state of Septuagint studies, prayer in the Old Testament and Early Judaism, and the method used, CIMOSA treats what he calls the primary vocabulary (προσεύχομαι and δέομαι, the secondary vocabulary προσκυνέω, and various words denoting praise and supplication as well as words which receive a religious meaning only in specific contexts, such as λαλέω and έσταμα έναντίων/ένώπιον. In the concluding chapter he summarizes his results and offers some remarks on the translation techniques in the Septuagint. In an appendix an alphabetical list of Greek words with their Hebrew equivalents, each with its translation in Italian, is presented.

This book is a preliminary study; CIMOSA announces a separate publication on the praise and supplication words (p. 69) and a more thorough investigation on the primary vocabulary of prayer in the whole Septuagint (p. 81). It may be asked, however, why the present booklet, which makes no serious mistakes, but is very schematic and so succinct as to offer hardly anything new, should have been published at all. In any case it is to be hoped that the larger studies will treat profane Greek usage, classical as well as post-classical, which is the context in which the Septuagint vocabulary must be analysed, in greater detail than the present one does.

A. HILHORST


Three Latin Psalters are connected with the name of Jerome: the *Psalterium Romanum* (RO), the *Psalterium Gallicanum* (GA) and the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* (HE). While the ascription of the first-named Psalter to Jerome has been challenged in recent times, the latter two can safely be considered his work. GA is his revision of an older Latin translation which was based on the Septuagint. HE on the other hand reflects, in Jerome’s words, the *Hebraica veritas*. The question is, however, what did Jerome mean by this expression. The traditional view is of course that it is the Hebrew text, and that HE is Jerome’s translation of it. But as it became increasingly clear that Jerome had at best a passive command of Hebrew and made a heavy use of the existing Greek translations, the Septuagint as well as the later Jewish ones, especially Aquila and Symmachus, doubts were cast upon this. In 1956 J. H. MARKS, in his *Der textkritische Wert des Psalterium Hieronymi iuxta Hebraeos*, concluded that HE was in principle a translation from Hebrew, but that it followed the Greek translations to such an extent as to make it an almost useless witness to the Hebrew text. Two years later G. MERCATI’s renowned edition of the Milan *Hexapla*
fragments of a number of Psalms appeared, which for the first time enabled students to investigate the Hexapla not in the crumbled pieces collected by Field, but in a number of continuous texts of some length. In the light of this precious evidence, Colette Estin has undertaken to study the question afresh (the title of her book should not lead one to expect a treatise on the interesting but neglected subject of earlier Latin Psalter translations made by Jews).

Her book, originally a thesis under the direction of the patristic scholar J. Fontaine, is organised as follows: chapter I discusses the Hebrew, Greek and Latin texts involved, including Jerome's exegetical works, II presents a quantitative approach to the question, a statistical analysis of the extent to which Jerome followed each of the Greek translations in GA and HE respectively, III offers a synoptic edition of the texts of GA and HE corresponding with the Mercati fragments, indicating typographically which Greek translation has been followed in each particular case and adding comparative material and comment in four apparatuses, IV deals with Jerome's criteria in following the different Greek Psalters, and V with stylistic matters. Finally there is an appendix listing every Psalm verse quoted in Jerome's correspondence, an appendix listing and discussing the textual discrepancies between GA and HE betraying variants in the Hebrew text, a Conclusion, an annotated bibliography, a subject index and indexes of proper names and Latin, Greek and Hebrew words.

An enormous amount of energy has been invested in this book, especially the third chapter with its synoptic edition indicating the translations followed. Here nine cases had to be discerned: independence from any translation; combined influence of the Hexaplaric Septuagint and Aquila, Symmachus and the Quinta; agreement with the Old Latin Psalters; exclusive influence of the Hexaplaric Septuagint; of the common Septuagint; of Aquila; of Symmachus; of Aquila and Symmachus together; synthesis of the renderings of Aquila and Symmachus respectively. To this end the book uses capitals, romans, capital italics, italics, spaced italics, bold face, underlined bold face, bold face capitals, and spaced bold face capitals. Combinations of these devices were needed if e.g. Aquila was followed for the choice of the lexeme and Symmachus for the grammatical form. Further use is made of superscript letters and asterisks.

Meanwhile, the question is whether all this effort has been worth while. In the list of possible relations mentioned just now the case in which a rendering corresponded with one or more of the Greek or earlier Latin translations and with the Hebrew text was missing. Indeed every word agreeing with an earlier translation is in fact treated as being translated from that translation. Renderings from the Hebrew is only one out of three possibilities of the category 'independence from any translation' (the other two being cases in which it is difficult to establish on which of the