

## IDUMA (*Ἰδοῦμα*)<sup>1</sup>

THE EARLIEST occurrence of this word is in the Hiberno-Latin creation poem *Altus Prosator*, ascribed to Columba of Iona (*ob.* 597): stanza 12 describes the suspension of the globe of the Earth in the circle of the great abyss in the words ‘suffultu dei, iduma omnipotentis valida’.<sup>2</sup> Later occurrences of the word in the so-called *Lorica Gildae* and the *Hisperica Famina*<sup>3</sup> are with the literal meaning ‘hand’.<sup>4</sup> But in *Altus Prosator* the word is clearly being used metaphorically, to mean the ‘hand of Almighty God’ – i.e. the exercise or presence of divine power. A plausible attempt at a derivation of the word from Hebrew *yādayim*, plural of *yad* ‘hand’, neither explains the transmission of the word to the Irish, who could not have had a first-hand knowledge of Hebrew, nor does it give any account of its peculiar usage in *Altus Prosator*.<sup>5</sup> Although it is used and declined as a first declension feminine common noun in the Irish sources, the implicit presumption that the word emerged as such in ordinary lexical usage – from Hebrew, or anywhere else – is not justified. Iduma as a proper noun occurs three times in Scripture, at Gen. 25:14, 1 Chr. 1:30 (a repetition of the Genesis genealogical verse) and Isa. 21:11, in the Vulgate as Duma (Septuagint *Ἰδοῦμα*, Hebrew *Dûmah*, never *Idumah*), and in the *Vetus Latina* and Vulgate variants as Iduma, the sixth child of Ishmael. In its various forms the word occurs as one of a group of names closely associated by virtue of various genealogical and historical connections, stemming from the ancient enmity between the descendants of Jacob and Esau. According to the mythical-symbolic account in Genesis, it was prophesied of the latter at birth that his brother would overcome him and rule over him (Gen. 25:23). In fulfilment of this, Esau carelessly surrendered his birthright for a mess of pottage (Gen. 25:27–34), and was

<sup>1</sup>The following study of one tiny facet of the Irish tradition of learning is respectfully offered to Prof. Brian Ó Cuív as a token of recognition of his fruitful labours in the field of Irish studies over many years. *Colligite fragmenta ne quid pereat*.

<sup>2</sup>J. H. Bernard, R. Atkinson, *The Irish Liber Hymnorum* I–II (Henry Bradshaw Society XIII–XIV, London 1898), text, vol. I, 66–83, esp. 76.70. Also G. M. Dreves, C. Blume, *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi* LI (Leipzig 1908) 275–83 (no. 216). Other editions and literature in M. Lapidge, R. Sharpe, *A bibliography of Celtic-Latin literature 400–1200* (Dublin 1985) no. 580.

<sup>3</sup>M. Herren, *Hisperica Famina: I. The A-text* (Toronto 1974) 66 line 32 n., 124–5 (five usages). Also *Lorica Gildae* (= *Lorica Laidcenn*) line 36 (‘binas idumas’), ed. F. J. H. Jenkinson, *The Hisperica Famina* (Cambridge 1908) 51–4; cf. M. Herren, *Hisperica Famina: II. Related poems* (Toronto 1987) 66–7, 80 line 38, attributed to Laidcenn mac Baith (*ob.* c.661). The latest occurrence is in a charter of Athelstan dated 930.

<sup>4</sup>MS T of *Altus Prosator*, Trinity College, Dublin, 1441 (E.4.2), f. 12 v, glosses: iduma] .i. manu; iduma Ebreice, circus Grece, manus Latine (Bernard and Atkinson I, 76 line 70a. See below for discussion. Also, the Vatican manuscript of *Hisperica Famina* (A-text), Reg. lat. 81, glosses (*s.l.*) the usage at line 32 (ed., p. 66) ‘i. manu’.

<sup>5</sup>A. E. Hutson, ‘The Semitic element in Hisperic’, *University of California Publications in Semitic Philology* 11 (1951) 211–16, esp. 214.

later duped out of his father's blessing by Jacob, upon whom he swore vengeance (Gen. 27). Subsequently, he married a daughter of Ishmael, the low-born son of his grandfather Abraham, cast out by him because of Sara's jealousy, and went to live in Seir in Edom, another name of Esau (Gen. 28:9, 25:30), thereby becoming the eponymous ancestor of its inhabitants, the Idumaeans (cf. Isa. 21:11, 'onus Duma clamat ad me ex Seir'). Although the precise connection between Iduma and Edom is nowhere stated, the implication is clear that Esau's marriage had given him rights of occupation upon land owned by Ishmael's family. Similarly, another son of Ishmael, Theman, had given his name to a part of Edom/Idumaea (cf. Ezek. 25:12-14). It seems likely that any account of Ishmael's descendants was deliberately excised by the compilers of Genesis.<sup>6</sup>

Against this background, the confusion in the biblical use of the names Esau, Edom, (I)duma, Idumaea, is not surprising. Iduma is the Vetus Latina (text-type I, 'Italischer text des 4/5 Jahr.') of Gen. 25:14<sup>7</sup> and is found as a variant in MS T in the citation of this verse in the *Liber genealogus*,<sup>8</sup> a fifth-century African Donatist compilation. The text-apparatus to Isa. 21:11 (Vulgate) renders the 'normal' form Duma, found in only one manuscript (Dumae R\*), variously as iduma  $\Delta^{L^*M^*}\Lambda^L$  (tenth-century Spanish codices); idumaea  $\Delta^{L^2M^2}R^2$ ; idumae  $Q\Gamma^A$ .<sup>9</sup> The Septuagint also consistently reads Idumaea, the Hebrew and Vulgate Edom. In consequence, a substantial common body of etymologies for these names – springing mainly from the biblical account of Esau – came into existence. Jerome's *Liber interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum*,<sup>10</sup> the first systematic collection of onomastica in Latin, renders them thus: Edom (5, 24) rufus sive terrenus (cf. Gen. 25:25-30, 27:39); (12, 29) rufus; Seir (10, 27) pilosus vel hispidus (=Esau; cf. Gen. 25:25); (20, 17) pilosus vel hircus; Esau (6, 3; 22, 12; 77, 30) factura sive rubens vel acervus lapidum sive vanus aut frustra; Duma (5, 8; 26, 28) tacens, silentium; gaudium; Idumaea (63, 22) rufa sive terrena.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup>A thorough study of the problems relating to the location of Seir and the genealogical links between its inhabitants and the Edomites can be found in J. R. Bartlett, 'The land of Seir and the brotherhood of Edom', *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969) 1-20.

<sup>7</sup>Vetus Latina 2, *Genesis*, hrsg. von B. Fischer (Freiburg 1951-4) *ad loc.* and pp. 18\*-19\*, 28\*. The form Idumas (Gr. Ἰδουμάς) with reference to Gen. 25:14 is found in the Latin text, from the school of Cassiodore, of Flavius Josephus' *Antiquitates Iudaicae*, ed. F. Blatt, *The Latin Josephus*: I. Introduction and text, The Antiquities: Books I-V (Acta Jutlandica 30/1, Humanistisk Serie 44, Aarhus / Copenhagen 1958) 152 line 8 (Book I 220 [= c. XII, 4]). Not used for Vetus Latina *Genesis*.

<sup>8</sup>T. Mommsen, *MGH Auctores antiquissimi* IX (Berlin 1892) 160-96, esp. 172.

<sup>9</sup>*Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem* . . . *Liber Isaiae* (1969), *ad loc.* The Greek text of Isa. 21:11 reads (gen.) τῆς Ἰδουμαίας.

<sup>10</sup>Corpus Christianorum series latina 72 (1959) 57-161, reprinted from the edition of P. de Lagarde, *Onomastica Sacra* (Göttingen 1870; 2nd ed. 1887) [hereafter Lag.]. Reference numbers in brackets are to the page and line of the latter.

<sup>11</sup>Thus, as Jerome says in *Hebraicae quaestiones in libro Geneseos*, Corpus Christianorum 72 (Lag.) 56, 6 (p. 44), 'Esau et Edom et Seir unius nomen est hominis'.

There is, of course, no etymology of Iduma in Jerome. But although Jerome was almost unique among the Fathers in having a command of both Hebrew and Greek, the common assumption that he was therefore the primary source or authority on sacred etymology is not correct. Etymological derivation and the exegesis of scripture built upon it – for etymologising is itself, as we shall see, a primitive form of exegesis, and an inseparable part of allegorical interpretation – are found throughout patristic literature. Leaving aside for the moment the central role credited to Origen in the compilation of the earliest Christian onomasticon,<sup>12</sup> the works of Ambrose, and to a lesser extent Hilary of Poitiers<sup>13</sup> and Augustine,<sup>14</sup> contain a substantial body of onomastica of Greek origin. Upon these and the Hieronymian corpus the later, secondary compilations of Eucherius of Lyons and Isidore of Seville are largely dependent. In addition a number of anonymous Latin compilations survive, chiefly the *Glossarium Ansileubi*<sup>15</sup> and the *Clavis Scripturae*<sup>16</sup> falsely attributed to Melito of Sardis. An examination, of these and other materials which constitute the Latin corpus fails to locate Iduma.<sup>17</sup> But that does not justify the neglect of the Greek corpus, from which the above are, directly or indirectly, derived.

The earliest known Greek specimens are the third- to early fourth-century Heidelberg papyrus fragment, probably from an amulet, found at an unknown location in Egypt on 1 March 1901,<sup>18</sup> and the verso of

<sup>12</sup>Those occurring in Origen's extant works and fragments (then known) are collected in E. R. Redepenning, *Origenes: Eine Darstellung seines Lebens und seiner Lehre* I (Bonn 1841) 460-01; and Wutz, 739-48 (see note 17).

<sup>13</sup>Collected by W. Wilbrand, 'Die Deutungen der biblischen Eigennamen beim hl. Ambrosius', *Biblische Zeitschrift* 10 (1912) 337-50. They are largely drawn from the allegorical works of Philo of Alexandria. Those in Hilary seem to be of Graeco-Christian origin and have a number of similarities with the Onomastica Vaticana (see below, note 21).

<sup>14</sup>Studied briefly in B. Altaner, 'Augustinus und die biblischen Onomastica', *Kleine patristische Schriften* (= Texte und Untersuchungen 83, Berlin 1967) 312-15, repr. from *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 4 (1953) 34-6.

<sup>15</sup>J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense* III (Paris 1855) 395-6 [hereafter Pitra], ascribed by him to Origen.

<sup>16</sup>idem, *Spicilegium Solesmense* III, 290-307. This is certainly a late Latin forgery, though it need not for that reason, as O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* I (Freiburg 1913) 555, 557, has alleged, be entirely dependent on Latin sources.

<sup>17</sup>All the extant materials from the Early Christian literatures collated and studied in F. Wutz, *Onomastica Sacra: Untersuchungen zum Liber Interpretationis nominum Hebraicorum des hl. Hieronymus* (Texte und Untersuchungen 41/1-2, 1914-15) [hereafter Wutz]. Subsequent bibliography is summarized in F. Vattioni, 'La lessicografia dei LXX nei papiri', *Studia Papyrologica* 19 (1980) 39-59, esp. 42-5. (I owe this reference to the kindness of Dr John Rea, one of the editors-in-chief of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri series.)

<sup>18</sup>A. Deissman, 'Papyrus Onomasticon sacrum (Tafel 57C)', *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung* I.5 (1905) 86-93 [hereafter Heidl.].

Oxyrhynchus papyrus 2745, also late third to early fourth century.<sup>19</sup> The extensive similarity in etymological content, particularly with regard to rare words, between these and the later Greek onomastica<sup>20</sup> made it possible to trace the latter back to a much earlier date, and to establish their common origin with the papyri in the early Christian period. Only one Greek text, Onomasticum Coislinianum [hereafter Coisl.], preserves an etymology of *Ιδουμα*: (Lag. 168, 45–6) *Ιδουμα γυνῶσις . Ιδουμαιος γήινος (= terrena), ἐπηρμένος, χειρὸς δμοιώσις, γνωστικός.*

Both *ἐπηρμένος* (perfect participle passive of *επαίρω* ‘to rise up, esp. haughtily, against somebody’ – cf. Abd. 3 and 2 Cor. 10:5, ‘extollo’) and *χειρὸς δμοιώσις* (‘the likeness of a hand’ – i.e. metaphorically speaking, ‘a hand’) are unique to this source. The preceding name, *Ιδιθουν* (Lag. 168, 44) is interpreted *χειρὸς ἀπάτη* (‘the deceiving of the hand’),<sup>21</sup> from which it may be assumed that the compiler of Coisl. had derived the first element in both names from Hebrew *yad* ( *yād* ), pl. (*yādāyim*) ‘hand’. However, Fr Martin McNamara, MSC, informs me that ‘the first element would be better derived from the Jewish Palestinian Aramaic form of *yad*, i.e. *ʾid* ( *ʾid* ), found also in certain forms of this word in *Christian Palestinian Aramaic*’. The second element (homoiosis) is also related to Hebrew *dāmāh* ‘to resemble’; but ‘the Palestinian Aramaic form could well have been known to those who drew up this etymology of *Ιδουμαιος*: Aram. (*ʾid*) + Aram. (*dēmē; dēmā*) “resembling”’.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup>R. A. Coles et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXXVI nos. 2745–2800* (Oxford 1968) 1–6, with comment by F. G. Turner (pp. 2–3) on D. Rokeah’s study ‘A new onomasticon fragment from Oxyrhynchus and Philo’s etymologies’, *Jn. Theol. Stud.* 19 (1968) 70–82 [hereafter P. Oxy.].

<sup>20</sup>Onomasticum Coislinianum [hereafter Coisl.] (de Lagarde 161, 1–172, 43) from M. H. Hohlenberg’s edition of the unique copy in Paris BN, Coisl. 1 (s. vii), *Fragmentum Libri Nominum Hebraicorum Antiquissimum* (Bonn 1836); Onomastica Vaticana [hereafter Onom. Vat.] (Lag. 172, 44–185, 83), from J. Martianay II, coll. 109–170. On the *Lexicon Origenianum* transmitted in the manuscripts of the Vaticana see note 23 below; Glossae Colbertinae (Lag. 200, 13–204, 50), from cod. Colbertinus 4124; Onomasticum Marchalianum, edited by E. Klostermann, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 23 (1903) 135–40, from the marginal notes in cod. Marchalianus (Vat. gr. 2125, s. vi), an Hexapla text of the prophets, designated Q in the critical Septuagint, and attributed by him to Origen (p. 136: ‘so gut wie sicher dem Origenes zuzuschreiben’).

<sup>21</sup>The New Testament usages of *apatē* in Matt. 13:22, Eph. 4:22, Col. 2:8, 2 Thess. 2:10 and Heb. 3:13 mean ‘deceit’, but that in 2 Pet. 2:13 is certainly meant ‘pleasure’ (*ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις* – ‘conviviis’, no vars.), which is the intended sense of Mark 4:19 (= Luke 8:14) and Jude 12 also. The dual sense of the Greek idiom could perhaps best be rendered ‘beguilement’, though Wutz adheres to the former meaning (Wutz, 488, ‘irreführen, verwirren’). Idithun was one of David’s chief harpists (cf. 1 Chr. 9:16; 16:38 and 41–2; 25:1, 3 and 6, and the *tituli* to Pss. 38, 61, 75), to which fact Jerome’s etymology (48, 22) ‘transsiliens sive saliens eos’ (sc. the harp strings) alludes. The other etymology in Coisl. *μάρτυς τέλειος* is unique, but related to that in Hesychius of Jerusalem, *De titulis Psalmorum* (ad Ps. 38 *tit.*, Patrologia Graeca 27, 800–801 and elsewhere) ‘unus iudex adveniēns’ – i.e. the Final (or complete) Revelation.

<sup>22</sup>I am very grateful to Fr McNamara for his learned assistance in this matter.

The survival of *epermenos* and *cheiros homioiosis* from a much earlier collection than Coisl. is demonstrated by the etymology of Ἡσαῦ (= *Ιδουμαίος*) as ἑπαρσις κυρίου (*sc.* 'elatio Domini') in the alphabetical onomasticon, *Lexicon Origenianum nominum Hebraicorum*<sup>23</sup> and of Seir (Σηειρ) in Syr III, 7,<sup>24</sup> in the Greek equivalent, as ἐπηρε σωμα (ἐν) χερσιν.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, Syr II, 19–20, renders *Ιδουμαία* as *δμοιουντες*,<sup>26</sup> and the Onomasticon armeniacum (a) 260<sup>27</sup> renders Duma as *homioiosis* – Iduma minus the I(d)! The root of the *epermenos* etymology must derive – though Wutz does not note it – from the Septuagint of Abd. 3, referring to Edom (i.e. Idumaea). The origins of the *cheiros homioiosis* etymology will be examined below. The third etymology in Coisl., *gnosis/gnostikos*, is also unique and without parallel in the etymologies of the cognate forms of (I)duma in the sources collated by Wutz or published subsequently. Wutz, who was rather puzzled by it, surmised it to be a by-form ('Verschiebung', 263) of *σιωπή* (= silentium/tacens). But there is ample evidence, biblical and extra-biblical, that the Idumaeans had a reputation among the Israelites for wisdom and technical skill – cf. Abd. 8 (Septuagint, in the translation of Jerome:<sup>28</sup> 'perdam [dicit Dominus] sapientes ex Idumaea et intellegentiam de monte Esau'); Job 2:11 (Eliphaz the Themanite) and Bar. 3:22–3. It may be connected with Hebrew *yad'/yada* 'to know'.<sup>29</sup>

Jerome's knowledge of the Hebrew and Septuagint texts certainly made him fully acquainted with these etymologies, for they are all alluded to in a remarkable piece of exegesis on Ezek. 25:12–14.<sup>30</sup>

Extendam manum meam super Idumaeam, et interficiam de ea hominem et pecus, et ponam eam desertam. . . . Et dabo ultionem meam super Idumaeam in manu populi mei Israel, et facient in Idumaeam iuxta iram meam et furorem meam, et cognoscent ultionem

<sup>23</sup>First published in J. Martianay, *Sancti Hieronymi opera* II (Paris 1699) coll. 181–246 (esp. 207–8), from Paris, BN, Fonds grec 464 and 2617, formerly codd. Regius 772/2282 and Glossae colbertinae 4124, re-edited in D. Vallarsi, *S. Hier. Opera* III (Verona 1735) coll. 605–666 (= PL 23, 1203–1252) from Onom. Vat. gr. 1456, the exemplar of the Paris manuscripts, re-edited in de Lagarde (1870 ed.) 185, 84–200, 12 from Onom. Vat. gr. 1450, (Vat. 1456 in 1877 ed.). This collection was accepted by Wutz as belonging to what he called the Philo-Origen group of onomastica. See Wutz, 74 and 111.

<sup>24</sup>Wutz, 163 and references.

<sup>25</sup>See also Onomasticon armeniacum (a) 361: Wutz, 894–5 and variants.

<sup>26</sup>Wutz, 152 and 797.

<sup>27</sup>Wutz, 488 and 883.

<sup>28</sup>Corpus christianorum 76, 362.

<sup>29</sup>Note from Fr McNamara.

<sup>30</sup>F. Glorie, *Comm. in Hiezechielem prophetam*, Corpus Christianorum 75 (1964) 341–3 (VIII.25). The text in Ezechiel is part of the 'prophecy against Edom' theme, found also in Ezek. 35:3–7; Isa. 34:5–6; Joel 3:19; Amos 1:11; Abd. 1–11. Jerome's exegesis of the latter in particular is very close to that of Ezek. 25:12–14 – cf. M. Adriaen, *In Abdiam*, Corpus Christianorum 76 (1969) 354–5.

meam, dicit Adonai Dominus<sup>31</sup> (Ezek. 25:13–14, Septuagint). Supra duo proposuerat: Pro eo quod dixerunt Moab et Seir (Ezek. 25:8), et postea de Seir tacens contra Moab tantum locutus est; nunc reddit coeptum πρόβλημα quid Seir, hoc est Idumaea, fecerit – quod autem Esau et Seir et Edom et Idumaea et Duma una gens appellantur, non ambiget qui scientiam habuerit scripturarum [cf. Isa. 21:11–17; Jer. 49:7–22; Amos 1:11–12; Abd. 1–21] . . . Nequaquam ergo Idumaea ut Moab locutus est, sed fecit ultionem de filiis Juda, peccavitque, sive memoriam pristini doloris tenuit, ut ultionem de eis caperet a quibus in utero supplantatus est. Idcirco non per angelos neque per alium quemlibet, sed ipse Dominus, manum extendens super Idumaeam, abstulit de ea hominem et iumentum, et civitates illius redegit in desertum, id est ‘Theman’ . . . de qua et de alia urbe Dedan interfecti gladio cadent; ‘cumque illi se de Juda ultimi fuerint, ego dabo ultionem super Idumaeos per manum sive in manu populi mei Israel, ut ab his opprimantur in quos exercuere vindictam, qui facient in Edom, sive Idumaeam, iuxta iram et furorem meum, ut . . . per manus populi mei Israel, in inimicam gentem mea ira desaeviat, et intellegant, contra iniquam ultionem Idumaeae meam iustam fuisse vindictam’ dicit Adonai Dominus. Secundum tropologiam, hic mihi sensus videtur. Idumaea ‘terrena’ appellatur et ‘carnea’ quae consurgit contra spiritum ut non faciamus ea quae spiritus sunt, et animam in meditullio positam ad se trahere festinat, vultque ultiones reddere quibus prius subdita fuerat filiis Juda, et recordatur doloris antiqui quod non propriae fuerit potestatis, et ideo vindictam expetit de eis qui, recedentes a carne, spiritum sequebantur; propterea iste Dominus, filiorum Juda ultor existens, extendit manum super Idumaeam et aufert de ea hominem et iumentum, quidquid vel rationis videtur habere vel simplicis fidei; ut eam redigat in solitudinem, et de ‘Theman’, quae interpretatur ‘deficiens’, et ‘Dedan’, quae et ipsa ‘cognitionem’ sonat, omnes gladio interfecit quem posuit in manu populi sui Israel, ut subvertatur Edom, et iram Domini sentiat ac furorem, et intellegat vindictam eius ad hoc profecisse. . . .

Jerome’s exposition here is almost wholly philological (based upon the historical position of the Israelites vis-à-vis the Idumaeans), with a little moral interpretation thrown in. Thus, ‘Seir tacens’ = Duma (σωπή); ‘et cognoscant / ut intellegant’ (sc. Idumaeae γνωστικός); ‘ut redegat in solitudinem’ (sc. Idumaea ἐκλειπουσα, recessus / solitudo).<sup>32</sup> ‘Theman deficiens’ is not found in the *Liber interpretationis* (11, 22 auster vel africanus), but it does occur<sup>33</sup> in the *Lexicon Origenianum*:

<sup>31</sup> A Greek form or translation of the divine tetragrammaton (YHWH). The phrase ‘Adonai Dominus’ (Vg. Dominus Deus) is equivalent to ‘Almighty God’.

<sup>32</sup> Wutz, 103 and 119.

<sup>33</sup> Wutz, 265.

(Lag. 192, 72) *θαμιμᾶν ἑκλειψις αὐτῶ* – a unique occurrence. ‘Dedan cognatio’ is merely an alternative form of the Greek source (no longer extant) rendered in *Liber interpretationis* (5, 5) as ‘fratruelis eorum’. The most important etymology, however, from the point of view of the usage of Iduma in *Altus Prosator*, is that which associates Idumaea with the ‘hand of (Almighty) God’,<sup>34</sup> in the execution of divine vengeance upon them by the Israelites. Although the Coisl. etymology has some philological basis (see above), it must also have a source in the text of the Septuagint of Ezek. 25:13–14 (Extendam manum meam super Idumaeam . . . dicit Adonai Dominus), as Jerome’s repeated allusion to it – or the ancestral form of it transmitted to Coisl. – in his exegesis of that passage clearly shows. The phrase ‘extendam manum meam super Idumaeam’ has an interesting parallelism with Ps. 59:10 and 107:10, ‘in Idumaeam extendam calceamentum meum’, used as part of the etymological exegesis of Idumaea in *Clavis Melitonis* 13, 7:<sup>35</sup> ‘Idumaea, sanguinea (= κοκκίνος), terrena, gentilitas conversa. “Et erit Idumaea possessio ejus” (Num. 24:18) . . . [Pss. 59:10!]’. ‘Sanguinea’ occurs in a number of Greek sources, but first appears in Latin tradition in Jerome’s *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, on Pss. 107:10,<sup>36</sup> and in his *Dialogus contra Pelagianos* 2, 25<sup>37</sup> (but not in *Liber interpretationis*), whence it was used by Cassiodore, *In Psalmos* 107, 10.<sup>38</sup> ‘Gentilitas conversa’ is similar to Jerome ‘quidquid . . . in solitudinem’, but directly related to Origen, *In Numeros homiliae* 18, 4,<sup>39</sup> on the text of Num. 24:18, which follows directly upon it in the *Clavis*.

Whether the latter is ultimately dependent upon Greek or Latin sources cannot readily be determined in this case. But what is certain is that Jerome had access to a far greater range of *onomastica sacra* than he chose to excerpt for his *Liber interpretationis* – a fact hinted at in his preface to that work – and that many of them are either used or alluded to as above, in his other works. However, before venturing on an explanation of the origins of the usage of *iduma* in *Altus Prosator*, some comment upon the source of the etymology underpinning that usage, in Coisl., is necessary. The contents of the unique manuscript at the heart of this problem show incontrovertible evidence of antiquity.<sup>40</sup> An important Greek uncial codex of the seventh century, it contains

<sup>34</sup>The hand of God usually signifies either the manifestation of divine power (e.g. Euseb. Caes. *Praep. Evang.* 4, 23, 6; 8, 10, 1, 7–9) or, more specifically, the wrath of God (e.g. Ambrose, *Explanatio Psalmorum XII*, ed. M. Petschenig, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 64 (1919): Pss. 37:20 (p. 151): ‘Manum autem Dei virtutem intellegimus puniendi’). It is curious that several of the scriptural passages relating to Esau refer to his hands – e.g. Gen. 27:22; 32:11 (Vg.).

<sup>35</sup>Pitra III, 292.

<sup>36</sup>Corpus Christianorum 72, 231.

<sup>37</sup>Patrologia Latina 23, 563–4.

<sup>38</sup>Corpus Christianorum 98, 990.

<sup>39</sup>*Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 30, 175.

<sup>40</sup>The codex is succinctly described in R. Devreesse, *Bibl. Nat., Département des manuscrits. Catalogue des manuscrits grecs: II. Le fonds Coislin* (Paris 1945) 1–2.

(ff. 5–227) a fragmentary text of Gen. 1:1 to 3 Kgs. 8:4.<sup>41</sup> The margins between the columns contain a great number of Hexaplaric *notae* and citations,<sup>42</sup> as well as brief explanations of words and a series of scholia described by Devreesse (p. 2) as ‘plus développées vraisemblablement d’origine alexandrine; quelques-unes se retrouvent mises ailleurs sous le nom d’Origène’. The attribution of collections of biblical scholia to Origen, as distinct from works preserved as *fragmenta e catenis*, is perfectly valid. Jerome, in the preface to his translation of Origen’s homilies on Ezechiel, points out that the latter’s vast output took three forms: ‘Primum eius opus Excerpta sunt, quae σχόλια nuncupantur, in quibus ea, quae sibi videbantur obscura, aut habere aliquid difficultatis, summam breviterque perstrinxit’;<sup>43</sup> then *homiliae*, and finally *τόμους* or *volumenta*, full-blown commentaries. The onomasticon on ff. 1–4 is largely drawn from 1–2 Chr. and contains a considerable number of rare words and etymologies paralleled mainly in the earliest papyrus fragments, the Heidelberg papyrus fragment and Oxyrhynchus papyrus 2745, and in Jerome. The following examples will illustrate that close affinity.

- (1) Coisl. (Lag. 170, 7) \*Ιωνοδαβ ιαω εκουσιώτης = P.Oxy. AB 12 = HES *Ps. tit.* (Patrologia Graeca 27, 931C)
- (2) Coisl. (Lag. 167, 34) \*Ιαμειν δεξιός = P.Oxy. AB 6 = HI nom (8, 25) : Iamin dextera cf. *Clav. Mel.* 6, 12 (Pitra 303, 30)
- (3) Coisl. (Lag. 170, 3) \*Ιωηλ άπαρχόμενος = P.Oxy. AB 10 = HI nom (36, 1; 52, 5; 69, 18) = *Clav. Mel.* 10, 2 (Pitra 306, 5)
- (4) Coisl. (Lag. 170, 99) \*Ιωχαζ άοράτου κράτος = P.Oxy. AB 13 = Heidl. 18 = *Ansil.* Ioachaz robustus (Pitra 396, 17) = *Clav. Mel.* 8, 22 (Pitra 305, 25)
- (5) Coisl. (Lag. 168, 50) \*Ιεθερ περιττής = P.Oxy. AB 15; cf. HI nom (13, 23) Iethro superfluous huius
- (6) Coisl. (Lag. 170, 94) Ιωδεμ άοράτου γυνῶσις = P.Oxy. AB 17 = HI nom (45, 28) Ioiade (exactly the orthographic form in P.Oxy.) domini cognitio
- (7) Coisl. (Lag. 162, 19) \*Αμνων (v.l. Αμμων) πίστις = P.Oxy. AB 18 ([Ιω]αμμων) = Heidl. 5
- (8) Coisl. (Lag. 168, 47) Ιεζειχαρ άοράτου μνήμη = P.Oxy. AB 19 (Ιωζαχα[ρ]) = HI nom (45, 28)

<sup>41</sup> Denoted by the siglum M in the Tübingen Critical Septuagint, after Swete.

<sup>42</sup> A selection of these edited by J. J. Griesbach, in J. G. Eichhorn (ed.), *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur* I (Leipzig 1777) 83–141 (text pp. 88–141) and II (1778) 194–240. The citations in Coisl. 1 were collated (*sub siglo X*) in F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt . . . fragmenta* I (Oxford 1867): cf. p. 5.

<sup>43</sup> W. A. Baehrens, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller* 33 (= Origenes, Achter Band, Leipzig 1925) 318. Three collections of scholia by Origen are extant, on Genesis (*Clavis Patrum Graecorum* 1412), the Psalter (CPG 1427) and Apocalypse (CPG 1468); but those in Coisl. 1 have not been published to the best of my knowledge.

- (9) Coisl. (Lag. 162, 31) \**Ελεαζαρ θεοῦ βοήθεια* = P.Oxy. AB 20 I [ελιε] (Γ)ζερ = Onom. Vat. (Lag. 182, 3: an exact correspondence with Coisl.) = HI nom (6, 3) = *Clav. Mel.* 7, 8 (Eliezer); 7, 9 (Eleazer) (Pitra 304, 15.16)
- (10) Coisl. (Lag. 171, 13) *Ιωσαβεε ἀοράτου πλησμονή* = P.Oxy. AB 21 = Onom. Vat. (Lag. 176, 43) = HI nom (45, 27) Iosabe ubi est saturitas vel domini saturitas
- (11) Coisl. (Lag. 162, 23) \**Αναηλ χάρις θεοῦ* = Heidl. 9
- (12) Coisl. (Lag. 169, 75) *Ιεφθαε Ιαω διάνοιξις* = Heidl. 12 = HI nom (28, 9) Iepte aperiens vel apertus = *Clav. Mel.* 7, 23 (Pitra 305, 11)
- (13) Coisl. (Lag. 167, 31) \**Ιακιν ἀοράτου ἀνάστασις* = Heidl. 19  
Deissman suggests that this form, which is not extant, may be a corruption of *Ιωακειμ*
- (14) Coisl. (Lag. 170, 93) *Ιωαβ ἀοράτος πατήρ* = Heidl. 6 (*Ιωβαβ*)

In those examples which are marked with an asterisk, Coisl. contains other etymologies of the relevant names, some of which are found in the other Greek onomastica, others unique. From the evidence of the earliest fragment, Oxyrhynchus papyrus 2745, Rokeah has argued that the earliest corpus was compiled in 'the late third or early second century B.C.' and drew its material from the Septuagint, compared against the Hebrew.<sup>44</sup> This eliminates Philo as a possible source in both respects, since he apparently knew no Hebrew. But Turner pointed out that the use at col. B5 of the *nomen sacrum* Θῠ indicated that Oxyrhynchus papyrus 2745 had been copied by a Christian scribe.<sup>45</sup> The Heidelberg papyrus fragment likewise uses the forms Θῠ (2; 3; 9), Θῠ̄ (24\*; 25\*, conjectured restorations by the editor), Θῠ̄ (7 bis). The ultimate derivation of the Greek onomastica from a Jewish background is, however, shown in the use of the vocalized representations *Ιω/Ιαω* and *ἀοράτος* of the divine tetragrammaton, which Philo habitually renders *κυριου* and Jerome as *Dei/domini*.<sup>46</sup> The evidence therefore of their derivation from an onomasticon of Judaeo-Christian origin is not inconsonant with Jerome's statement in the preface to his own collection<sup>47</sup> that Origen

<sup>44</sup> *Jn. Theol. Stud.* 19 (1968) 81.

<sup>45</sup> *Oxyrhyn. Pap.* XXXVI, 2-3. The Hellenistic Jewish origin of the *nota* Θῠ proposed by L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung* (Munich 1907) 31-2, was rejected by A. H. R. E. Paap, *Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of first five centuries A.D.: The sources and some deductions* (Leiden 1959) 124. It is generally accepted now that the *nomina sacra* are of Christian origin.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. 'Iao', Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* IX/1 (1914) 698-721, esp. 702-4. More particularly in L. Blau, *Revue des études juives* 32 (1896) 152-60, a review of O. Bardenhewer, *Der Name Maria: Geschichte der Deutung desselben* (Freiburg 1895). Vattioni (note 17 above) considers the use of *Ιαω* a symptom of Aramaic influence (p. 46).

<sup>47</sup> *Corpus Christianorum* 72, 59-60.

'laboravit, ut quod Philo quasi Iudaeus omiserat,<sup>48</sup> hic ut Christianus impleret'. Based upon this and upon the unequivocal testimony of the author of the *Quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos*, a late fourth- to early fifth-century Greek text, variously ascribed to Diodore of Tarsus and Theodoretus of Cyrus, which refers in *quaestiones* 82 and 86 to the then extant 'Interpretatio nominum Hebraicorum' of Origen,<sup>49</sup> the consensus of scholarship has been that the latter most probably did compile an onomasticon of the New Testament, as well as perhaps revising or completing that drawn up by Philo from the Old Testament.<sup>50</sup> The disputed question of his knowledge of Hebrew<sup>51</sup> can be got around by supposing, as Wutz (p. 50) did, that a student of Origen's – perhaps a Hellenized or convert Jew who did know Hebrew – drew up such a corpus after his master's death. Origen's acquaintance with Rabbinic tradition and his long association with Palestine – neither of which is disputed – would certainly have provided him with ample opportunity to amass materials for such a compilation.

It is hardly possible in the present state of our knowledge to examine the evidence relating to the etymology of *Ιδουμα*/*Ιδουμαιος* in Coisl. to any greater extent. But a number of firm conclusions can be drawn:

(1) As it occurs in *Altus Prosator*, the word *iduma* must derive in part from an onomasticon related to Coisl. The metaphorical use of the word in *Altus Prosator* tallies perfectly with the Coisl. etymology of the equivalent generic form *Ιδουμαιος*, and contrasts sharply with the non-sacral, literal use of the word in the *Hisperica Famina* and other Latin texts. This would suggest that *Altus Prosator* is closer to its onomastic source, and therefore earlier in date.

(2) The Coisl. etymology alone could not have been the basis for the contextual use of *iduma* since it established no link between *iduma* and the manifestation of divine power implicit in *Altus Prosator*. Jerome's exegesis of Ezek. 25:12–14 provides that link and in stating the equivalence of the singular personal form (I)duma with the generic Idumaeus / Idumaea ('Idum. et Duma una gens appellentur') justified the

<sup>48</sup>Jerome's testimony with respect to Philo is supported by Eusebius Caes., *Historia ecclesiastica* 2.18.7 (GCS 9/1, pp. 156/157), who asserts that Philo compiled 'interpretationes nominum hebraicorum, quae sunt in lege et prophetis'.

<sup>49</sup>PG 6, 1249–1400 (from a manuscript attributing the text to Justin Martyr). The etymologies referred to in qq. 82 and 86 have a remarkable affinity with the *Lexicon Origenianum* (note 23 above). This similarity was noted by Martianay and Vallarsi, who upon the basis, and other grounds, concluded that the *Lexicon* was Origen's.

<sup>50</sup>Deissmann, 88: 'darf unser Blatt mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit als ein Stück indirekter Origenes- und Philo-Überlieferung bezeichnet werden'. Turner p. 3: 'It therefore becomes necessary to ask . . . whether this text is a copy of part of an onomasticon compiled by Origen. Its palaeographical date is entirely suitable'. The views of Klostermann and Devreesse, with respect to their own fields of evidence, are in full agreement with this. Indeed, Deissmann, observing the striking similarity between Coisl. and Heidl. asks (p. 93) 'Sollte in Coisl die Origenes-Überlieferung am reinsten bewahrt sein?'

<sup>51</sup>The most recent review of the evidence is in G. Sgherri, 'A proposito di Origene e la lingua ebraica', *Augustinianum* 14 (1974) 223–57.

attachment of the etymology of the latter to the former in the Irish source. Two sources are therefore implicated: the equivalence 'iduma = cheiros homoiosis' could not have been extrapolated from the exegesis of Ezek. 25:12–14, but any scholar who was familiar with either source would have immediately perceived the connection with the other.

(3) The most suitable vehicle for such an exposition must have been a scholium on the text from Jerome or an extended etymological exegesis of Iduma, such as those found in the *Clavis Melitonis* or the *Glossarium Ansileubi*,<sup>52</sup> since we may hardly suppose that the author of *Altus Prosator* did all the work for himself, merely to decorate his work with obscure vocabulary. The partial dependence of that scholium (or whatever it was) upon a Greek source is also shown in the gloss attaching to *iduma* in Trinity College, Dublin, MS 1441:<sup>53</sup> 'iduma ebraice, ciros (Γ) grece, manus latine'.<sup>54</sup> The mis-identification of *iduma* and *ciros* (from the genitive of *χειρ*) with nominative 'manus' certainly implies that the gloss is derived from a corrupt or misunderstood text of a scholium drawing upon the Coisl. etymology. Likewise, the influence of Jerome is indirectly shown in the Irish usage of the 'Hebrew' original (*iduma*), in place of its etymological derivation, which is the reverse of Jerome's clever insertion of the etymologies of Hebrew words in disguise into the exposition of scriptural passages containing them.

(4) It would be vain to speculate on how the Coisl. etymology was transmitted to the Irish. But transmitted it was – whether alone, as seems improbable, or as part of a parent collection. Only much more research into the sources of the *onomastica sacra* found in Hiberno-Latin texts will establish the extent of their dependence upon non-Latin sources. But the common assumption that the mainstay of their knowledge of the meaning of biblical names was Jerome must be revised in the light of the above.

AIDAN BREEN

*Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies*

<sup>52</sup>Wutz' comment (p. 6) on this text is instructive: 'Die Etymm. dieser Liste sind beachtenswert, da sie zwei Gruppen angehören, die sonst nirgends vereinigt sind'.

<sup>53</sup>See note 4 above.

<sup>54</sup>The manuscript is now partly illegible at this point, but 'ciros' seems to be the reading (so also J. H. Todd, *Leabhar Imuinn: The Book of Hymns from the ancient Irish Church* (Irish Archaeological and Celtic Society, Dublin 1855) 216 n., who first suggested the derivation from the genitive *χειρος*).