

Wilfrid Laurier University

Scholars Commons @ Laurier

Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)

1991

Jerome's commentary on Jonah: Translation with introduction and critical notes

Timothy Michael Hegedus
Wilfrid Laurier University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hegedus, Timothy Michael, "Jerome's commentary on Jonah: Translation with introduction and critical notes" (1991). *Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive)*. 115.
<https://scholars.wlu.ca/etd/115>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (Comprehensive) by an authorized administrator of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**Jerome's Commentary on Jonah:
Translation with Introduction and Critical Notes**

By

Timothy Michael Hegedus
B.A., University of Victoria, 1980
M.Div., Lutheran Seminary, University of Saskatchewan, 1985

THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Religion and Culture
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts degree
Wilfrid Laurier University
1991

©Timothy Hegedus, 1991



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-68685-5

ABSTRACT

This thesis presents the exegetical practice of the Biblical scholar Eusebius Hieronymus, better known as Jerome (c.331-420), as exhibited in his Commentary on the book of Jonah. Through a translation of this work for English-language readers and an introductory chapter, the thesis offers a case study of Jerome's hermeneutical approach as it may be observed in his interpretation of a specific Biblical text.

Jerome composed his Commentary on Jonah at a critical point in his career as a Biblical scholar and interpreter. It was the first Biblical commentary Jerome wrote after he professed to have repudiated his allegiance to the Origenist manner of Biblical interpretation, which had hitherto served as a primary inspiration in his study of the Bible. Therefore, the thesis includes an extended introductory chapter examining the influence of Origen upon Jerome's Biblical scholarship. Following this, the translation of the Commentary is given in full. (It marks the first appearance of this work in an English edition.) Significant cruces in the manuscript tradition are treated in footnotes to the text of the Commentary, while extensive endnotes are provided in order to clarify the meaning of the text, illuminate obscurities, and indicate sources and also allusions to other works. Finally, a bibliography is appended.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....i

Table of Contents.....ii

Abbreviations.....iii

Introduction.....vi

On Jonah the Prophet.....1

Notes.....70

Bibliography.....93

ABBREVIATIONS

I. General Works:

- Antin=Saint Jérôme, Sur Jonas, Introduction, Texte Latin, Traduction et Notes de Paul Antin. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1956.
- BAG=Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, trans. W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, 2nd ed. rev. by F.W. Gingrich and F.W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- BDB=Francis Brown, S.R. Driver, C.A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.
- BSV=Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, ed. Robert Weber. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969.
- CCL=Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina
- CSEL=Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
- Duff=The Letters of Saint Jerome: a Selection to Illustrate Roman Christian Life in the Fourth Century, ed. James Duff. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1942.
- Duval=Jérôme, Commentaire sur Jonas, Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Commentaire par Yves-Marie Duval. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985.
- Duval, "La conversion des lettrés"=Yves-Marie Duval, "Saint Cyprien et le roi de Ninive dans l'In Ionam de Jérôme: La conversion des lettrés à la fin du IV^{ème} siècle" in Epektasis: Mélanges Patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972) pp.551-570.
- Duval, Le Livre de Jonas=Yves-Marie Duval, Le Livre de Jonas dans la Littérature Chrétienne Grecque et Latine: Sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme. 2 vols. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1973.
- Fremantle=St. Jerome: Letters and Selected Works, trans. W.H. Fremantle, with G. Lewis and W.G. Martley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.
- IDB=The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 4 vols., ed. G.A. Buttrick et al. and Supplementary vol. 5, ed. Keith Crim et al. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962, 1976.
- Kelly=J.N.D. Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Labourt=Saint Jerome, Lettres, Texte Établi et Traduit par Jérôme Labourt. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1949-1961.

Lewis and Short=Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, A Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958.

Liddell and Scott=Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, rev. ed. Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.

PG=J.-P. Migne, ed. Patrologia Graeca

PL=J.-P. Migne, ed. Patrologia Latina

Richardson=Theodoret, Jerome, Gennadius, Rufinus: Historical Writings, etc., trans. Blomfield Jackson, Ernest Cushing Richardson, and W.H. Fremantle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.

Weingreen=J. Weingreen, A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew, 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.

Wright=Letters of St. Jerome, trans. F.A. Wright. London: Heinemann, 1954.

Ziegler=Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, v.XIII: Duodecim Prophetae, ed. Joseph Ziegler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1943.

II. Manuscripts and Editions (based on Duval, pp.154-156):

Manuscripts:

A=Cologne, 9th century
E=Paris, 9th century
C=Cambrai, 9th century
D=Laon, 9th century
E=Paris, 8th-9th centuries (extracts)
F=Kassel, 8th century
G=Saint-Gall, 9th century
H=Karlsruhe, 9th century
I=Karlsruhe, 9th century
J=Troyes, 9th century
K=Cologne, 8th-9th centuries
L=Paris, 9th century
M=Paris, 9th century
N=Namur, 9th century
O=Orleans, 9th century
P=Paris, 9th century
X=Le Mans, 9th century
Y=Le Mans, 9th century
Bi=Mont-Cassin, 11th century

Editions:

Era=Erasmus ed. (1516, and often reprinted)
Gre=Bernardini Gadolo ed. (1497, printed by Gregorian brothers)
Vic=Victor Mariani ed. (1565, and often reprinted)
Mar=J. Martianay ed. (1704)
Val=Dominici Vallarsi ed. (1734, 1768)
Ant=P. Antin ed. (1956)
Adr=M. Adriaen ed. (1969)
Duval=Y.-M. Duval ed. (1985)

INTRODUCTION

Among the greatest figures of Biblical scholarship during the early centuries of the Common Era is Eusebius Hieronymus, more commonly known as Jerome (c.331-420). He is best remembered, of course, for his translation of the Latin version of the Bible which came to be known as the Vulgate; however, his extensive literary accomplishments also include translations of other texts as well as significant works of his own on various aspects of Biblical studies, commentaries on most of the Biblical writings, and an extensive correspondence. The present work is his commentary on Jonah rendered into English, with an introduction and critical notes to the text.

Jerome wrote his commentary on Jonah during the year 396 or early in 397. The latest date of composition for De Viris Illustribus (January, 393¹) indicates early 396 as the terminus a quo for dating the work 'about three years' later.² The echoes of the De Resurrectione Mortuorum of Tertullian (cf. below on 2:2, p.30; on 2:7b, p.40) which Jerome was also using in his pamphlet Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum may suggest that Jerome was working on the latter at the same time as his commentary on Jonah, i.e.

¹. T.D. Barnes, Tertullian (Oxford: University Press, 1971) pp.235-236.

². J.N.D. Kelly, Jerome (New York: Harper and Row, 1975) p.220. (Jerome uses the phrase triennium circiter at the opening of the prologue to the present commentary.)

during the winter of 396-397.³

Jerome had early shown an interest in Christianity and the pursuit of scholarship, particularly in Biblical studies. After having completed his education in Rome he travelled to Trier in about 367 where, as we read in one of his letters, he transcribed two works by Hilary of Poitiers (c.315-367), including the latter's Tractates on the Psalms (c.365), in which Hilary had imitated Origen.⁴ Thus already at this stage in his life Jerome was concerning himself with Biblical scholarship. Jerome's ardent asceticism may be linked to his avowed repudiation of ornate classical literary style, which enabled him to overcome his earlier antipathy to the plain literary style he found in the Scriptures. The year 374 saw the composition of his first Biblical commentary, on Obadiah (now lost). Over the following two decades Jerome went on to produce other works including translations of other authors, devotional and controversial works, works on Hebrew names and on places of the Holy Land, his Hebraicae Quaestiones in Genesim, numerous letters and also commentaries on Ecclesiastes, selected Psalms, and the epistles to Philemon, the Galatians and the Ephesians. Moreover, he commenced work on a new translation of the

³. Yves-Marie Duval, "Introduction" to Jérôme, Commentaire sur Jonas, Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Commentaire par Yves-Marie Duval (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985) p.12. Ferdinand Cavallera, Saint Jérôme: Sa Vie et Son Oeuvre (Paris: Champion, 1922) v.2, pp.34-36, 44, 158-159 dates Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum and the Commentary on Jonah to the last months of 396, while according to Kelly, Jerome, pp.207, 220 the Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum was written in early 397.

⁴. Letter 5, 2 (Labourt, v.1, p.18). On Hilary's imitation of Origen, see Jerome, De Viris Illustribus 100 (PL 23, 699).

Bible based on the original languages: the translation of the minor prophets (c.390-392⁵) preceded Jerome's commentaries on this portion of the Scriptures.⁶ By 393 Jerome had embarked on his series of commentaries on the minor prophets and had completed works on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Haggai.⁷

The next in the series on the minor prophets was the commentary on Jonah of 396/397. During the preceding three years, however, Jerome's exegetical practice had started to undergo a significant shift resulting from a reversal of his estimation of his great predecessor in Biblical studies, Origen (c.185-254). Throughout his career to this point, Jerome's Biblical scholarship had been marked by his admiration for Origen; in 393, however, Jerome began to renounce his earlier allegiance to Origen, a distinctly new position which culminated in his vehement controversy with Rufinus in 401. The commentary on Jonah was the first Biblical commentary Jerome wrote after his initial volte-face regarding Origen: it is thus the product of an especially critical stage in Jerome's development as an interpreter of the Bible.

The commentary on Jonah does not mention Origen explicitly, although some sections of the work contain vehement refutations of opinions that at the time were being attributed to Origen and that were being increasingly branded as heterodox (see below on 3:6-9,

⁵. Duval, "Introduction" to Jérôme, Commentaire sur Jonas, p.18n39.

⁶. Cavallera, Saint Jérôme, v.2, pp.28-29.

⁷. De Viris Illustribus 135 (PL 23, 719). The same information is found in the Prologue to the present commentary: see below, p.1.

pp.51ff.; on 2:7b, p.40). Nevertheless, the influence of Origen on Jerome's exegesis of Jonah is still evident in this work. Jerome would also adopt a similar approach in his subsequent commentaries, including the great works on Isaiah, Ezekiel and Matthew, and even in his final work, the commentary on Jeremiah, which was left unfinished at the time of his death in 420. In his later works of Biblical exegesis, therefore, even while castigating Origen Jerome continued to follow Origen's exegetical practice, especially in adhering to the non-literal interpretation. Thus the influence of Origen on Jerome's exegesis continued through to the end of his life.

A variety of influences are evident in Jerome's writings, including that of the so-called "schools" of Antioch and Alexandria; the influence of Jewish exegesis of the time is also apparent. Jerome shares with the "school" of Alexandria a devotion to the non-literal interpretation of the Biblical text; with the "school" of Antioch (and rabbinic exegesis), he also shows a strong concern to understand the text on the literal or historical level. The writings of Jerome have their own unique place within the various exegetical tendencies and practices of his day, however. Nevertheless, it would be impossible to fully appreciate Jerome's exegesis apart from the influence of Origen. By way of introduction to the present commentary, therefore, it is fitting to examine the exegesis of Origen and its influence upon Jerome's approach to the Biblical text.

The Structure of Origen's Exegesis

Origen systematizes his exegetical strategy as follows:

One must therefore pourtray (sic) the meaning of the sacred writings in a threefold way....so that the simple man may be edified by what we call the flesh of the scripture, this name being given to the obvious interpretation; while the man who has made some progress may be edified by its soul, as it were; and the man who is perfect and like those mentioned by the apostle: 'We speak wisdom among the perfect; yet a wisdom not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, which are coming to nought; but we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory'--this man may be edified by the spiritual law, which has 'a shadow of the good things to come'. For just as man consists of body, soul and spirit, so in the same way does the scripture.⁸

While Origen rejects the Platonic threefold partition of the soul as being foreign to Scripture⁹, the image of body, soul and spirit is also used elsewhere to illustrate his approach to exegesis.¹⁰

Nevertheless, in spite of his stated exegetical agenda, Origen is often accused of abandoning altogether the literal sense of Scripture in favour of an allegorical or spiritual method. Thus R.P.C. Hanson writes:

In an effort to distinguish objectively between three different senses of Scripture he [Origen] only succeeded in reaching a position where all distinctions were dissolved in a 'spiritual' sense which was in fact governed by nothing but Origen's arbitrary fancy as to what doctrine any given text ought to contain...to maintain that all passages must yield, when allegorized or treated in any way any scholar likes to suggest, a

⁸. Peri Archon 4, 2, 4 (Origen, On First Principles, trans. G.W. Butterworth (New York: Harper and Row, 1966) pp. 275-276; hereafter cited as Butterworth).

⁹. Peri Archon, 3, 4, 1 (Butterworth, p.231).

¹⁰. See Origen, In Leviticum Homilia 2 (PG 12, 421).

'spiritual' sense having direct relevance to Christian doctrine, and that many passages must not be taken in their literal sense because their literal sense, though not nonsense, is improper or irrelevant to Christian doctrine or in some way contains statements that ought not to be in the Bible--these are suggestions which it is exegetical suicide to entertain. The best intentions in the world cannot redeem the expositor who adopts these principles.¹¹

Similarly, C.J. Scalise claims that the erosion of the literal sense contributes to a "loss of hermeneutical control" in Origen's exegesis.¹² The question arises, however, as to the fairness of these criticisms of Origen's hermeneutical methodology, and the resulting implications for Jerome's work. Is the literal sense truly all but swallowed up by Origen's non-literal interpretation? What is the relationship between the literal and the non-literal sense in Origen's exegesis?

The Literal Sense in Origen's Exegesis

Origen is perhaps best known for his use of the allegorical method (the "spiritual" level of interpretation described in the quotation from Peri Archon, Book 4 cited above). However, it is fair to say that the literal sense (also called the historical or corporeal sense, the type, the image, or the enigma¹³; it is

¹¹. R.P.C. Hanson, Allegory and Event (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox, 1959) pp.257-258.

¹². Charles J. Scalise, "Origen and the Sensus Literalis", Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988) p.129.

¹³. Henri Crouzel, Origen, trans. A.S. Worrall (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989) p.79.

called the "flesh" of Scripture in the above citation from Peri Archon Book 4) held no little significance for him:

Nos vero...et litteram et spiritum in Scripturis sanctis defendimus...et dicimus quia neque secundum litteram maledici oportet neque secundum spiritalem intellegentiam blasphemari. (But we...maintain both the letter and the spirit in the holy Scriptures...and we say that it is right neither to speak ill after the letter nor to blaspheme after the spiritual understanding.)¹⁴

Indeed Origen, along with Jerome, has been described as "the greatest critical exegete and the greatest literal exegete of Christian antiquity".¹⁵

This is evident especially in his monumental production of the Hexapla, a work that was esteemed extremely highly by Jerome among others:

Exceptis Septuaginta interpretibus, alias quoque editiones in unum congregaret, Aquilae scilicet Pontici proselyti et Theodotionis Hebionei et Symmachi....Praeterea quintam et sextam et septimam editionem, quas etiam nos de eius bibliotheca habemus, miro labore reperit, et cum caeteris editionibus comparavit. (Taking the Septuagint translation, he [Origen] gathered the other versions also in a single work, namely that of Aquila a proselyte of Pontus, and Theodotion the Ebionite and Symmachus....And besides these, a fifth, sixth, and seventh version, which we also have from his library, he sought out with great diligence, and compared with other versions.)¹⁶

Jerome here makes use of information from the Historia

14. In Leviticum Homilia 4, 2 (PG 12, 554).

15. Crouzel, Origen, p.61.

16. Jerome, De Viris Illustribus, 54 (PL 23, 665); the version in Theodoret, Jerome, Gennadius, Rufinus: Historical Writings, etc., trans. Blomfield Jackson, Ernest Cushing Richardson, and W.H. Fremantle (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d.) p.374, incorrectly renders Pontici as a proper name.

Ecclesiastica of Eusebius¹⁷; other ancient Christian authors offer various descriptions of the Hexapla as well.

The term Hexapla itself refers to Origen's production of a parallel edition of the Hebrew Bible comprised of six columns. It basically consisted of the Greek versions of the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, with a fifth (Quinta) and sixth (Sexta) version; on occasion (as in the above citation from Jerome) a seventh (Septima) version is also included in the list of contents. The columns were prefaced by the Hebrew Masoretic text transliterated into Greek characters. Based on the more reliable witness of Eusebius, Pierre Nautin argues that the Hexapla did not contain a column of the Masoretic text in Hebrew characters as was claimed by Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus¹⁸; others maintain that the Hebrew column was indeed included.¹⁹ Text critical sigla, borrowed from Alexandrian grammarians, were employed in the column containing the Septuagint: asterisks marked readings found in the Masoretic text but not in the Septuagint, while obeli marked segments in the Septuagint which were not to be found in the

17. Pierre Nautin, Origène: Sa Vie et Son Oeuvre (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977) p.218; Pierre Courcelle, Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources, trans. Harry E. Wedeck (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969) p.100.

18. Nautin, Origène, p.320.

19. N.R.M. de Lange, Origen and the Jews (Cambridge: University Press, 1976) p 25; William McKane, Selected Christian Hebraists (Cambridge: University Press, 1989) p.23.

Masoretic text.²⁰ Only fragments of the Hexapla survive, drawn primarily from quotations by other authors.²¹

Origen's rationale for producing the Hexapla has been the subject of some debate. It has been seen as a primer for the study of Hebrew²², while in the view of S.P.Brock the Hexapla was composed for apologetic reasons within the context of Jewish-Christian polemic.²³ Several scholars believe the purpose of the Hexapla was to link the text of the Septuagint with the tradition of the Masoretic text, or, in Origen's words, to "heal the discrepancies" in the various versions.²⁴ From a more practical perspective, Origen's purpose in compiling the Hexapla may have

20. John Wright, "Origen in the Scholar's Den: A Rationale for the Hexapla", Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988) p.51; on the use of these signs see also Ernst Würthwein, The Text of the Old Testament, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979) pp.55-56.

21. These are collected in Frederick Field, ed. Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt (2 vols) Hildesheim: Olms, 1964 (reprint of Oxford 1875 ed.) and also in PG 15 and 16; the second apparatus of the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint (Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1931-) also contains the Hexaplaric material.

22. Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Columnar Order of the Hexapla", Jewish Quarterly Review N.S. 27 (1936-1937), 146, 148-149.

23. S.P. Brock "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament" Studia Patristica 10 (1970) 215-218.

24. Τὴν μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης διαφωνίαν, θεοῦ διδόντος, εὐρομεν ἰάσασθαι. (We were able, by God's favour, to heal the discrepancies which occurred in the copies of the Old Testament.) Commentaria in Matthaeum 15, 14 (PG 13, 1293). This is the view of Würthwein, Text, p.55; H.B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: University Press, 1900), p.68; S. Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), p.101; Nautin, Origène, p.351-353. McKane, Hebraists, p.28, seeks to combine this view with that of Brock (see n23 above).

been to produce a resource for the detailed comparison of texts as an aid to exegesis.²⁵ This last view indeed proved to be the case for, among others, Jerome: a copy of the Hexapla was kept at the famous library at Caesarea where it was consulted by Eusebius (who obtained a copy of the Septuagint from it) and also by Jerome, who adopted the critical signs of the Hexapla in his initial revision of the extant Latin versions of the Bible.²⁶ Jerome also claimed to have consulted the Hexapla at the library in Caesarea in order to obtain a corrected text of the Hebrew Bible for his own translation and commentaries.²⁷

Whatever its compiler's intention, the resulting work must have been of immense size: H. Swete's estimate (based on the size of Codex Vaticanus) of 6500 pages has been thought to be much too low.²⁸ A work of such magnitude and exegetical usefulness provides ample testimony of Origen's concern with the literal text.²⁹

²⁵. De Lange, Origen and the Jews, p.50; Wright "Origen in the Scholar's Den", p.54, 61-62; D. Barthélemy writes "Origène avait conçu les hexaples comme une ample collection d'informations" ("Origène et le texte de l'Ancien Testament" Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1978) p.203).

²⁶. Kelly, Jerome, p.158.

²⁷. Jerome, Commentaria in Epistolam ad Titum (on 3:9) in PL 26, 595; on Jerome's use of the Hexapla, see Swete, Introduction, pp.74-75; on Jerome's use of the library at Caesarea, see Cavallera, Saint Jérôme, v.2, pp.88-89.

²⁸. Wright, "Origen in the Scholar's Den", p.53.

²⁹. Indeed based on the format of the Hexapla represented in the Milan palimpsest discovered by Mercati in 1895, the Hexapla may have offered a word for word correspondence between the Hebrew version and the various Greek translations, indicating a remarkable and even "self-defeating" attention to the literal text. See

Indeed, such was his interest in the literal sense (as exemplified in the production of the Hexapla) that there has been considerable debate as to the extent of Origen's own knowledge of Hebrew. According to Eusebius, Origen "made a thorough study of the Hebrew tongue"³⁰ and in De Viris Illustribus 54 Jerome also added

Quis ignorat et quod tantum in scripturis divinis habuerit studii, ut etiam Hebraeam linguam contra aetatis gentisque suae naturam edisceret? (Who is unaware also that he [Origen] had such enthusiasm for the divine Scriptures that against the nature of his time and of his nation he even learned thoroughly the Hebrew language?)³¹

However, the presence in the Hexapla of the column of the Hebrew Scriptures transliterated into Greek characters would suggest that he lacked expertise in the Hebrew script, or at least required assistance with vocalization of the consonantal Hebrew text.³² Some hold that Origen had at least a limited knowledge of Hebrew³³, while several scholars argue that Origen's knowledge of

McKane, Hebraists, p.23; Würthwein, Text, pp.56, 189 (plate 34).

³⁰. καὶ τὴν Ἑβραϊδα γλώτταν ἐμαθεῖν Historia Ecclesiastica 6, 16 (PG 20, 553).

³¹. PL 23, 665; see also Letter 39, 1 (Labourt, v.2, p.72).

³². The latter view is set forth by J.A. Emerton, "The Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla," Journal of Theological Studies N.S. 7, (1956) 83-86 and reiterated by the same author in "A Further Consideration of the Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla" Journal of Theological Studies N.S. 22 (1971) 15-27. See the list of articles on this topic in Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. Peter R. Ackroyd (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965) p.711n64.

³³. Crouzel, Origen, p.12; M.F. Wiles, "Origen as Biblical Scholar" Jerome Biblical Commentary v.1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), p.457; R.P.C. Hanson, Origen's Doctrine of Tradition (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p.155; Hanson, Allegory and Event, pp.171-172. On p.172 of the latter work Hanson writes "It is quite

Hebrew was slight at best, that he could not speak or write Hebrew himself, and that he relied on Jewish colleagues and scribes to offer assistance with the Hebrew text as was required; nevertheless, according to de Lange, Origen is to be credited for the trouble he took to study the Hebrew text.³⁴

The concerns with the literal text that had led Origen to the work of the Hexapla were continued in his commentaries and homilies as well. His use of the scholarship that was available in his day in history, geography, grammar, philosophy, medicine, and natural history in these works betrays his interest in the literal sense of Scripture.³⁵ Jewish and rabbinic sources were also evidently consulted in his efforts to shed light on the literal sense of a text, although the extent of direct Jewish influence on Origen is not easy to ascertain.³⁶ Origen is singular in his use of rabbinic

misleading to say that Origen knew virtually no Hebrew; he knew far more than any eminent Christian theologian for a century before him, or any of his own day. But his knowledge was very superficial and he had little confidence in it himself."

³⁴. De Lange, Origen and the Jews, pp.21-22, 58 (see the citations on p.153n61 of this work, where the question of Origen's lack of Hebrew is described as a "red herring"). Brock's argument that the purpose of the Hexapla was to equip Christians for controversy with the Jews leads him to treat the question of Origen's knowledge of Hebrew as incidental ("Origen's Aims", p.345). Cf. also Swete, Introduction, p.61; C.J. Elliott, "Hebrew Learning Among the Fathers", A Dictionary of Christian Biography v.2 (London: Murray, 1880) pp.856-857, 859; G. Bardy, "Les Traditions Juives Dans L'Oeuvre d'Origène" Revue Biblique 34 (1925) 219; and P. Nautin "Introduction", Origène: Homélie sur Jérémie (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976) p.116.

³⁵. See the list of examples in Crouzel, Origen, pp.61-62.

³⁶. see de Lange, Origen and the Jews, pp.23-28, 39-47, 116-117 et passim. One possible example of rabbinic influence is Origen's view of the authorship and correct order of the Psalms

sources: as one author writes:

En un temps où l'hostilité des Juifs et des chrétiens reste entière, le docteur alexandrin ne craint pas d'interroger avec avidité non seulement des convertis, mais les plus savants d'entre les Juifs, pour apprendre d'eux les traditions sur les récits bibliques.³⁷

This offered a dilemma for Origen in that as a Christian theologian of the period he condemned the Jews, while as a Biblical scholar and exegete he depended on them.³⁸ Origen's approach that nothing in the Biblical text is to be ignored, that nothing is superfluous, and that every word and nuance is capable of conveying some deeper meaning, is remarkably similar to rabbinic exposition of the Bible, particularly that of Rabbi Akiba or the Greek version of Aquila.³⁹ Indeed, Origen focussed on the literal sense of the Biblical text to a surprising degree; an example is his defense to Apelles the Marcionite of the historical veracity of the dimensions of Noah's ark given in Genesis.⁴⁰

However, it is fair to say that Origen's understanding of the

(see N.R.M. de Lange, "Origen and the Rabbis on the Hebrew Bible" Studia Patristica 14, 3 (1971) 117-121). S. Krauss, "The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers" The Jewish Quarterly Review 5 and 6 (1893-1894) 147-157 lists other possible examples as well.

³⁷. Bardy, "Les Traditions Juives", p.251.

³⁸. Thus he distinguished between Ioudaioi (as a polemical term) and Hebraioi (to describe his philological and other sources); see de Lange, Origen and the Jews, pp.30-31. The same distinction was also made by Jerome; see Louis N. Hartmann, "St. Jerome as an Exegete", A Monument to St. Jerome, ed. Francis X. Murphy (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952), p.79n42.

³⁹. De Lange, Origen and the Jews, pp.110-111.

⁴⁰. In Genesim Homilia 2, 2 (PG 12, 163-168); see also Contra Celsum 4, 41 (PG 11, 1095-1098) and the discussion in G. Bardy "Les Traditions Juives" p.231.

truth of the literal sense of the text was rather different from that of the modern critical exegete, especially insofar as the latter is concerned with establishing the original intention of the Biblical author.⁴¹ Origen viewed Scripture as dynamic and energetic, offering multiple meanings for the skilled interpreter:

Videtur mihi unusquisque sermo divinae Scripturae similis esse alicui seminum, cuius natura haec est, ut cum iactum fuerit in terram...multipliciter diffundatur, et tanto cumulatius, quanto vel peritus agricola plus seminibus laboris impenderit, vel beneficium terrae fecundioris indulserit. (Each word of divine Scripture seems to me to be similar to a sort of seed whose nature is this, that when it has been cast into the earth...it spreads out in various ways, and it is increased the more as either the expert farmer looms over the seeds with toil or the benefit of the earth yields more abundance.)⁴²

Other metaphors express a similar view: the words of Scripture act as goads which prod the interpreter⁴³; they are shepherds⁴⁴, or

⁴¹. See for example Raymond E. Brown's definition of the literal sense as: "The sense which the human author directly intended and which the written words conveyed" in "Hermeneutics" The New Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. Raymond E. Brown et al. (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1990) p.1148. For a recent view of modern Biblical scholarship as similar to the traditional allegorical method see James Barr, "The Literal, the Allegorical, and Modern Biblical Scholarship" Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 44 (1989) 3-17, and the response of B.S. Childs in ibid., 46 (1990) 3-9.

⁴². Homilia in Exodum 1, 1 (PG 12, 297).

⁴³. Origen, Philocalia 6, 1 in Origène, Philocalie 1-20: Sur Les Écritures, trans. Marguerite Harl (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983), p.308. (See also the editor's discussion of this passage on p.316.)

⁴⁴. Ibid., p.308. Patricia Cox Miller, "Poetic Words, Abysmal Words" Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988) p.168 is incorrect in citing 'springs' as a metaphor for the Biblical words in the 13th Homily on Genesis: the image is used instead for the "living spring from our souls" (de anima...nostrum ...aperiat fontem vivum) and the

simply mysteries.⁴⁵ The interpreter's task is to dig deep for the meaning contained in the words of Scripture as Isaac dug the wells of vision.⁴⁶ The words are to be broken as Christ broke the bread for the five thousand⁴⁷; they are to be plucked as David played the lyre.⁴⁸ In his commentary on the story of the Witch of Endor Origen writes: "See what a great struggle (ἀγών) there is in the Word of God"⁴⁹; the interpretive process therefore is agonistic, requiring hard work and activity on the part of the interpreter.⁵⁰ Origen is also aware of the limitations of the words of Scripture: if "'the world is unable to contain the books that would be written' (Jn.21:25) concerning the divinity of Jesus, it is not because of the number of books but because of the greatness of the realities which cannot be said in human language."⁵¹ The burden

"spring of knowledge within" (Iste fons scientiae intra te erat situs) (In Genesim Homilia 13, 4; PG 12, 234).

45. Origen, Homilia in Canticum Canticorum 1, 4 (PG 13, 41).

46. Origen, In Genesim Homilia 13, 3 (PG 12, 232); see also the image of digging used in Origen's interpretation of the parable of the treasure buried in a field (Mt.13:44) in Peri Archon 4, 3, 11 (Butterworth, p.306).

47. Origen, In Genesim Homilia 12, 5 (PG 12, 229).

48. Origen, Philocalia 6, 2 in Origène, Philocalie 1-20, pp.310-311.

49. ὁρᾶτε ὅσος ἀγών ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ Origenes, Eustathius von Antiochien und Gregor von Nyssa über Die Hexe von Endor, hrsg. Erich Klostermann (Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1912), p.7, l.20-21.

50. Patricia Cox Miller, "Poetic Words, Abysmal Words", p.170.

51. Origen, Philocalia 15, 19 in Origène, Philocalie 1-20, pp.437-438.

of Origen's exegetical practice is to actively seek those realities which are to be found in the Biblical words: he does not reject the literal sense, therefore, so much as strive to grasp the realities behind it.

Moreover, in a study of Origen's homilies on the Hexateuch, Henri Crouzel concludes that on those occasions when Origen departs from the literal sense the primary reason is usually a pastoral concern for his listeners to stay clear of that which may be contrary to the teachings of Christ and the regula fidei.⁵² Such is Origen's practice as a preacher, an office which for Origen is to be seen in terms of the role of the spiritual director.⁵³

In a famous passage Origen even makes the claim that certain Biblical texts have no "bodily" (literal) sense at all and are only to be interpreted non-literally, on the level of the "soul" and the "spirit". The jars of water mentioned in John 2:6 which contain "two or three firkins" provide Origen with an image to express this: those with "two firkins" refer to passages which have "the soul meaning and the spiritual meaning", while others (those containing "three firkins") possess a literal, "bodily" sense as well.⁵⁴ Origen lists some examples of Biblical passages which cannot be accepted on the literal level in Peri Archon Book 4, 3,

⁵². Crouzel, Origen, pp.62-63: less frequently in these homilies Origen's reasons for rejecting the literal sense can be his refusal to follow a defective translation in the (authoritative) Septuagint, or (rarely) his own lack of appreciation for the literal context.

⁵³. Ibid., p.75.

⁵⁴. Peri Archon, Book 4, 2, 5 (Butterworth, pp.277-278).

1-3, although in the very next section Origen asserts his belief in the literal veracity of the Biblical text, also with examples.⁵⁵ These more speculative remarks in Peri Archon would appear to allow for the careful comparison of texts and the use of allegory to explain Biblical passages that Origen cannot accept on the literal level:

When, therefore....the passage as a connected whole is literally impossible, whereas the outstanding part of it is not impossible but even true, the reader must endeavour to grasp the entire meaning, connecting by an intellectual process the account of what is literally impossible with the parts that are not impossible but are historically true, these being interpreted allegorically in common with the parts which, so far as the letter goes, did not happen at all. For our contention with regard to the whole of divine scripture is, that it all has a spiritual meaning, but not all a bodily meaning; for the bodily meaning is often proved to be an impossibility. Consequently the man who reads the divine books...must exercise great care.⁵⁶

Clearly Origen is far from completely rejecting the literal sense here, and even farther from committing "exegetical suicide".⁵⁷ While he may move rather rapidly from the literal to the non-literal sense⁵⁸, nevertheless insofar as possible he usually attempts to grasp the literal sense before seeking to move on to what possesses for him far greater significance--the non-literal

⁵⁵. Peri Archon Book 4, 3, 1-3 (Butterworth, pp.288-293).

⁵⁶. Peri Archon, Book 4, 3, 5 (Butterworth, p.297).

⁵⁷. Hanson, Allegory and Event, p.258.

⁵⁸. "Le plus souvent, il passe aussitôt du sens historique brièvement rappelé au sens 'intérieur' sur lequel il s'appesantit: il a hâte d'en venir ad interiora mysteria" (Henri de Lubac, Histoire et Esprit, (Paris: Aubier, 1950) p.149). De Lange, Origen and the Jews, pp.83-84, describes the literal sense as "merely a pourboire" for Origen.

meaning of the text.

The Non-literal Sense in Origen's Exegesis

Origen is less than consistent in adhering to the tripartite exegetical system laid out in Peri Archon Book 4. Indeed, the system of the three senses corresponding to the flesh, the soul and the spirit (derived from Origen's anthropology) gives the impression of being imposed artificially. The distinction between the "fleshly" and "spiritual" in Scripture can be explicated in other terms than an edifying function for the "simple" and the "perfect". Origen also distinguishes on the basis of the content of a text between a spiritual interpretation which is theological and christological and, on the other hand, a moral interpretation which relates to human experience. Thus the spiritual meaning of Noah's ark refers to Christ and the Church, while the moral interpretation is applied to a person's turning from the evil world and constructing an "ark of salvation" in the heart by obeying the divine precepts.⁵⁹

One difficulty lies in maintaining the clarity of the distinction between the "soul" of Scripture and the "spiritual" meaning. The "soul", or "psychic" level of interpretation is ambiguous in its relationship to the Biblical revelation: does the "psychic" interpretation refer to a natural morality independent of Christian faith, or does it presuppose a specifically Christian

⁵⁹. Wiles, "Origen as Biblical Scholar", p.468.

foundation?⁶⁰ Henri de Lubac argues strongly that the latter was Origen's exegetical intent.⁶¹ However the "psychic" sense is to be related to the other levels of interpretation, in practice the distinction between it and the "spiritual" sense usually disappears and the three levels of interpretation are collapsed into two--the literal and the non-literal.⁶²

The practice of non-literal exegesis is found already within the New Testament itself. Of course, symbolic language, anthropomorphisms, and the symbolic meanings attached to various etymologies and numbers are evident already in the Hebrew Scriptures, as is the non-literal treatment of, for example, the Exodus story. However the specific New Testament basis for non-literal exegesis arises from the relationship of the New Testament to the Hebrew Scriptures, and specifically from the claim that the

⁶⁰. Henri de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale: Les Quatre Sens de l'Écriture (Aubier, 1959) p.203; cf. de Lubac, Histoire et Esprit, pp.141-149.

⁶¹. De Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, pp.202-204. De Lubac betrays a sense of Christian triumphalism here, as well as a rather ambiguous estimation of Philo: after describing "une ressemblance indéniable" between the spiritual sense in Philo and Origen, he goes on to write however "Philon ne peut fonder son exégèse 'mystique' sur le seul fondement qui la rendrait objective: 'le mystère caché en Dieu jusqu'à ce qu'il fût révélé en Jésus-Christ'....Par le troisième sens origénien, l'exégèse philonienne, ou l'exégèse juive en général, n'est pas seulement 'modifiée': elle est, grâce à l'entrée en jeu d'un nouveau principe qui ne lui doit absolument rien, réellement dépassée" (ibid., pp.206-207).

⁶². Crouzel, Origen, p.79; Harry Austryn Wolfson, The Philosophy of the Church Fathers v.1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956) p.58; de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, pp.209-210.

fulfillment of the latter is Jesus proclaimed as the Christ.⁶³ A key passage in this regard is II Corinthians 3:6-18 where the distinction is introduced between "the letter" which "kills" and "the spirit" which "makes alive": τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶσσει. (It is no accident that this fundamental passage is echoed by Jerome at the climactic moment of the Prologue to the present commentary.⁶⁴) Other New Testament passages which offered a basis for non-literal exegesis include I Corinthians 10:1-11 and Galatians 4:21-31; the former exemplifies what would come to be typology (indeed τύποι, τυπικῶς are used in vv. 6 and 11⁶⁵) while the Galatians passage offers an allegory (ἀτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα proclaims v.24), and both passages are cited by Origen in Peri Archon Book 4, 2, 6 in order to justify the practice of non-literal exegesis.⁶⁶ (Another relevant passage to which reference is often made is Hebrews 10:1 where the Jewish Law is contrasted with the Christ event as σκιά "shadow" versus εἰκὼν τῶν πραγμάτων "(true) form of things".⁶⁷)

⁶³. Crouzel, Origen, p.64; cf. de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.363: "le sens spirituel...est...le Nouveau Testament lui-même...se révélant à nous 'comme accomplissement et transfiguration de l'Ancien'". On the relationship between Christian anti-semitism and the view of the Hebrew Scriptures as fulfilled christologically see R. Ruether, Faith and Fratricide (New York: Seabury, 1979) pp.160-165.

⁶⁴. See below, p. 4. On the significance of this New Testament text for the history of exegesis, see de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.439.

⁶⁵. Note also the use of the term τύπος in Rom. 5:14.

⁶⁶. Butterworth, p.280.

⁶⁷. Crouzel, Origen, p.68; cf. also Colossians 2:17.

Many scholars have also seen the influence of the Hellenistic tradition of allegorical interpretation on Origen primarily by means of the exegesis of his fellow Alexandrian Philo.⁶⁸ Philo had extensively practiced a non-literal exegetical method in order to offer an interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures within the context of Greek-speaking Alexandria, and he is especially renowned for the use of allegory in Scriptural interpretation. Even prior to Philo the term ἀλληγορία was already in use as a Greek rhetorical term to describe a continuous series of metaphors.⁶⁹ In later Hellenistic literature the word was used to refer to the non-literal interpretation of Homer.⁷⁰ (We have already seen Paul's use of ἀλληγορούμενα in Gal. 4:24.) Some see the direct influence of the Hellenistic allegorists upon Philo⁷¹; the attestations of Philonic

⁶⁸. eg. Wolfson, Philosophy of the Church Fathers, pp.57-58; R.P.C. Hanson, "Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church", Jerome Biblical Commentary, v.1. (Cambridge: University Press, 1970) p.436.

⁶⁹. Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria 8, 6, 14 in The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, trans. H.E. Butler, v.3 (London: Heinemann, 1966) pp.308-309; Cicero, Orator, 27, 94 in Cicero, Brutus; Orator, trans. G.L. Hendrickson, H.M. Hubbell (London: Heinemann, 1952) p.374. Philo also uses the term ὑπόνοια 'the underlying sense' (Wolfson, Philosophy of the Church Fathers, p.30; Crouzel, Origen, p.80).

⁷⁰. Plutarch, Moralia (Quomodo Adolecens Poetas Audire Debeat) 4, 19 in Plutarch, Moralia, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt, v.1 (London: Heinemann, 1949) pp.100-101.

⁷¹. Jenny Morris, "The Jewish Philosopher Philo" in Emil Schürer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, new English version by Geza Vermes et al., v.3, part 2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987) p.877 (and n21). Less confident of such influence is C.K. Barrett, "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New" Jerome Biblical Commentary, v.1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970) p.382.

treatises in Origen's Commentaria In Matthaeum 15, 3; 17, 17⁷² would certainly indicate some direct Philonic influence upon Origen, the extent of which is not clear. Other influences on the practice of non-literal exegesis by Origen have been suggested as well; they include Platonism, Valentinian Gnosticism, other apocryphal writings of the New Testament period, as well as perhaps the Egyptian hermetic literature.⁷³

According to Crouzel, Origen's non-literal exegesis is ultimately founded theologically upon his belief in revelation in Christ. This christological basis has a pastoral aspect as well in that the interpretation of Scripture is informed by the practical exigencies of relating to the spiritual needs of his listeners.⁷⁴ Origen's christological aim easily leads to the practice of non-literal exegesis, and even to the search for a spiritual meaning in every detail of the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament alike. Thus, for example, he offers interpretations of minute details of the ceremonial law in his Homilia in Leviticum 5, 5.⁷⁵ This approach to exegesis is also related to Origen's view of Biblical inspiration which focusses on the Holy Spirit as the true author of Scripture.

The vocabulary which Origen uses to describe the non-literal

⁷². PG 13, 1259-1260; 1531-1532.

⁷³. Crouzel, Origen, pp.78-79.

⁷⁴. Ibid., pp.69, 73. See also Karen Jo Torjesen, Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986), pp.124-138.

⁷⁵. PG 12, 454-456.

sense is comprised of terms that are, to say the least, fluid in their use: he speaks of the mystery, the truth, the realities, that which is mystical, true, reasonable, intelligible (as opposed to perceptible), spiritual (as opposed to corporeal), invisible (as opposed to visible), but "there is scarcely any difference to be seen between these words when they are applied to spiritual exegesis."⁷⁶ As we have seen, the same fluidity of terminology obtains in Origen's literal level of interpretation. Perhaps one consistent key to his overall exegetical method is the reality of the distinction between the literal and the non-literal rather than any constant in his exegetical terminology. This essentially bipartite exegetical methodology betrays a perspective that is akin to the Platonic; however, in Origen's epistemology the perceptible world can know the imperceptible by participation and by overcoming of the duality through knowledge that is love.⁷⁷

The argument of de Lubac in Exégèse Médiévale is that Origen's exegesis is the origin of the medieval doctrine of the quadruple sense of Scripture⁷⁸:

Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,
Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.⁷⁹

This elaboration clearly presupposes Origen's distinction between

⁷⁶. Crouzel, Origen, p.79.

⁷⁷. Ibid., pp.79, 117. On the relationship between Origen and Platonic "exemplarism", see also ibid., pp. 78, 92, and 100.

⁷⁸. De Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.212 et passim.

⁷⁹. Ibid., p.23; the distich, usually attributed to Nicholas of Lyra, was actually composed by the Dominican Augustine of Dacia.

the literal and non-literal, as well as the tripartite exegetical schema described in Peri Archon Book 4. After the literal sense comes the allegorical which obtains especially the Christian appropriation of the Hebrew Scriptures (i.e. the Church's primary impetus for non-literal Biblical interpretation). Then follow two corollaries which further spin out the non-literal sense: the moral (or tropological sense) which is the application of Scripture to the formation of virtues in the present, and the anagogical which lifts the attention of the Christian upward toward the divine and forward toward eschatological hope. Thus the exegesis of Origen continued to exert tremendous influence⁸⁰: as another Biblical exegete--whose reputation suffered a fate somewhat similar to that of Origen--Richard Simon, wrote:

La plupart des Pères qui ont vécu après Origène n'ont fait presque autre chose que copier ses commentaires et ses autres traités sur l'Écriture. Ceux mêmes qui étaient les plus opposés à ses sentiments ne purent s'empêcher de les lire et d'en profiter.⁸¹

Jerome's Appreciation of Origen's Exegesis

Jerome was a great admirer of Origen's exegesis⁸². While he

⁸⁰. J. Leclercq has claimed that in medieval monastic culture, of all the ancient Greek authors, Origen was "the most widely read, and in every domain" (The Love of Learning and the Desire for God, trans. Catharine Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1961) p.115).

⁸¹. Richard Simon, Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament, Nouvelle Édition. Frankfurt, 1967 (reprint of Rotterdam edition of 1685), p.403.

⁸². Principal passages concerning Origen in Jerome's writings are listed in Henri Crouzel, Bibliographie Critique d'Origène (Nijhoff, 1971) pp.56-58.

had no doubt encountered the thought of Origen early in his career his interest in Origen's exegesis was presumably sharpened under the influence of Gregory of Nazianzus, from whom Jerome received instruction in Scripture while attending the Council of Constantinople in 381; Gregory had called Origen "the whet-stone of us all."⁸³ One of Jerome's earliest endeavours in translation was his rendering into Latin, at the suggestion of his friend Vincentius, of selected homilies of Origen--fourteen on the Jeremiah, fourteen on Ezekiel--while he was at Constantinople between 379 and 381. Presumably Gregory's enthusiasm for Origen was a factor in Jerome's decision to undertake translations of Origen's works at this time. In later years Jerome was to excuse his translations of Origen's sermons on Jeremiah and Ezekiel as having been conducted in adolescentia (he was actually close to fifty years of age at the time⁸⁴). The translation of nine of Origen's homilies on Isaiah is often dated to this period as well.⁸⁵ A few years later, during his stay in Rome, Jerome went on to translate two of Origen's homilies on the Song of Songs, dedicating the work to Pope Damasus and stating that the work provided but a foretaste (gustus) of Origen's commentary on the same Biblical text; he praises the latter commentary, saying Origenes, cum in ceteris

⁸³. Cited in Kelly, Jerome, p.76.

⁸⁴. Jerome, Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini 2, 23 (PL 23, 447). De Lubac (Exégèse Médiévale, p. 216n9) is incorrect when he claims that Jerome was about thirty-three when he translated these homilies.

⁸⁵. See the discussion of the dating of this translation in Kelly, Jerome, pp.76-77.

libris omnes vicerit, in Cantico Canticorum ipse se vicit (Origen, after surpassing all others in his other books, surpassed himself in [commenting on] the Song of Songs).⁸⁶ Between 388 and 391, Jerome (then residing at Bethlehem) also translated thirty-nine homilies by Origen on St. Luke's Gospel. He often expressed his desire to translate all of Origen's writings into Latin (an immense project), or at least the homilies.⁸⁷ These careful renderings of seventy-eight of Origen's homilies have preserved for posterity works of Origen of which the original Greek versions have been lost.⁸⁸

In the preface to his translation of the homilies on Ezekiel Jerome had cited the esteem that Didymus the Blind⁸⁹ (under whom he would study for a brief time during his visit to Alexandria in 386) also had for Origen: Origenem... iuxta Didymi videntis sententiam alterum post Apostolum Ecclesiarum magistrum (according to the opinion of Didymus, the one who sees clearly, Origen [was] the second master of the Church after the Apostle). (The epithet

⁸⁶. Jerome, Prologue to Origen, Homilia in Canticum Canticorum (PG 13, 35-36).

⁸⁷. Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p.101, claims Jerome was determined to translate at least Origen's homilies.

⁸⁸. On the faithfulness of Jerome's translation of Origen's homilies, see Kelly, Jerome, p.77.

⁸⁹. On Didymus, see Johannes Quasten, Patrology, v.3 (Utrecht, Spectrum, 1960), pp.85-100 and Alice Thompson Croft, Didymus the Blind on I Corinthians 15 (M.A. Thesis: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1987); on Jerome's relation to Didymus, see Cavallera, Saint Jérôme, v.2, pp.127-130.

videntis is intentional⁹⁰, and suggests that Jerome concurred with Didymus's estimation.⁹¹ Jerome also applied the epithet "Chalcenterus" (Χαλκέντερος, the man of brass)⁹² to Origen, as well as the term Adamantius (the man as hard as steel or iron)⁹³:

Ad Adamantium nostrum nostrumque Chalcenterum veniamus, qui tanto in sanctarum scripturarum commentariis sudore laboravit, ut iuste adamantis nomen acceperit. (Let us come to our Adamantius and our Chalcenterus, who worked with such sweat in commentaries of the holy scriptures that he has justly received the name of the adamant one.)⁹⁴

In contrast to Origen, Jerome can only say that his own name is invidiosus (envious).⁹⁵ He admires Origen's devotion to prayer and Scripture reading⁹⁶, and also his reputed self-mutiliation.⁹⁷

⁹⁰. De Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.241n10.

⁹¹. Jerome refers to Origen in almost identical terms in the preface to Liber de Nominibus Hebraicis (PL 23,772), written around 389-391.

⁹². Liddell and Scott, p.1972, has the definition "of brazen bowels". (Cf. De Lubac's definition in Exégèse Médiévale, p.243-244n9 of 'l'homme aux entrailles d'airain'.)

⁹³. Lewis and Short, p.30.

⁹⁴. Jerome, Letter 33, 4 (Labourt, v.2, p.40); Letter 34, 1 (Labourt, v.2, p.44); cf. Letter 43, 1 (Labourt, v.2, p.92): tam innumerabiles libros vere Adamantius et noster Χαλκέντερος explicavit (Adamantius and our Chalcenterus truly explained so many innumerable books). Eusebius and Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus, had claimed that Adamantios had been a surname of Origen (Historia Ecclesiastica 6, 14 (PG 20, 552); Panarion 64, 1, 1 in The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, trans. Philip R. Amidon (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990) p.213.).

⁹⁵. Jerome, Preface to Liber Hebraicorum Quaestionum in Genesim (PL 23, 938).

⁹⁶. Letter 43, 1 (Labourt, v.2, pp.92-93).

The sheer amount of Origen's literary output impresses Jerome, while the glory of his eloquence and knowledge are more than his opponents can endure, and so they seek to condemn him, yet when he speaks all are reckoned as silent.⁹⁸ His occasional lapses are to be excused:

Quis nostrum tanta potest legere quanta ille conscripsit? quis ardentem in scripturis animum non miretur? Quod si quis Iudas zelotes opposuerit nobis errores eius, audiat libere: "Interdum magnus dormitat Homerus. Verum operi longo fas est ignoscere somnum." (Who of us is capable of reading all that he has written? Who does not wonder at his soul that burned so for the Scriptures? And if any zealot Judases present his errors before us, let them freely hear: "Occasionally great Homer nods, but when the work is long it is right to excuse sleep.")⁹⁹

Jerome also writes of Origen's genius (ingenium) in relation to his work on the Hexapla¹⁰⁰.

During 387-388, Jerome composed commentaries on the letters to the Galatians and Ephesians which owe much to Origen's interpretation of these letters. Jerome writes in his Galatians commentary Origenis commentarios sum secutus (I followed the

⁹⁷. Letter 84, 8 (Labourt, v. 4, pp. 134-135); on Origen's self-castration see Crouzel, Origen, pp.8-9; on the attitudes of other writers toward it see de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.245.

⁹⁸. Letter 33, 5 (Labourt, v.2, p.43-44).

⁹⁹. Letter 84, 8 (Labourt, v.4, p.135), echoing Horace, Ars Poetica, 359-360.

¹⁰⁰. Jerome, Commentaria in Epistola ad Titum (on 3:9) (PL 26), 595: Haec immortale illud ingenium suo nobis labore donavit (That immortal genius gave this (the Hexapla) to us by his effort). The identical description is also used in De Viris Illustribus 54 (PL 23, 665). On Jerome's appreciation of the Hexapla, see also Dominique Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d'Aquila (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963), pp. 213-227 and Swete, Introduction, pp.76-77.

commentaries of Origen)¹⁰¹ and he quotes a long passage from Origen's Stromateis, Book 10.¹⁰² In the commentary on Ephesians he mentions 'little commentaries' (commentarioli) by Apollinarius and Didymus as well as three full volumes by Origen quem et nos ex parte secuti sumus (whom we also partly followed)¹⁰³: apparently the phrase ex parte here is to be taken as a deliberate euphemism and Origen should in fact have the lion's share of credit among Jerome's sources for this commentary.¹⁰⁴ By pressing Origen into his own service Jerome hoped to increase the great exegete's prestige: laudem ego maximam duco, cum illum imitari volo (I bring greatest praise when I wish to imitate him [Origen]).¹⁰⁵ Until the year 393, therefore, as Jerome's biographer Ferdinand Cavallera writes: "Il n'a mis, jusqu'au moment où éclate la controverse, aucune sourdine à ses éloges....Jérôme n'a rien écrit de défavorable à Origène."¹⁰⁶

Indeed Jerome was to become involved in a bitter controversy

101. PL 26, 308; cf. Letter 112, 4 (Labourt, v.6, pp.21-22).

102. PL 26, 434-436. See the detailed discussion of this commentary in Margaret A. Schatkin, "The Influence of Origen upon St. Jerome's Commentary on Galatians", Vigiliae Christianae 24 (1970) 49-58.

103. PL 26, 442.

104. Francis Deniau, "Le Commentaire de Jérôme sur Ephésiens Nous Permet-Il de Connaître Celui d'Origène?" Origeniana (Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975) p.173. Cf. also Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p.102.

105. Jerome, Preface to Commentaria in Michaeam 2 (PL 25, 1189).

106. Cavallera, Saint Jérôme, v.2, pp.116, 120.

that altered his professed admiration of Origen. Jerome had long enjoyed the friendship of Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, who has been described as "inordinately lacking in judgment, tact, and charity".¹⁰⁷ Epiphanius had developed a keen dislike for Origen's theological views: among the list of Origen's theological opinions to which Epiphanius objected was the belief that the devil will in the end repent and be restored to his former state (a doctrine which Jerome also vehemently attacks in the present commentary¹⁰⁸). In 393 a band of monks led by one Atarbius, an agent of Epiphanius, demanded a formal renunciation of Origenist views from the members of Jerome's monastic community at Bethlehem as well as from those of the monastery of Rufinus on the Mount of Olives in Jerusalem. A close friendship had existed between Jerome and Rufinus from the days of their schooling together in Rome, although the relationship had cooled somewhat after they had embraced the ascetic life; both were also well-known for their enthusiastic admiration for Origen. Jerome, desiring to vindicate his complete orthodoxy and maintain the good opinion of Epiphanius, immediately complied with the request from Atarbius's delegation. Rufinus, however, refused to accede to Atarbius and barred him from the premises of his monastery, and thus commenced in earnest the

¹⁰⁷. Kelly, Jerome, p.197. De Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.257, lists several similar estimations of Epiphanius.

¹⁰⁸. See on Jonah 3:6-9 below, pp.51ff. This particular charge against Origen was not included in Epiphanius's Panarion 64; Epiphanius added it to his list of charges against Origen during his controversy with Bishop John of Jerusalem. See Jon F. Dechow, Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), p.400.

antagonism between Rufinus and his old comrade Jerome.

Epiphanius had acted with some measure of circumspection in his attempt to deal with the Origenists in Palestine. His next move was to visit the bishop of Jerusalem, John, who had ordained Rufinus to the priesthood and who was an admirer of Origen as well. John invited his fellow bishop to preach, probably at the well-attended Dedication festival at the Church of the Resurrection, and Epiphanius's sermon took the form of a vitriolic attack against the errors of Origen. In the days that followed the two bishops engaged in a debate of sorts, resulting in John's offering a complete exposition of the Christian faith which, perhaps to his surprise, Epiphanius found to be entirely orthodox. Epiphanius returned home, but the lines were clearly drawn between John and Rufinus on the one side, and Epiphanius and Jerome on the other. Then in 394 Epiphanius took the unusual step of ordaining Jerome's brother Paulinian to the priesthood to serve the monastic community at Bethlehem. In response to this interference with the affairs of his diocese, John excommunicated Jerome and the monks of the Bethlehem community, as well as any who recognized the validity of Paulinian's ordination. Epiphanius responded with a lengthy letter, in which he defended his actions and reiterated the charge of Origenism against John. When John refused to stoop to a reply, Epiphanius branded his fellow bishop as a heretic.

Apparently at the request of a guest, Eusebius of Cremona, Jerome translated Epiphanius's letter into Latin.¹⁰⁹ Somehow the

¹⁰⁹. Letter 51 in Labourt, v.2, pp.156-172.

translation made its way to John and Rufinus, who accused Jerome of toning down the letter's expressions of courtesy and magnifying the accusations, as well as adding inflammatory comments of his own in the margin. In his own defense Jerome prepared his Letter 57 to Pammachius on the best method of translation¹¹⁰, which presented Jerome's views on the methodology of translation in general and also sought to vindicate his actions in the controversy. This struck John as particularly defiant, and he took the step of requesting an order from Flavius Rufinus, minister of the young emperor Arcadius, that Jerome and his monks be expelled from Palestine. The order was never implemented, due to the execution of Flavius Rufinus by the eastern imperial army outside Constantinople in 395. Bishop John wrote an Apology to Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, which affirmed his orthodox beliefs and also depicted Jerome as a prime culprit in the whole controversy between himself and Epiphanius. John's Apology received a sympathetic response in Rome; when Jerome's friend Pammachius requested an explanation from Jerome, he prepared a furious tirade Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum¹¹¹ early in 397. Impressed with John's Apology, Theophilus requested Jerome and his monks to be reconciled with their bishop, and the controversy died down temporarily: John recognized Paulinian's ordination and lifted the ban on the

¹¹⁰. Labourt, v.3, pp.55-73. See also Jerome, Liber de Optimo Genere Interpretandi (Epistula 57): Ein Kommentar, ed. G.M. Bartelink (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980).

¹¹¹. PL 23, 355-396. On the influence of Epiphanius on this work, see Dechow, Dogma and Mysticism, p.435.

Bethlehem monastic community, while Jerome and Epiphanius ceased their attacks against John's orthodoxy.

The second phase of the controversy began in 398 when Rufinus, whose ardour for Origen had remained undiminished, undertook the translation into Latin of the Peri Archon of Origen. On the assumption that the unorthodox elements of Origen's writings were the result of interpolations into the text, Rufinus in his translation felt free to modify the sense of the Peri Archon in order to conform it to the orthodoxy of his day. However, when in the preface to his translation Rufinus claimed that he was merely continuing Jerome's stated project of translating the works of Origen, he raised consternation among Pammachius and others of Jerome's friends in Rome and eventually provoked the ire of Jerome himself. In response to a request from Pammachius, Jerome prepared a literal translation of the Peri Archon, along with a public letter (No. 84¹¹²) defending himself against the charge of Origenism (implicit in Rufinus's preface) and going on the attack against the advocates of Origen, primarily Rufinus (although he did not mention him by name). Rufinus's Apologia In Hieronymum¹¹³ appeared in 401, followed thereafter by Jerome's three books of Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini¹¹⁴, both works marked by defensive rancour and bitterness; the friendship of Jerome and Rufinus was ruptured, and the public nature of their disagreement

¹¹². Labourt, v.4, pp.125-139.

¹¹³. PL 21, 541-624.

¹¹⁴. PL 23, 397-492.

occasioned sorrow among their admirers and friends.

Ever since he had yielded to the request of Atarbius that he revoke his allegiance to Origen, Jerome's enthusiasm for Origen came to be qualified. He wrote in a letter to Theophilus:

Sicut enim interpretationem et ὑπομνήματα scripturarum Origeni semper adtribui, ita dogmatum constantissime abstuli veritatem. (For just as I always recognized Origen's interpretation and commentaries so I most constantly refused [to attribute to him] dogmatic truth.)¹¹⁵

Similarly he wrote to Rufinus: Origenes...nostrum voco ob eruditionem ingenii, non ob dogmatum veritatem (I call Origen ours because of the erudition of his genius, not because of dogmatic truth).¹¹⁶ The distinctions were multiplied: Laudavi interpretem, non dogmatisten; ingenium, non fidem; philosophum, non apostolum (I praised the interpreter, not the theologian; the genius, not the belief; the philosopher, not the apostle).¹¹⁷ In his own defence he asserted that reading Origen was no different than reading Tertullian, Apollinarius or Eusebius, all of whom espoused various heresies; the counsel of the Apostle was to be followed: "Test all things, hold to what is good".¹¹⁸ Jerome also claimed that his

¹¹⁵. Letter 82, 7 (Labourt, v.4, p.118); cf. Letter 85, 4 (Labourt, v.4, p.140): ne me putes...cuncta Origenis reprobare quae scripsit...sed tantum prava dogmata repudiare (do not think that I condemn of Origen all that he wrote...but I only reject the perverse doctrines).

¹¹⁶. Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini, 2, 34 (PL 23, 455).

¹¹⁷. Letter 84, 2 (Labourt, v.4, p.126).

¹¹⁸. Letter 62, 2 (Labourt, v.3, p.116) quoting I Thessalonians 5:21; the same point is elaborated in Letter 84, 2 (Labourt, v.4, p.126). Cf. Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini 3, 27 (PL 23, 477).

admiration for Origen was a product of his youth, not his mature years.¹¹⁹ Jerome joined Epiphanius and others in condemning the list of Origen's unorthodox theological opinions¹²⁰: Eodem fervore quo Origenem ante laudavimus, nunc damnatum toto orbe damnemus (With the same fervour with which we praised Origen before, now that he has been condemned by the whole world let us condemn him also).¹²¹

The influence of Origen on Jerome continued, however, in Jerome's exegetical practice. In the prefaces to his translations of Ezra and Chronicles from the Hebrew (written in 395) Jerome referred with approval to Origen's work in the Hexapla.¹²² In 398, he wrote of having recently read Origen's homilies on Genesis¹²³, and he admitted to having read twenty-five volumes of Origen on Matthew and as many homilies.¹²⁴ His long letter (No.78) of 400 to Fabiola on the stages of the Israelites crossing

¹¹⁹. Erravimus juvenes, amendemur senes...Ignosce mihi quod Origenis eruditionem et studium Scripturarum antequam eius haeresim plenius nossem, in iuvenili aetate laudavi (We were mistaken as youths, let us be corrected as old men....Forgive me that I praised Origen's learning and zeal for the Scriptures in my young age before I came to fully know his heresy) Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini 3, 9 (PL 23, 464).

¹²⁰. See the extensive list of Origen's heresies in Letter 124, 2-14 (Labourt, v.7, pp.96-113) reiterated in Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini 2, 11-12 (PL 23, 434-436), and the discussion of the condemnations of Origen in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, pp.247-250.

¹²¹. Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini 3, 9 (PL 23, 464).

¹²². PL 28, 1404, 1325.

¹²³. Letter 73, 2 (Labourt, v.4, p.20).

¹²⁴. Prologue, Commentaria in Evangelium Matthaei (PL 26, 20).

the desert liberally imitates Origen's twenty-seventh homily on Numbers.¹²⁵ Writing to Augustine in 404, Jerome relied on Origen's commentaries to defend his interpretation of Galatians 2.¹²⁶ He made use of Origen's volumes on Zechariah in his own commentary on that text written in 406¹²⁷, and in a letter the same year he wrote that Origen explained Paul's letters to the Thessalonians vario prudentique sermone (in various and wise language): by now such praise of Origen had become rare from Jerome, and later in the same letter he endeavours to clarify his position on Origen:

Ego et in adulescentia et in extrema aetate profiteor et Origenem et Eusebium Caesariensem viros esse doctissimos, sed errasse in dogmatum veritate. (Both in youth and old age I have acknowledged both Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea to be most learned men, but to have erred in the truth of doctrine.)¹²⁸

Origen is mentioned--sometimes with approval, often with disapproval--in Jerome's commentaries on Daniel (407) and Isaiah (408-410), in the Dialogus Adversus Pelagianos (415) and in several letters dating from the final period of his life. Even his final work, the commentary on Jeremiah, shows signs of dependence on

¹²⁵. Letter 78 (Labourt, v.4, pp.52-93); de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.234; Kelly, Jerome, p.212. Origen, In Numeros Homilia 27 is in PG 12, 780-801.

¹²⁶. Letter 112, 4 (Labourt, v.6, p.21).

¹²⁷. Prologue, Commentaria in Zachariam Prophetam (PL 25, 1418).

¹²⁸. Letter 119, 9, 11 (Labourt, v.6, pp.111, 119).

Origen.¹²⁹ While he abandoned his predilection for Origen, Jerome continued to use the categories and terms of Origen's exegesis until the end of his life. As Cavallera writes:

Pendant des années ce fut un enchantement, et même quand il eut pris parti avec tant d'éclat contre lui, il continua à le lire et à l'utiliser, jusque dans son dernier commentaire, où cependant il ne lui épargne pas de sanglantes injures.¹³⁰

The Literal Sense in Jerome's Exegesis

The Bible held an unending fascination for Jerome throughout his career. He describes it as oceanum et mysteriousum Dei, ut sic loquar, labyrinthum (an ocean, and if I may speak thus, a labyrinth of the mysteries of God);¹³¹ Scripture is infinita sensuum silva (an infinite forest of meanings).¹³²

As had Origen before him, Jerome affirmed the significance of the literal meaning of the Biblical text. It is stupid (stultus), he writes, to take the figure of Melchizedek to be an angel instead of a king and so destroy the truth of the literal sense.¹³³ The

¹²⁹. E. Klostermann, "Die Überlieferung der Jeremiahomilien des Origenes" Texte und Untersuchungen 1, 3 (Gebhardt-Harnack) 66-75, cited in Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p.102.

¹³⁰. Ferdinand Cavallera, "Jérôme" Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement (Paris: 1928) 895, cited in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.213n5.

¹³¹. Commentaria In Ezechielem, 14 (PL 25, 448).

¹³². Letter, 64, 21 (Labourt, v.3, p.135).

¹³³. Letter 73, 9 (Labourt, v.4, pp.25-26).

literal sense has a beauty of its own¹³⁴; it is to be contrasted with the cloud of allegory and the shadow of tropology.¹³⁵ To ignore the literal sense results in an interpretation that is vain and lazy, and not rooted in the truth.¹³⁶ Thus, in his Biblical commentaries Jerome frequently makes reference to details of geography¹³⁷, history¹³⁸, and the interpretation of names.¹³⁹

Moreover, as had Origen before him, Jerome practiced critical exegesis of a sort, especially in consulting various versions of the Biblical text. Aware of the discrepancies between the many Latin versions of the Bible that were in use in his day, he came to bestow some measure of authority upon the Hebrew original, a decision that earned him the criticism of many, including Augustine.¹⁴⁰ However, Jerome's esteem of what he termed the Hebraica veritas (Hebrew truth) had significant results for his

134. In Psalmos, 67, cited in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.432.

135. Letter 74, 6 (Labourt, v.4, p.31); cf. the serene exposition which scatters the cloud of (Origenist) allegory (allegoriae nubilum serena expositione discutitur) in Letter 84, 2 (Labourt, v.4, p.126).

136. vana...et umbratica, et nullis veritatis fixa radicibus (Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas 3; PL 26, 423).

137. See, for example, the description of the area of Joppa in the present commentary on Jonah 1:3b below, p.10.

138. See Commentaria In Daniele 11, 5 (PL 25, 559); Commentaria In Isaiam 5 (on 23:1) (PL 24, 201).

139. See below, p.liv, on the numerous examples in the present commentary.

140. Letter 56, 2 (Labourt, v.3, p.51); Letter 104, 4-6 (with reference to Jerome's translation of Jonah 4 from the Hebrew) (Labourt, v.5, pp.98-100).

work and for the subsequent history of the Western church, especially in the development of a change of attitude regarding the authority of the Septuagint and of the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁴¹

As with Origen, Jerome's interest in the literal sense is also evident in the attention he gave to the original text of the Hebrew Scriptures. According to his own account, Jerome's turn to the study of Hebrew was linked to a battle with his passions:

Dum essem iuvenis, et solitudinis me deserta vallarent, incentiva vitiorum ardoremque naturae ferre non poteram; quae cum crebris ieiuniis frangerem, mens tamen cogitationibus aestuabat. Ad quam edomandam, cuidam fratri, qui ex Hebraeis crediderat, me in disciplinam dedi, ut post Quintilliani acumina, Ciceronisque fluvios, gravitatemque Frontonis, et lenitatem Plinii, alphabetum discerem, stridentia anhelantiaque verba meditarer....Et gratias ago Domini quod de amaro semine litterarum, dulces fructus capio. (When I was young, and the desert walled me in solitude, I was not able to bear the enticements of my sins and the ardour of my nature; while I had broken them with frequent fasting, nevertheless my mind was seething with thoughts. To subdue it, I put myself in the training of a certain brother, who had converted from the Hebrews; thus, after the keenness of Quintillian, the "rivers" of Cicero, the gravity of Fronto, and the gentleness of Pliny, I should come to learn an alphabet, and practice hissing and aspirate words....And I thank the Lord that from the bitter seed of these letters, I am collecting sweet fruits.)¹⁴²

In addition to this form of "linguistic mortification of the mental flesh"¹⁴³, presumably Jerome's decision to take up the study of

¹⁴¹. See the thorough discussion in Henry H. Howorth, "The Influence of St. Jerome on the Canon of the Western Church" Journal of Theological Studies 10 (1908-1909) 481-496; 11 (1909-1910) 321-347; 13 (1911-1912) 1-18.

¹⁴². Letter 125, 12 (Labourt, v.7, pp.124-125).

¹⁴³. James Barr, "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 49 (1966) 285.

the Hebrew language also stemmed from his own scholarly curiosity, as well as from a nascent recognition of the potential value of the Hebraica veritas for all questions of precision in Biblical scholarship.¹⁴⁴ Jerome developed sufficient fluency in Hebrew to abandon the project Pope Damasus had assigned him of standardizing the existing Latin versions of the Bible in favour of undertaking a fresh translation of his own based on the original languages of Hebrew and Greek. Beginning with his Commentaria in Ecclesiasten (c.389), he also increasingly made use of the Hebrew text in his Biblical commentaries.¹⁴⁵

In learning Hebrew, Jerome had no prepared grammatical aids to assist him. He was entirely dependent, therefore, on the personal aid of his teachers and the unpointed Hebrew Biblical text, along with other Hebrew books to which he may have had access.¹⁴⁶ He boasts he has learned Hebrew from eruditissimus gentis illius (the most learned of that nation [i.e. the Jews]).¹⁴⁷ The Hebrew teachers Jerome mentions are various; they include the Christian convert mentioned in Letter 125 cited above, as well as one

¹⁴⁴. Ibid., p.286.

¹⁴⁵. Hartmann, "St. Jerome as an Exegete", p.41.

¹⁴⁶. In Letter 78, 20 and 26 (Labourt, v.4, pp.73, 76) Jerome refers to an apocryphal "Little Genesis" (i.e. the Book of Jubilees), and to an apocryphal book of Jeremiah in his Commentaria in Evangelium Matthaei 4 (on 27:9-10) (PL 26, 205). It is by no means clear (as Hartmann, "St. Jerome as an Exegete" p.58 claims) that the works brought to him by a Jew from a Roman synagogue (Letter 36, 1; Labourt, v.2, p.51) were midrashic commentaries; they could well have been Biblical scrolls (see Samuel Krauss, "Jerome" Jewish Encyclopedia, v.7 (New York: KTAV) p.117).

¹⁴⁷. Letter 73, 9 (Labourt, v.4, p.25).

Baranina (i.e. Bar Hanina)¹⁴⁸, another whom Jerome claims was so perfect in Hebrew that he was called Chaldaeus¹⁴⁹, and another who was a native of Lydda.¹⁵⁰ When it came to the Aramaic text of Daniel and Tobit, Jerome relied on a person who was bilingual in Aramaic and Hebrew: listening to the latter's oral translation he simultaneously dictated a Latin translation to a scribe.¹⁵¹ Thus it is difficult to ascertain whether Jerome could actually speak Aramaic himself.¹⁵² He may also have had some slight knowledge of Syriac.¹⁵³

Jerome's references to the Hebrew original in his commentaries are primarily lexical in character¹⁵⁴; he makes little mention of

¹⁴⁸. Letter 84, 3 (Labourt, v.4, p.127); his name was not Nicodemus (contra Krauss, "Jerome", p.115), but rather he represented to Jerome a second Nicodemus (Timebat enim Iudaeos, et mihi alterum exhibebat Nicodemum) as Jerome studied with him by night. Rufinus sought to revile Jerome's Hebrew scholarship with the taunt that Jerome's teacher was not Baranina, but Barabbas (Apologia Adversus Libros Rufini 1, 13; PL 23, 407).

¹⁴⁹. Letter 18A, 10 (Labourt, v.1, p.65). Krauss, "Jerome", p.115 believes this teacher to be the same as the Christian convert mentioned in Letter 125, 12.

¹⁵⁰. Preface to Job (PL 28, 1081); Jerome claims to have paid a not inconsiderable sum of money to this teacher. Cf. Commentaria In Abacuc 1 (on 2:15-17) (PL 25, 1301).

¹⁵¹. Preface to Tobit (PL 29, 25-26). It is not clear whether Jerome's bilingual interpreter actually taught him Aramaic (contra Krauss, "Jerome", p.115).

¹⁵². Barr, "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew" pp. 290-291. According to Barr, Jerome's cites etymologies that betray some knowledge of Aramaic (ibid., pp. 287-288).

¹⁵³. Kelly, Jerome, pp.49, 55.

¹⁵⁴. Barr, "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew", p.296. This is evident in the present commentary also.

grammatical structure, aside from matters of gender: at one point he reassures his readers who may be scandalized that the noun $\pi\lambda\lambda$ (Spirit [of God]) in Hebrew is feminine!¹⁵⁵ Jerome is able to explain word plays found in the Hebrew text.¹⁵⁶ The presence in his Biblical commentaries of transliterations of Hebrew words in letters of the Latin alphabet illustrate the pronunciation of Hebrew in his day (well before the Masoretic system of vocalization was introduced).¹⁵⁷ As his exegesis at times parallels rabbinic exegesis¹⁵⁸, and he expressly refers to an interpretation of Baraciba (i.e. the renowned Rabbi Akiba, c.50-135)¹⁵⁹, Jerome's commentaries may well reflect Jewish traditions of Biblical

¹⁵⁵. Commentaria In Isaiam Prophetam 11 (on 40:9-11) (PL 24, 405).

¹⁵⁶. See Commentaria In Isaiam Prophetam 2 (on 5:7) (PL 24, 79) where the Hebrew puns produce elegans structura sonusque verborum (an elegant structure and sound of words).

¹⁵⁷. Barr, "St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew", pp.282-283, 300. On the value of these transliterations for our knowledge of Hebrew pronunciation of the day, see E.F. Sutcliffe, "St. Jerome's Pronunciation of Hebrew" Biblica 29 (1948) 112-125 and James Barr, "St. Jerome and the Sounds of Hebrew" Journal of Semitic Studies 12 (1967) 1-36.

¹⁵⁸. According to Hartmann, "St. Jerome as an Exegete", p.61 Jerome's Commentaria In Zachariam 2 (on 11:11) (PL 25, 1496) exhibits a midrash. Krauss, "Jerome", p.117, offers several other possible examples of rabbinic exegesis paralleled in Jerome's writings. Cf. also Krauss, "The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers", pp. 249-261; Elliott, "Hebrew Learning Among the Fathers", p.865.

¹⁵⁹. Commentarius In Ecclesiasten 4:13-16 (PL 23, 1048-1049). Cf. Letter 121, 10 (Labourt, v.7, p.53), which mentions Akiba, Simon, and Hillel. In the Commentaria In Abacuc 1 (on 2:15-17) (PL 25, 1301) he writes of having heard a $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\varsigma$ (i.e. a tanna).

exegesis.¹⁶⁰ As had Origen, Jerome found himself in a paradoxical relationship with the Jews: he was frequently in touch with individual Jewish teachers and rabbis which, as one scholar has written, "presupposes at least a minimum of human politeness and amity"¹⁶¹, yet Jerome also clearly betrays an attitude of Christian anti-semitism¹⁶² and his writings partake of the patristic Adversus Iudaeos tradition.¹⁶³

The Non-Literal Sense in Jerome's Exegesis

For Jerome, the literal level provides the foundation (fundamenta) for further interpretation of the Scriptures¹⁶⁴: he

¹⁶⁰. See the estimation of the opinions of various scholars on this question in Cyrus H. Gordon "Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs" Journal of Biblical Literature 49 (1930) 385-387. More recently, Jacob Neusner has acknowledged Jerome's use of Jewish exegesis, but sees no "intersection" between the questions Jerome and the rabbis respectively brought to the Biblical text (Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) pp.120-123).

¹⁶¹. Marcel Simon, Verus Israel: a Study of the Relations Between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425), trans. H. McKeating (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986) p.230; Hartmann's assertion ("St. Jerome as an Exegete", p.62) that Jerome "would say that many of his best friends were Jews" is rather difficult to substantiate.

¹⁶². For example (one of many), he describes the prayers of Jews as grunnitus suis et clamor asinorum (the grunting of a pig and the braying of asses) (Commentaria In Amos 2 (on 5:23); PL 25, 1054). On Jerome's attitude to the Jews, see Simon, Verus Israel, pp.214, 216, 230-231.

¹⁶³. On the Adversus Iudaeos tradition, see R. Ruether, Faith and Fratricide, pp.117-182.

¹⁶⁴. Commentaria In Amos 3 (on 9:6) (PL 25, 1090); Letter 129, 6 (Labourt, v.7, pp.163-164); see also Jerome's discussion of the "historical foundations" (historiae fundamenta) in the Prologue to the present commentary, p.3 below.

writes of building a spiritual edifice on the foundation of history, and of the literal sense having to precede the non-literal.¹⁶⁵ As with Origen, this is also due in no small measure to Jerome's christological view of the Bible, including the Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁶⁶

Thus, like Origen as well, Jerome's exegesis gives prominence to the non-literal sense: Non historiam denegamus, sed spiritalem intelligentiam praeferimus (We do not deny the history, but we prefer the spiritual understanding).¹⁶⁷ He writes of seeking altiozem intelligentiam (a higher understanding)¹⁶⁸:

Nobis curae est non solum secundum historiam sed secundum spiritalem intellegentiam interpretari. (Our concern is to interpret not only according to the history but

¹⁶⁵. Commentaria In Isaiaem Prophetam 6 (preface) (PL 24, 205): super fundamenta historiae...spirituale exstruere aedificium (to build a spiritual edifice upon the foundations of the history). (See also Duval, "Introduction" to Jérôme, Commentaire sur Jonas, p.55); Commentaria In Isaiaem Prophetam 5 (on 13:19) (PL 24, 158-159): spiritualis interpretatio sequi debeat ordinem historiae (the spiritual interpretation ought to follow the order of the history).

¹⁶⁶. Nos spiritualem...eum verum dicimus, qui...Christum in divinis libris videns nihil in in eis Judaicae traditionis admittat (We say that that one is truly spiritual who...seeing Christ in the divine books allows nothing in them of the Jewish tradition) (Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas 2 (on 4:24); PL 26, 390).

¹⁶⁷. Commentaria In Marcum 9, 1-7 (cited in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.481).

¹⁶⁸. Commentaria in Isaiaem Prophetam 7 (on 19:1) (PL 24, 250): Sed et in hoc et in aliis Scripturarum locis pleraque ponuntur, quae non possent stare iuxta historiam: ut rerum necessitate cogamur altiozem intelligentiam quaerere (But in this and also in other places of Scripture are put a good many things which cannot stand according to the history: so that by the necessity of things we are forced to seek the higher understanding). See also Commentaria in Aggaeum (on 1:1) (PL 25, 1391) and Commentaria in Zachariam 2 (on 9:5-10) (PL 25, 1484).

according to the spiritual understanding.)¹⁶⁹

One scholar has written "c'est l'exégèse allégorique et mystique qui intéresse surtout Jérôme".¹⁷⁰ Indeed, he affirmed that once the literal sense is established, all of Scripture is to be interpreted spiritually¹⁷¹; when the literal sense was impossible (for example, the two animals on which Jesus rides in Matthew's version of the Palm Sunday narrative), the non-literal interpretation was to be taken up.¹⁷² Interpretation according to the non-literal sense was to be attempted whenever possible¹⁷³; it is the Lord's own way of understanding the text.¹⁷⁴

The movement from the literal to the non-literal sense is depicted with the use of a variety of metaphors in Jerome's writings. He describes it as breaking the nut to arrive at the

¹⁶⁹. Cited in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.308n9.

¹⁷⁰. Paul Antin, Essai Sur S. Jerome (1951), p.160, cited in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.663.

¹⁷¹. Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 1 (preface) (PL 24, 20): post historiae veritatem, spiritualiter accipienda sunt omnia (after the truth of the history, everything is to be received spiritually).

¹⁷². Commentaria in Evangelium Matthaei 3 (on 21:4-5) (PL 26, 147): Ergo cum historia vel impossibilitatem habeat vel turpitudinem, ad altiora transmittimur (Therefore when the history has either an impossibility or something shameful, it is raised to a higher level).

¹⁷³. See on 1:3b of the present commentary, p.12 below.

¹⁷⁴. Letter 52, 10 (Labourt, v.2, p.186): ut Dominus quoque noster intellexit.

sweet kernel within¹⁷⁵, or discovering and collecting the spiritual fruit hidden under the leaves of the letter.¹⁷⁶ With the aid of the non-literal interpretation, the divine word is born daily from the virginal soul.¹⁷⁷ To move to the non-literal sense is to spread sails, guiding one's boat among rugged rocks¹⁷⁸, or to take the wings of a dove, lifted above the clouds of the law and the gospel, above the prophets and the apostles, borne to the heights by their doctrine.¹⁷⁹

Jerome also employs a variety of terms to refer to the non-literal interpretation itself. He makes use of the following terms: spiritalis intelligentia; sensus spiritalis; typicus intellectus; tropica intelligentia; allegoria¹⁸⁰ (in Greek or Latin); more

¹⁷⁵. Letter 58, 9 (Labourt, v.3, p.83): Totum quod legimus in divinis libris...fulget etiam in cortice, sed dulcius in medulla est. Qui esse vult nucleum frangit nucem (all that we read in the divine books...shines even in the shell, but it is sweeter in the center. Whoever wants to eat the kernel breaks the nut) (quoting Plautus Curculio 55). (It is to be noted that here the "shell" has a beauty of its own.)

¹⁷⁶. Commentaria in Ezechielem 14 (on 47: 6-12) (PL 25, 475). Cf. Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 9 (on 30:17-21) (PL 24, 335).

¹⁷⁷. Commentaria In Amos 3 (on 9:6) (PL 25, 1090).

¹⁷⁸. Commentaria in Abdia (on verses 20-21) (PL 25, 1116). Cf. Letter 64, 18 (Labourt, v.3, p.132).

¹⁷⁹. Letter 119, 10 (Labourt, v.6, p.118).

¹⁸⁰. Commentaria in Amos 3 (on 6:7-12) (PL 25, 1063): Tenues historiae lines duximus, nunc allegoriae imprimamus manum (We have taken the delicate lines of the history, now let us lay hand on [the lines] of allegory). Cf. Jerome's discussion of allegory in his Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas 2 (on 4:24) (PL 26, 389-390).

frequently tropologia¹⁸¹; as well as imago, figura, umbra, sensus or intellectus mysticus, typus, and of course spiritus, with the related adjectives and adverbs.¹⁸² Like other early Christian exegetes, Jerome's use of these terms is fluid and highly eclectic: one scholar has commented that Jerome's exegetical vocabulary "apparaît fâcheusement imprécis".¹⁸³ Jerome, like Origen, can describe his "method" in terms of a threefold approach to Scripture corresponding to a tripartite view of the human person:

Triplex in corde nostro descriptio et regula Scripturarum est: prima, ut intelligamus eas iuxta historiam; secunda, iuxta tropologiam; tertia, iuxta intellectum spiritalem. ...Quos tales Christus invenerit, ut et corpore et anima et spiritu integri conserventur et perfectam habeant triplicis in se scientiae veritatem. (In our heart the description and rule of the Scriptures is threefold: first, that we understand them according to the history; second, according to tropology; third, according to the spiritual understanding....Whom Christ has found so that they may be preserved whole in body and soul and spirit and may have in them the perfect truth of threefold knowledge.)¹⁸⁴

¹⁸¹. See the extensive list of texts in which Jerome refers to tropology in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.418n7, as well as the present commentary on Jonah 1:1-2 (p.5); 1: 3b (pp.11ff.); 1:6 (p.15); 4:10-11 (pp.66ff.) below.

¹⁸². See the list of texts cited in Duval, "Introduction" to Jérôme, Commentaire sur Jonas, pp.87-88. Duval does not mention anagoge, which Jerome uses (in Greek) in the present commentary on Jonah 2:4a (p.33) below, and also in the passages cited in de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.419n11, n16, n17 and p.420n1.

¹⁸³. Henri de Lubac, "Typologie et Allégorisme" Recherches de Science Religieuse 1947, p.180, cited in Émile Bonnard, "Introduction" to Saint Jérôme: Commentaire Sur S. Matthieu, introduction, traduction et notes par Émile Bonnard, v.1 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1977) p.34n.

¹⁸⁴. Letter 120, 12 (Labourt, v.6, p.162). Cf. Commentaria in Ezechielem 5 (on 16: 30-31) (PL 25, 147): Scripturas sanctas intelligamus tripliciter. Primum, iuxta litteram; secundo, medie per tropologiam; tertio, sublimius, ut mystica quaeque noscamus.

De Lubac claims that the divisions of the medieval fourfold sense of Scripture are present in Jerome as well.¹⁸⁵ The division between the literal and non-literal is, however, fundamental to Jerome's exegetical approach, as it was for Origen; both would have agreed with the following from Gregory of Nyssa:

τὴν διὰ τῆς ἀναγωγῆς θεωρίαν, εἴτε τροπολογίαν, εἴτε ἀλληγορίαν, εἴτε τι ἄλλο τις ὀνομάζειν ἐθέλοι, οὐδὲν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος διοισόμεθα, μόνον εἰ τῶν ἐπωφελῶν ἔχοι [το] νοημάτων.... Ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τούτοις τοῖς...ὀνόμασι τῆς κατὰ τὸν νοῦν θεωρίας, ἐν ὑφηγεῖται διδασκαλίας εἶδος ἡμῖν, τὸ μὴ δεῖν πάντως παραμένειν τῷ πράγματι...ἀλλὰ μεταβαίνειν πρὸς τὴν αὐτὸν τε καὶ νοητὴν θεωρίαν. (contemplation through anagoge, or tropology, or allegory, or however anyone may wish to call it (we shall not quarrel over the name, provided that it has something for useful thoughts)....In all these...names for the contemplation of the mind, one form of teaching leads the way for us, that we must by no means remain with the letter...but pass on to the immaterial and spiritual contemplation.)¹⁸⁶

Jerome's Exegesis in the Commentary on Jonah

Jerome's approach to the the literal level of interpretation can be seen in several places in the text of the commentary on Jonah. These include, for example: the geographical description of Sepphoris/Diocaesarea (Prologue, pp.2-3), of Joppa (on 1:3b, p.10), and of the size of Nineveh and how far Jonah travelled in it (on 3:3-4a, p.47); the historical discussion (with reference to

(Let us understand the holy Scriptures in a threefold way. First, according to the letter; secondly, in a middle degree, by means of tropology; thirdly, in a more sublime way, that we may discover whatever mysteries [there are].)

¹⁸⁵. De Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, p.420.

¹⁸⁶. Gregory of Nyssa, Preface, In Canticum Canticorum (PG 44, 757).

Herodotus) of the fall of Nineveh (Prologue, p.3); and the botanical description of the ciceion plant (on 4:6, pp.62-63). In the latter section Jerome makes his concern with the literal sense explicit: Discutiamus ergo historiam et, ante mysticos intellectus, solam litteram ventilemus (Therefore let us investigate the history, and before the mystical meaning let us bring forth only the literal).

The commentary also contains several examples of Jerome's fascination with the meanings of names: Jonah is explained as "dove" (Prologue, p.1) and "sufferer" (on 4:1-2a, p.57) (cf. on 1:1-2, p.5; on 4:5, p.60); Amittai means "truth" (Prologue, p.2); Nineveh means "beautiful" (on 1:1-2, p.5; cf. on 4:10-11, p.68) and "world" (on 1:1-2, p.5; cf. on 3:3-4a, pp.47-48); Tharsis is interpreted as "sea" (on 1:3a, p.8) and "contemplation of joy" (on 1:3a, p.9; on 1:6, p.15; on 1:12, p.22; cf. on 4:2b-3, p.58); Joppa is "beautiful" (on 1:3a, p.9); Jordan equals "descent" (on 4:5, p.60); and Ramoth "visions of death" (on 4:5, p.60).

Each section of the commentary is prefaced by a translation from the Septuagint and the Hebrew. In the body of the commentary itself Jerome cites the Septuagint of Jonah four times, and provides transliterations of the Hebrew six times.¹⁸⁷ He struggles with the difference between the Hebrew and the Septuagint

¹⁸⁷. Citations from the Septuagint of Jonah: παρεβιάζοντο (on 1:13, p.23); ἀρα (on 2:5b, p.36); καρόχοι αἰώνιοι (on 2:6b-7a, p.39); ὁ δὴ (on 4:2b-3, p.58). Transliterations of the Hebrew: iered (on 1:3b, p.10); daq gadol (on 2:1a, p.28); salos, arbaim (on 3:4b, p.48); anna (on 4:2b-3, p.58); hadra lach (on 4:4, p.59); ciceion (on 4:6, pp.62-64).

of 3:4b (p.48). His attention to the literal interpretation is also evident in the lexical distinctions he makes between the words Iudaeus (Jew) and Hebraeus (Hebrew) (on 1:9, p.18), and terra (earth) and arida (dry land) (on 1:9, p.18), as well as in his word study of malitia (evil) (on 1:7, pp.16-17; cf. on 3:10, p.56).

Jerome also takes the story line of the book of Jonah as historically true. From the summary of the story of Jonah (Prologue, p.4) to the miracle of the gourd which, without supports, grew in one night to a height from which it could provide Jonah with shade (on 4:6, p.63), the entire story is taken as an historical account. The action of the story is imaginatively illuminated by Jerome: for example, the flight to Joppa to set sail for Tharsis is seen as befitting a frightened fugitive (on 1:3a, p.8), while the sailors are depicted as treating Jonah with respect and honour (on 1:15, p.25). Most striking to modern readers is his defense of the historicity of Jonah's sojourn in the belly of the whale, which he buttresses with examples of other miracle stories drawn from the Bible as well as from Ovid's Metamorphoses (on 2:2, p.31).

Of course the commentary on Jonah reveals Jerome's fondness for non-literal interpretation as well. Already in the Prologue Jonah is described as a 'type' (typus) of the Saviour who prefigured (praefiguravit) the Lord's resurrection (p.1), a 'type' best interpreted by Christ himself (p.4, quoting Mt. 12:41 et par.) Similarly, Jonah's prayer in the belly of the whale is described as a 'type' of the Lord's prayer (on 2:2, p.30) although Jerome does

not elaborate on this. The figure of Jonah asleep in the ship is a 'type' of a different sort, here referring to a person stupefied by error (on 1:5b, pp.14-15).

The commentary also refers to tropology at several points: the sending of Jonah to Nineveh corresponds to the sending of Christ to the world (on 1:1-2, p.5); the prayers of the sailors refers to the conversion of "many" to the one God (on 1:6, p.15). Jerome confesses the difficulty of arriving at a tropological interpretation of the withering of the plant (on 4:10-11, pp.66ff.), while earlier in the commentary he discusses the inevitable limits involved in tropology, that it is not possible to explain everything in the book of Jonah in this fashion although he intends to attempt to do so insofar as is possible (on 1:3b, pp.11-12). (In the latter passage, he also uses the term tropology interchangeably with allegory.) There is one instance of the term ἀναγωγή (in Greek) describing a progressive interpretation which moves from the sea surrounding Jonah to the sea of difficulties endured by Christ to "the force of the river (which) makes glad the city of God" (Ps. 45:5 LXX) (on 2:4a, pp.33-34).

Frequently the non-literal interpretation in the present commentary is christological in nature. Thus verse 2:5a "I am cast away from your eyes" is seen as referring to Christ's being surrounded by human flesh and imitating human feelings (pp.35-36). Jonah's flight to Tharsis is also explained with regard to the incarnation (on 1:3a, p.8), although Jerome connects it as well to the giving of oneself to contemplation (on 1:3a, p.9), and to

humanity's flight from God (on 1:4, pp.12-13). Jonah's paying for his passage on the ship is paralleled to Christ's ministry beside the sea (on 1:3b, pp.10-11), while the proclamation in 3:4b is linked with Christ's fasting for forty days (Mt. 4:2 et par.) and "shouting" (Jn. 7:37), as well as with Christ's overall message quia de magnis praedicat (since he preached about great things) (p.49). Similarly the assurance Jerome sees in Jonah's prayer in 2:5b is referred to Christ's unwavering faith (pp.36-37). The subsiding of the storm at sea moves, of course, to Jesus' calming of the storm (Mt. 8:24-26; Mk. 4:37-39); Jerome then goes on to write of the church being surrounded by the perils of the world (on 1:12, p.22).

The passion of Christ is the non-literal meaning which Jerome seems to discern most frequently: during the storm, the sinking of Jonah which obtains the relief of the ship is termed sacramentum eius qui passurus erat (the mystery of him who was to suffer) (on 1:13, p.23); the tranquillity of the sea which is accomplished through Jonah's being thrown from the ship is paralleled to the tranquillity of faith and the peace and freedom from care and turning to God wrought through Christ's passion (on 1:15, pp.25-26); Jonah's plight in the sea is related to the temptations and sufferings of Christ (on 2:4b and 2:5a, pp.34-36) and Jonah's distress in the belly of the whale simply elicits three quotations related to Christ's passion with no further explanation from Jerome (on 2:8a, p.42). Of course the words of Christ concerning Jonah lie behind Jerome's interpretation of the story along these lines (see

Prologue, p.4; on 2:1b, p.29).

Jerome also sees the descent of Christ into hell at several points in the story of Jonah, including Jonah's entry into the depths of the sea (on 2:4a, pp.33-34; on 2:6a, p.37) and into the belly of the whale (on 2:3, p.32). As well, the resurrection is signified by Jonah's being vomited out of the whale (on 2:11, p.45), and by Jonah's return to his mission to Nineveh (on 3:1-2, p.46). Related to this is Jerome's interpretation of the size of Nineveh (a 'three days' journey') as referring to the Trinitarian names of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the baptismal formula the apostles were commanded to use by the risen Christ (on 3:3-4a, p.47). (Cf. also the convoluted baptismal interpretation in part of Jerome's comments on 4:7-8, p.65.)

Jerome's triumphalist view of Christianity as superceding Judaism is also evident in his non-literal interpretation of Jonah. The righteousness of the (pagan) sailors is contrasted with the Jews' rejection of Christ (on 1:13, p.23). The sailors are lauded for their great faith--Grandis vectorum fides (Great is the faith of the sailors)--and their voice is described as being that of Pilate washing his hands of Christ's blood, while the hands of the Jews are full of blood and so their prayers are not heard (on 1:14, p.24). (Jerome here invokes Mt. 27:25, so often used in the history of Christian anti-semitism.¹⁸⁸) Verse 2:9 speaks of "forsaking mercy", and here too Jerome cites as his example the Jews'

¹⁸⁸. On the function of this verse in Christian anti-semitism, see R. Ruether, Faith and Fratricide, p.94.

"forsaking" of God (p.43). The repentance of the people of Nineveh is contrasted with Israel's unbelief (on 3:5, p.49); thus Nineveh, defined earlier as the "world" (on 1:1-2, p.5; cf. on 3:3-4a, pp.47-48) at the end of the commentary comes to prefigure the Church which outnumbers the ten tribes of Israel (on 4:10-11, p.68). Several times in the commentary the salvation of the gentiles is connected to the divine "rejection" of the Jews. Since the closest Jerome can find in Scripture to the 'gourd' (cucurbita) in the Septuagint of 4:6ff. is Is. 1:8 ("The daughter of Zion will be left like a tent in the vineyard, and like a hut in a cucumber field, as a city which is under attack"), he connects the 'cucumber' in the latter passage with the 'gourd' in Jonah in order to reiterate the "abandonment" of the Jews by God. Jerome then goes on to use the plant in the Jonah story as an image of Israel which 'quickly grows up and quickly withers' (p.64), and is 'drying up' (on 4:7-8, p.65), and (by a curious progression of thought) is like the locusts on which John the Baptist fed:

animal parvum, infirmas habens alas, de terra quidem consurgens sed altius non valens avolare, ut plus sit quam reptile et tamen avibus non aequetur (a small animal with feeble wings, rising from the ground at least but not strong enough to fly higher, so that it is more than a creeping animal and yet not equal to the birds) (on 4:6, p.64).

The same theme is echoed in a series of rhetorical antitheses at the close of the Prologue:

Illi habent libros, nos librorum Dominum; illi tenent prophetas, nos intellegentiam prophetarum; illos 'occidit littera', nos 'vivificat spiritus'; apud illos Barabbas latro dimittitur, nobis Christus Dei filius solvitur.
(They have the books, we have the Lord of the books; they have the prophets, we have the understanding of the

prophets; the "letter kills" them, the "Spirit makes us alive"; among them Barabbas the robber is let loose, for us Christ the son of God is set free.) (p.4)

Jerome also sees the rejection of the Jews as the reason for Jonah's initial reluctance to obey the call to preach repentance in Nineveh (on 1:3a, pp.6-7), and for Jonah's pained reaction to the repentance of the Ninevites (on 4:1-2a, p.57; on 4:2b-3, p.59; on 4:9, p.66). Jerome's ascribing to Jonah of this Christian view that the salvation of the Church entails the "rejection" of the Jews is indeed singular.

Other examples of non-literal exegesis in the present commentary would be the interpretation of the 'waters' in 2:6a as meaning fleshly temptation (they are friends of bodies and they are warmed by its pleasures [amicae...sunt corporum et eius voluptatibus confoventur]) (p.37), and the identification of the 'abyss' in the same verse with evil forces and powers, or alternately with the mysteries and judgments of God (p.38). Jerome also offers an interesting interpretation of the repentance of the king of Nineveh in 3:6-9 as meaning that Christians are to put aside flowery speech and eloquence (pp.53-54). The same section of the commentary (on 3:6-9, pp.51-52) also contains a highly rhetorical polemic presumably directed against Origen and specifically the teaching of the final restoration of all things, including the devil, at the end of time. In a similar vein, the section on 2:7b (p.40) insisting that the resurrected body will be the same as the present body is possibly intended to reaffirm Jerome's orthodox position over against the heretical views of

Origen; the basis of Jerome's interpretation of this point is that Jonah's body was not destroyed in the belly of the whale.

Despite these criticisms of Origen, the extent of the latter's influence on Jerome's exegesis of the book of Jonah is evident in the profusion of non-literal interpretation found in the present commentary. In this the first commentary written by Jerome after his repudiation of his allegiance to Origen the influence of Origen is nevertheless strongly felt. There is, however, no better way to appreciate this fact than to turn to the text of the commentary itself.

ON JONAH THE PROPHET

PROLOGUE

About three years have passed since I commented on the five prophets Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah and Haggai¹, and being occupied with another work² I have not been able to complete what I began; for I wrote a book on Famous Men³, two volumes against Jovinian, also an Apology⁴, a work to Pammachius on the best kind of interpretation⁵, two books to Nepotian or on Nepotian⁶, and others which it would be too long to list.⁷ Therefore, after so much time, by way of a return to activity⁸ I am first taking up the interpretation of Jonah: I pray⁹ that he who is a type of the Saviour, and prefigured the resurrection of the Lord in spending three days and nights in the belly of the whale (Mt. 12:40), might bestow on us also our pristine fervour so that we might be worthy of the coming of the Holy Spirit to us. For if "Jonah" is translated as a "dove"¹⁰ and the dove moreover refers to the Holy Spirit, we also comment on the "dove" on account of the coming of the Dove to us.

I know that ancient persons of the church, both Greek and Latin, have said much concerning this book¹¹, and with their great questions¹² have not revealed but rather obscured its sentences, so that their very interpretation needs interpretation and readers go away much more uncertain than they were before reading them. I do not say this in order to disparage great geniuses and revile others with my estimation, but it is the duty of a commentator quickly and plainly to make clear things which are obscure: they

explain not so much to show off their eloquence as the meaning of that which they are expounding.

Therefore, let us search out the prophet Jonah apart from his book and the Gospels, that is the Lord's testimony concerning him; where else in the Holy Scriptures do we read about him? And unless I am mistaken it is written concerning him in the book of Kings in this way: "In the fifteenth year of Amaziah the son of Joash the king of Judah Jeroboam the son of Joash reigned as king of Israel in Samaria for forty-one years. And he did evil in the sight of the Lord, and he did not desist from all the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, which he made Israel to sin. He restored the borders of Israel in Samaria from the entrance of Hamath up to the sea of the wilderness, according to the word of the Lord the God of Israel which he spoke by the hand of his servant Jonah the prophet, the son of Amittai, who was from Gath which is in Opher."¹³ (II Kings 14:23-25) However, the Hebrews relate that he was the son of the widow of Zarephath whom Elijah the prophet raised up after he had died (I Kings 17: 8-24).¹⁴ Afterwards, the boy's mother said to him: "Now I know that you are a man of God, and the word of the Lord of truth^{a15} is in your mouth" (I Kings 17:24) and for this reason this very boy was so named. Amittai, in fact, means truth in our language¹⁶, and because Elijah spoke the truth he who was resurrected is said to be the son of truth.¹⁷ Furthermore, in the second millennium Geth was Sepphoris, which today is called

^a veritas C(corrected) D(corrected) G(corrected) Bi Era Vic Val(in text) Ant.

Diocaesarea when we go to Tiberias; it is not a large village, and there also his tomb is displayed.¹⁸ Others would have it that he was born and buried near Diospolis, that is Lydda. However, they do not know that what is added--Opher--serves to distinguish Geth from the other cities which are displayed these days near Eleutheropolis or Diospolis.

The book of Tobit--granted that it is not found in the Canon, nevertheless it is used by men of the church--also mentions him in this way, when Tobit is saying to his son: "My son, behold I have grown old, and I am at the point of departing my life. Take your sons and go to Medea, my son; for I know what Jonah the prophet said concerning Nineveh, that it would be overthrown" (Tobit 14:3-4).¹⁹ Indeed, with regard to historical accounts (both Hebrew and Greek ones)--especially in Herodotus (Histories I, 102-106)--we read that when Josiah was reigning over the Hebrews and Cyaxares^b was king of the Medes, Nineveh was overthrown. From this we know that at that first time, Nineveh attained forgiveness when it had repented at the preaching of Jonah; afterwards however, since the Ninevites persevered in their earlier vices, a sentence was called forth by God against them. The Hebrews also relate that Hosea and Amos, and Isaiah and Jonah, prophesied at that same time. This much pertains to the historical foundations.

For the rest we are not unaware, venerable Father

^b emending the text to cyaxare following the suggestion of Duval (presumably based on the passage from Herodotus). The name of Cyaxares exhibits great variety in the manuscript tradition of the present commentary (see Duval, p.166); it endured a similar fate in the Chronicle of Eusebius (see ibid., p.330n37).

Chromatius²⁰, that it is a labourious burden to relate all of this prophet to the knowledge of the Saviour: he fled, he slept, he was thrown into the sea, he was taken up by a whale; when he was thrown upon the shore, he preached repentance; saddened on account of the salvation of a city which could not be numbered, he took delight in the shade of a gourd; rebuked by God for having more concern for a plant which flourished and suddenly withered than for such a multitude of human beings; and the other things which are in the same book we shall endeavour to explain. And yet, in order to comprise the whole meaning of the prophet in a brief preface there will be no better interpreter of his type than he who inspired the prophets and indicated beforehand in his servants the lines of truth to come. For he spoke as follows to the Jews who did not believe in his word and did not know that Christ was the Son of God: "The men of Nineveh will arise in judgment with this generation and they will condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold a greater than Jonah is here." (Mt. 12:41; Lk. 11:32) The generation of the Jews is condemned by the believing world, and while Nineveh repented, unbelieving Israel perishes. They have the books, we have the Lord of the books; they have the prophets, we have the understanding of the prophets; "the letter kills" them, us "the Spirit makes alive" (II Cor. 3:6); among them Barabbas the robber is let loose (Jn. 18:40), for us Christ the son of God is set free.

CHAPTER ONE

THE BOOK BEGINS

1:1-2 Heb.: And the word of the Lord came to Jonah, the son of Amittai, saying: 'Arise and go to Nineveh, the great city, and proclaim to it, for its evil is rising up before me.'

LXX: With the exception that they said: "The cry of its evil is rising up to me," the Septuagint translated the rest similarly.

For the condemnation of Israel Jonah is sent to the Gentiles, because while Nineveh repents Israel perseveres in its evil. Moreover, when it says: "its evil is rising up before me" (Heb.) or: "the cry of its evil is before me" (LXX), the same thing is said in Genesis: "the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah has been multiplied" (Gen. 18:20) and to Cain: "the voice of the blood of your brother is crying to me from the earth." (Gen. 4:10)

According to tropology, however, our Lord, that is Jonah--the "dove" or the "sufferer"²¹--for he can be understood as both, whether it be because the Holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove and rested on him, or because he suffered for our wounds, wept over Jerusalem, and "by his bruises we are healed" (Is. 53:5)--he who is truly the Son of Truth, for God is Truth²², is sent to Nineveh the beautiful²³, that is, to the world, than which with our bodily eyes we see nothing more beautiful. Among the Greeks as well the κόσμος receives its name from the idea of ornament²⁴, and when each of the works of Creation were completed it was said concerning it: "God saw that it was good." (Gen. 1:10,12,18,21,25,31)

To Nineveh, I say, the great city, so that since Israel disdained to listen, the whole world of the gentiles might hear-- and this moreover because its evil was rising up before God. For although God had constructed a kind of home which was most beautiful for humankind so that they might serve him, humanity was depraved through its own will and from childhood its heart is diligently inclined to evil: "he has turned his mouth against heaven" (Ps. 72:9) and a tower of pride has been constructed. (Gen. 11:3-9) Therefore, it merited that the Son of God descended to them so that by the defeat of repentance they might ascend to heaven who had not been able to enter it because of the swelling of their pride.

1:3a Heb.: And Jonah arose, so that he might flee to Tharsis from the face of the Lord.

LXX: Similarly.

The prophet knows, by the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, that the repentance of the gentiles is the ruination of the Jews. For this reason this one who loves his own nation does not so much begrudge the salvation of Nineveh as he does not wish his own people to perish. Besides, he had read that Moses, when he was praying, said this on their behalf: "If you will forgive them their sin, forgive it them; however, if you will not forgive them blot me out also from your book which you have written" (Ex. 32:31-32) and that at his prayer Israel was saved and Moses was not blotted out from the book. In fact, the Lord took the opportunity instead

through his servant to show mercy to Moses's other fellow servants. Indeed, when he said: "Let me alone" (Ex. 32:10) he showed that he could be held back. The Apostle also says something similar: "I would wish to be cursed on behalf of my brothers who are Israelites according to the flesh" (Rom. 9:3)²⁵; not that he to whom "to live is Christ and to die is gain" (Phil. 1:21) actually wished to perish, but rather he deserved more to live since he wished to save others. Moreover, when Jonah saw his fellow prophets being sent to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 10:6; 15:24) in order to stir the people to repentance--the divinely-inspired Balaam had also prophesied concerning the salvation of the Israelite people (Num. 23-24)--Jonah was sorry that he alone had been chosen to be sent to the Assyrians, Israel's enemies, and to the greatest city of the enemy, where there was idolatry, where there was ignorance of God; and what is more than this, he was afraid lest through the occasion of his preaching they would be converted to repentance, and so Israel would be utterly abandoned. For by the same Spirit by which he had been entrusted to be a public proclaimer to the gentiles he knew that when the nations would believe then the house of Israel would perish, and he was anxious that whenever that would be, it should not take place in his own time.

Thus, he imitated Cain, and turning back "from the face of God" (Gen. 4:16²⁶) he wished to flee to Tharsis, which Josephus interprets as Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, but with the first letter of the word changed (Josephus, Jewish Antiquities I, 6, 1-2).²⁷ However, insofar as it is given to be understood in Chronicles a

certain place in India is named thus.²⁸ Moreover, the Hebrews generally assert that Tharsis means the sea²⁹ according to this passage: "With a violent wind you crush the ships of Tharsis" (Ps. 47:8), that is, of the sea; and in Isaiah: "Wail, O ships of Tharsis!" (Is. 23:1,14) (I remember speaking of this many years ago in a certain letter to Marcella.³⁰) Thus, the prophet did not seek to flee to a specific place, but setting out upon the sea he hurried to arrive wherever he could. This is more appropriate for a fugitive and a fearful person: not to choose a place to flee to leisurely, but to seize the first opportunity for setting sail. We can also say this: he who thought: "God was only known in Judea, and in Israel only is his name great" (Ps. 75:2) recognized him in the waves and afterwards confessed and said: "I am a Hebrew, and I fear the Lord of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land." (1:9) But if he made the sea and the dry land, why did you leave the dry land behind supposing that on the sea you could avoid the Creator of the sea? And at the same time he was taught by the salvation and conversion of the sailors that even the great multitude at Nineveh could be saved through a similar confession.

Concerning our Lord and Saviour, however, we can say that he left his home and his homeland (Jer. 12:7), and when he assumed flesh in a certain sense he fled from the heavens and came to Tharsis, that is, to the "sea"³¹ of this age, according to that which is said elsewhere: "This great and broad sea, there are reptiles which have no number, animals small and large; there do ships cross over; there is the dragon whom you formed to play with

it." (Ps. 103:25-26) Therefore, also in his Passion he said: "Father if it is possible, may this cup pass from me" (Mt. 26:39) lest by the people shouting: "Crucify, crucify such a man" (Jn. 19:15a) and: "We have no king except Caesar" (Jn. 19:15c) "the full number of the gentiles might enter in" and the branches of the olive tree might be broken and cuttings of a wild olive tree might grow up instead. (Rom. 11:17-25) And he was of such piety and love for his people for the sake of the election of the fathers (Rom. 9:4-5; 11:28) and of the renewed promise to Abraham, that when he was put on the Cross he said: "Father, forgive them, for what they do they do not know." (Lk. 23:24)

Or indeed, since Tharsis means "contemplation of joy"³², when the prophet comes to Joppa--which itself also means "the beautiful"³³--he is hurrying to go to joy, and enjoying the blessing of rest to give himself entirely to contemplation³⁴, thinking that it is better to enjoy the beauty and variety of knowledge than to cause by the occasion of the gentiles' salvation his own people to perish, from whom Christ would be begotten in the flesh. (Rom. 9:5)

1:3b Heb.: And he went down to Joppa, and found a boat that was going to Tharsis, and he paid his fare, and went down into it, so that he might go with them to Tharsis from the face of the Lord.

LXX: And he went up to Joppa and found a ship that was going to Tharsis, and he paid his fare, and went up into it, so that he might sail with them to Tharsis from the face of the Lord.

We read in both the books of the Kings³⁵ and the Chronicles

that Joppa is a port of Judea (II Chron. 2:16), to which also Hiram the king of Tyre brought the trees of Lebanon across on rafts. They were then carried through to Jerusalem by a journey on land. Until today this is the place where on the shore the boulders are displayed on which Andromeda formerly was bound and was liberated with the assistance of Perseus (Ovid, Metamorphoses 4,663-752; Josephus, The Jewish War 3,420); the learned reader knows the tale. But also because of the nature of the region it is rightly said of the prophet coming from the mountains and heights to Joppa and the flat lands that "he went down".³⁶ He found a ship that was losing its moorings from the shore and journeying out onto the ocean, and he paid his "fare", or the cost of the ship, that is, of his passage (according to the Hebrew), or the fare for himself (as the Septuagint translated it).

And either: "he went down into it", as it is said strictly in the Hebrew (for iered means "he went down"³⁷) as a fugitive anxiously searches for hiding places; or: "he went up", as it is written in the common edition³⁸, so that he might arrive wherever the ship should proceed, thinking that he had escaped so long as he had left Judea behind.

But our Lord also, when he was at the edge of the shore of Judea--which is called most beautiful, since it was in Judea-- did not wish to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs (Mt. 15:26); but since he had come to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Mt. 10:6, 15:24) he gives the price to the transporters. Thus, he who wishes to save his own people first saves those who

dwell near the sea; and amidst whirlwinds and tempests (that is his Passion and the jeerings of the Cross), sunk into hell, he saved those whom it seemed he overlooked as he was sleeping in the boat. (Mt. 8:24-25)

The prudent reader must be asked not to expect the same order for the tropology and for the story. For the Apostle also related Hagar and Sarah to the two testaments (Gal. 4:22ff.), and yet we are not able to interpret tropologically everything which is told in that story. And to the Ephesians, discussing Adam and Eve, he said: "Because of this a man will leave his father and mother, and will cleave to his wife, and they will be two in one flesh. This is a great mystery; however, I am speaking in Christ, and in the Church." (Eph. 5:31-32; Gen. 2:24) Can we then relate to Christ and the Church the whole beginning of Genesis, and the creation of the world, and the condition of humanity, because the Apostle has used the passage in this way? Make it then that that which is written: "Therefore, a man leaves his father" we shall relate to Christ when we say that he left his Father, God, behind in heaven, so that he may unite the gentiles to the Church; how could we interpret what follows--"his mother"--unless perhaps we might say that he left the heavenly Jerusalem, which is "the mother of the saints" (Gal. 4:26), and other things that are much more convoluted than this? That which is written also by the same Apostle: "For they drank from the spiritual rock which followed them; however that rock was Christ" (I Cor. 10:4) by no means constrains us to relate the whole book of Exodus to Christ. What then are we able to say? That that

rock was struck by Moses not once but twice (Ex. 17:6; Num. 20:11), that waters flowed out and the torrents were filled (Ps. 77:20). Surely on this occasion we shall not submit the whole of the history in this passage under the laws of allegory. Is it not better that every single passage, following the diversity of the account, should receive a distinct spiritual meaning? Therefore, just as these texts have their own interpretations, and neither what precedes them nor what follows requires the same allegorical interpretation, so also all of the book of Jonah cannot be related to the Lord without danger for the commentator. It is written in the Gospel: "A most evil and adulterous generation seeks a sign, and a sign will not be given to it, except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For just as Jonah was in the belly of the whale for three days and three nights, so will the Son of man be in the heart of the earth for three days and three nights" (Mt. 12:39-40)--but this was not written so that everything else which is related in the book of the prophet is to be referred to Christ to the same degree. Certainly wherever this can be done without danger we also shall strive to do it.

1:4 Heb.: But the Lord sent a great wind upon the sea, and a great tempest began on the sea, and the ship was in danger of being broken to bits.

LXX: And the Lord stirred up a wind on the sea, and a great tempest began on the sea, and the ship was in danger of being broken to bits.

The flight of the prophet can be referred to humanity in

general, which despising the precepts of God withdraws "from his face" (Gen. 3:8³⁹) and delivers itself over to the world, where afterwards by the tempest of evil and the whole world violently shipwrecked against it humanity is compelled to notice God and to turn back to him from whom it had fled. From this we also understand that the things which people think are advantageous for themselves are turned, by God's will, to calamity, and not only is help of no use for these when it is offered to them, but those who offer it are equally broken to bits. Even so we read that Egypt was defeated by the Assyrians because it brought help to Israel against the will of the Lord. (Is. 20:3-6) That ship was in danger which had taken up a dangerous person; the seas are stirred up by the wind, a tempest arises upon tranquillity: nothing is secure when God is opposing one.

1:5a Heb.: And the sailors were afraid and the men called to their god, and they threw the gear which was in the boat into the sea so that it might be lightened from them.

LXX: And those who were sailing were afraid and they cried each to his god, and they threw the gear of the ship into the sea, so that the ship could be lightened.

They suppose that the ship is weighed down with its usual load, and they do not understand how great is the weight of the runaway prophet. "The sailors are afraid", "each one cries to his god": they are unaware of the truth, but they are not unaware of providence, and beneath the error of their religion they know that there is something which is to be venerated. They throw their

freight into the sea so that the ship, being lighter, might leap over the expanse of the waves. But on the contrary, neither through good nor misfortune does Israel come to know God, and while Christ is bewailing his people (Lk. 19:41) their eyes are still dry.

1:5b Heb.: And Jonah went down to the interior of the boat and he was fast asleep.

LXX: However, Jonah went down into the belly of the ship, and he slept, and he was snoring.

As far as the story goes, the carefree mind of the prophet is described. He is not disturbed by the tempest nor by the dangers: in both the calm and in the threatening shipwreck he exhibits the same attitude. At last the others shout to their gods, they throw over the cargo, each one does what he is able. But he is so peaceful and secure, with such a tranquil spirit, that "he went down to the interior of the boat" and fully enjoyed a quiet sleep.

But this also can be said: he was aware of his flight and his sin by which he had despised the precepts of the Lord, and he discerned that the tempest was raging against him even if the rest were unaware of it. For this reason "he went down to the interior of the ship" and being sad he hid himself, lest he should see the waves, like avengers of God, rise up against him. He sleeps, however, not from being secure but from being sad. For we read in the Passion of the Lord that the apostles too were weighed down with sleep because of the magnitude of their sadness. (Lk. 22:45)

But if we are interpreting in a type, the sleep of the

prophet--his most heavy torpor--describes a person who is stupefied by the torpor of error, for whom it is not enough to flee "from the face of God" (Gen. 3:8⁴⁰) unless also his mind is overwhelmed by a certain senselessness, so that he ignores the wrath of God and sleeps as if he were secure: his very deep sleep resounds through his raucous nostrils.

1:6 Heb.: And the captain came up to him and said to him: "Why are you weighed down by sleep? Arise, call upon your God, if perhaps God might consider us and we might not perish."

LXX: And the lookout came up to him and said to him: "Why are you snoring? Arise, call upon your God, if in some way God might make us safe and we might not perish."

It is natural that each person in his own moment of peril hopes more from another person. Because of this the captain, or the lookout--who ought to have comforted the frightened passengers--discerning the magnitude of the crisis awakens the sleeper, accuses him of improvident security, and reminds him that he also should pray to his God to the best of his ability, so that those whose danger was common might also pray in common.

Moreover, according to tropology there are many who, sailing with Jonah and having their own gods (1:6a), are rushing to go to the "contemplation of joy".⁴¹ But after Jonah will have been detected by lot (1:7) and the tempest of the world has been calmed by his death and peace returned to the sea (1:15), then the one God will be adored and spiritual victims will be sacrificed (1:16), which at least according to the letter they will not have in the

midst of the waves.

1:7 Heb.: And each man said to his companion: "Come and let us cast lots, and we shall know why this evil is upon us." And they cast lots, and the lot fell upon Jonah.

LXX: And each one said to the one next to him: "Come, let us cast lots, and we shall learn because of whom this evil is upon us." And they cast lots, and the lot fell upon Jonah.

They knew the nature of the sea, and during such time as they have been sailing they have learned the rules of tempests and winds. At least if they had seen the waves rise up as usual--waves which they had experienced at some time or other--they would never have sought out by lot the one who was responsible for the shipwreck and tried to avoid a certain crisis by an uncertain method. Nor ought we at once to give credence to lots because of this example, nor connect to this passage that one from the Acts of the Apostles where Matthias is elected to the apostolate by lot (Acts 1:23-26), since the privileges of individuals cannot render a common rule. For just as a she-ass spoke for the condemnation of Balaam (Num. 22:28), as Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar learned of the future in dreams for their judgment yet did not know that God was being revealed (Gen. 41:1ff.; Dan. 2:1ff., 4:1ff.), as Caiaphas also unknowingly prophesied that it was expedient for one to perish on behalf of the whole (Jn. 11:49-50, 18:14), so also this fugitive is detected by lot--not by the power of lots, especially the lots of heathens, but by the will of him who directs uncertain lots.

As for that which is said: "And we shall learn because of whom this evil is upon us", here we ought to take "evil" to mean

affliction and calamity, following this text: "Sufficient for the day is its own evil" (Mt. 6:34) and in the prophet Amos: "Is there evil in a city which God has not made?" (Amos 3:6) and in Isaiah: "I am the Lord who makes peace and I create evil." (Is. 45:7) However, in another place "evil" is understood as the opposite of virtue^c as that which we have read in this same prophet above: "The cry of their evil is rising up unto me." (1:1)

1:8 Heb.: And they said to him: "Show us whose cause is this evil which is upon us. What is your occupation, what is your country, and where are you going, or out of which people are you?"

LXX: And they said to him: "Announce to us for whose sake this evil is on us. What is your occupation, and whence do you come, and where are you going^d and from what region, and from what people are you?"

They compel him whom the lot had pointed out to confess with his own voice why there was such a tempest, or why the wrath of God was raging furiously against them: "Show us," they say, "for whose sake is this evil, what occupation you follow, from what land, from what people did you start out, where are you rushing to get to?" And that brevity⁴² must be noted which we are used to admiring in Vergil:

Young men, what cause impels you
To try unknown roads? Where are you headed? he said.
What race? From what home? Do you bring here peace, or war?
(Aeneid 8:112-114)

^c virtuti K Vic Mar Val; virtute L (uncorrected); veritati N X Gre v(in margin).

^d all editions (except Gre and Duval) include et quo vadis.

He is asked his identity, his region, his route, his city, so that out of these the cause of the crisis might also be found out.

1:9 Heb.: And he said to them: "I am a Hebrew, and I fear the Lord God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land."

LXX: And he said to them: "I am a servant of the Lord, and I worship the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land."

He did not say: "I am a Jew"--the name the separation of the ten tribes from the two others gave to the people⁴³--but: "I am a Hebrew", that is, *περάτης*⁴⁴, one who passes by, just as Abraham was also, who was able to say: "I am a stranger and a foreigner, just like all my fathers" (Ps. 38:13), of whom it is written in another psalm: "They 'travelled across' from nation unto nation and from one kingdom to another people." (Ps. 104:13). Moses said: "I shall 'go across' and see this great vision." (Ex. 3:3)

"And I fear the Lord God of heaven", not the gods upon whom you call and who are not able to save, but: "the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land"--the sea to which I flee, the dry land from which I flee. It is termed correctly in order to distinguish it from the sea: not "earth" but "dry land". And in a brief span the maker of the universe is revealed, he who is Lord of heaven, and of earth, and of the sea.

It is to be asked, however, how may it be proven that he said: "I fear the Lord God of heaven" sincerely since he is not fulfilling his commands. Perhaps we may reply that even sinners fear God, and it belongs to servants not to love but to fear.

Nevertheless, in this place fear can be understood to stand for worship, corresponding to the capacity of those who were listening and as yet did not know God.

1:10 Heb.: And the men were terribly afraid, and they said to him: "Why have you done this?" For the men knew that he was fleeing from the face of the Lord, since he had made it known to them.

LXX: And the men were terribly afraid, and they said to him: "Why have you done this?" For the men knew that he was fleeing from the face of the Lord, he whom he had made known to them.

The order of the story is reversed: for while it could be said that there was no cause for fear from what he had confessed to them saying: "I am a Hebrew and I serve the Lord God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land", immediately it is added that they were afraid because he had made known to them that he was fleeing from the face of the Lord, and had not fulfilled his commands. At last they debate with him and they say: "Why have you done this?", that is, if you fear God, why are you fleeing from him? If you proclaim him whom you worship to have such great power, how do you think that you can escape him?

Also "they are terribly afraid", for they know that he is holy, and a man from a holy nation. Indeed, when they had cast off their moorings from Joppa, they had known the privileged position of the Hebrew nation and nevertheless they could not conceal the fugitive. He who flees is great, but greater is he who is searching for him. They do not dare to hand him over, but they are not able to conceal him. They deplore his crime, they confess their fear,

they ask that he himself be the remedy since he was the source of the sin.

Or indeed, when they say: "Why have you done this?" they are not blaming but asking him, seeking to know the reason for the flight of the servant from his Lord, of the son from his father, of the man from his God. They ask: "What is this great mystery that the land is abandoned, the seas are sought after, the homeland is left behind, and strange places are longed for?"

1:11 Heb.: And they said to him: "What shall we do to you so that the sea will leave us alone?" For the sea was approaching, and it was rising.

LXX: And they said to him: "What shall we do to you, so that the sea will be quiet for us?" For the sea was approaching, and the waves were rising more and more.

You say: "It is because of you that the winds, the waves, the sea, and the whirling waters are stirred up." You have related the cause of the distress; show us that of the cure. From the fact that the sea is rising up against us we know that its wrath is from our having taken you on board. If the crime is that we took you on board, what can we do so that God would not be angry? "What shall we do to you", that is, shall we kill you? But you are a worshipper of the Lord. Shall we save you? But you are fleeing from God. Our part is to hold forth our hand; yours is to order what is to happen. It is yours to command what to do so that the sea may become quiet which now testifies to the Creator's wrath by its torrential swelling.

And at once the narrator attaches the cause to this sort of question saying: "the sea was approaching and it was rising." "It was approaching" as it had been commanded; "it was approaching" for the vengeance of its Lord; "it was approaching" in pursuit of the fugitive prophet. Moreover, "it was rising" moment by moment, and as the sailors were delaying "it was rising" in higher and higher waves, so that it might demonstrate that one cannot put off the vengeance of the Creator.

1:12 Heb.: And he said to them: "Take me up and throw me into the sea, and the sea will leave you alone; for I know that the great storm is upon you because of me."

LXX: And Jonah said to them: "Take me up and throw me into the sea, and the sea will become quiet for you; for I know that the great waves are against you because of me."

Against me does the storm thunder; it seeks me. A shipwreck threatens you so that it may lay hold of me; it will lay hold of me, so that by my death you may live. "I know", he says, "that this great storm is because of me." I am not unaware that for my punishment are the elements disturbed and there is disorder in the world. The elements are enraged with me, yet the shipwreck threatens you. The waves themselves command you to throw me into the sea. If I endure the storm, you will recover tranquillity. And the magnanimity⁴⁵ of our fugitive is equally to be observed: he does not turn his back, he does not dissemble, he does not deny it; but he who had admitted his flight freely takes up the punishment, wishing that he might perish so that the others should not perish

because of him and the guilt of another's death also be added to the sin of his flight.

So much for the account: as to the rest, we are not omitting that in the Gospel the Lord who commanded the winds that blew to become quiet, and the little boat in peril in which Jonah was sleeping, and the rising sea which he reproved: "Be silent" and: "Be quiet" (Mt. 8:24-26; Mk. 4:37-39) are to be referred to the Lord our Saviour, and to the Church which is surrounded by peril, or to the apostles who awoke him--the apostles who when they forsook him in his passion in a certain sense they threw him into the waves. This Jonah says: "I know that the great storm is upon you because of me", for the winds saw me with you on the way to Tharsis, that is, sailing to "the contemplation of joy"⁴⁶ so that I may lead you through with me to joy, so that where I am and the Father, there you also may be. (Jn. 14:3; 17:24) For this reason are they furious, for this reason the world, which is "placed in wickedness" (I Jn. 5:19) rages, for this reason are the elements disturbed: death wishes to devour me, so that he may crush you at the same time, and he does not know that he takes the bait on the hook, so that through my death he may die.

"Take me and throw me into the sea." But it is not for us to lay hold of death, but to receive it willingly when it is inflicted on us by others. From this also it follows that in times of persecution one must not die at one's own hand--except in the situation where chastity is endangered⁴⁷--but to submit our necks to the executioner. "In this way", he says, "you calm the winds, in

this way you pour out libations upon the sea: the storm which rages against you because of me will subside with my dying."

1:13 Heb.: And the men were rowing to turn back to the dry land but they were not strong enough, since the sea was approaching and it was rising above them.

LXX: And the men were attempting to return to land, but they were not able since the sea was approaching, and it was rising mightily against them.

The prophet had pronounced the sentence against himself, but when the sailors heard that he was a worshipper of God, they did not dare to lay a hand upon him. For that reason they laboured to turn back to the dry land and to flee from the danger, lest they should shed blood, preferring to perish rather than destroy him.

Such a reversal of things! The people that had served God said: "Crucify, crucify such a one". (Lk. 23:21; Jn. 19:6) The sailors, however, were ordered to kill him--the sea is raging, the storm is commanding--yet ignoring their own danger they are anxious about the safety of another. For this reason the Septuagint also says *παρεβιάζοντο*⁴⁸, that is, they sought to use force and conquer the nature of things, so that they would not violate a prophet of God.

However, when it says: "the sailors were rowing to turn back to the dry land", they were thinking that the ship was able to save them from danger, apart from the mystery of him who was to suffer, whereas the sinking of Jonah would be the relief of the ship.

1:14 Heb.: And they shouted to the Lord, and they said: "We ask, Lord, that we would not perish for the soul of this man, and that you would not hold over us the blood of an innocent man; since you, Lord, have done just as you have wished."

LXX: And they shouted to the Lord, and they said: "By no means, Lord, may we perish because of the soul of this man, and do not hold over us the blood of a just man; for you, Lord, have done just as you wished."

Great is the faith of the sailors, who are themselves in danger, yet they pray for the soul of another: for they know that death from sin is worse than physical death. "And do not hold over us", they say, "the blood of an innocent man." They call God to witness that whatever they would do should not be reckoned against them, and in a way they are saying: "We do not wish to kill your prophet, but he himself has admitted your wrath, and the storm tells us 'that you, Lord, have done just as you have wished'-- your will is being fulfilled through our hands."

Does not the voice of the seamen seem to us to be the confession of Pilate, who washes his hands and says: "I am clean from the blood of this man." (Mt. 27:24) The gentiles do not wish Christ to perish; they protest that this is the blood of an innocent man. But the Jews say: "His blood be upon us, and upon our children." (Mt. 27:25) Therefore, if they lift up their hands in prayer they are not heard, since they are full of blood.

"For you, Lord, have done just as you have wished." What we have here taken up--that the whirlwind rose up, that the winds raged, that the sea stirs up its waves, that the fugitive is brought forth by lot which shows us what ought to happen--all this

is from your will, O Lord, for "you have done just as you have wished." From this also the Saviour says in the psalm: "Lord, I have wished to do your will." (Ps. 39:9)

1:15 Heb.: And they took up Jonah and they threw him into the sea and the sea ceased from its raging.

LXX: And they took up Jonah and they threw him into the sea and the sea ceased from its commotion.

It did not say: "they seized him", it does not have: "they fell upon him", but: "they took him up", as if they were carrying him with respect and honour. They threw him who offered no resistance into the ocean, laying their hands on him according to his own will.

And the sea stood still, since it had found the one whom it had been seeking: just as if one is pursuing a fugitive, and goes on with hurried steps, then after the person has been reached, one stops running and stands still and takes hold of the person that one has apprehended. In this way also the sea which had been raging without Jonah is now holding within it the one it had been seeking, and it rejoices and it cherishes him, and because of its joy tranquillity returns.

Let us consider, before the passion of Christ, the errors of the world, and the contrary winds of conflicting doctrines (Eph. 4:14), and the little boat of the whole human race, that is, the creation of God which is surrounded by peril, and after his passion the tranquillity of faith, and the peace of the world, and all

things being free from care, and conversion unto God, and we shall see how after Jonah was thrown into it the sea ceased from its furor.

1:16 Heb.: And the men feared the Lord greatly, and they sacrificed animals to the Lord, and they offered vows unto him.

LXX: Similarly.

Before the Lord's passion they shouted fearfully unto their gods; after his passion they fear the Lord, that is, they revere and worship him; and they were not merely afraid as we read at first (1:5), but were greatly afraid, according to that which is said: "with your whole soul, and with your whole heart, and with your whole mind." (Deut. 6:5)

"And they sacrificed animals", which reading literally they did not do in the midst of the waves; but since: "the sacrifice to the Lord is a troubled heart" (Ps. 50:19), and it is said in another place: "Offer to God the sacrifice of praise, and pay your vows to the Most High," (Ps. 49:14), and again: "We shall pay to you the calves of our lips" (Hosea 14:2 Heb.⁴⁹), therefore, they sacrifice animals upon the sea and they promise other things of their own will, vowing that they would never turn back from him whom they had begun to worship. For they were greatly afraid since from the tranquillity of the sea and the departure of the storm they understood that the words of the prophet were true. Jonah--the fugitive on the sea, the one who was shipwrecked, the one who was dead--saved the ship when it was tossed about on the waves: he

saved the heathen who were the first to be thrown about among various opinions by the error of the world. And Hosea, Amos, Isaiah and Joel, who were prophesying at the same time, were not able to correct the people in Judea. From which it is shown that a shipwreck cannot be checked except by the death of a fugitive.⁵⁰

CHAPTER TWO

2:1a Heb.: And the Lord prepared a great fish to swallow Jonah up.

LXX: And the Lord commanded a large whale and it devoured Jonah.

The Lord ordered death and hell that it [sic] should catch the prophet; which thinking him to be prey for its avid gullet was as joyful in devouring him as it was sorry to vomit him up. And then was accomplished that which we read in Hosea: "I will be your death, O death; I will be your sting, O hell." (Hosea 13:14) However, we read "great fish" in the Hebrew, which the Septuagint translators along with the Lord in the Gospel call instead a "whale" (Mt. 12:40), stating the same thing more briefly. For it is said in Hebrew dag gadol⁵¹ which is translated as "great fish": there can be no doubt that it means a whale. And it must be noted that where death is awaited there is a safeguard.⁵²

Furthermore, when it says "he prepared [it]" that was either when he fashioned it at the beginning, about which it is also written in the Psalm: "That Dragon which you formed to play with it" (Ps. 103:26), or else when he made it come near the ship so that it might receive Jonah into its bosom as he was falling and furnish for him a dwelling place instead of death. Thus, he who had experienced God as being angry while he was on the ship would in death experience him as being gracious.

2:1b Heb.: And Jonah was in the belly of the fish for three days and three nights.

LXX: And Jonah was in the belly of the whale for three days and three nights.

The Lord explains the mystery of this passage in the Gospel (Mt. 12:39-40; Lk. 11:29-31), and it is superfluous to say either the same thing or something different than what he who suffered has explained. Only this do we seek to learn: why he spent three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. Some divide the παρασκευή⁵³ into two days and nights since with the sun disappearing the night followed the day from the sixth hour to the ninth hour (Mt. 27:45; Mk. 15:33; Lk. 23:44-45) and they consider the three days and three nights counted up when they put the Sabbath Day with it. But we συνεκδοχικῶς⁵⁴ understand the whole from the part, so that from the fact that he died ἐν παρασκευῇ (Mt. 27:62; Mk. 15:42; Lk. 23:54; Jn. 19:14,31,42) we count one day and night, and with the Sabbath another day and night; but we include the third night, which is transferred to the Lord's Day, with the beginning of the third day.⁵⁵ For in Genesis also night does not belong to the preceding day but to the one following (Gen. 1:4,5 etc.): it is the beginning of the day to come, not the end of the one that came before. To make it possible to understand this, I shall say it more simply: suppose some persons left their house at the ninth hour and on the next day they arrived at another house at the third hour. If I shall say that they made a journey of two days I shall not be immediately censured for lying since those who were walking had not used up all the hours on the journey but only a certain part of each day. This certainly seems to me to be the

interpretation. However, if anyone did not accept this interpretation and can expound the mystery of this passage with a better understanding, their own opinion is rather to be followed.

2:2 Heb.: And Jonah prayed to the Lord his God from the belly of the fish and said:

LXX: Similarly.

If Jonah is to be related to the Lord, and on the basis of this the fact that he was in the belly of the whale for three days and three nights points to the Saviour's passion, his prayer also ought to be a type of the Lord's prayer.

I am not unaware that there are certain people to whom it seems incredible that a man could be kept unharmed for three days and nights in the belly of a whale, in which are digested^e shipwrecks.⁵⁶ These will certainly be both believers and unbelievers. If they are believers they shall be compelled to believe to a much higher degree: how three boys who were put in the furnace of burning fire were unharmed to such an extent that the "smell of the fire" (Dan. 3:94 Vg.=Dan. 3:27) did not even touch their clothing; how the sea receded and stood rigid like walls on one side and the other, so that it might furnish a road for the people as they were going across (Ex. 14:22,29); by what human reason the frenzy of the lions in their great hunger looked at

^e digerebantur B M(corrected) F K J(corrected in text) Bi Era Vic Mar Duval; degerebantur Y M(uncorrected) L H I G J(uncorrected) P(corrected in margin); dirigebantur A D N X P O J(corrected in margin) other editions; diregebantur C.

their prey yet were afraid, and they did not touch him (Dan. 6:22; cf. Dan. 14:31 Vg.); and many things of this kind. However, if they are unbelievers let them read the fifteen books of Naso's [Ovid's] *Μεταμορφώσεις*, and all Greek and Latin history, and they will see either that Daphne was changed into a laurel-tree (Metamorphoses 1, 452-567), or the sisters of Phaeton were changed into poplar trees (Metamorphoses 2, 333-367); how Jupiter, their highest deity, was changed into a swan (Metamorphoses 6, 109), flowed in a shower of gold (Metamorphoses 6, 113), committed rape in the form of a bull (Metamorphoses 6, 103), and other things in which the very shamefulness of the stories denies the sanctity which belongs to divinity.⁵⁷ They believe these things and say all things are possible for God, but since they believe in shameful things and defend them with the entire power of God, they do not assign the same worth to the virtuous things as well.

However, because it is written: "And Jonah prayed to the Lord his God from the belly of the fish, and said," we know that when he realized that he was safe and sound in the belly of the whale, he did not despair of the mercy of God and was totally turned to entreating prayer. For God who had said of the righteous: "I am with him in tribulation" (Ps. 90:15) and: "When he calls on me I shall say 'Here I am'" (Is. 58:9) was near to him, and when he was heard he was able to say: "In trouble you have enlarged me." (Ps. 4:2)

2:3 Heb.: I cried to the Lord from my trouble, and he listened to me; from the bosom of hell I called and you listened to my voice.

LXX: The Septuagint similarly, only with this changed: from the bosom of hell [you have heard] my cry.⁵⁸

He did not say: "I cry", but: "I cried"; nor is he praying about what is to come but he is giving thanks concerning the past, making known to us that from that time when he had been thrown into the sea and saw the whale--the great mass of its body, and the huge gaping jaws open to swallow him in its mouth--he remembered the Lord (2:8) and cried to him--either through the waters withdrawing and his cry finding its way, or with the entire passion of his heart, following that which the Apostle says: "Crying in your hearts 'Abba, Father'". (Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6; Col. 3:16) And he cried to him who alone knows the hearts of persons, and who says to Moses: "Why are you crying to me?" (Ex. 14:15), although Scripture does not mention at all that Moses had cried with his voice prior to this. This is what we read in the first psalm of ascents: "I cried to the Lord when I was troubled, and he listened to me." (Ps. 119:1)

However, the "bosom of hell" we understand to be the stomach of the whale, which was of such a great size that it relates to the appearance of hell. But this can be better referred to the person of Christ, who under the name of David sings in the psalm: "You will not abandon my soul in hell and you will not allow your Holy One to see corruption" (Ps. 15:10)--he who was alive in hell, free among the dead.

2:4a Heb.: And you have flung me into the depth, into the heart of the sea, and the flood surrounded me.

LXX: You have flung me into the depth of the heart of the sea, and the floods surrounded me.

The interpretation is not difficult as regards the person of Jonah: shut up in the belly of the whale he was in the greatest depths and in the midst of the sea, and he was "surrounded" (2:6) by the floods.

As regards the Lord our Saviour, let us take the example of Psalm 68 in which he says: "I am held fast in the mud of the depths, and there is no place underneath on which to stand.⁵⁹ I came into the depth of the sea and the storm submerged me." (Ps. 68:3). It is also said of him in another psalm: "You have cast aside your Christ, you have despised him, you have scattered him abroad; You have overthrown your servant's covenant, you have defiled his sanctuary on the earth, you have torn down all its walls" and the rest. (Ps. 88:39-41) For in comparison with celestial blessedness and that place of which it is written: "In holy peace is its dwelling place" (Ps. 75:3) all earthly habitation is full of waves, full of storms.

Furthermore, the "heart of the sea" signifies hell, instead of which we read in the Gospel: "the heart of the earth". (Mt. 12:40) Even as the heart of an animal is in the midst of it, so also hell is said to be in the midst of the earth. Or indeed, according to ἀναγωγή⁶⁰, he remembers that in the "heart of the sea" he is in

the midst of storms.^f And yet when he was among the bitter waters, and: "he was tempted in all things without sin" (Heb. 4:15), he did not sense the bitter waters but "he was surrounded by the flood" of which we read in yet another place: "The force of the river makes glad the city of God". (Ps. 45:5 LXX) To others, when they drink them, they are salted waters, but I was drinking⁶¹ the sweetest running waters in the midst of storms.⁹

Let it not seem blasphemous if now the Lord says: "You have flung me into the depths"--he who says in the psalm: "For they persecuted the one whom you have beaten". (Ps. 68:27) This corresponds to that which is attributed in Zechariah to the person of the Father: "I shall strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered." (Zech. 13:7)

2:4b Heb.: All your whirling waters and your waves have passed over me.

LXX: All your rising [waters] and your waves have passed over me.

No one doubts that the swelling "waves" of the sea "passed over" Jonah and the fierce storm thundered forth. However, we ask how "all the rising [waters]" and the "whirling waters" and the "waves" of God "passed over" the Saviour. "The life of people upon the earth is temptation" (Job 7:1 LXX) or, as it is used in the

^f reading with MSS against editions: tempestationibus K(uncorrected); tempestatibus N X Adr; fluctibus tempestatibus E; temptationibus Vic Mar Val Duval.

⁹ reading with MSS against editions: tempestatibus E N X Adr; temptationibus K Vic Mar Val Duval.

Hebrew, "a battle", since here we wage a battle so that in another place we might wear a crown. And there is no one of humankind who is able to bear all temptations together without him who "was tempted in all things" according to our likeness "without sin" (Heb. 4:15). From this it is said to the Corinthians: "Temptation will not take hold of you except what is human; however God is faithful who will not allow you to be tempted beyond that which you are able, but with the temptation will also make a way out so that you may bear it." (I Cor. 10:13) And since all persecutions and everything that happens do not assail us without God's will, therefore they are called the "whirling waters" and "waves" of God. They did not overwhelm Jesus but they "passed over" him, threatening a great shipwreck but not causing one. Therefore, all persecutions together, and whirlwinds, by which the human race is tormented and on which all ships are broken, have "thundered forth" over my head. I have weathered the storms, and I have broken the fierce whirlwinds, so that others might sail more securely.

2:5a Heb.: I said: "I am cast away from the sight of your eyes."

LXX: I said: "I am cast away from your eyes."

Before "I cried out from my trouble and you will answer me" (2:3) since I "took the form of a servant" (Phil. 2:7), imitating its human fragility as well, I said: "I am cast away from the sight of your eyes". When I was with you, and I rejoiced in your light, and in your light I was the light⁶², at that time I did not say

"I am cast away". But after "I came into the depth of the sea" (Ps. 68:3), and I was surrounded with the flesh of humanity, I imitate human feelings and I say: "I am cast away from the sight of your eyes." This I said as a man; the rest as God, and one who was in your form yet I "did not think it robbery to be equal to you" (Phil. 2:6). I wished to lead the human race to you, so that where I am, and you are, there those who believed in me and you may be also. (Jn. 14:3b; 17:24) I say:

2:5b Heb.: Nevertheless I shall see your holy temple once again.

LXX: Instead of which the LXX translates: Do you think I shall increase so that I shall see your holy temple?

That which in Greek is said ἄρα⁶³ and the common edition⁶⁴ has as "do you think" can be translated "therefore" so that it can function as the final conclusion of a major and minor proposition, and of a confirming assertion and of a syllogism⁶⁵, to express not the uncertainty of one who wavers but the faith of one who affirms. For which we have translated: "Nevertheless I shall see your holy temple once again" following that which is said in his name⁶⁶ in another psalm: "Lord, I have loved the splendour of your house, and the place of the tent of your glory" (Ps. 25:8), and the Gospel reading in which it is written: "Father glorify me before you, with that glory which I had before the world was" (Jn. 17:5) and the Father replied from heaven: "I have glorified it and I shall glorify it." (Jn. 12:28) Or indeed as it is read: "The Father in me, and I in the Father" (Jn. 10:38; 14:10-11; 17:21): as the Son

is the temple of the Father so the Father is the temple of the Son. For he himself said: "I went out from the Father and I have come" (Jn. 16:28) and "The Word was with God and God was the Word" (Jn. 1:1). Or one and the same Saviour demands as a man, promises as God, and he is sure of his own possession which he always had.

But for the person of Jonah it can be clearly understood that when he was placed in the depth of the sea, either in a mood of desiring or of confidence, he longed to see the temple of the Lord, and by means of his prophetic spirit he was elsewhere and gazed upon some other thing.

2:6a Heb.: The waters have surrounded me unto my soul, the abyss has walled me in.

LXX: The water has flowed around me unto my soul, the extreme abyss has walled me in.

Those waters which are neighbours of the abyss, which roll forth and flow away on land, which draw much mud with them, are trying to kill not the body but the soul since they are friends of bodies and they are warmed by its pleasures.⁶⁷ From this the Lord says in the psalm that which we quoted above: "Save me, Lord, for the waters have entered unto my soul" (Ps. 68:2) and in another place: "Our soul crossed a torrent" (Ps. 123:5) and: "Let not the pit press its mouth upon me" (Ps. 68:16) and let not hell enclose me. Let it not deny a way out to me: I who have descended of my own will shall ascend of my own will. I who came as a voluntary captive, am bound to free the captives, so that this might be

fulfilled: "Ascending to the heights he lead captivity captive" (Ps. 67:19; Eph. 4:8)--for those who had before been captives in death he has led to life.

However, we must take it that the "abysses" are certain destructive and terribly evil forces, or powers, devoted to tortures and punishments, to which in the Gospel even the demons ask not to be forced to go. (Lk. 8:31⁶⁸) From this also: "the darkness was over the abyss." (Gen. 1:2) Sometimes "abyss" is also taken to mean mysteries and profound ideas, and the judgments of God: "the judgments of the Lord are a great abyss" (Ps. 36:7) and: "Deep calls to deep, in the voice of your cataracts" (Ps. 41:8).

2:6b-7a Heb.: The sea covered over my head. I went down to the ends of the mountains, and the doorbolts of the land enclosed me forever.

LXX: My head entered to the divisions of the mountains; I went down to the earth, whose doorbolts are everlasting bonds.

It is doubtful to no one that "the sea covered over Jonah's head" and "he went down to the ends of the mountains" and he came to the depths of the earth by which, as if they were bars and columns, the globe of earth is supported by the will of God. Of these it is also said elsewhere: "I have made firm its columns" (Ps. 74:4).

Concerning the Lord and Saviour however, it seems to me it can be understood thus, following both versions. First his head, that is, the soul which with a body he worthily took on for our salvation, "went down" "to the divisions of the mountains". These

were covered over by waves, which withdrew themselves from the freedom of heaven, which the abyss encircled and which separated themselves from the majesty of God. And afterwards, the soul of Christ entered even to hell, where the souls of sinners are dragged as in the extreme mud of their sins, as the psalmist says: "They will enter into the lower places of the earth, they will be the portions of foxes" (Ps. 62:10-11) These are "the doorbolts of the earth", and as certain bars for the final prison and place of punishment they do not allow the captive souls to go out from hell. Significantly, because of this the LXX translates καρῶχοι αἰώνιοι⁶⁹, that is, desiring to hold forever those who had once entered in.

But our Lord--of whom under the person of Cyrus we read in Isaiah: "I shall smash the bronze doors, and I shall break into pieces the iron bars" (Is. 45:2)--"went down to the ends of the mountains" and was shut in by the eternal "doorbolts" so that he might set free all those who had been shut in.

2:7b Heb.: And you will raise up my life from corruption, O Lord my God.

LXX: And may my life mount up from corruption, O Lord my God.

It says properly "you will raise up" or "may my life mount up from corruption" since he had descended to corruption and to hell. This is what the apostles understand was prophesied of the person of the Lord in Psalm 15: "For you will not leave my soul in hell, nor will you allow your Holy One to see corruption" (Ps. 15:10; cf.

Acts 2:31; 13:35-37); for clearly David both died and was buried (Acts 2:29), but the flesh of the Saviour will not see corruption.

But others⁷⁰ understand that in comparison with celestial blessedness and the Word of God the body is corruption, which is begotten in corruption (cf. I Cor. 15:42) and in Psalm 102 it is noted of the righteous person: "Who heals all your infirmities, who redeems your life from corruption" (Ps. 102:3-4). From this also the Apostle says: "Wretched man am I, who will free me from the body of this death?" (Rom. 7:24) and it is called the body of death, or the body of lowliness (Phil. 3:21). They bring out this text as an opportunity for their heresy, and under the person of Christ they lie about the antichrist. They hold churches so that they might feed their extremely fat stomachs, and living according to the flesh they contend against the flesh.⁷¹

But we know that the body that was taken up from an uncorrupted virgin was not corruption, but the temple of Christ. If we are led to the statement of the Apostle to the Corinthians in which the body is said to be spiritual (I Cor. 15:44), lest we seem to be contentious we shall say that indeed the same body and the same flesh which is buried, which is formed in the soil, will rise again--but that its glory will change, even if its nature will not change: "for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality" (I Cor. 15:53). When "this" is said, in a way the body is shown grasped with two fingers⁷²: this body in which we are born, this body in which we die, this body which those who are to be punished are afraid to accept, this body

which virginity anticipates for its reward but adultery dreads for its punishment.

About Jonah however it can be understood in this way: that he who ought to have been destroyed in the belly of the whale according to his bodily nature, and to have been useful as food for the beast, and to be diffused throughout its veins and joints--he remained safe and whole. Moreover, that he said: "O Lord my God" displays the emotion of one seeking to please because he felt that the common God of all people was his God through the greatness of his favour, and as if God was his very own.

2:8a Heb.: When my soul was distressed within me, I remembered the Lord.

LXX: When my soul abandoned me, I remembered the Lord.

He says, when I hoped for no other help, the remembrance of the Lord was my salvation, according to this text: "I remembered the Lord, and I rejoiced" (Ps. 76:4), and in another place: "I remembered the days of long ago, and I held in my mind eternal years". (Ps. 76:6) Therefore, when I despair of salvation, and the weakness of the flesh allows me nothing to hope from life in the belly of a whale, whatever seems impossible has been overcome through remembrance of the Lord. I saw that I was enclosed in this belly, and all my hope was the Lord. From this we learn, according to the Septuagint, that in that time when our "soul abandons us" and is torn away from our bodily frame, we must not turn our thought to another but to him who is our Lord both in the body and

outside of the body. (II Cor. 12:3; Rom. 14:8-9)

But the interpretation is not difficult concerning the person of the Saviour, who says: "My soul is sorrowful unto death" (Mt. 26:38; Mk. 14:34) and: "Father, if it is possible, may this cup pass from me" (Mt. 26:39) and: "Into your hands I commend my spirit" (Lk. 23:46; Ps. 30:6) and other things similar to these.

2:8b Heb.: So that my prayer might come to you, to your holy temple.

LXX: Similarly.

Therefore, in my trouble "I remembered the Lord" (2:8a) "so that my prayer" might ascend from the end of the sea and "the divisions of the mountains" (2:6b LXX) unto the heavens and "come to your holy temple", in which you delight in eternal blessedness. And it must be noted that he is praying in a new way--his prayer is for his prayer: he prays that his prayer might ascend to the temple of God. However, he asks as a high priest, that in his body his people might be set free.

2:9 Heb.: Those who guard vain things for nothing forsake their mercy.

LXX: Those who guard vain things and lies have forsaken their mercy.

God is compassionate by nature, and ready to save by his mercy those whom he cannot save by his justice; but through our defect we lose and abandon the mercy which has been prepared and now offers

itself anew. And he did not say, those who practice vain things--since: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity" (Eccl. 1:2)--lest he seem to damn everyone, and to deny mercy to the human race altogether, but he said: "those who guard vain things" or "a lie" (LXX), those "who go over in the affection of their heart" (Ps. 72:7), those who not only practice these things but "guard vain things" in such a way as if they love them and think they have found a treasure in them. And at the same time notice the magnanimity⁷³ of the prophet: in the depth of the sea, covered over with eternal night in the belly of such a great beast, he does not think of his own danger but he philosophizes with general opinions on the nature of things. "They forsake their mercy", he says. Yes, mercy is offended, which we can understand is God himself--for "the Lord is compassionate and merciful, patient and of much pity" (4:2-3; Ex. 34:6-7; Ps. 144:8; etc.)--nevertheless, he does not forsake those who guard vain things, he does not hate them, but waits for them to return; but they of their very own accord "forsake the mercy" which stands before them and offers itself anew.

This can also be prophesied from the person of the Lord concerning the faithlessness of the Jews, who while they think they follow "precepts of men" (Mk. 7:7; Is. 29:13 LXX) and the commands of the Pharisees, which are "vanity" and "a lie", they "have forsaken" God who had always been merciful to them.

2:10 Heb.: But I shall sacrifice to you with the voice of praise. Whatever I have vowed I will return to the Lord for salvation.

LXX: But I shall sacrifice to you with the voice of praise and of confession. Whatever I have vowed I shall return to you to preserve, O Lord.

"Those who guard vain things have forsaken their mercy" (2:9), but I who am devoured for the salvation of many, "I will sacrifice to you with the voice of praise and confession", offering myself, "for Christ our Passover Lamb has been sacrificed" (I Cor. 5:7). He offered himself for us as the high priest (Heb. 7:26-27) as well as the sheep. And I shall confess to you, he says, as I confessed before saying, "I confess to you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth" (Mt. 11:25; Lk. 10:21⁷⁴) and "I shall return to the Lord" the vows which I made for the salvation of all people, that all which you gave me might not perish into eternity (Jn. 6:39; 10:28; 17:12). We understand what the Saviour promised for our salvation in his passion. Let us not make Jesus a liar (I Jn. 1:10). Let us be pure (Is. 1:16), and separate from all the filthiness of sins, so that he might offer us to God the Father as the sacrifices which he had vowed.

2:11 Heb.: And the Lord spoke to the fish, and it vomited Jonah forth onto the dry land.

LXX: And he directed the whale, and it threw Jonah out upon the dry land.

In the belly of the whale the Lord prayed these things which we read above under the person of Jonah, of which Job also spoke in mystical fashion: "May he curse the one who cursed this day, he who

is to capture the great whale" (Job 3:8, LXX).⁷⁵ Therefore, he "directed" this great whale both in the abyss and in hell, that it should restore the Saviour, even he who had been dead, to the earth, that he might set free those who were held in the chains of death and lead many forth with him unto life. But that which is written: "it vomited [him] forth" we must take ἐμφατικώτερον⁷⁶ because out of the lowest of the vitals of death life came forth the conqueror.

CHAPTER THREE

3:1-2 Heb.: And the Word of the Lord came to Jonah a second time, saying: "Arise and go to Nineveh the great city, and proclaim in it according to the earlier proclamation which I am telling you."

LXX: And the message of the Lord came to Jonah a second time, saying: "Arise and go to Nineveh the great city, and proclaim in it according to the earlier proclamation which I spoke to you."

It is not said to the prophet: "Why did you not do what had been commanded you?" but the reproach of the shipwreck and of being devoured was enough for him, so that he who had not known the Lord as the One who commanded him understood him as the One who set him free. Otherwise, it is superfluous to desire to blame after the punishment what the servant who failed did when this sort of reproach is not so much a correction as a censure.

But our Lord was sent to Nineveh a second time after the resurrection, so that he who first in a sense had fled when he said: "Father, if it is possible let this cup pass from me" (Mt. 26:39), and did not wish to give the children's bread to the dogs (Mt. 15:26)--only now these children had said: "Crucify, crucify such a one. We have no king except Caesar" (Lk. 23:21; Jn. 19:15)--of his own accord he proceeded to Nineveh, and there he proclaimed after the resurrection what he had been commanded to proclaim before his passion. But he obeyed all that he was commanded, which he obeyed, which he did not desire, which he was forced to desire once again: he accomplished the will of the Father a second time. All these relate to the man and to "the form of a servant" (Phil. 2:7) to whom such words can be applied.

3:3-4a Heb.: And Jonah arose, and went to Nineveh according to the word of the Lord; and Nineveh was a great city of God, a journey of three days; and Jonah began to enter into the city on a one day's journey.

LXX: And Jonah arose, and went to Nineveh, just as the Lord had spoken to him. But Nineveh was a great city for God, about a journey of three days' march; and Jonah began to enter the city on about a one day's journey.

Immediately Jonah carried out the duty which he had been commanded. But Nineveh, to which the prophet was proceeding, was a great city and of such a circumference that it was scarcely possible to go around it in a three days' journey. But he, remembering what he had been commanded and his recent shipwreck, completed a three days' march with haste in one day. However, there are those who understand it more simply in this way, that he only preached in the third part of the city, and the message of his proclamation reached the others immediately after.

But our Lord is properly said to have risen after the descent into hell, and to have preached the word of the Lord when he sent the apostles to baptize those who were in Nineveh in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit (Mt. 28:19), that is, in a "three days' journey". And this very sacrament of the salvation of humankind is a "one day's march", that is, in the confession of the one God Jonah did it not so much as the apostles⁷⁷ but according to the manner of the apostles' preaching. For he himself said: "Look, I am with you every day unto the consummation of the age." (Mt. 28:20)

And it is doubtful to no one why Nineveh is the "great city of

God" since the world and everything were "made through him, and without him nothing was made" (Jn. 1:3). It is to be noted also that it does not say three days and nights, or one day and night, but absolutely "days" and "day" so that it might show that in the mystery of the Trinity, and the confession of the one God, there is no darkness at all.

3:4b Heb.: And he shouted and said: "Yet forty days, and Nineveh will be overthrown."

LXX: And he proclaimed and said: "Yet three days, and Nineveh will be overthrown."

The number three which is set down by the Septuagint is not appropriate for penitence, and I am completely amazed why it was translated in this way, since in Hebrew the letters, nor the syllables, nor the accents, nor the words have anything in common: for three is salos and forty arbaim.⁷⁸ Besides, the prophet who was sent from Judea on such a journey to the Assyrians was demanding penitence worthy of his message, so that ancient and rotting wounds might be healed by applying a plaster for a long while. Moreover, the number forty is suitable for sinners, and for fasting, and for prayer, and for sackcloth, and for tears, and for prayer for perseverance; because of this Moses fasted for forty days on Mount Sinai (Ex. 34:28; Dt. 9:18), and Elijah who was fleeing from Jezebel, when he announced the famine to the land of Israel (I Kings 17:1) and the anger of God was hanging over them, is described as having fasted for forty days (I Kings 19:8).

The Lord himself--the true Jonah--as well, when he was sent to proclaim to the world, fasted for forty days (Mt. 4:2; Lk. 4:2). He left to us the heritage of fasting to prepare our souls to eat his body under this number. However, that he "shouted" is fulfilled in this Gospel passage: "Standing he shouted in the temple saying: 'Those who are thirsty, let them come and drink.'" (Jn. 7:37). For every word of the Saviour is called a "shout" since he preached about great things.

3:5 Heb.: And the men of Nineveh believed in God, and they proclaimed a fast, and dressed in sackcloth from the greatest to the smallest.

LXX: Similarly.

Nineveh believed, and Israel remained unbelieving. The uncircumcised believed, and the circumcision remained unfaithful. And first "the men of Nineveh believed"--those who had reached the full age of Christ (Eph. 4:13)--"and they proclaimed a fast and dressed in sackcloth from the greatest to the smallest." Both the diet and the attire of penitence were deserved, that those who had offended God in their excess and their ostentation might be pleasing to him through the rejection of those things by which they had given offense beforehand.⁷⁹ Sackcloth⁸⁰ and fasting are the weapons of penitence, the help of sinners: first the fasting and then the sackcloth; first that which is hidden (Mt. 6:18) and afterwards what is open; the first is always before God (Mt. 6:18), the second is sometimes displayed also to human beings. And if of

the two requisites one must be taken away I would rather choose fasting without sackcloth than sackcloth without fasting.

Those of adult age begin, and it reaches "to the smallest" for none is without sin, not even if their life were only one day, or the years of their life were able to be counted. (Job 14:5 LXX) For if "the stars are not pure before the face" of God "how much more the worm and rottenness" (Job 25:5-6 LXX⁸¹), and those who are held liable through the sin of Adam, the one who gave offense. But the order itself is very beautiful: God commands the prophet, then the prophet proclaims to the city. First the men believe, and when they proclaim a fast people of all ages clothe themselves in sackcloth. The men do not proclaim the sackcloth but only the fast; nevertheless truly those to whom penitence is proclaimed connect the sackcloth to the fasting in rightful consequence, so that the empty stomach and the mournful attire would beseech the Lord more urgently.

3:6-9 Heb.: And word reached the king of Nineveh and he arose from his seat, and took off his robe and put on sackcloth, and sat down in ashes. And one proclaimed and said in Nineveh, from the mouth of the king and his princes, saying: "Let not persons nor beasts, nor cattle, nor flocks, taste anything; let them neither eat food nor drink water, and let persons and beasts be covered with sackcloth. And let them cry to God with strength and let a man turn from his evil way, and from the iniquity which is in his hands. Who knows if God might turn and forgive, and turn back from the fury of his wrath, and we shall not perish?"

LXX: And the message came near to the king of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne and took off his outer garment and was covered with sackcloth, and sat down in ashes. And it was proclaimed in Nineveh from the king, and from all his great ones, saying: "Let persons and beasts and cattle and sheep not taste anything, let them not eat food nor drink water." And the people and beasts were covered with sackcloth, and they cried vehemently to God, and all turned

back from their evil way and from the iniquity which was in their hands, saying: "Who knows, if God will repent and turn back from the wrath of his fury and we might not perish?"

The king of Nineveh was the last to hear the preaching. He went down from his seat and took off his former adornment and dressed in sackcloth he sat down in ashes, and not being satisfied with his own conversion he proclaimed penitence to the others with his generals saying: "that persons and beasts and cattle and sheep" were to be afflicted with hunger, covered with sackcloth, and having condemned their former vices, should devote themselves entirely to penitence. I know that many⁸² understand this king of Nineveh to be the devil, who at the end of the world, since no creature that is rational and which was made by God may perish, will come down from his pride and repent and be restored to his former place. To confirm this opinion they also bring forward that example from Daniel where Nebuchadnezzar repented for seven years and was restored to his former kingdom. (cf. Dan. 4:27,32,36= Dan.4:24,29,33 Vg.) But since holy Scripture does not teach this and it turns the inner person away from the fear of God, and as long as people slide into vices easily when they think that even the devil--who is the author of evil and the fountain of all sins-- can repent and be saved, let us throw this teaching away from our minds. And let us know that in the Gospel sinners are sent into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels (Mt. 25:41), and of them it is said: "their worm does not die and their fire is not quenched." (Is. 66:24; Mk. 9:48) We know of course that

God is kind and we who are sinners do not delight in his cruelty, but we read: "The Lord is merciful and just and our God has mercy." (Ps. 114:5) The justice of God is surrounded by his mercy, and he proceeds to judgment with this kind of display: he spares so as to judge, he judges so as to have mercy. "Mercy and truth have met each other; justice and peace have kissed." (Ps. 84:11) Moreover, if all rational creatures are equal, and either from their virtues or from their vices by their own will they are raised upwards or plunged to the depths, and after a long period of time and infinite ages there would be the restoration of all things, and one rank for all the combatants, then what distance will there be between a virgin and a prostitute? What difference between the mother of the Lord and--it is a sin just to say it--the victims of public lusts⁸³? Will Gabriel and the devil be equal? The apostles and demons equal? The prophets and false prophets equal? The martyrs and persecutors equal? Think whatever you please, double the years and the times and heap up infinite ages for punishments: if the end of all things is the same, everything that has taken place is for nothing since we are not looking for something that we once were, but what we shall always be.

I am not unaware that they are used to speaking against this, to prepare hope for themselves as well as salvation along with the devil. Truly, it is not the time to write at greater length against the perverse teaching and the diabolic σύνφραγμα⁸⁴ of those who teach this in the corners and deny it in public. It is enough for us to have indicated what we perceive in this passage and, as is

usual in commentaries, to make known briefly who the king of Nineveh is whom God's "message reached" the last. What the influence of eloquence and secular wisdom is among people of this age is witnessed to by Demosthenes, Tullius [Cicero], Plato, Xenophon, Theophrastus, Aristotle and other orators and philosophers who are regarded as kings among humankind, and whose precepts are regarded not as the precepts of mortal beings but are received as divine oracles. From this Plato even says that states would be happy either if philosophers would reign over them or if kings would philosophize.⁸⁵ However, how difficult it is for people of this sort to believe in God as, not to mention everyday examples and keeping silent about the ancient histories of the heathen, the testimony of the Apostle is enough for us to demonstrate. When he wrote to the Corinthians he said: "Look to your calling, my brothers, for there are not many among you who are wise according to the flesh, not many powerful, not many noble. But God chose the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God chose the weak things of the world to confound the strong, and God chose the ignoble things of the world, and things which were contemptible" (I Cor. 1:26-28) and so on. Whence he says again: "I shall destroy the wisdom of the wise, and I shall reject the knowledge of the learned" (I Cor. 1:19; cf. Is. 29:14) and: "Look to it that no one deceives you through philosophy and vain seduction." (Col. 2:8) From this it is clear that the kings of the world are the last to hear the proclamation of Christ: they put aside the splendour of their eloquence and of their rhetorical ornament and

the embellishment of their words, and devote themselves entirely to simplicity and rusticity, and having been restored to a common style they take their seat in the dirt and they destroy what they had proclaimed before. Let us place before ourselves the blessed Cyprian⁸⁶, who before was an advocate of idolatry, and attained such renown for his eloquence that he even taught oratory in Carthage. He heard at last the message of Jonah and having been converted to penitence he attained such courage that he proclaimed Christ publicly and bent his neck to the sword for his sake. We certainly understand that "the king of Nineveh" came down "from his seat" and replaced his purple robe with sackcloth, his ointments with mud, his neatness with baseness--not baseness of opinions but of words. Whence it is also said in Jeremiah concerning Babylon: "Babylon is a golden chalice making all the earth drunken" (Jer. 51:7). Who has not been made drunk by the eloquence of this age? Whose souls have not been dulled by the putting together of words and the splendour of their eloquence?⁸⁷ It is difficult for people who are powerful and noble and rich--and for the eloquent much more difficult than these--to believe in God, for their minds are blinded (II Cor. 4:4) with riches and might and luxury, and being surrounded by vices they are not able to see virtue: they judge the simplicity of holy Scripture not from the majesty of its meaning but from the baseness of its words. But when those who before had taught evil things turn to penitence and begin to teach good things, then we will see the Ninevite people be converted by one proclamation, and that which we read in Isaiah will take place: "Is

a people born but once?" (Is. 66:8 LXX)

Also understand the people and beasts covered in sackcloth and crying to God in the same sense: those who were rational and those who were senseless⁸⁸, the wise and the simple, repented at the preaching of Jonah, according to that which is said elsewhere: "You will save persons and beasts, O Lord" (Ps. 35:7).

However, we can also interpret the beasts covered with sackcloth otherwise, especially from these texts in which we read: "Sun and moon are clothed with a garment of goat's hair" (Joel 2:10?, 3:15?⁸⁹), and in another place: "I shall clothe the sky with sackcloth." (Is. 50:3) Of course, sackcloth is mentioned *μεταφορικῶς*⁹⁰ for a mournful attire and sadness and gloom.

Also, when it is said: "Who knows if God might turn and forgive", doubt and uncertainty are set out, for when people are doubtful of their salvation they repent more energetically and they call to God for mercy all the more.

3:10 Heb.: And God saw their works, that they converted from their evil way, and God lamented the evil which he had said he would do to them, and he did not do it.

LXX: And God saw their works, that they turned back from their evil ways, and God repented of the evil which he said he would do to them, and he did not do it.

Following both interpretations, God threatens the people-- either at that time the people of the capital city of Assyria, or each day the people of the world--that they should repent. If they would be converted, he also would overturn his sentence, and it

would be changed through the conversion of the people. Jeremiah and Ezekiel explain this more clearly, namely that God will not fulfill the good things which he promised if the good turn to vices, nor will he fulfill the evil things which he threatened to the worst if they turn back to salvation (Jer. 18; Ez. 18). Therefore, it is this way also that "God saw their works that they converted from their very evil way." He did not hear the words which Israel used to often promise: "All things whatever that the Lord has said we shall do" (Ex. 24:3,7), but he observed their works, and since he prefers the repentance of sinners rather than their death (cf. Ez. 18:23,32; 33:11; II Pet. 3:9), he joyfully changed the sentence since he saw the changed works. Or rather God, desiring from the first to be merciful, persevered in his intention, for none who wish to punish someone warn them of what they are going to do.

But take "evil", as we said above⁹¹ to mean punishments and tortures--not that God would consider doing anything evil.

CHAPTER FOUR

4:1-2a Heb.: And Jonah was struck with great distress and he became angry, and he prayed to the Lord and said:

LXX: And Jonah became sad with great sorrow, and he was perplexed, and he prayed to the Lord and said:

Seeing the "fullness of the gentiles" (Rom. 11:25) enter by stealth, and that fulfilled which is said in Deuteronomy: "they have provoked me with these which are not gods, and I will provoke them with a nation which is not, I will rouse them to wrath with a foolish nation" (Deut. 32:21; Rom. 10:19), he despairs of the salvation of Israel and is agitated with great pain which bursts forth in his voice. And he reveals the reasons for his gloom and says, so to speak: "I alone have been chosen out of such a great number of prophets to announce disaster to my own people through the salvation of others." He is not saddened therefore, as some think, because the multitude of the gentiles is saved, but because Israel is perishing.

Because of this also our Lord wept over Jerusalem (Lk. 19:41) and refused to "take the children's bread and give it to the dogs" (Mt. 15:26; cf. Mk. 7:27). The apostles also preached first to Israel (Acts 13:46), and Paul wished to be "anathema for his brothers, who are Israelites, whose are the adoption, and the glory, and the covenant, and the promises, and the Law, from whom are the fathers, from whom is Christ according to the flesh". (Rom. 9:3-5) However, the "sufferer"⁹² as Jonah is translated is well afflicted with suffering, and his soul is sad even unto death (Mt.

26:38; Mk. 14:34), for he endured many things--as much as was in him--so that the population of the Jews might not perish. The name of sufferer is also very fitting to the history, showing the prophet beset with difficulties and weighed down with the wretchedness of his journey and the shipwreck.

4:2b-3 Heb.: "I beseech you, O Lord, was this not my word while I was still in my country? Because of this did I hasten⁹³ to flee to Tharsis. For I know that you, O God, are kind and merciful, patient and of great pity, forgiving of evil. And now I ask, O Lord, take my soul from me, for death is better for me than life."

LXX: "O Lord, were not these my words while I was still in my country? Therefore, I hastened⁹⁴ to flee to Tharsis. For I know that you are compassionate and One who has mercy, patient and of great pity, and you repent concerning evil. And now, O Lord the Ruler, take my soul from me for it is better for me to die than to live."

That which we have interpreted as "I beseech" and the Septuagint translated $\acute{\omega} \delta\eta$ ⁹⁵ is read in Hebrew as anna⁹⁶: this interjection of prayer seems to me to signify the emotion of one seeking to please. Since his prayer, while he says that he rightly wished to flee, in a way accuses God of injustice, he tempers his complaints at the beginning of the prayer: he says: "was this not my word⁹⁷ when I was still in my country?" I knew that you would do this, I was not unaware that you are compassionate, and because of this I did not wish to proclaim that you are harsh and cruel. Therefore, I desired to flee to Tharsis, to have leisure for the "contemplation"⁹⁸ of things and on the "sea"⁹⁹ of this age to enjoy quiet and relaxation instead. I abandoned my house, I left my heritage (Jer. 12:7), I went out from your bosom, and I came. If I

would have said that: "You are compassionate and kind and forgiving of evil", no one would have repented. If I would have proclaimed that you are cruel and only a judge, I knew that this is not your nature. Therefore, placed in this uncertain situation, I preferred rather to flee than either to deceive with mildness those who repented or to preach about you what you are not.

Therefore, "O Lord, take my soul since death is better for me than life." "Take my soul" which was "sad to the point of death" (Mt. 26:38). "Take my soul" for "into your hands I commend my spirit" (Lk. 23:46), for "death is better for me than life." Being alive I was not able to save the one nation of Israel; I shall die and the world shall be saved.

The story is clear and can be understood concerning the person of the prophet in this way, as we have already said frequently, namely that he was sad and wished to die because he feared lest when the multitude of the gentiles had been converted Israel might perish eternally.

4:4 Heb.: And the Lord said: "Do you think you are right to be angry?"

LXX: And the Lord said to Jonah: "Are you so exceedingly sad?"

The Hebrew word hadra lach¹⁰⁰ can be translated both "are you angry" and "are you sad". And both are appropriate to the prophet and to the person of the Lord: for either he was angry lest in Nineveh he seem to have been a liar, or he was sad in knowing that Israel would perish. And reasonably he does not say to him:

"you are wrong to be angry"--or "sad"--lest he seem to condemn him when he is sad. Again, he does not say: "you are right to be angry"--or "sad"--lest he go against his own sentence. But he asks him who is "angry" and "sad", so that either he might reply with the reasons for his anger, or his sorrow, or if he remain silent, out of his silence the true judgment of God would be confirmed.

4:5 Heb.: And Jonah went out from the city and he sat down opposite the east of the city, and he made a shade for himself, and he sat underneath it in the shade until he should see what would happen to the city.

LXX: Similarly.

Cain the fratricide and murderer¹⁰¹, who dedicated the blood-stained world with his brother's blood, was the first to build a city, and he called it after the name of his son Enoch. (Gen. 4:17). From this also the prophet Hosea says: "I am God and not a human being; I am holy in your midst, and I will not enter the city" (Hosea 11:9) For as the psalmist says: "To the Lord belong the issues of death" (Ps. 67:21). For this reason also one of the cities of fugitives is called Ramoth (Deut. 4:43) which means "vision of death". And whoever are fugitives, and do not deserve to live in Jerusalem because of their sins, rightly dwell in the city of death, and live across the river of Jordan, which is translated as "descent".¹⁰² Therefore, "dove" or "sufferer"¹⁰³ comes out from such a city and dwells "opposite the east" where the sun rises, and he is in his tent. He observes each moment of time that passes and waits for what might happen to the above-mentioned

city. Before Nineveh was saved and the gourd withered, before the Gospel of Christ shone and the prophecy of Zechariah was completed: "Behold a man; his name is the East" (Zech. 6:12 LXX¹⁰⁴), Jonah was under the shade. For the truth had not yet come, of which the same evangelist and apostle says: "God is truth" (Jn. 3:33; 14:6; I Jn. 5:6).

And it is neatly added: "he made a shade for himself" next to Nineveh. "He made it for himself" for none of the Ninevites of the time was able to live with the prophet. "And he sat underneath it in the shade", either in the mien of a judge or reduced in majesty, and "his loins were girded in strength" (Job 38:3; cf. Prov. 31:17? Job 40:2??; Ps. 64:7?) so that his clothing would not slide down completely to his feet--and to us who are below--but might be clasped together with a higher^h belt.¹⁰⁵

Furthermore, when it says: "so that [sic] he should see what would happen to the city", it employs the accustomed usage of the Scriptures, that it connects human feelings to God.

4:6 Heb.: And the Lord God prepared an ivy, and it went up over Jonah's head, so that there was shade over his head, and it sheltered him, for he had been labouring; and Jonah rejoiced with great joy concerning the ivy.

LXX: And the Lord directed a gourd, and it went up over Jonah's head so that it was a shade over his head and it protected him from his evils, and Jonah rejoiced with great joy concerning the gourd.

^h altiore B Y M L H I G J Duval; altiori X Mar Val(in margin); artiore K; artiori A P O Bi Era Vic Ant Adr; arctiori C D(uncorrected) Gre Val(in text).

On this point a certain Canterius, of the very ancient family of the Cornelii or, as he himself boasts, of the stock of Asinius Pollio, is said to have accused me recently in Rome of sacrilege because instead of 'gourd' I translated 'ivy'.¹⁰⁶ Evidently, he was afraid lest if ivies spring forth instead of gourds he would not have anything from which to drink secretly and in the dark! In fact on these very gourds of small cups, which they generally call saucomariae¹⁰⁷, are usually represented the likenesses of the apostles, from whom that person has even assumed his name--which is not his own. If names are changed so easily, and instead of the seditious tribunes the Cornelii, they are named the Aemilii, the consuls, I am amazed that I am not permitted to translate 'ivy' instead of 'gourd'.

But let us come to serious matters. Instead of gourd, or ivy, in Hebrew we read ciceion¹⁰⁸ 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.¹ 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

¹ all editions (except Duval) add suo trunco se perhaps following suo trunco se sustinens in Jerome, Letter 112, 22 (Labourt, v.6, p.42, l.22).

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 κισσός¹⁰⁹ in Greek, for they did not have another word which they could say.

Therefore, let us investigate the history, and before the mystical meaning let us bring forth only the literal. The gourd and the ivy are of such a nature that they creep on the ground¹¹⁰, and without supports or assistance on which to lean themselves they do not try to reach up higher. How then, while the prophet was unaware, did the gourd, which does not have the nature to rise on high without poles and rods or wooden stakes¹¹¹ rise up in one night and supply shade? However, the ciceion--while it exhibited a miracle in its sudden rising and displayed the power of God through verdant shade's protection--still followed its own nature.

But as to the person of the Lord the Saviour--lest we thoroughly forsake the gourd because of the φιλοκολόκυνθος¹¹²--he can be related when we remember this from Isaiah: "The daughter of Zion will be left like a tent in the vineyard, and like a hut in a cucumber field, as a city which is under attack." (Is. 1:8) And since we do not find the gourd in any other passage of Scripture, let us say that where the cucumber grows there also usually grows the gourd. Israel is compared to this type of plant because formerly it protected Jonah under its shade as he was awaiting the

conversion of the gentiles, and it bestowed on him no little "joy" making a shade and a tent for him rather than a home¹¹³: it had the likeness of a roof, but it did not have the foundations for houses. Furthermore, our ciceion, our modest little tree, which quickly grows up and quickly withers, can be compared in sequence and in life to Israel, which sends its small roots into the ground and at least tries to be lifted up to the heights, but it is not equal to the height of the cedars (Ps. 79:11) and fir trees (Is. 37:24; Zech. 11:2) of God. They seem to me to also signify the locusts which John fed upon (Mt. 3:4; Mk. 1:6), who said under the type of Israel: "He must increase, and I must decrease" (Jn. 3:30): a small animal with feeble wings, at least rising from the ground but not strong enough to fly higher, so that it is more than a creeping animal and yet not equal to the birds.

4:7-8 Heb.: And God prepared a worm the next day at the break of dawn, and it pierced the ivy, and it dried up; and when the sun rose the Lord directed a hot and burning wind and the sun beat over Jonah's head, and he was hot and he begged his soul to die, and said: "It is better for me to die, than to live."

LXX: And the next day in the morning God directed a worm, and it pierced the gourd, which dried up; and immediately when the sun rose, God directed a breeze of burning heat; and the sun beat over Jonah's head, and he was distressed and weary of his soul, and he said: "It is better for me to die, than to live."

Before the "Sun of Justice" arose (Mal. 4:2), the shade was thriving, and Israel was not "dried up". After he arose, and the Ninevite darkness was dispelled by his light, a worm was prepared "the next day at the break of dawn" from which Psalm 21 is

inscribed: "for the lifting up of the morning" (Ps. 21, title). He arose from the earth without any seed and said: "I am a worm and not a human being" (Ps. 21:7) and he "pierced" the shade: forsaken by God's help he lost all his verdure.

And "the Lord directed a hot and burning wind", of which it is prophesied in Hosea: "The Lord will lead a burning wind rising up from the desert, and it will dry its streams and will leave its fountain desolate" (Hosea 13:15). And Jonah began to be "hot" and once again to "wish to die" in baptism with Israel so that in the "washing" (Tit. 3:5¹¹⁴) he would receive the moisture which he had lost in his denial.¹¹⁵ From this also Peter says to the Jews who are drying up: "Repent and be baptized each among you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 2:38)

There are those who understand the worm and the burning wind to be the Roman generals who after Christ's resurrection completely annihilated Israel.

4:9 Heb.: And the Lord said to Jonah: "Do you think you are right to be angry concerning the ivy?" And he said: "I am right to be angry even unto death."

LXX: And the Lord God said to Jonah: "Are you so extremely sad concerning the gourd?" And he said: "I am extremely sad even unto death."

Above, when the Ninevites were repenting and the city of the gentiles was saved, the prophet himself was asked: "Do you think you are right to be angry?" (4:4) He made no reply, but his silence

confirmed God's question, for since he knew that God is kind and merciful and patient and of great pity and forgives evils (4:2; Ex. 34:6-7; Ps. 102:8), he was not sorry over the salvation of the gentiles. Now however, after the dried gourd Israel has dried up, and when he has been precisely asked: "Are you well to be angry over the ivy?" he replies confidently and says: "I am right to be angry--or sad--even unto death"; for I did not want to save those ones in this way that these ones perish; not to win (I Cor. 9:19) those outsiders in this way, that I destroy my own.

And truly, unto the present day Christ bewails Jerusalem (Lk. 19:41) and wails "even unto death"--not his own, but that of the Jews, that in denying him they die, but they will rise again (Rom. 11:15) in confessing the Son of God.

4:10-11 Heb.: And the Lord said: "You mourn over the ivy, for which you did not labour, nor did you make it grow, which sprouted up in one day and perished in one day; and I, may I not spare Nineveh the great city, in which are more than 120,000 people who do not know what is between their right hand and their left hand, and many cattle?"

LXX: And the Lord said, "You spared the gourd, for which you did not labour nor did you cultivate it, which sprouted up in a night and in a night it perished; but I, may I not spare Nineveh the great city, in which live more than 12,000 men who are unaware of their right hand and their left, and many herds [of cattle]?"

It is very difficult to expound how according to tropology it may be said to the Son: "You mourn over the ivy, for which you did not labour, nor did you make it grow" since "all things were made through him, and without him nothing was made" (Jn. 1:3). From this someone¹¹⁶ interpreting this passage so as to solve the question

at hand runs into blasphemy. For taking up this passage from the Gospel: "Why do you call me good? No one is good except God alone" (Mk. 10:18) he understood that the Father is good but that the Son takes a lesser position in comparison with him who is the perfect and true Good. And in saying these things he has not considered that he has run into the heresy of Marcion--who set forth one God who only was good, and one who was the judge and creator--rather than the heresy of Arius, who while he asserted that the Father was greater and the Son was lesser, did not deny that the Son was the creator. Therefore, the things which we will say are to be heard by your leave, and our efforts are to be encouraged with kindness and prayer rather than scorned by a malevolent ear; for even the ignorant are able to criticize and detract, but it belongs to those who are learned, and know the sweat of labouring, either to reach out a hand to those who are weary or to show the way to those who are wandering.

Our Lord and Saviour "did not labour" the same way in Israel as "he laboured" among the people of the gentiles. Indeed, Israel confidently says: "Look, so many years I have served you, and I never neglected your orders, and you never gave me a young goat that I might feast with my friends. But after this son of yours who wasted his substance with prostitutes has come, you killed the fattened calf for him". (Lk. 15:29-30) Yet he is not put to silence by his father, but kindly it is said to him: "My son, you are always with me, and all my things are yours; it was right for you to feast and be joyful, for this your brother was dead and he has

come to life again, he had been lost and has been found." (Lk. 15:31-32) For the people of the gentiles the fattened calf has been sacrificed and the precious blood has been poured out, which Paul discusses most fully to the Hebrews (Heb. 9-10). And David in the psalm says: "The brother has not redeemed; the man¹¹⁷ shall redeem." (Ps. 48:8 LXX) Christ has decreed that this people should grow; he died, so that this people might live; he descended to hell so that this people might ascend to the heavens. But there was no such "labour" for Israel. Because of this Israel is also envious of his younger brother, because after his substance was squandered with prostitutes and seducers he received a ring for his finger and a gown (Lk. 15:22) and he is strong in his former dignity.

But when it says "which sprouted up in one night" it means the time before the coming of Christ, who was the light of the world (Jn. 8:12, 9:5), of whom it is said: "the night is past, but the day is near" (Rom. 13:12). And "in one night it perished" when the "Sun of Justice" (Mal. 4:2) was laid to rest for them, and they lost the message of God.

But the great and most beautiful¹¹⁸ city of Nineveh prefigures the Church, in which there is a greater number than the ten tribes of Israel, which also signify the fragments of twelve baskets in the desert (Mt. 14:20; Mk. 6:43; Lk. 9:17; Jn. 6:13).

But "they do not know what is between their right hand and their left hand" either because of their innocence and simplicity, so that it would show their age¹¹⁹ to be that of suckling milk, and would let us learn what is the number of the other [older] age,

when there are so many young ones. Or indeed--since the city was large, and "in a great house there are not only gold and silver dishes, but also wooden and clay ones" (II Tim. 2:20)--there was in them a very great multitude who before they repented did not know what was between good and evil, between the right side and the left.

But "also many cattle", for in Nineveh there is a great number of cattle and senseless people¹²⁰, who are compared to foolish beasts (Ps. 48:21) and are considered as similar to them.

Notes:

1. In De Viris Illustribus 135 (PL 23, 719), written in 392 or 393, Jerome claims to have completed five commentaries to date on the minor prophets, namely on Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Haggai. (In his English translation of De Viris Illustribus, E.C. Richardson alters the list of these commentaries to follow the canonical order; see Richardson, p.384.) The sequence listed by Jerome in the present commentary reflects the canonical order; on the order in which these commentaries were actually written, see Duval, pp.18ff. Jerome did not return to writing commentaries on the prophets until three years later in 396, beginning with the commentary on Jonah.

2. "another work": possibly an understated reference to Jerome's writings during the controversy with Rufinus.

3. "a book on Famous Men" (De Viris Illustribus): a biographical list of 135 Christian authors written by Jerome between January 392 and January 393 at the urging of Nummius Aemilianus Dexter, a Christian and son of a bishop of Barcelona, who had been proconsul of Asia and became praetorian prefect of Italy in 395. Dexter had suggested that Jerome publish such a list of distinguished Christian writers as an apologetic work to demonstrate to the Church's pagan critics the pre-eminence of the heritage of Christian letters. On the date of De Viris Illustribus see T.D. Barnes, Tertullian (Oxford, 1971) pp.235-236. (The latter study also offers a valuable discussion of other aspects of De Viris Illustribus; see pp.4-12, 237-239.)

De Viris Illustribus may be found in PL 23, 601-720; English version is in Richardson, pp.359-384.

4. "two volumes against Jovinian; also an Apology": In 393 Jerome composed a long diatribe in two volumes entitled Adversus Iovinianum in which he sought to refute the opinions of the Roman monk Jovinian who had criticized the growing tendency in the Church to attribute superiority to the practices of celibacy, virginity and fasting. (David Hunter, "Resistance to the Virginal Ideal in Late Fourth-Century Rome: the Case of Jovinian" Theological Studies 48 (1987) 45-64 argues that Jovinian's polemic was actually directed against the Manichaeans and Manichaean tendencies he saw among Christian ascetics at Rome in his day, and not against virginity and asceticism per se.) The excessively crude and violent style with which Jerome attempted to demolish Jovinian's views caused consternation among Jerome's friends who had originally solicited his help against Jovinian. Pammachius attempted to control the damage, and at his request Jerome composed an apology (Letter 49) to justify his conduct in the matter. (Another defense by Jerome is found in Letter 50 to Domnio.) See the discussions in: Peter Brown, The Body and Society (New York: Columbia University

Press, 1988) p.377; Elizabeth A. Clark, Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1986) pp.359-362; Elaine Pagels, Adam, Eve and the Serpent (New York: Random House, 1988) pp.91-95.

Adversus Iovinianum (two books) is found in PL 23, 211-338; English version is in Fremantle, pp.346ff.

Letter 49 is found in Labourt, v.2, pp.119-150; it was accompanied by Letter 48 found in Labourt, v.2, pp.116-118. English versions of these letters are in Fremantle, pp.66ff.

5. "to Pammachius on the best kind of interpretation": During the controversy with Rufinus, Jerome prepared a Latin translation of a letter written in Greek by Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, to John, bishop of Jerusalem. The faithfulness of Jerome's version of the letter was severely questioned by John, Rufinus and others who charged Jerome with rendering Epiphanius's remarks so as to be less courteous and more accusatory toward John. In response to this criticism Jerome composed a letter (no.57) in 395-396 to his friend Pammachius De Optimo Genere Interpretandi (On The Best Kind of Interpretation). Seeking to defend his reputation as a translator, Jerome argued in this letter that instead of merely adhering to the letter the good translator is to reproduce the sense and spirit of the text. (The exception to this, in Jerome's view, is the translation of Scripture where even the literal words themselves have significance.)

Letter 57 may be found in Labourt, v.3, pp.55-73, and Jerome, Liber de Optimo Genere Interpretandi (Epistula 57): Ein Kommentar, ed. G.M. Bartelink. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980. (Bibliotheca Classica Batava: Mnemosyne Supplement, 61); English translation is in Fremantle, pp.112ff.

6. "two books to Nepotian or on Nepotian": Nepotian was the nephew of Heliodorus, a friend whom in earlier years Jerome had entreated to join with him in his monastic vocation in the desert. Having become bishop of Altinum, Heliodorus had ordained his nephew to the priesthood. In 393 or 394 Jerome wrote a letter (no.52) to the young man on the duties of a priest. On Nepotian's premature death Jerome composed a letter of consolation (no.60) to Heliodorus eulogizing the nephew in glowing terms. The reference in this second letter "on Nepotian" to the assassination of Rufinus, prime minister to the emperor Theodosius, fixes the date of its writing to after November 27, 395. (The date of the assassination of Rufinus is provided by Socrates, Historia Ecclesiastica 6, 1 (PG 67, 661).) In Letter 77 to Oceanus, written in 400 (contra Fremantle, p.157), Jerome speaks of having written the epitaph for Nepotian four summers before (Labourt, v.4, p.40).

Letter 52 may be found in Labourt, v.2, pp.172-192, and Duff, pp.195ff.; English translation is in Fremantle, pp.89ff., and in Wright, pp.188ff.

Letter 60 may be found in Labourt, v.3, pp.90-110, and Duff,

pp.228ff.; English translation is in Fremantle, pp.123ff., and in Wright, pp.264ff.

7. "other works which it would be too long to list": These would include the following: two letters (no.53 and no.58) to Meropius Portius Paulinus written in 394 and 395 expressing friendship and commenting on the Bible and on the ascetic life, a letter (no.54) to Furia on widowhood written in 395, and possibly a letter (no.59) to Marcella in response to questions she had posed to him concerning the interpretation of certain Biblical passages. (While the date of this latter work is uncertain, it was probably written shortly after the controversy with Jovinian (see n4 above), to which it refers in paragraph two.) As well, Jerome was possibly at work on Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum (Against John of Jerusalem) at this time (Duval, p.12). It should be noted that Jerome makes no reference to the controversy with Rufinus which had presumably been occupying much of his time since 393 and which resulted in "quelques basses besognes" (Duval p.321n10) on Jerome's part.

Letter 53 is found in Labourt, v.3, pp.7-25; Letter 58 is in Labourt, v.3, pp.73-85, and Duff, pp.217ff.; Letter 54 is found in Labourt, v. 3, pp.25-41, and Duff, pp.207ff.; Letter 59 is in Labourt, v.3, pp.85-90; Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum is found in PL 23, 355-396. English versions of Letter 53 in Fremantle, pp.96ff.; Letter 58 in Fremantle, pp.119ff.; Letter 54 in Fremantle, pp.102ff., and Wright, pp.228ff.; Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum in Fremantle, pp.424ff.

8. "return to activity": the Latin postliminium is defined in Lewis & Short, p.1406 as: "'a return behind one's threshold, i.e. to one's home'; hence 'a return to one's old condition and former privileges, the right to return home and resume one's former rank and privileges, the right of recovery, reprisal, postliminium'". Jerome makes use of postliminium in this sense in Vita Malchi, 4 (PL 23, 55). However, he also uses the word in a strictly temporal sense, for example in Letter 128, 4: infanti senex longo postliminio scriberem (Labourt, v.7, p.154, l.18-19) which Fremantle, p.260, broadly renders "only recently have I recovered sufficient composure to write an old man's letter to a little child". Jerome's use of the word in his preface to the translation of the book of Joshua (PL 28, 464; BSV, 1, p.286) clearly indicates a return to work which he had left off due to the death of Paula (omissum iam diu opus quodam postliminio repetere), i.e. the work of Biblical translation. The identical phrase quodam postliminio in the present commentary suggests a translation along similar lines: "return to activity", i.e. the activity of commenting on the Bible, and particularly the minor prophets. (Compare Duval's rendering "rentrée en activité", although on p.321n12 he explains the use of the word in the present commentary in a geographical, rather than temporal, sense.) The word would thus appear to be equivalent to the phrase longum silentium in the prologue to Jerome's Commentaria

in Amos (CCL 76, p.300, l.42) and the preface to his translation of the Rule of Pachomius, 2 (PL 23, 63). (The latter does not have postliminium, contra Duval, p.321n12.)

9. The invocation of the Holy Spirit is customary at the opening of a work such as this: here it is similar in form to that found in the preface to Jerome's Vita Hilarionis (PL 23, 29; see Fremantle, p.303). (A list of these invocations occurring in Jerome's Biblical commentaries is found in Duval, p.321n13.) In Letter 65, 6 Jerome describes such invocations as taking the place of the appeal to the Muses of the pagan poets (Labourt, v.3, p.147, l.5-6). The invocation of the prophet himself in the present commentary may be paralleled to the invocation of Paul in Jerome's Commentaria in Epistolam ad Ephesios 2 (PL 26, 477).

10. The Hebrew word יָוֵב (Jonah) means 'dove' (BDB, pp.401-402). It is one of two meanings for the word cited by Jerome in his Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum (CCL 72, p.124, l.10). See also n21 below.

11. It is not easy to ascertain to which "ancient persons of the church, both Greek and Latin" Jerome is referring. Duval terms the phrase veteres ecclesiastici "un pluriel d'indétermination" and conjectures them to have been Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea (as the Greek writers) and Tertullian and Victorinus of Pettau (as the Latin writers). (Duval, pp.75, 322-323n16) (While Origen may well have produced a commentary on Jonah, no such work by any of these writers has survived.) Antin, pp.18-21, notes that among Greek writers prior to Jerome, there are references to Jonah in the works of Irenaeus and Cyril of Jerusalem, while Apollinarius of Laodicea, and perhaps also Diodore of Tarsus, had written commentaries on the prophets (possibly including works on the book of Jonah). Jerome may have also had in mind Didymus the Blind, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia (whose commentary on Jonah is found in PG 66, 317-346). Most of these are so close to being Jerome's contemporaries that it seems difficult to characterize them as veteres. Among Latin writers, Zeno of Verona had written on Jonah (PL 11, 444-450) and Tertullian and Hilary of Poitiers mention the story of Jonah, as do Jerome's contemporaries Ambrose and Augustine. Antin excludes from consideration the little poem De Iona attributed to Tertullian (PL 2, 1108-1114) which dates from the latter third century, as well as certain verses of Paulinus of Nola. The identity of these veteres ecclesiastici ultimately remains a mystery: Antin cites a personal correspondence with R.P. Vaccari in which the latter writes "sur leur nombre et leurs noms...il faut se résigner à dire: Ignoramus et ignorabimus" (Antin, p.19).

12. "questions" (Quaestiones) refers to a genre of textual commentary consisting of pointed treatments of specific problems in the interpretation of a given text. It was a popular genre of commentary during this period: Jerome had himself written Hebraicae Quaestiones in Genesim (PL 23, 935-1010; CCL 72, pp.1-56) and a great many other authors are credited with works belonging to this genre. (See the thorough historical discussion in G. Bardy, "La littérature patristique des Quaestiones et responsiones sur l'Écriture sainte" Revue Biblique 41 (1932) 210-236, 341-369, 515-537; 42 (1933) 14-30, 211-229, 328-352 and Henri de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale, (Aubier, 1959) pp.95ff.) Duval, p.324n18, sees Jerome's treatment of Jesus' "three days and three nights" in the tomb (on 2:1b below, pp.29-30) as an example of the Quaestiones genre within the present commentary.

13. "Gath which is in Opher": neither the Hebrew (גתה נל) nor the LXX (Γεθγοβερ) of II Kings 14:25 (or Joshua 19:13) render Jerome's Geth quae est in Opher. The latter rather reflects Jerome's interpretation which a few lines further allows him to distinguish this Gath from other cities by the same name. See the parallel usages of ad distinctionem in his Commentaria In Michaeam 2 (on 5:2) (PL 25, 1198) and Commentaria In Amos 3 (on 6:2-6) (PL 25, 1059).

14. According to Duval, Le Livre de Jonas, pp.88-89 and 328n13, the identification of Jonah with the son of the widow of Zarephath is found the apocryphal Lives of the Prophets, which are based on Jewish sources. He also cites the same identification in Talmud of Jerusalem, Sukkah 5, and Midrash Rabbah Genesis 93, 11: however, the identification is actually found in Midrash Rabbah Genesis 98 (not 93), while it is not explicit in Talmud of Jerusalem, Sukkah 5, where in a discussion of the tribe from which Jonah came several Biblical passages are listed in parallel, including I Kings 17:9 and II Kings 14:25. (At best this latter Talmudic passage conveys an implicit identification between Jonah and the widow's son.)

15. "of truth": the genitive veritatis is retained as the lectio difficilior (note the numerous manuscript emendations to veritas). The Hebrew, LXX and Vulgate all have "truth" as the predicate nominal form placed at the end of the sentence for stylistic effect. Cf. also the phrase verum Helias locutus est (Elijah spoke the truth) in the next sentence of the present commentary.

16. "Amittai, in fact, means (sonat) truth in our language" (i.e. in Hebrew): אמיתאי, the name of the father of the prophet Jonah, is connected with אמית "firmness, faithfulness, truth" (from the root אמת "to confirm, support") in BDB, p.54. In his Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum Jerome defines Amathi as

veritas mea vel fidelis meus (CCL 72, p.124, l.9).

17. "Amittai, in fact...the son of truth": Based on the interpretation of the name of the father of Jonah as "truth" (see n16 above), Jerome goes on to draw a parallel between Jonah (the son of Amittai=truth) and Jesus (the son of Truth). On another father of a prophet, see Jerome, Commentaria In Sophoniam 1, 1 (PL 25, 1338).

18. Jerome draws upon authentic tradition here: the traditional site of Jonah's tomb was the village Meshed, very near Gath-Hepher. (G.W. van Beek, "Gath-Hepher" IDB, v.2, p.356.)

19. Jerome here translates from the Rv-type recension of the book of Tobit (today represented mainly in Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus); the Rs-type recension (represented today especially in Codex Sinaiticus) ascribes the prophecy of the overthrowing of Nineveh to Nahum. (R.H. Charles, ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), v.1, p.239) In his translation of the Vulgate of Tobit Jerome followed (loosely) the Rs-type recension, as had the Old Latin version; he may have also had access to a Semitic ("Chaldee") text of Tobit. (Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, v.1, pp.175ff.; A. Wikgren, "Tobit, Book of", IDB, v.4, p.659) It is to be noted, however, that the Vulgate of Tobit 14:3ff. omits the name of the prophet altogether. On Jerome's view of the question of the place of Tobit in the canon, see P.W. Skehan, "St. Jerome and the Canon of Holy Scripture", in A Monument to St. Jerome, ed. F.X. Murphy (New York: Sheed and Ward) pp.262, 283 (referring to the present commentary), 287n26 and also Duval, p.328n33.

20. Chromatius had been a priest at Aquileia c.365-370, and a member of Jerome's circle of friends during his stay there. Another member of this circle was Rufinus, whom Chromatius had baptized. After Jerome's relocation to Bethlehem, Chromatius assisted with financing the costs of stenographers and copyists Jerome required in his literary production. (Praefatio in Libros Salomonis, PL 28, 1241; BVS, t.2, p.32). In 388 Chromatius became bishop of Aquileia. He attempted to mediate in the dispute between Jerome and Rufinus but was unsuccessful. He died c.406-408. Jerome's translations of the books of Chronicles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Tobit, and Judith were addressed to him, and Jerome's Commentaria in Abacuc (PL 25, 1273-1338) was also dedicated to Chromatius. It may be that the dedication of the present commentary to Chromatius was intended to reassure him of his continued friendship following the controversy with Rufinus. (Duval, pp.37-38n52)

Chromatius's detailed christological interpretation of the story of Jonah in the treatment of Mt. 16:4 in his Tractatus 54 in

Matthaeum suggests that he may have made use of Jerome's commentary on Jonah (Duval, p.39n60); on Chromatius as an exegete, see the introduction by Joseph Lemarie in Chromace D'Aquilée, Sermons, v.1 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1969) pp.57ff.

The title "venerable father" (papa venerabilis) is applied to Chromatius as a term of affection and respect; it was not yet used as an official title. (See the references in Duval, p.331n42 and Antin, p.54n4.)

21. In the section on the book of Jonah in his Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum Jerome gives the meaning of the name 'Jonah' as columba vel dolens (dove or sufferer). (CCL 72, p.124, l.10) Elsewhere in the same work he apparently qualifies these meanings: the section on IV Kings has Iona columba vel ubi est donatus sive dolens (p.116, l.4-5), while the section on Luke contains only Iona columba (p.140, l.1.). In Letter 53, 8 (Labourt, v.3, p.19) Jonah is described as columba pulcherrima. Jerome gives an interesting folk etymology in his Commentaria in Sophoniam 3, 1: Iona enim tam columbam quam Graeciam significat. Unde et usque hodie Graeci Iones, et mare appellatur Ionium, et apud Hebraeos permanet eorum vetus vocabulum. (For Jonah means dove as well as Greece. Because of this even up to today the Greeks are called Ionians and their sea the Ionian, and among the Hebrews their old name remains.) (PL 25, 1372-1373)

22. cf. Prologue, p.2 and n17 above.

23. Jerome defines the name Nineveh as pulchra vel germen pulchritudinis in his Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum. (CCL 72, p.69, l.5)

24. Liddell and Scott, p.985, defines κόσμος as (I) "order" and (II) "ornament, decoration." Jerome's use of Greek characters for Greek words was retained in the manuscript tradition: see Beryl Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages, 3d ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1983) p.44n.

25. Compare the following similar passage from Letter 128, 5 (Labourt, v.7, pp.153-154): Moysi loquitur Deus: "Dimitte me, et delebo populum istum." Quando dicit: "Dimitte me" ostendit se teneri, ne faciat quod minatus est, Dei enim potentiam servi preces inpediebant. Quis putas ille sub caelo est, qui nunc irae Dei possit occurrere? qui obviare flammis? et iuxta Apostolum dicere: "Optabam ego anathema esse pro fratribus meis"? (God said to Moses: "Let me alone, and I shall destroy this people." (Ex. 32:10) When he said: "Let me alone" he showed that he was able to be held back, lest he perform what he had threatened: for the prayers of his

servants were restraining the power of God. Who do you think is the one under heaven who is now able to resist the wrath of God, to face the flame of his judgment and to say with the apostle: "I would wish to be cursed on behalf of my brothers"? (Rom. 9:1)

26. "from the face of God": the OL of Genesis 4:16 is a facie Dei. (Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel, v.2, pt.1, Genesis, hrsg. B. Fischer (Freiburg: Herder, 1951) p.88.)

27. Josephus's actual treatment of the story of Jonah is found in Jewish Antiquities 9, 208-214 where mention is made of "Tarsus in Cilicia" (see Flavii Iosephi Opera, ed. Benedictus Niese (Weidmann, 1955) 2, pp.310-311); in Jewish Antiquities 1, 127 (ibid., 1, p.30, l.12-15) he describes the change from the letter theta of Tharsos to tau of Tarsus. (Tharsum instead of Tarsum in the CCL edition of the present commentary (vol.76, p.381, l.57) obscures the distinction Jerome is citing from Josephus.) Jerome also mentions Josephus's attribution to the Greeks of the alteration of the initial letter of this word in Letter 37, 2 (Labourt, v.2, p.66) and elsewhere. (See Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 18 (on 66:18-19) (PL 24, 667) as well as the citations in Pierre Courcelle, Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources (Cambridge: Harvard, 1969) p.83n179.) Duval (p.339n9) rightly points out that Courcelle incorrectly charges Jerome with changing his assessment of Josephus on this point after his Hebraicae Quaestiones in Genesim since the latter was written by Jerome some six or so years after Letter 37; nevertheless, pp.83-85 of Courcelle's work offer a valuable discussion of Jerome's use of the writings of Josephus, whom Jerome called the Greek Livy. (Letter 22, 35; Labourt, v.1, p.152)

28. Presumably a reference to II Chron. 20:36, which describes ships built at Ezion-geber for travel to Tarshish, i.e. a destination out of the Gulf of Aqaba. (The parallel at I Kings 22:48 says that the ships were wrecked at Ezion-geber.) Jerome describes some who hold Tharsis to be a region of India in: Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 1 (on 2:16) (PL 24, 53) and 18 (on 66:18-19) (PL 24, 666); Commentaria in Danielelem (on 10:6) (PL 25, 554); and Commentaria in Jeremiam 2 (on 10:6-10) (PL 24, 748). In the latter two this view is attributed to Josephus, although more commonly he cites Josephus's identification of Tharsis with Tarsus in Cilicia (see n27 above). In Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 1 (on 2:16) (PL 24, 53), Jerome argues against locating Tharsis in India because Jonah would not have been able to sail for India by setting out from Joppa (on the Mediterranean).

29. Jerome frequently defines Tharsis as "sea": Melius autem est Tharsis vel mare vel pelagus absolute accipere. (Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 1, (on 2:16) in PL 24, 53) The reason for this

interpretation is unclear; Duval conjectures that the association of Tharsis with Phoenician commerce and its distance "au bout du monde occidental, au-delà des mers, dans un monde quasi irréel" may provide the reason for the Jews to have equated Tharsis with the sea. (Duval, p.339n9) The interpretation is already present in the Targum of Jon. 4:2 and other Targumim. (The Targum of the Minor Prophets, trans. Kevin J. Cathcart and Robert P. Gordon (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1989) p.105n4) Jerome himself ascribes this interpretation to Hebrew sources in Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 1 (on 2:16) (PL 24, 52) and 18 (on 66:18-19) (PL 24, 666), as well as to the Septuagint in Commentaria in Danielelem (on 10:6) (PL 25, 554). He interprets Tharsis as "sea" in the following works as well: Commentaria in Amos 3 (on 9:2-5) (PL 25, 1088); Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 17 (on 60:8-9) (PL 24, 593); Commentaria in Ezechielem 1 (on 1:15-18) (PL 25, 27) and 11 (on 38:1-23) (PL 25, 360); and Commentaria in Jeremiam 2 (on 10:6-10) (PL 24, 748).

30. Letter to Marcella: In his Letter 37 (to Marcella), Jerome criticizes a commentary on Canticles by Reticus, Bishop of Autun, (a work he had previously admired: see De Viris Illustribus, 82 (PL 23, 689-692) and Kelly, pp.48, 95) and goes on to answer some questions of Biblical interpretation posed by Marcella. In Letter 37, 2 he offers a detailed example of his interpretation of the word Tharsis: it is a homonym referring to a region of India as well as the sea itself and also a type of blue rock (Labourt, v.2, pp.65-66). (שׁוֹהַר is defined as a type of precious stone in BDB, p.1076.)

31. On Tharsis as "sea" see n29 above.

32. "Tharsis means 'contemplation of joy'" (contemplatio gaudii): Jerome offers yet another interpretation of Tharsis. This definition is similar to the meaning exploratio gaudii for Tharsis given in the section on III Kings in Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum. (CCL 72, p.113, 1.26) See also the alternative interpretation noted in passing while commenting on the variant Καρχηδόνοϛ (=Carthage) in Is. 23:14 LXX: Tharsis enim secundum aliam interpretationem in linguam nostram vertitur consummatio sex, sive laetitiae. In sex autem diebus mundum istum factum legimus, qui iuxta traditiones ecclesiasticas postea consummabitur. (According to another interpretation in our language Tharsis is translated as the consummation of six, or of joy. For we read that this world was made in six days which will be consummated after these things, according to the traditions of the church.) (Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 7 (on 23:14) in PL 24, 279)

33. In the sections on Jonah and the Acts of the Apostles in Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum the meaning of Joppa is given as pulchritudo. (CCL 72, p.124, l.10 and p.146, l.19)

34. "contemplation" (theoria): The word θεωρία literally means "a looking at, viewing, beholding"; then, in a derived sense "(of the mind) contemplation, speculation". (Liddell and Scott, p.797) The latter sense is found in Plato, Republic, 486a, 517d (Plato, The Republic, v.2, trans. Paul Shorey (London: Heinemann, 1956), pp.8-9, 130-131). Aristotle uses the term to mean "seeing" things that are both perceptible and imperceptible. (Aristotle's Metaphysics, ed. W.D. Ross, v.1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1924) 989b25; The Works of Aristotle, v.8, trans. W.D. Ross (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908) ibid.) The term is found with the sense of "study, understanding" in the letters of Epicurus. (Epistles 1,35; 2,86; 3,128 in Epicurus: The Extant Remains, trans. Cyril Bailey (Hildesheim: Olms, 1970) pp.18, l.7; 56, l.13; 86, l.12) Plutarch applies the phrase μεθόδου θεωρίας "of a speculative turn of mind" to the philosopher Tarutius in Romulus, 12, 3. (Plutarch's Lives, v.1, trans. Bernadotte Perrin (London: Heinemann, 1982) pp. 121-122) Jerome writes in Letter 120, 12: in spiritali θεωρία ad sublimiora transimus (in spiritual contemplation we pass on to more lofty things). (Labourt, v.6, p.162, l.9-10)

35. There is no mention in the books of Kings of Joppa being a port of Judea.

36. In Letter 108, 8 (Labourt, v.5, p.166, l.14) Jerome speaks of Paula--and presumably himself (see Kelly, p.117)--visiting Joppa, fugientes portum Jonae (the port of Jonah's flight); he also alludes in the same letter to the story of Andromeda. Nevertheless it is uncertain whether the description of the boulders on the shore at Joppa and the topography in the present commentary derives from Jerome's own experience of the site.

37. Transliteration from root 77' "to come or go down, descend" (BDB, p.432); in the Hebrew text it is used in the Qal imperfect form with prefixed waw conversive to mean "he went down".

38. "common edition": Jerome clearly uses the term editio vulgata here to refer to the Septuagint (so also on 2:5b below, p.36); elsewhere he uses it to mean the Old Latin edition (eg. Commentaria in Epistolam ad Galatas 3 (on 5:24) in PL 26, 422). (See the discussion by H.F.D. Sparks in The Cambridge History of the Bible, I, ed. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (Cambridge: University Press, 1970) p.518 and n2.; Sparks cites Vulgata editio in Jerome's Commentaria in Isaiam Prophetam 6 (on 16:14) (PL 24, 239) as

referring to the Old Latin, but there the words centum nonaginta could equally be based on Is. 16:14 LXX.) The word Vulgate was not used to designate Jerome's translation of the Bible until the thirteenth century; on the history of the term, see E.F. Sutcliffe, "The Name 'Vulgate'" Biblica 29 (1948) 345-352 and A. Allgeier, "Haec Vetus et Vulgata Editio" ibid., 353-390.

39. The OL of Gen.3:8 has a facie: see Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel, v.2, pt.1 Genesis, hrsg. B. Fischer (Freiburg: Herder, 1951) p.63. Cf. the phrase a facie Domini Dei of the Vulgate, which follows LXX.

40. See n39 above.

41. See n32 above.

42. "brevity": an ideal of classical rhetorical style. Beginning already with Isocrates in Greek rhetoric, it was valued by numerous Latin authors as well, including Horace (Ars Poetica 25: brevis esse laboro; Ars Poetica 335-336: quidquid praecipies, esto brevis, ut cito dicta percipiant animi dociles teneantque fideles; see Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica, trans. H. Rushton Fairclough (London: Heinemann, 1970), pp.452, 478). Cicero weighs the merits of brevitas in De Oratore 2, 326-328, De Partitione Oratoria 19 and Brutus 50. (Cicero, De Oratore, v.1, trans. E.W. Sutton (London: Heinemann, 1948), pp.444-447; Cicero, De Oratore, v.2, with Other Works, trans. H. Rackham (London: Heinemann, 1960), pp.324-327; Cicero, Brutus, trans. G.L. Hendrickson (London: Heinemann, 1952), p.50) Quintilian also treats the subject of brevitas in Institutio Oratoria 4, 2, 32 and 40-51. (The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian, v.2, trans. H.E. Butler (London: Heinemann, 1977), pp.66, 72-78) The tradition of the value of brevitas was handed down by later Roman rhetoricians (see Rhetores Latini Minores, ed. C. Halm (Teubner, 1863) pp.204, 205, 210; 419, 424; 536). According to E.R. Curtius, Jerome was fond of using verbal formulae in praise of brevitas. (Ernst Robert Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. Willard R. Trask (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953) p.487; see the excellent discussion of "Brevity as an Ideal of Style" on pp.487-494 of this work.)

43. Jerome is presumably referring to the derivation of 'Jew' from the Hebrew 'יְהוּדָי' which was originally applied to members of the tribe of Judah, then, after the division of the kingdoms, to the members of the Southern Kingdom which consisted of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. After the fall of the Northern Kingdom of Israel in 722 B.C.E. the term generally came to be used (especially

by non-Jews) to mean citizens of Israel and/or worshippers of Israel's God. See Yehoshua M. Grintz, "Jew (Heb. יהודי Yehudi)", Encyclopaedia Judaica, v.10 (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 22.

44. περάτης: "wanderer, emigrant" (Liddell and Scott, p.1365). The word is found in Gen. 14:13 LXX; the Hebrew text reads אַבְרָם הַיְהוּדִי (Abram the Hebrew). This passage was used by Origen to distinguish between Hebrews and Jews (following Philo), and then to identify Christians with the Hebrews (those who "go across" from darkness to light, from death to life, etc.) in contrast to the Jews. See the discussion in N.R.M. de Lange, Origen and the Jews (Cambridge: University Press, 1976) p.32.

45. "magnanimity": according to Aristotle, along with justice and liberality, one of the virtues of the soul as a whole. "It belongs to magnanimity to bear nobly and bravely alike good and bad fortune, honour and dishonour; not to admire luxury or attention or power or victory in contests, but to have a sort of depth and greatness of soul. The magnanimous is one who neither values living highly nor is fond of life, but is in disposition simple and noble, one who can be injured and is not prompt to avenge himself." (Aristotle, De Virtutibus et Vitiis 1, 5 in The Works of Aristotle, v.9, trans. and ed. W.D. Ross (Oxford: University Press, 1915) 1249b, 1250b; see also: Magna Moralia 1, 1 and 25 in ibid., 1182b-1183a, 1192a; Ethica Eudemia 3, 5 in ibid., 1232a-1233a; Rhetorica 1, 9 in ibid., v.11, 1366b.)

46. See n32 above.

47. A not unusual opinion from Jerome, the ardent advocate of chastity: see the tales--drawn from 'pagan' sources--of the suicide of virgins who were being threatened with violation in Adversus Iovinianum 41, especially the story of the daughters of Phidon (PL 23, 271) and the virgin captured by Nicanor (PL 23, 272). Ambrose provides an extended account of the 'martyrdom' of Pelagia and her mother and sisters in De Virginibus, 3, 7 (PL 16, 229-232). See also the somewhat less enthusiastic opinion of Augustine in De Civitate Dei 1, 26. (Saint Augustine: The City of God Against the Pagans, v.1, trans. George E. McCracken (London: Heinemann, 1957) pp.108-112)

48. From παραβιάζομαι "do a thing by force against nature or law; use violence" (Liddell and Scott, p.1305).

49. In his commentary on Hosea, Jerome explains this text as follows: Et reddemus, ait, vitulos labiorum nostrorum. Pro vitulis qui Hebraice appellantur Pharim, fructum Septuaginta transtulerunt qui dicitur Pheri, falsi sermonis similitudine. Vituli autem labiorum, laudes in Deo sunt et gratiarum actio: Sacrificium enim Deo spiritus contribulatus. ("And," he says, "we shall pay the calves of our lips." Instead of "calves", which are called Pharim in Hebrew, the Septuagint translates "fruit", which is called Pheri, through false similarity to the word. The "calves of our lips" are praises unto God and an act of grace: "The sacrifice of God is a troubled heart" (citing Ps.50:19).) (Commentaria in Osee 3 (on 14:2-4) in PL 25, 942)

50. The last few lines contain an interesting parallel to prayers and sacrifices offered to Poseidon following the damage to the Persian navy caused by a storm at sea in 480 B.C.E. (Herodotus, Histories 7, 192): from that time, according to Herodotus, Poseidon was venerated as "Saviour". There is record also of drowning sacrifices to Poseidon, and of a young man thrown into the sea for Poseidon as a pharmakos, one who was sacrificed as an atonement. See Walter Burkert, Greek Religion, trans. John Raffan (Cambridge: Harvard, 1985), pp.82-83, 137-138.

51. Transliteration of Jonah 2:1 Heb. גָּדָל גָּד (great fish): see BDB, p.185.

52. "where death is awaited there is a safeguard", i.e. help is available when one is expecting death.

53. παρασκευή: "among the Jews, the day of Preparation before the sabbath of the Passover" (Liddell and Scott, p.1324). See also the references in BAG, p. 622.

54. συνεκδοχικῶς: "by way of synecdoche" (Liddell and Scott, p.1706). (On this term, see Quintillian, Institutio Oratoria 8,6,19 in The Institutio Oratoria of Quintillian, v. 3, trans. H.E. Butler (London: Heinemann, 1966), pp. 310-313.) During his education in Rome, Jerome had attended the lectures of the renowned grammaticus Aelius Donatus, known for his elaborate commentaries on the plays of Terence and also the poems of Vergil. It was Donatus's practice to intersperse his commentaries with Greek words and phrases, assuming that his students had a basic knowledge of Greek terms; these terms were retained in the rhetorical manuals of the day. (Kelly, p.14) Jerome follows his teacher's practice, as is evidenced in several instances in the present commentary.

55. The topic of Jonah's sojourn in the belly of the whale seems to have naturally led to a discussion of the "three days" between Good Friday and Easter. Compare the following similar passage from Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana 3, 119: Pars enim novissima diei quo passus est, nisi pro toto die accipiatur, id est adiuncta etiam nocte praeterita, et nox in cuius parte ultima resurrexit nisi totus dies accipiatur, adiuncto scilicet die inlucescente dominico, non possunt esse tres dies et tres noctes quibus se in corde terrae praedixit futurum. (For unless the last part of the day on which he suffered is taken as a whole day--that is with the previous night added--and unless the night in the last part of which he arose is taken as a whole day--that is to say, adding the day of the Lord's dawning--there cannot be three days and three nights in which he predicted he would be "in the heart of the earth".) (CSEL, 80, pp.112-113, l.27ff.) The allusion to Mt. 12:40 in the final phrase of the latter passage is noteworthy for our purposes as it is the key passage in the Gospels that refers to the "sign of Jonah". In his discussion of Mt. 12:39-40 in his Commentaria in Matthaeum, Jerome similarly turns to this topic: after referring the reader to his Commentary on Jonah, Jerome writes: hoc breviter nunc dixisse contenti quod συνεκδοχικῶς totum intellegatur ex parte, non quo omnes tres dies et tres noctes in inferno Dominus fecerit, sed quod in parte parasceues et dominicae et tota die sabbati tres dies et totidem noctes intellegantur. (We are content to say this briefly now, that by way of synecdoche the whole is to be understood from the part, not that the Lord stayed for three whole days and nights in hell, but that three days and as many nights are meant by part of the Day of Preparation and part of the Lord's Day and the whole Sabbath Day.) (Saint Jérôme. Commentaire Sur S. Matthieu, Texte Latin, Introduction, Traduction et Notes par Émile Bonnard (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977) v.1, pp.256-257; PL 26, 82, with συνεκδοχικῶς changed to synecdochice)

56. Jerome here echoes Tertullian, De Resurrectione Mortuorum 58,8: quod Ionas, devoratus a belva maris in cuius alvo naufragia de die digerebantur, triduo post incolumis expuitur (that Jonah, having been devoured by the monster of the sea in the belly of which shipwrecks are at times digested, was spit out three days later unharmed). (CCL 2, p.1006, l.25-26; PL 2, 880)

57. The parallel of Biblical miracles with wondrous tales from Ovid's Metamorphoses is at first startling, but proves to furnish an occasion to attack 'pagan' writings. "It must be admitted that the suggestion of Ovid's Metamorphoses as a standard of comparison with the Bible was hardly calculated to inspire respect for the Holy Scriptures." (Jean Steinmann, Saint Jerome, trans. Ronald Matthews (London: Chapman, 1959) p.256.)

58. "my cry": Jerome's clamoris mei is a direct translation of LXX κραυγῆς μου which is in the genitive as object of ἤκουσας.

59. "no place underneath on which to stand" for Latin non est substantia.

60. ἀναγωγή: literally "leading up", a word also used to mean the "lifting up of the soul to God" (Liddell and Scott, p.102). The term especially refers to one of the primary "methods" of Biblical interpretation: "En son acception la plus générale et la plus abstraite, le sens anagogique est donc celui qui conduit la pensée de l'exégète 'en haut'." (Henri de Lubac, Exégèse Médiévale (Aubier, 1959) p.622) On Jerome's use of similar Greek terms, see n54 above.

61. Note the abrupt change to the first person: Jerome expects his readers to supply the transition for themselves.

62. "in your light I was the light": an allusion to the credal phrase Lumen de Lumine, which occurred in the creeds recorded by Lucian of Antioch, Eusebius of Caesarea and (Jerome's acquaintance) Epiphanius Bishop of Salamis, and was included in the version of the Nicene Creed approved at the Council of Constantinople in 381, at which Jerome was present. See Philip Schaff, ed. The Creeds of Christendom, rev. David S. Schaff, vol.2 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983) pp.25-26, 29-30, 32-38, 57-58.

63. ἄρα: "[term] expressing consequence, then, or mere succession, there and then, and in many derived senses....B. Later usage, always with inferential force: 1. in drawing conclusions; in pseudo-syllogistic conclusions: esp. by way of informal inference" (Liddell and Scott, p.232).

64. On "common edition" see n38 above.

65. "the final conclusion of a major and minor proposition, and of a confirming assertion and of a syllogism" (propositionis et adsumptionis confirmationisque ac syllogismi extrema conclusio): The terms are found in identical order in Jerome's description of the book of Job: Omnisque dialectae proponit λήμματα, propositione, adsumptione, confirmatione, conclusione determinat. (It displays all the gains of logic, it determines by means of major propositions, minor propositions, confirming assertions, conclusions.) (Letter 53, 8 in Labourt, v.3, p.17, l.9-11) On logic in Jerome, see Antin, p.84n1.

66. "in his name" for Latin ex persona eius.

67. Possibly a reference to the luxury of the baths, which Jerome viewed as carnal pleasures; see, for example, his Commentaria in Jeremiam 4, 57, 4 (CCL 74, p. 223, l.15-18).

68. Duval adds here the parallel passages Mt. 8:30 and Mk. 5:10. However, the Mt. passage makes no mention of demons begging not to be sent away, while the account in Mk. has the demons begging not to be sent out of the country.

69. Jonah 2:7 LXX has κάτοχοι αἰώνιοι which may be translated "eternal bars". (See the entries in Liddell and Scott, pp.45 and 930.) There is an echo here of the phrase σιδήρειαί τε πύλαι καὶ χάλκεος οὐδός "gates of iron and a brazen doorstone" of the lowest depths of the underworld, Tartarus, described in Iliad, 8, 15. (The Iliad of Homer, trans. Richmond Lattimore (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951) p.182.)

70. The object of the polemic in these paragraphs is presumably the view (ascribed to Origen by Epiphanius and others) that the resurrected body does not have any continuity with the material body of earthly life, along with a corollary view of general disparagement of the body. (See Jon F. Dechow, Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988) pp.349-390 et passim.) It is interesting to see here the ascetic Jerome presenting a view of the body in positive terms.

71. "living according to the flesh they contend against the flesh" (carnaliter viventes, contra carnem disputent): an echo of Tertullian, De Resurrectione Mortuorum 11, 1: Nemo enim tam carnaliter vivit, quam qui negant carnis resurrectionem: negantes enim et poenam despiciunt et disciplinam. (For no one lives so much according to the flesh as those who deny the resurrection of the body: for in denying [it] they despise both its punishment and its discipline.) (CCL, 2, p.933, l.2-4; PL 2, 808)

72. "the body is shown grasped with two fingers": an image again echoing Tertullian, De Resurrectione Mortuorum (51, 9): also commenting on I Cor. 15:53, Tertullian writes: cum dicit istud corruptivum et istud mortale, cutem ipsam tenens dicit (when he says "this corruptible" and "this mortal", he says it while touching his very skin). (CCL, 2, p.995, l.47-48; PL 2, 870) Compare also Jerome, Letter 84, 5: Quod si obduraveris frontem, et

urguere coeperis, carnem digitis tenens, an ipsam dicant resurgere (But if you fix your countenance and, while touching your flesh with your fingers, you begin to press them whether they say this very [flesh] is to rise). (Labourt, v.4, pp. 130-131)

73. On "magnanimity" see n45 above.

74. The word ἐξομολογοῦμαι "I confess" (Mt. 11:25; Lk. 10:21) came to mean more generally "I praise" (BAG, p.277); however, both in the Vg. and in the present commentary Jerome retains the root meaning of the word and renders it confiteor (I confess).

75. In a similar discussion of prayer, Origen uses the example of Jonah in the whale as an encouragement to prayer and makes the same reference to Job 3:8 LXX. See Origen, On Prayer, 13, 4, in Origen: An Exhortation to Martyrdom, etc., trans. Rowan A Greer (New York: Paulist, 1979) p.108.

76. ἐμφατικώτερον: "with more emphasis", comparative adverb from ἐμφατικός, term used especially in rhetoric to mean "significance, emphasis" (Liddell and Scott, p.550). On this term, see Quintillian, Institutio Oratoria, 8, 3, 83ff. and 9, 2, 3 in The Institutio Oratoria of Quintillian, trans. H.E. Butler, (London: Heinemann, 1966), v.3, pp.256ff., 374-377. On Jerome's use of Greek rhetorical terms, see n54 above.

77. "not so much as the Apostles", i.e. the apostolic use of the Trinitarian formula.

78. Transliterations of שלש, שלשה "three" and ארבעים "forty" (BDB, pp.1025, 917; Weingreen, pp.242-243).

79. Compare Tertullian, De Ieiunio 3, 4: Quis iam dubitabit omnium erga victum macerationum hanc fuisse rationem, qua rursus interdicto cibo et observato praecepto primordiale iam delictum expiaretur ut, homo per eandem materiam causae satis deo faciat per quam offenderat, id est per cibi interdictionem. (Who will yet doubt that of all macerations of food this was the rationale, that by the forbidding of food once again and the keeping of the precept the wrong that had been done might be atoned, so that humanity might make satisfaction to God through the very same material by which it had offended, that is through the interdiction of food.) (CCL, 2, p.1260, 1.27-31; PL 2, 958).

80. On the theme of sackcloth in Jerome's writings, see Paul Antin, "Le cilice chez saint Jérôme" Recueil sur saint Jérôme, (Bruxelles: Latomus Revue d'Études Latines, 1968), pp.304-309.

81. The identical terms putredo and vermis were used in the translation of Job 25:6 Vg.

82. The object of the polemic in the following section of the commentary is the teaching of the final restoration of all things (ascribed to Origen by Epiphanius and others). See Dechow, Dogma and Mysticism, pp.421-423 et passim.

83. "public lusts": presumably a reference to prostitution. Jerome uses the same phrase victimae libidinum publicarum in Letter 14, 5 (Labourt, v.1, p.38) and Letter 123, 8 (Labourt, v.7, p.83); in Adversus Helvidium 20 (PL 23, 204) the phrase is libidinum victimae. That Jerome parallels prostitutes (in the previous sentence) with victims of public lusts is perhaps unique: one would expect censure of prostitutes rather than a depiction of them as victims.

84. From the root $\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\gamma\mu\alpha$ "fence, breastwork, screen; protection; 2. generally defence, means of defence" (Liddell and Scott, p.1952).

85. Citation ad sensum of Republic 5, 473 c-d (Plato: The Republic, trans. Paul Shorey (London: Heinemann, 1963), v.1, pp.506-509). The sentence echoes Lactantius, Institutiones Divinae, 3, 21, 6: At idem dixit beatas civitates futuras fuisse, si aut philosophi regnarent aut reges philosopharentur. (But the same one said that city states to come would be blessed, if either philosophers would reign or kings would be philosophers.) (CSEL 19, I, p.249, l.5ff) See Duval, "La conversion des lettrés", p.565 and n121.

86. "Cyprian": born c.200, bishop of Carthage 248-258. In De Viris Illustribus 67, Jerome writes of Cyprian: Huius ingenii superfluum est indicem texere, cum sole clariora sint eius opera. (It is superfluous to build a monument to his genius, since his works are brighter than the sun). (PL 23, 677) Jerome often mentions Cyprian with approval: see the extensive testimonia listed in Adolf von Harnack, Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius, (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1958), 2. Halbband, pp.704-706. On Jerome's appeal to Cyprian in the present commentary, see Duval, "La conversion des lettrés", pp.558-562, and Paul Antin, "Saint Cyprien et Jonas" Recueil sur saint Jérôme, (Bruxelles: Latomus Revue d'Études Latines, 1968), pp.225-228. As Antin points out in the latter article, Jerome is not claiming that Cyprian was

actually converted through reading the book of Jonah, although such a view has been advocated on the basis of the present commentary (eg. in Michael M. Sage, Cyprian (Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975), pp.117-118).

87. Compare Jerome, Letter 21, 13: Daemonum cibus est carmina poetarum, saecularis sapientia, rhetoricorum pompa verborum. Haec sua omnes suavitate delectant et, dum aures versibus dulci modulatione currentibus capiunt, animam quoque penetrant et pectoris interna devinciunt. (It is the food of demons: the songs of the poets, the wisdom of the age, the ostentation of the rhetorician's words. These delight everyone with their sweetness, and while they capture the ears with verses that run with sweet rhythm they also penetrate the soul and bind the heart within.) (Labourt, v.1, p.93, l.8-12)

88. For a similar distinction see below on 4:10-11, p.69.

89. Duval, p.283n, offers these Biblical references from the book of Joel for this citation, but the citation does not correspond to the Hebrew or LXX of Joel. It is unclear precisely what passage Jerome had in mind.

90. μεταφορικῶς, adverb of μεταφορικὸς "metaphorical" (Liddell and Scott, p.1118). On Jerome's use of Greek rhetorical terms, see n54 above.

91. See above on 1:7, pp.16-17.

92. See above n21.

93. On praeoccupavi in the sense of "I hastened" see Lewis and Short, p.1424 "praeoccupo" II.

94. On occupavi in the sense of "I hastened" see Lewis and Short, p.1253 "occupo" I, B, 3.

95. ὦ δῆ is found in Jonah 4:2 in a corrected copy of Codex Sinaiticus. (Ziegler, p.251) Jerome's identification of ὦ δῆ, "an exclamation expressing surprise, joy, or pain" and "a particle of emphasis" (Liddell and Scott, pp.2029, 383) with Hebrew וַיִּקְרַע which he renders as Latin obsecro is unclear.

96. Transliteration of ׀׀ך, usually ׀׀ך, a strong interjection expressing an entreaty: "ah, now! I (or we) beseech thee" (BDB, p.58).

97. "my word", i.e. verbum (following the Hebrew) rather than sermones (as in Jerome's translation from LXX) (contra Duval, p.289). Jerome's preference for the singular (in the sense of 'the Word') may be deliberate.

98. See n32 above.

99. See n29 above.

100. Transliteration of ׀׀ ׀׀׀׀׀ in Jonah 4:4 Heb. (see BDB pp.948-949; Weingreen, pp.80, 52) The epenthetic 'd' is surprising. On the significance of the word ׀׀ in the book of Jonah, see Hans Walter Wolff, Obadiah and Jonah: A Commentary, trans. Margaret Kohl (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), pp.83, 165.

101. Jerome may be quoting Tertullian, De Patientia 5,16: Cain ille primus homicida et primus fratricida. (CCL 1, p.304, l.53-54; PL 1, 958)

102. Jordan, which is translated as "descent", i.e. from the root ׀׀׀ "come or go down, descend" (BDB, p.432; see also n37 above). In the section on the book of Numbers in his Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum Nominum the definition of Jordan (Iarden) is descensio eorum vel vide iudicium (CCL 72, p.82, l.26-27); the definition offered in the section on the Gospel of Luke is descensio eorum aut adprehensio eorum vel videns iudicium (CCL 72, p.140, l.27-28). The tradition of interpretation of Jordan as "descent" is also evident in the Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis (Legum Allegoria) 2, 89 of Philo (Philo, trans. F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, (Harvard University Press, 1956) v.1, p.280-281) and in Origen's Commentary on the Gospel According to John 6, 217 (Origen, Commentary on the Gospel According to John: Books 1-10, trans. Ronald E. Heine (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1989) p.227.)

103. See n21 above.

104. The citation Ecce vir, Oriens nomen eius is identical to Zech. 6:12 Vg.; both depend on LXX. The Hebrew has ׀׀׀ "sprout, growth" (BDB, p.855), which is the source of the RSV translation: "Behold the man whose name is the Branch". In commenting on this verse

Jerome refers to Oriens, quod Hebraice dicitur sema, non per sin, sed per sade litteram scriptum and adds the equivalents from the LXX and other Greek versions; otherwise he emphasizes the non-literal interpretation of the verse. (Commentaria in Zachariam 2 (on 6:9-15) in PL 25, 1455-1458) The word Oriens may be rendered in English as "East" or "Rising sun" (Lewis and Short, p.1279): in support of the former, it is helpful to compare the English rendering by Gary Wayne Barkley of the citation of Zech. 6:12 LXX in Origen, Homilies on Leviticus 13, 2 (from Rufinus's Latin version of that work). See Origen, Homilies on Leviticus, trans. Gary Wayne Barkley (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1990), p.234.

105. The confusion regarding Jerome's meaning at this point is reflected in the manuscript variations.

106. Jerome mentions the same accusation in Letter 112, 22 (Labourt, v. 6, p.42, l.9-12). The furor caused by Jerome's innovation in translation here is described in Augustine, Letter 104, 5 (Labourt, v.5, pp.98-99) and Jerome, Letter 112 (ibid., pp.42-43). See also Bernard P. Robinson, "Jonah's qigayon Plant" Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 97 (1985) 391.

107. The meaning of this word is uncertain: see the conjectures in Duval, p.420n5.

108. Transliteration of ךׁׁׁׁׁׁ "a plant" (BDB, p.884). The word occurs several times in Jonah 4:6-10.

109. κισσός: "ivy" (Liddell and Scott, p.954). The word is usually associated with Dionysus, of course (eg. Homeric Hymn to Dionysus 40; Euripides, The Bacchae, 81). The epithet φιλοκισσοφόρος in Euripides, Cyclops, 620 (Euripides, v.2, trans. Arthur S. Way, (London: Heinemann, 1929), p.580) is perhaps echoed in this section of the commentary: see n112 below.

110. Possibly an echo of the form of ivy which is described as growing upon the ground in Theophrastus, Historia Plantarum 3, 18, 6. See Theophrastus: Enquiry into Plants, and other works, trans. Arthur Hort (London: Heinemann, 1948), pp.272-273.

111. "wooden stakes" (hastilibus): literally "spear shafts" (Lewis and Short, p.842).

112. φιλοκολόκυνθος: "pumpkin-lover", from φίλος "beloved, dear; loving, friendly" (Liddell and Scott, p.1939) and κολοκύνθη "round gourd, Cucurbita maxima" (Liddell and Scott, p.973). (Jerome may have coined the word himself.) Aristophanes, Nubes, 327 has a similar comic phrase: λημῶς κολοκύνταις (your eyes must be pumpkins). (Aristophanes, v.1, trans. Benjamin Brickley Rogers (London: Heinemann, 1950), pp.292-293) As well, there is an echo here of the epithet φιλοκισσοφόρος applied to Dionysus in Euripides, Cyclops, 620: see n109 above.

113. "making a shade and a tent for him rather than a home": possibly an allusion to II Cor. 5:1-4. (In the Vg. of the latter, domum non manufactam aeternam in caelis in v.1 is contrasted with living in tabernaculo in v.4.)

114. "washing": The word lavacrum was used in the OL of Tit. 3:5 (lavacrum regenerationis) according to Vetus Latina: die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel 25, v.2, 2, hrsg. Hermann Josef Frede (Freiburg: Herder, 1983) p.927. (The same word is also found in Tit. 3:5 Vg.)

115. The parallel would appear to be that the denial of Christ is represented by Jonah's loss of moisture under the burning sun. The latter image is also here related to the theme of baptism (hence the allusion to Tit. 3:5). Another baptismal association may be between Jonah's "wish to die" and the image in Rom. 6:3 of dying in baptism (with Christ!): it is far from clear what Jerome could have meant by "baptism with Israel". On the whole, the interpretation at this point in the commentary seems rather far-fetched.

116. The identity of this "someone" is unknown. According to R.P. Vaccari, Jerome's polemic here is directed against the semi-Arian bishop Hypatios of Nicea, who was expelled from office by the emperor Theodosius around 380 (Antin, p.21-22). Duval, p.429n2, argues rather that Jerome had Origen in mind.

117. The translation "man" for homo (rather than "person") here is based on the use of vir at the parallel in Ps.48:8 Vg. The exact meaning of Jerome's citation of this text at this point is unclear.

118. See n23 above.

119. Another possible reference to Eph. 4:13: see above on 3:5, p.49.

120. cf. above on 3:6-9, p.55.

Bibliography

- Antin, Paul. Recueil sur saint Jérôme. Bruxelles: Latomus Revue d'Études Latines, 1968. (Collection Latomus 95)
- Barôy, G. "Les Traditions Juives Dans L'Oeuvre d'Origène" Revue Biblique 34 (1925) 217-252.
- Barnes, T.D. Tertullian. Oxford: University Press, 1971.
- Barr, James. "St. Jerome's Appreception of Hebrew" Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 49 (1966) 280-302.
- Barrett, C.K. "The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New" in The Cambridge History of the Bible, v.1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), pp.377-411.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. Les Devanciers d'Aquila Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963. (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 10)
- "Origène et le texte de l'Ancien Testament" Études d'Histoire du Texte de l'Ancien Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1978.
- Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem, ed. Robert Weber. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1969.
- Braverman, Jay. Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: a Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978. (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 7)
- Brock, S.P. "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament" Studia Patristica 10 (1970) 215-218, reprinted in Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations, ed. Sidney Jellicoe (New York: KTAV, 1974), pp.343-346.
- Burkert, Walter. Greek Religion, trans. John Raffan. Cambridge: Harvard, 1985.
- Cavallera, Ferdinand. Saint Jérôme: Sa Vie et Son Oeuvre 2 vols. Paris: Champion, 1922.
- Courcelle, Pierre. Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources, trans. Harry E. Wedeck. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Crouzel, Henri. Bibliographie Critique d'Origène. Nijhoff, 1971. (Instrumenta Patristica 8)

- Crouzel, Henri. Origen, trans. A.S. Worrall. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1989.
- Curtius, Ernst Robert. European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, trans. Willard R. Trask. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953.
- Dechow, Jon F. Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988. (Patristic Monograph Series 13)
- De Lange, N.R.M. Origen and the Jews. Cambridge: University Press, 1976.
- . "Origen and the Rabbis on the Hebrew Bible" Studia Patristica 14, 3 (1971) 117-121.
- De Lubac, Henri. Exégèse Médiévale: Les Quatre Sens de l'Écriture, 2 vols. Aubier, 1959.
- . Histoire et Esprit: l'Intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène. Paris: Aubier, 1950.
- Deniau, Francis. "Le Commentaire de Jérôme sur Ephésiens Nous Permet-Il de Connaître Celui d'Origène?" Origeniana: Premier Colloque International des Études Origéniennes (Istituto di Letteratura Cristiana Antica, 1975) pp.163-179. (Quaderni di "Vetera Christianorum" 12)
- Di Bernardino, Angelo, ed. Patrology, vol.IV: the Golden Age of Latin Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicea to the Council of Chalcedon, trans. Placid Solari. Westminster, MD.: Christian Classics, 1986.
- Duval, Yves-Marie. Le Livre de Jonas dans la Littérature Chrétienne Grecque et Latine: Sources et Influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de Saint Jérôme. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1973.
- . "Saint Cyprien et le Roi de Ninive dans l'In Ionam de Jérôme: La Conversion des Lettrés à la Fin du IVième Siècle" in Epektasis: Mélanges Patristiques Offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972) pp.551-570.
- Elliott, C.J. "Hebrew Learning Among the Fathers", A Dictionary of Christian Biography, v.2 London: Murray, 1880.
- Emerton, J.A. "A Further Consideration of the Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla" Journal of Theological Studies N.S. 22 (1971) 15-27.

- Emerton, J.A. "The Purpose of the Second Column of the Hexapla," Journal of Theological Studies N.S. 7, (1956) 83-86, reprinted in Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations, ed. Sidney Jellicoe (New York: KTAV, 1974), pp.347-355.
- Fitzmeyer, Joseph A. "A Recent Roman Scriptural Controversy" Theological Studies 22 (1961) 426-444.
- Froehlich, Karlfried, trans. and ed. Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. "Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs" Journal of Biblical Literature 49 (1930) 384-416.
- Grant, Robert M., with David Tracy. A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible, second ed. revised and enlarged. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Grintz, Yehoshua M., "Jew (Heb. 'יהודי' Yehudi)", Encyclopaedia Judaica, v.10 (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 21-23.
- Hanson, R.P.C. Allegory and Event (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox, 1959).
- "Biblical Exegesis in the Early Church", in The Cambridge History of the Bible, v.1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), pp.412-453.
- Origen's Doctrine of Tradition. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Hartmann, Louis N. "St. Jerome as an Exegete" in A Monument to St. Jerome, ed. Francis X. Murphy (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1952), pp.37-81.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. The Septuagint and Modern Study. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Jérôme. Commentaire sur Jonas, Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Commentaire par Yves-Marie Duval. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985. (Sources Chrétiennes 323)
- Jerome. Liber de Optimo Genere Interpretandi (Epistula 57): Ein Kommentar, ed. G.M. Bartelink. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980. (Bibliotheca Classica Batava: Mnemosyne Supplement 61)
- Kelly, J.N.D. Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies New York: Harper and Row, 1975.
- Krauss, Samuel. "Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus Sophronius)" The Jewish Encyclopedia, v.7 (New York: KTAV) pp.115-118.

- Krauss, Samuel. "The Jews in the Works of the Church Fathers" The Jewish Quarterly Review 5 (1893) 122-157 and 6 (1894) 82-99, 225-261 reprinted in Judaism and Christianity: Selected Accounts, 1892-1962. New York: Arno Press, 1973.
- Leclercq, Jean. The Love of Learning and the Desire for God, trans. Catharine Misrahi. New York: Fordham University Press, 1961.
- The Letters of Saint Jerome: a Selection to Illustrate Roman Christian Life in the Fourth Century, ed. James Duff. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1942.
- Letters of St. Jerome, trans. F.A. Wright. London: Heinemann, 1954.
- McKane, William. Selected Christian Hebraists. Cambridge: University Press, 1989.
- Miller, Patricia Cox. "Poetic Words, Abysmal Words: Reflections on Origen's Hermeneutics" Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.
- Nautin, Pierre. Origène: Sa Vie et Son Oeuvre. Paris: Beauchesne, 1977. (Christianisme Antique 1)
- Neusner, Jacob. Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Origen. On First Principles, trans. G.W. Butterworth. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Origène. Homélie sur Jérémie trans. Pierre Husson and Pierre Nautin. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976. (Sources Chrétiennes 232)
- Origène. Homélie sur le Cantique des Cantiques, trans. Olivier Rousseau. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1966. (Sources Chrétiennes 37)
- Origène. Philocalie 1-20: Sur Les Écritures, trans. Marguerite Harl. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1983. (Sources Chrétiennes 302)
- Origenes, Eustathius von Antiochien und Gregor von Nyssa über Die Hexe von Endor, hrsg. Erich Klostermann. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber, 1912. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 83)

- Orlinsky, Harry M. "The Columnar Order of the Hexapla", Jewish Quarterly Review N.S. 27 (1936-1937), 137-149, reprinted in Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations, ed. Sidney Jellicoe (New York: KTAV, 1974), pp.369-381.
- The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, trans. Philip R. Amidon. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Robinson, Bernard P. "Jonah's qiqayon Plant" Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 97 (1985) 390-403.
- Ruether, Rosemary. Faith and Fratricide. New York: Seabury, 1979.
- Saint Jérôme. Commentaire Sur S. Matthieu, Texte Latin, Introduction, Traduction et Notes par Émile Bonnard. 2 vols. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1977. (Sources Chrétiennes 242)
- Saint Jérôme. Lettres, Texte Établi et Traduit par Jérôme Labourt. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres", 1949-1961.
- Saint Jérôme. Sur Jonas, Introduction, Texte Latin, Traduction et Notes de Paul Antin. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1956. (Sources Chrétiennes 43)
- Scalise, Charles J. "Origen and the Sensus Literalis", Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.
- Schatkin, Margaret A. "The Influence of Origen Upon St. Jerome's Commentary on Galatians", Vigiliae Christianae 24 (1970) 49-58.
- Schürer, Emil. The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, new English version by Geza Vermes et al., 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-1987.
- Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, v. XIII: Duodecim Prophetarum, ed. Joseph Ziegler. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1943.
- Simon, Marcel. Verus Israel: a Study of the Relations Between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425), trans. H. McKeating. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Sparks, H.F.D. "Jerome as Biblical Scholar" in The Cambridge History of the Bible, v.1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), pp.510-541.

- St. Jerome: Letters and Selected Works, trans. W.H. Fremantle, with G. Lewis and W.G. Martley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d. (A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church 6)
- Steinmann, Jean. Saint Jerome, trans. Ronald Matthews. London: Chapman, 1959.
- Swete, H.B. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek Cambridge: University Press, 1900.
- Theodoret, Jerome, Gennadius, Rufinus: Historical Writings, etc., trans. Blomfield Jackson, Ernest Cushing Richardson, and W.H. Fremantle. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, n.d. (A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church 3)
- Torjesen, Karen Jo. Hermeneutical Procedure and Theological Method in Origen's Exegesis Berlin: De Gruyter, 1986. (Patristische Texte und Studien 28)
- Wiles, M.F. "Origen as Biblical Scholar" in The Cambridge History of the Bible, v.1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), pp.454-489.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. Obadiah and Jonah: A Commentary, trans. Margaret Kohl. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. The Philosophy of the Church Fathers, v.1 Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Wright, John. "Origen in the Scholar's Den: A Rationale for the Hexapla", Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William L. Petersen Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.
- Würthwein, Ernst. The Text of the Old Testament, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.