «Soon [...] Jerome started on Job, the Psalter and the Prophets. His friend Sophronius made an "elegant Greek translation" of Jerome's rendering of Job and the Psalter». These two sentences have again been borrowed from Kelly⁴²: «Soon [...] Jerome] was at work on the Psalter, the Prophets, and Job [...]. His friend Sophronius had already made an "elegant Greek translation" of his renderings of the former two». However Brown's modification of his source has again led to error. Here he has altered the order in which the biblical books are given in Kelly's first sentence: the latter's «the Psalter, the Prophets, and Job» is replaced by «Job, the Psalter and the Prophets». Hence the reference in Kelly's second sentence to «the former two» is no longer apposite. It has nonetheless misled Brown into erroneous mention of «Job and the Psalter», which are now «the former two» in his own rearrangement: he should have referred instead to «the Psalter and the Prophets»⁴³.

The next paragraph, which is the penultimate one of *The Vulgate Translation*⁴⁴, contains borrowings from yet another section of Kelly's book. Again two sentences are at issue. In the first one Brown's «He [scil. Jerome] first translated the Pentateuch, having been asked to by his friend Desiderius» reproduces Kelly's «First he [scil. Jerome] tackled the Pentateuch, being pressed to do so by his friend Desiderius»⁴⁵. Brown's second sentence reads: «His preface makes it clear that he thinks there is still a good deal to be done before his translation of the Old Testament would be

³⁹ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 161.

⁴⁰ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 161 n. 38. Nothing in the prologue itself corresponds to Brown's wording.

⁴¹ P. 1164 (= *Vir Trilinguis* 103).

⁴² Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 161.

⁴³ It may also be noted that in *Vir Trilinguis* the words «Job and the Psalter» are equipped with a footnote (p. 103 n. 77) referring the reader to *Vir. ill.* 134. This passage runs: *in graecum sermonem elegantissime transtulit (scil. Sophronius) psalterium ... et prophetas*. Brown accordingly fails to perceive the discrepancy between this Hieronymian text and his own statement to which it serves as a gloss.

⁴⁴ P. 1165 (= *Vir Trilinguis* 103).

⁴⁵ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 283.

complete». The first half of this statement has been appropriated from Kelly⁴⁶: «This selfsame Preface [...] makes it plain that a great deal still remained to be done». In order however to adapt this particular borrowing to its new context Brown tacks on a reference to the *Old Testament*: «before his translation of the Old Testament would be complete». The addition is again erroneous, since here Jerome is not speaking of the entire *Old Testament*, but only of the *Pentateuch*. This limited reference is made clear by what Jerome himself says⁴⁷; it is also evident from the context of Kelly's own sentence, since here he is discussing the vexed issue of the dating of Jerome's translation of just the *Pentateuch*.

The following paragraph brings *The Vulgate Translation* to an end⁴⁸. It too is marked by phraseological indebtedness. Here Brown is dealing with the prologue to Jerome's translation of *Joshua*: «In the preface, he expresses his relief at having finished the Pentateuch: "Having at last finished Moses' Pentateuch, I feel like a man released from a crippling load of debt"». Again the language has come from Kelly⁴⁹: «The Preface [...] opens with [...] a sigh of relief, "Having at last completed Moses's Pentateuch, I feel like a man released from a crippling load of debt"». In the second half of this quotation from the prologue to *Joshua* what Jerome actually says is simply *velut grandi fenore liberati*⁵⁰: for these four words the rendering «I feel like a man released from a crippling load of debt» is very free and rather florid. This clause ends the penultimate sentence of *The Vulgate Translation*. Its very last sentence then speaks of the conclusion of a labour of «some 14 years». This phrase has evidently been appropriated from Kelly's next page: it flatly contradicts what Brown has just said on the previous page, where in contrast to Kelly he made Jerome's work on the *Old Testament* extend from 390 to 406.

Lincoln, Nebraska

NEIL ADKIN

⁴⁶ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 283.

⁴⁷ *Praef. Vulg. pent.* p. 63,1ff. (*Desiderii mei desideratas accepi epistolas ... obsecrantis ut translatum in latinam linguam de hebraeo sermone pentateuchum nostrorum auribus traderem*); *ibid.* p. 69,3ff. (*nunc te precor, Desideri carissime, ut qui tantum opus me subire fecisti, et a Genesi exordium capere, orationibus iuves, quo possim eodem spiritu quo scripti sunt libri, in latinum eos transferre sermonem*).

⁴⁸ P. 1165 (= *Vir Trilinguis* 103).

⁴⁹ Kelly, *o.c.* (n. 9) 283.

⁵⁰ *Praef. Vulg. Ios.* p. 3,1.