



Some Alleged Echoes of Apuleius in Jerome

Author(s): Neil Adkin

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 106, No. 1 (January 2011), pp. 66-75

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](http://www.uchicago.edu)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/659115>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 06:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bartsch, W. 1934. *Der Charitonroman und die Historiographie*. Diss. Leipzig.
- Connors, C. 2002. Chariton's Syracuse and Its Histories of Empire. In *Space in the Ancient Novel*, ed. M. Paschalis and S. Frangoulidis, 12–26, Ancient Narrative, suppl. 1. Groningen.
- Cueva, E. 1998. Longus and Thucydides: A New Interpretation. *GRBS* 39: 429–40.
- Garnaud, J.-P. 2002. *Achille Tatius, le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*³. Paris.
- Hunter, R. 1994. History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton. *ANRW* 2.34.2: 1055–86.
- Kuch, H. 1996. A Study on the Margin of the Ancient Novel: “Barbarians” and Others. In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling, 209–20. Leiden.
- Luginbill, R. D. 2000. Chariton's Use of Thucydides' *History* in Introducing the Egyptian Revolt. *Mnemosyne* 53: 1–11.
- . 2002. A Delightful Possession: Longus' Prologue and Thucydides. *CJ* 97: 233–47.
- Morgan, J., and S. Harrison. 2008. Intertextuality. In *The Cambridge Companion to the Greek and Roman Novel*, ed. T. Whitmarsh, 218–36. Cambridge.
- O'Sullivan, J. N. 1995. *Xenophon of Ephesus: His Compositional Technique and the Birth of the Novel*. Berlin.
- . ed. 2005. *Xenophon Ephesius, “De Anthia et Habrocome Ephesiacorum” libri V*. Munich.
- Papanikolaou, A. D. 1973. *Chariton-Studien*. Göttingen.
- Reardon, B. P. 1996. Chariton. In *The Novel in the Ancient World*, ed. G. Schmeling, 309–35. Leiden.
- . ed. 2004. *Chariton Aphrodisiensis: “De Callirhoe narrationes amatoriae.”* Munich and Leipzig.
- Sexauer, H. 1899. *Der Sprachgebrauch des Romanschriftstellers Achilles Tatius*. Diss. Heidelberg.
- Smith, S. D. 2007. *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton*. Ancient Narrative, suppl. 9. Groningen.
- Trzaskoma, S. M. 2005. A Novelist Writing “History”: Longus' Thucydides Again. *GRBS* 45: 75–90.
- Vieillefond, J.-R., ed. 1987. *Longus: “Pastorales.”* Paris.
- Vilborg, E., ed. 1955. *Achilles Tatius: “Leucippe and Clitophon.”* Stockholm.
- . 1962. *Achilles Tatius: “Leucippe and Clitophon”; A Commentary*. Gothenburg.
- Zimmermann, F. 1961. Chariton und die Geschichte. In *Sozialökonomische Verhältnisse im alten Orient und im klassischen Altertum*, ed. R. Günther and G. Schrot, 329–45. Berlin.

SOME ALLEGED ECHOES OF APULEIUS IN JEROME

Harald Hagendahl's survey of Jerome's borrowings from the classics failed to register any debt to Apuleius.¹ More recently, however, Susan Weingarten has endeavored to show that Jerome's *Vita Hilarionis* exhibits several reminiscences of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.² Weingarten opens her case for Apuleian influence with the following state-

Works are cited according to *OCD*³ and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum*² (Leipzig, 1990) with its online *Addenda* at <http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/pdf/addenda.pdf>, unless otherwise indicated.

1. H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis 64.2 (Göteborg, 1958). Apuleius is likewise absent from his supplementary study, “Jerome and the Latin Classics,” *VigChr* 28 (1974): 216–27, and from the earlier investigation by E. Lübeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Leipzig, 1872).

2. S. Weingarten, “Jerome and the *Golden Ass*,” in *Studia Patristica*, vol. 33, ed. E. A. Livingstone (Leuven, 1997), 383–89. She notes (p. 389) that scholarship has already recognized a general resemblance to the

ment: "Jerome himself records that he read 'Milesian fables' in his youth at Rome."³ Here, however, there would appear to be grounds for supposing that the "Milesian fables" at issue are not in fact Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.⁴ In the same opening paragraph Weingarten also provides a review of previous scholarship, where she registers only one specific debt: "De Vogüé . . . notes an isolated use of an image from Apuleius' *Florida* in Jerome's *Life of Malchus*."⁵ There would seem to be no reason, however, to believe that in this case Jerome is indebted to Apuleius: the use of *rubigo* at the start of the *Vita Malchi* is merely a stock form of the "modesty topos."⁶ The object of the present article is to argue that the Apuleian echoes that Weingarten herself alleges in Jerome's *Vita Hilarionis* are all similarly illusory.

Weingarten begins her study with a series of "verbal" echoes, which in her view are "undeniable" (p. 384, n. 6). The first (pp. 384–85) is identified in *Vita Hilarionis* 6.3 (*nudus latrones non timet*), which according to her has been inspired by *Metamorphoses* 1.15.3 (*an ignoras, inepte, nudum nec a decem palaestritis despoliari posse?*). Here it should be pointed out that the source for this Hieronymian phrase had instead been already identified by A. S. Pease as Juvenal 10.22 (*cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator*).⁷ While Jerome's knowledge of Juvenal has been questioned,⁸ arguments have

Hellenistic Greek novella in Jerome's hagiography and concludes her own study with the words: "In Apuleius we now have a Latin novella as a convincing source." Owing to delays in the publication of the present article, reference has not been made to Weingarten's general study, *The Saint's Saints: Hagiography and Geography in Jerome*, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 58 (Leiden, 2005).

3. Weingarten, "Jerome" (n. 2 above), 383. What Jerome actually says is merely *quasi non cirratorum turba Milesiarum in scholis figmenta decantent* (Adv. Rufin. 1.17).

4. Jerome's use of the terms *cirratorum turba* and *decantent* (cf. TLL 5.1:118.14–15 [s.v. *decanto*] "i.q. trita, vulgata semper repetere, iterare, recitare ad nauseam, deblaterare"; the present passage is adduced in lines 27–28), together with the immediately succeeding reference to the *Testamentum Grunii Corocottae Porcelli* as provoking guffaws from the notoriously boorish Bessi, would seem to suggest a more popular author than Apuleius, who is qualified by the unsympathetic Augustine as *magna . . . praeditus eloquentia . . . philosophus* (Ep. 138.19). In the same connection Weingarten also adduces Jerome's *Commentarii in Isaiam lib. 12 praef.* 1–3 Gryson: *nullus tam imperitus scriptor est quin lectorem inveniat similem sui, multoque pars maior est Milesias et fabellas revolvendum quam Platonis libros*. Here, however, the antithesis to *Platonis libros* would seem to rule out the Platonist Apuleius: for *Platonicus* as the standard epithet for Apuleius, cf., e.g., Charisius *Gramm.* p. 314.4–5 (*apud Apuleium Platonicum*) and Sid. Apoll. Ep. 9.13.3 (*a Platonico Madaurensi*). The first of these texts cites Apuleius' *De proverbii*, while the second deals with his *Convivales quaestiones*: though neither work has to do with philosophy, on both occasions Apuleius is nonetheless designated as *Platonicus*.

5. A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité I, Le monachisme latin: De "L'itinéraire d'Égérie" à l'éloge funèbre de Népotien (384–396)* (Paris, 1993), 79 with n. 10, where *Vita Malchi* 1.2 (*veluti quandam rubiginem linguae abstergere*) is said to have been inspired by *Flor.* 17.8 (*ut gladius usu splendescit, situ robiginat, ita vox in vagina silentii condita diutino torpore hebetatur*).

6. Cf. H. Bruhn, *Specimen vocabularii rhetorici ad inferioris aetatis latinitatem pertinens* (Marburg, 1911), 27 (s.v. *rubigo*): the chapter in question is entitled "De affectata modestia". Weingarten fails to note that in addition de Vogüé qualifies as "particulièrement proche d'Apulée" Jerome's wording at *Regula Pachomii praef.* 1 p. 3.2–4: *gladius . . . si diu in vagina conditus fuerit, sordescit rubigine et splendorem . . . amittit*. It would seem, however, that here too there is no warrant for positing an imitation of the *Florida*. The suggestion has been made by V. Hunink (*Apuleius of Madauros: "Florida"* [Amsterdam, 2001], 175–76) that Apuleius' own sources in this passage are Hor. Sat. 2.1.39–43 (*hic stilus . . . me veluti custodiet ensis / vagina tectus . . . ut pereat positum robigine telum*) and Quint. Inst. 8 proem. 15 (*similia gladio condito atque intra vaginam suam haerenti*). Jerome possessed an intimate knowledge of both of these authors; for his debt in particular to an adjacent passage of the proem of Quintilian's eighth book, cf. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers* (n. 1 above), 412. If therefore a specific source needs to be posited for Jerome's wording, he may be supposed to have been influenced by the same pair of texts as Apuleius. The idea that unused swords rust, however, is hardly remarkable; for other fifth-century examples, cf., e.g., Prudent. *Psychomachia* 104–6 (*nec . . . condere vaginae gladium, ne tecta rubigo / occupet . . . nitorem*) and Sid. Apoll. Ep. 6.6.1 (*ne vester affectus quandam . . . duceret ut gladius inoplitus de curae raritate robiginem*).

7. A. S. Pease, "The Attitude of Jerome towards Pagan Literature," *TAPA* 50 (1919): 166 n. 117.

8. Cf. H. Hagendahl, rev. of D. S. Wiesen, *St. Jerome as a Satirist* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1964), *Gnomon* 40 (1968): 583 with n. 2.

recently been adduced that would seem to indicate that he had in fact read him.⁹ However the passage of the *Vita Hilarionis* currently at issue is merely proverbial.¹⁰ There is accordingly no justification for positing a source for these words in either Juvenal or Apuleius.

Weingarten maintains further (p. 385) that the “unusual Greek word” *palaestrita* that Apuleius employs in the same sentence has prompted Jerome’s use of this term in a later chapter of the *Vita Hilarionis* (10.8), where the saint applies it to a victim of demonic possession who assaults him: *mihi meum palaestritam dimittite*. If, however, it is necessary to propose a particular source for this admittedly rather infrequent noun, which has to be glossed as *athleta* by the scholiast on Persius 4.39, this passage of Persius itself would seem a more likely candidate: Jerome enjoyed an intimate acquaintance with this satirist, from whom he was accustomed to borrow precisely such recherché vocabulary.¹¹ The context in which Persius employs the term *palaestrita* is highly prurient:¹² Jerome was irresistibly drawn to just such salacity.¹³

After his preface Jerome introduces the saint himself with the observation that his birth from heathen parents made him “a rose from thorns” (2.1). This language has, in Weingarten’s view (p. 385), been suggested by the “key image” of roses among thorns that occurs in the *Metamorphoses* at 4.2.5 and 10.29.2. Jerome’s phrase “a rose from thorns,” however, is shown incontrovertibly to have been nothing more than a proverb by a letter of Gregory Nazianzen (183): *ρόδα ἐξ ἁκανθῶν, ὡς ἡ παροιμία, συλλέγομεν*.¹⁴ Weingarten ends this paragraph (p. 385, n. 11) by considering Hilarion’s first hallucination: *cernit rhedam ferventibus equis super se irruere, cumque inclamasset Iesum, ante oculos eius repentino terrae hiatu pompa omnis absorpta est* (3.8). She suggests that Jerome’s *terrae hiatu* . . . *absorpta* may be an allusion to the words which in the *Metamorphoses* conclude the mime of the Judgment of Paris: *terrae vorago decepit*

9. Cf. N. Adkin, “Juvenal and Jerome,” *CP* 89 (1994): 69–72; “Jerome, Seneca, Juvenal,” *RBPPhil* 78 (2000): 119–28, where it is argued that Jerome had not studied Juvenal at school, but merely perused the recently fashionable commentated edition during his second stay in Rome; hence he was less familiar with this satirist than with Horace and Persius, who were school authors.

10. Cf. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890; repr. Hildesheim, 1962), 247 (no. 1250; s.v. *nudus* 3); R. Häussler, *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer* (Hildesheim, 1968), 194.

11. The opening of the same fourth satire (2: *sorbitio* . . . *cicutae*) would seem to have motivated Jerome’s use of this striking collocation in the roughly contemporaneous *Adv. Iovinian*. (1.49; on the date of the *Vita Hilarionis*, cf. N. Adkin, “Vergil, *Eclogues* 2 and 10 in Jerome,” *Eirene* 35 [1999]: 110 n. 40). For the whole of the classical and patristic periods no other instance of this juxtaposition is provided by the online *Library of Latin Texts* or by *Patrologia Latina Database* (Alexandria, Va., 1995). This particular echo of Persius has hitherto escaped the attention of investigators of Jerome’s debt to the classics.

12. The entire passage (lines 35–41) is omitted as “*dévergondé*” from the commentary by B. L. Gildersleeve, *The Satires of A. Persius Flaccus* (New York, 1903; repr. 1979), 149.

13. Cf. N. Adkin, “*Hieronymus Sallustianus*,” *GrazBeitr* 24 (2005): 101, where it is noted that Jerome is alone in his imitation of Sallust’s very uncharacteristic use of *penis* at *Cat.* 14.2 (*manu ventre pene; penis* also opens this section of Persius). In the case of the *Vita Hilarionis* Jerome’s incorporation of material from such a smutty context into the life of a Christian saint should occasion no surprise; on such indifference to “context” in his borrowings, cf. N. Adkin, “Tertullian’s *De ieiunio* and Jerome’s *Libellus de virginitate servanda*,” *WS* 104 (1991): 150.

14. Cited by N. Adkin, “Some Further Additions to Otto’s *Sprichwörter*,” *Sileno* 19 (1993): 366 n. 29. The suggestion is made by B. Degórski (*Girolamo: Vite degli eremiti Paolo, Ilarione e Malco*, Collana di Testi Patristici 126 [Rome, 1996], 93 n. 13), that Jerome’s wording is due to *Cant.* 2.2 (*sicut lilium inter spinas*); however the use of similar phraseology by the pagan Ammianus Marcellinus (16.7.4: *inter vepres rosae*) would appear to make such an assumption unnecessary. Weingarten herself mentions this text of Ammianus (p. 385, n. 10), but with a wrong reference (16.8.4).

(10.34.2).¹⁵ It would appear that here Jerome is instead echoing a biblical passage whose identification has hitherto eluded commentators on the *Vita Hilarionis*. His next sentence (3.9), which follows immediately upon the words at issue here, starts with a literal quotation of the verse that opens the Song of Moses in Exodus 15: *equum et ascensorem proiecit in mare* (Exod. 15:1). This song also contains the phrase *devoravit eos terra* (Exod. 15:12).¹⁶ The same wording is also used in the Vulgate text of Numbers 16:31–32 (*terra . . . devoravit illos*); here Sabatier fails to provide an Old Latin version.¹⁷ The context of this passage is the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram against Moses. It is accordingly noteworthy that patristic references to the fate of these rebels should employ the very same collocation of *hiatus terrae* and *absorbere* as occurs in the *Vita Hilarionis*.¹⁸ When therefore Jerome uses the identical phrase *terrae hiatus . . . absorpta* in conjunction with Hilarion, he too is evidently alluding to the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram: his Hilarion is thereby depicted very effectively as Moses, who is appropriately the original speaker of the saint's immediately succeeding quotation of Exodus 15:1.¹⁹ In the *terrae hiatus . . . absorpta* of the *Vita Hilarionis* there would accordingly appear to be no place for an allusion to Apuleius' quite different wording (*terrae vorago decepit*) describing a mime of the Judgment of Paris.

The next debt alleged by Weingarten (p. 385) is the "important part" played by Venus in both the *Metamorphoses* and the *Vita Hilarionis*. In this connection it should be observed that the latter work mentions the goddess only once (16.1). Moreover, this mention is simply required by the particular anecdote that Jerome is telling: Hilarion establishes a church in the Saracen town of Elusa, which is devoted to the goddess' worship. Here Jerome merely introduces Venus in order to inform the reader that her worship was in consequence abandoned. As further evidence of the influence supposedly exercised by the Apuleian Venus on the *Vita Hilarionis* Weingarten refers (p. 385,

15. Here *decipere* is explained as "to take down, swallow down" by M. Zimmerman, *Apuleius Madaurensis: "Metamorphoses," Book X* (Groningen, 2000), 405. Earlier in Jerome's sentence a further echo of the classics was detected by Bastiaensen (C. Mohrmann, A. A. R. Bastiaensen, J. W. Smit, L. Canali and C. Moreschini, *Vita di Martino, Vita di Ilarione, In memoria di Paola*⁴, Vite dei Santi 4 [Milan, 1998], 81), who believed that the Hieronymian *sollicitis oculis huc illucque circumspicens* was due to Verg. *Aen.* 2.68 (*oculis Phrygia agmina circumspectis*). The assumption would seem to be unwarranted; cf. Adkin, "Vergil" (n. 11 above), 109 n. 34.

16. Text of Jerome's Vulgate, which matches the Old Latin version given by P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. 1 (Reims, 1743; repr. Turnhout, 1991), 165.

17. Sabatier, *Bibliorum* (n. 16 above), 295.

18. Viz. Cyprian *Ep.* 3.1.2 (*Core, Dathan et Abiron . . . hiatus terrae absorpti ac devorati*); Ps. Origen (= Gregory of Elvira) *Tractatus* 4.11 (*Dathan et Abiron et omnis synagoga Coreb . . . hiatus terrae absorpti*); Ambrose *Ep. extra coll.* 14.52 (*Dathan et Abiron et Core . . . hiatus terrae absorbit*; cf. *De patriarchis* 8.37 *ibi . . . hiatus est terrae, qui absorbeat calumniantes*); Bachiarius *De reparatione lapsi* 12 (*synagoga illa Core cum . . . hiatus hiatus . . . fuisset absorpta*); Jer. *Commentarii* in Amos 9.2 line 79 (*quos [sc. Dathan et Abiron] . . . terrae hiatus absorbit*); *Regula Pachomii* 159 p. 62.1 (*peccatores terrae hiatus absorbit*); August. *De baptismo* 1.8.10 (*schismaticos . . . terrae hiatus absorbit*); *In Psalmos enarrationes* 54.16 lines 8–9 (*audi viventes . . . absorberi hiatus terrae*; line 24 *ipsos duces terrae hiatus absorbit*; line 29 *quos [sc. duces] terrae hiatus absorbit*); Ps. August. *Quaestiones veteris et novi testamenti* 101.7 (*hiatus terrae absorpti sunt Chore et consentientes ei*); 110.7 (*Chore et CCL viros . . . hiatus terrae absorptos esse*); *Serm. ed. Caillau* 1.7.20 (*hiatus terrae . . . absorpti [sc. Chore, Dathan, et Abiron]*). In this connection it may be noted that Augustine, who links the phrase *terrae hiatus absorbit* to Exod. 15:12 in *Serm.* 363.2, observes at *Quaest. hept.* 4.28: *quod ait Moyses de Core et Abiron et Dathan: "in visione ostendet dominus et aperiens terra os suum absorbebit eos"* [Num. 16:30], *quidam interpretati sunt: "in hiatus ostendet dominus," credo putantes dictum χάσματι, quod graece positum est φάσματι*.

19. Jerome's addition of *repentinus* to *hiatus* is merely a characteristic *Selbstzitat* from his recent *In eccles.* 7.18.287 (again à propos of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram): *repentino terrae hiatus*. This commentary is assigned to 388 by P. Jay, *L'exégèse de S. Jérôme d'après son "Commentaire sur Isaïe"* (Paris, 1985), 407–9.

n. 12) to an episode in which Jerome describes a young man's infatuation for a Christian virgin (12.1–10). Here it must be said that mention of Venus is studiously avoided. This youth tries unsuccessfully to seduce the virgin by magical means: *portentosas figuras sculptas in aeris cyprii lamina* (12.3). Weingarten attaches particular importance to this phrase, since Venus was associated with Cyprus. Here however *aes cyprium* would merely appear to mean “Kupfer.”²⁰

The episode of the *Vita Hilarionis* involving the phrase *terrae hiatu absorberi* that was discussed in the previous paragraph but one is followed by a further hallucination of the saint: *psallentique gladiatorum pugna spectaculum praebuit, et unus quasi interfec-tus et ante pedes eius corruens sepulturam rogavit* (3.11). With this incident Weingarten (p. 385) associates a prognostication in the story of Cupid and Psyche concerning the latter's crossing of the Styx: *tibi pigrum fluentum transmeanti quidam supernatans senex mortuus putris adtollens manus orabit ut eum intra navigium trahas* (6.18.8). A more likely source for Jerome's account, however, would seem to be Aeneas' meeting with Palinurus at *Aeneid* 6.337–83, which has evidently inspired the Apuleian passage as well.²¹ Whereas Jerome's knowledge of the *Metamorphoses* is open to question, his familiarity with *Aeneid* 6 is not.²² Moreover, the Vergilian episode matches the *Vita Hilarionis* in entailing a petition for burial,²³ which is significantly absent from the Apuleian text: here Weingarten's paraphrase “begging for burial” is a tendentious distortion.

The next parallel to which Weingarten draws attention (p. 386) has to do with languages. In the *Vita Hilarionis* the saint exorcizes a member of the imperial bodyguard, who knows only Latin and Frankish; however, he suddenly begins to speak Syriac and Greek (13.1–10).²⁴ This occurrence is connected by Weingarten with two episodes in the *Metamorphoses*. In the first (9.39.2–4) a soldier asks a question in Latin; since his interlocutor is unfamiliar with the language, he merely repeats it in Greek. The second passage (4.32.6) describes how the god of prophecy gives an oracle in Latin rather than Greek for the benefit of the Latin-speaking author of the work; however, a mere diglot courtesy of this kind is unremarkable for someone who is qualified in the previous sentence as *tantum numen*. A more serious objection to Weingarten's view is the circumstance that neither of these two episodes resembles the *Vita Hilarionis* in making a human being speak by supernatural agency in a language he does not know. Such, however, is precisely the case in Acts 2:4–11: a student of the Bible like Jerome naturally enjoyed an intimate familiarity with this passage. Furthermore, in both Acts and the *Vita Hilarionis* a number of completely unknown languages are involved;²⁵ in the *Metamorphoses*, on the other hand, the bilingual individuals in question are merely utilizing their “other” language. It would seem, therefore, that Jerome is here more likely to have been influenced by the Acts of the Apostles than by Apuleius.

In the same linguistic connection Weingarten also refers (p. 386) to a passage of the *Vita Hilarionis* (14.1–5) that introduces a Bactrian camel described by her as “another

20. Cf. H. Blümner, “Kupfer,” *RE* 11 (1921): 2195–96, and the translations of, e.g., L. Schade, *Des hl. Kirchenvaters Eusebius Hieronymus ausgewählte historische, homiletische und dogmatische Schriften*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter 15 (Kempten, 1914), 49 (“Kupferplatten”), and M. Fuhrmann, *Christen in der Wüste: Drei Hieronymus-Legenden* (Zurich, 1983), 54 (“Kupferstäbe”).

21. So E. J. Kenney, *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche* (Cambridge, 1990), 215 (ad loc.).

22. For his massive debt to this book, cf. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers*, 414.

23. Cf. *Aen.* 6.365–66: *tu mihi terram / inice*.

24. Weingarten fails to supply the reference.

25. For those at issue in the biblical account, cf. Acts 2:9–11; in Jerome they are Syriac and Greek.

surprising speaker of Syriac.” Since Weingarten notes that “Lucius as an ass never manages to speak,” she concludes that here Jerome’s biography has therefore outdone the *Metamorphoses*. It should be pointed out, however, that in the Hieronymian passage the speaking is not done by the camel, but by Hilarion; nor does the camel make any response to Hilarion’s words. This episode of the *Vita Hilarionis* accordingly provides no evidence whatsoever that Jerome is trying to “go one better” than Apuleius.

The same Bactrian camel of the *Vita Hilarionis* is also linked by Weingarten (p. 386) to a passage of the *Metamorphoses* (7.14.1) in which she states that Lucius is “compared to a Bactrian camel”; again the parallel is seen as significant. In this connection three points may be made. In the first place, the hero of the *Metamorphoses* is not “compared to” the camel; Apuleius merely says: *matrona . . . praeseptum meum ordeo passim repleri iubet faenumque camelo Bactrinae sufficiens apponi*. Second, the Apuleian *Bactrinae* differs in both form and gender from Jerome’s *Bactrum* (14.1). Third and most important, it would seem possible to show that both authors had perfectly good reasons of their own for choosing the term “Bactrian.” Here it is natural to turn for help to modern commentaries, which do in fact supply such *raison d’être*. Apuleius’ use of the epithet is accordingly ascribed by the Groningen commentary to his “tendency to precision.”²⁶ Bastiaensen, on the other hand, explains Jerome’s *Bactrus camelus* as simply “‘cammello’ comune, per distinguerlo dal *camelus Arabicus*, ‘dromedario,’” while Moreschini’s accompanying translation renders the collocation as merely “un cammello.”²⁷ It would seem, however, that all of these commentators are no less mistaken than Weingarten. The correct interpretation of “Bactrian” in these passages would instead appear to come from ancient glossography: while Isidore of Seville observes that *dromeda . . . est minoris . . . staturae* (*Orig.* 12.1.36), one finds in *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* 5.616.19 the explicit statement that *Bactrius* (cod. *baccus*) *est magnus camelus*. Both Apuleius and Jerome have accordingly chosen to qualify the camel as specifically “Bactrian” in order to stress its size: while the former speaks hyperbolically of *faenum . . . camelo Bactrinae sufficiens*, the latter makes express reference to *Bactrum camelum enormis magnitudinis*. To explain Jerome’s “Bactrian” camel there is accordingly no need to invoke a debt to Apuleius.

The chapter of the *Metamorphoses* that immediately precedes Apuleius’ mention of a camel depicts the virgin Charite as *asino triumphantem* (7.13.2).²⁸ Weingarten suggests (p. 386) that the *Vita Hilarionis* may owe something to this Apuleian passage, since Jerome pictures Aristaenete as *asello sedens* on her visit to Hilarion (8.4); moreover, Weingarten points out that this wife of a future praetorian prefect is also characterized as *oblita matronalis pompae* (*ibid.*), while the same term *pompa* similarly opens the aforementioned sentence of Apuleius, who likewise describes Charite as a *matrona* shortly afterwards (7.14.1). Again, however, there would appear to be no warrant for positing a debt to the *Metamorphoses* in this passage of the *Vita Hilarionis*. In the first place, Apuleius had employed both *pompa* and *matrona* in a quite different sense from Jerome. Whereas *pompa* in the *Metamorphoses* had meant “a procession,”²⁹ in the *Vita*

26. B. L. Hijmans, R. T. van der Paardt, V. Schmidt, R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, and A. G. Westerbrink, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses, Books VI.25–32 and VII* (Groningen, 1981), 170.

27. Mohrmann et al., *Vita* (n. 15 above), 303 and 105.

28. Again Weingarten fails to provide the reference.

29. So Hijmans et al., *Apuleius* (n. 26 above), 164 (*ad loc.*). Cf. *OLD*, s.v. *pompa* (sect. 1): “a ceremonial procession (to celebrate a festival, triumph, or sim.).” The *TLL* article has not yet appeared.

Hilarionis the word instead signifies “apparato.”³⁰ Similarly, Apuleius had used *matrona* to denote “la mariée,”³¹ while in Jerome the corresponding adjective *matronalis* bears the meaning “che spetta a una grande dama.”³² Nor is both authors’ mention of riding an ass a reason for surmising literary dependence; here two considerations may be advanced. First, since the ass was a common mode of transportation, its use for this purpose in Jerome as well as Apuleius is scarcely remarkable.³³ Second, the point of Jerome’s mention of this detail is the contrast it provides to the antecedent description of Aristaenete as *valde nobilis inter suos et inter christianos nobilior* (8.1):³⁴ for this reason Jerome deliberately employs the meiotic diminutive *asellus*,³⁵ which Apuleius significantly avoids.

Weingarten also states (p. 386, n. 18) that “the relationship between Hilarion and Aristaenete . . . has parallels to the relationship between Jerome and Paula, and Jerome relates a similar incident about Paula’s scarcely agreeing to ride an ass during their pilgrimage round the Holy Places (*Ep.* 108).” Here two objections may be raised. The relationship between Hilarion and Aristaenete evinces no parallel to that between Jerome and Paula: whereas Aristaenete visited Hilarion, Jerome accompanied Paula. Nor did Paula “scarcely agree” to ride an ass: Jerome says simply *asello sedens profecta est* (*Ep.* 108.7.3). At the same time, this passage of Jerome’s *Letter* 108 can in fact shed light on his anecdote about Aristaenete; it is necessary, however, to go beyond Weingarten’s simple identification of the parallel of “riding an ass.” Here the antecedent wording of the letter repays attention: *femina nobilis, quae prius eunuchorum manibus portabatur, asello sedens profecta est*. This passage accordingly exhibits precisely the same antithesis between *nobilis* and *asellus* as the *Vita Hilarionis*; here, however, the two terms have been conveniently juxtaposed in order to make the point absolutely clear. Significantly, both Hieronymian texts employ the depreciatory diminutive *asellus*—unlike Apuleius.

Weingarten then (pp. 386–87) turns to consider Hilarion’s final abode, which Jerome describes as a *hortulus peramoenus* (31.4): she is convinced that this phrase has been inspired by Apuleius’ similar formulation *hortulus amoenus* at *Metamorphoses* 3.29.5. In these “pleasant little gardens” Lucius refuses to eat roses (3.29.8) and Hilarion refuses to eat fruit (31.4): here Weingarten detects another significant parallel. It would seem, however, that both hypotheses of indebtedness are again unwarranted. Whereas Lucius refrains from eating *ne, si rursus asino remoto prodirem in Lucium, evidens exitium inter manus latronum offenderem vel artis magicae suspicionem vel indicii futuri criminationem* (3.29.7), Hilarion’s abstention is an allusion to Genesis 2:17 (*de ligno autem scientiae boni et mali ne comedas*) rather than to Apuleius. Nor is each author’s use of the phrase “a pleasant little garden” significant. The particular form *hortulus*

30. So Moreschini in Mohrmann et al., *Vita*, 89. Cf. *OLD*, s.v. *pompa* (sect. 3): “ostentation, display.”

31. So Vallette in D. S. Robertson and P. Vallette, *Apulée: “Les Métamorphoses”*², vol. 3 (Paris, 1956), 18 (cf. Hijmans et al., *Apuleius*, 169). Cf. *TLL* 8:486.40, s.v. *matrona*: “i.q. femina nupta.”

32. So Moreschini in Mohrmann et al., *Vita*, 89. Cf. *TLL* 8:487.13, s.v. *matrona*: “i.q. femina nobilis.”

33. Cf., e.g., I. Opelt, “Esel,” *RAC* 6 (1966): 582: “In Palästina [where Hilarion lived] . . . das übliche Verkehrsmittel.”

34. This phrase is invested with particular prominence by its combination of chiasmus and polyptotic *reditio* (for the latter, cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*³ [Stuttgart, 1990], 317–18 [no. 625]).

35. For the word’s depreciative force, cf., e.g., Sulpicius Severus *Dialogi* 1.21.4: *qui antea pedibus aut asello ire consueverat, spumantibus equis superbus invehitur*. Hence Moreschini’s translation of this Hieronymian diminutive as “asino” is incorrect (in Mohrmann et al., *Vita*, 89); for a more accurate rendering, cf., e.g., Degórski, *Girolamo* (n. 14 above), 104: “asinello.”

is merely due to the fondness for such diminutives that is shared by both Apuleius³⁶ and Jerome.³⁷ and it would seem possible to show that in later Latin the application of *amoenus* to *hortus* is merely conventional.³⁸ One such indication is the tendency of the juxtaposition to occur in colloquial Latin; here reference may be made to the *Itinerarium Egeriae*³⁹ and to a sermon of Augustine.⁴⁰ Further evidence for the triteness of the collocation is provided by its employment as an elucidatory gloss.⁴¹ There would in fact appear to have been some effort to avoid the simple adhibition of *amoenus* to *hortus* as too commonplace. A passage of Cyprian's *Ad Donatum* (1) that is marked by *mirabiliter affluentissima fecunditate facundiae*⁴² instead resorts to the periphrastic *hortorum facies amoena*, while the neuter plural *amoena* with dependent genitive *hortorum*⁴³ is preferred by Paulinus of Milan (*Vita Ambr.* 1) and by Jerome himself in his letter to Lucinus (*Ep.* 71.1.4); both of these passages aim to eschew banality.⁴⁴ The same avoidance of the commonplace has evidently led in the *Vita Hilarionis* to Jerome's choice of the very rare compound *peramoenus*, which is elsewhere attested only in Tacitus' highly polished *Annals*.⁴⁵ If, on the other hand, at *Vita Pauli* 3.2 Jerome does merely attach the simplex adjective directly to the noun (*amoenissimos hortulos*), he himself admits that in this particular work *propter simpliciores quosque multum in deiciendo sermone laboravimus* (*Ep.* 10.3.3). Since all this evidence shows beyond question that the collocation was no more than a commonplace, there is no reason to posit a debt to Apuleius.

Weingarten also compares (p. 387, n. 20) Jerome's description of Hilarion's abode with the Apuleian depiction of the entrance to Hades. The "verbal similarities" that she

36. Cf. M. Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura: Ein Beitrag zur Stilistik des Spätlateins*, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 2 (Stuttgart, 1927), 135–38 ("Bis ins Maßlose gesteigert hat die Zahl der Deminutiva unser Autor" [p. 135]). While the simple form *hortus* occurs only once in the *Metamorphoses*, no fewer than seven instances of the diminutive *hortulus* are recorded in W. A. Oldfather, H. V. Canter, and B. E. Perry, *Index Apuleianus*, APA Philological Monographs 3 (Middletown, 1934), 187. The short sentence currently at issue contains two others: *villulas, herbulas*.

37. Cf. H. Goelzer, *Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de S. Jérôme* (Paris, 1884), 121–30 ("Il n'y a pas dans la langue latine de dérivés dont S. Jérôme se soit servi plus volontiers" [125]).

38. The TLL article on *hortus* by W. Ehlers (6.3:3015.24–3018.79) unfortunately fails to identify the use of the word in conjunction with *amoenus* as a standard form of expression.

39. 15.2: *statim ergo cepimus ire cum eo pedibus totum per vallem amenissimam, donec perveniremus usque ad hortum pomarium valde amenum*. Here the same adjective is used in two directly contiguous clauses; on such lack of *variatio* as typical of the *Umgangssprache*, cf. J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 2.2.2 (Munich, 1965), 820–22.

40. *Serm.* 360B.3 coll. Dolbeau 1996, p. 249, line 34: *cum dictum nobis fuerit in paradisum nos futuros, cogitamus aliquem hortum amoenum*. Here the colloquial tone is clear from the antecedent use of *in* "c. esse . . . pro verbis movendi"; cf. TLL 7.1:795.15–16 (s.v. *in*, "usus sc. vulgaris").

41. Cf., e.g., Lactant. *Div. inst.* 2.12.15 (*deus hominem . . . posuit in Paradiso id est in horto fecundissimo et amoenissimo*); Jer. *Commentarii in Isaiam* 18.66.17 line 32 Gryson (*in locis deliciarum et voluptatum, hoc est in hortis amoenissimis*). In this connection one might also point to Prob. *App. gramm.* 4.203.13 (*inter ortus et hortus hoc interest, quod ortus processus significat, hortus vero agros amoenos esse demonstrat*); here *amoenus* glosses *hortus* itself.

42. So August. *De doctrina christiana* 4.85.

43. On this mode of expression, cf. R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus* (Oxford, 1966), 149 ("the two words form a unit which would more normally be expressed by a noun and adjective in agreement").

44. In Paulinus of Milan the words at issue occur at the end of a particularly elaborate instance of the "modesty topos," on which cf. E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*⁹ (Stuttgart, 1983), 595 n. 1 ("gerade den stilistisch allerraffiniertesten Werken vorausgeschickt"). On the stylistic pretensions of Jerome's letter to Lucinus, cf. N. Adkin, "The Ninth Book of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* and Jerome," *Arctos* 32 (1998): 20–21.

45. Tac. *Ann.* 4.67.2; cf. TLL 10.1:1187.69–71. Jerome's own attention to literary refinement in this passage is evidenced by his imitation of Vergil in the immediately preceding words; cf. N. Adkin, "Two Further Echoes of Sallust's *Historiae* in Jerome (*Vita Hilarionis* 22.3 and 30.2)?" *VetChr* 37 (2000): 210 n. 6.

detects here would seem to be confined to one sentence of the *Metamorphoses* (6.13.4: *videsne insistentem celsissimae illi rupi montis ardui verticem, de quo fontis atri fuscae defluunt undae proxumaeque conceptaculo vallis inclusae Stygias irigant paludes?*), which she evidently believes to have inspired the *aquas de supercilio collis irriguas* of the *Vita Hilarionis* (31.4). This Hieronymian phrase is in fact a conflation of two passages of the *Georgics*, whose *inriguum . . . fontem* (4.32) has prompted Jerome's similarly framing *aquas . . . irriguas*, while the latter's *de supercilio collis* is likewise due to the Vergilian *supercilio*⁴⁶ *clivosi*⁴⁷ *tramitis*⁴⁸ (1.108). Jerome combines the same two texts of the *Georgics* again in *Letter* 125.11.3.⁴⁹

In the same discussion of Hilarion's last dwelling place Weingarten also adduces (p. 387, n. 20) two echoes of Sallust identified by Marie Ewald.⁵⁰ It would seem that these reminiscences are equally illusory. The first concerns a passage of the *Bellum Catilinae* (59.2), which is allegedly the source of Jerome's *asperos . . . montes* (31.3). However, the collocation of *asper* and *mons* is shown to have been a mere stereotype by its repeated occurrence in technical writers.⁵¹ It should moreover be pointed out that the Sallustian *asper* does not in fact qualify *mons*, but *planities*. The second text of Sallust is *Bellum Iugurthinum* 17.2 (*ob . . . asperitatem*); these words are stated to have occasioned Jerome's *propter asperitatem* (31.5). Again, however, the banality of the Hieronymian locution is indicated by its recurrent use in the *gromatici*.⁵²

Weingarten closes her study with considerations of a more general nature (pp. 387–88). Here three points are made. In the first place, Weingarten draws attention to Hilarion's self-apostrophe as an ass (3.4: "*ego*," inquit, "*aselle* . . ."); in these words she sees a reference to Apuleius' novel. It would seem, however, that Jerome's language here has instead been determined by the particular context of the *Vita Hilarionis*. The saint's problem is with the recalcitrance of his own sensuality.⁵³ The ass was a palmary type of both stubbornness and lust.⁵⁴ Paulinus of Nola likewise calls his body an ass,⁵⁵ while the exegetical handbook of his contemporary Eucherius provides the following definition: *asinus corpus humanum*.⁵⁶ In this passage of the *Vita Hilarionis* there is accordingly no need to posit an allusion to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

Weingarten's second point concerns a variant in one branch of the MS tradition of the *Vita Hilarionis*: after the title the MSS in question add the sentence *in sanctis*

46. The ablative is again one of separation.

47. For *clivus* as synonymous with *collis*, cf. *TLL* 3:1358.29 (s.v. *clivus*).

48. As in the *Vita Hilarionis*, the context here is similarly irrigative, since Vergil's very next words are *undam / elicit*.

49. Cf. N. Adkin, "Vergil's *Georgics* and Jerome, *Epist.* 125.11.3–4," *WürzJbb.*, n.s., 22 (1998): 187–98.

50. M. L. Ewald, "Life of St. Hilarion by St. Jerome," in *Early Christian Biographies*, Fathers of the Church 15, ed. R. J. Deferrari (Washington, D.C., 1952), 278.

51. Cf., e.g., Colum. 2.2.1; Frontin. *Strat.* 1.5.21; Hyg. *Lim. grom.* p. 161.22.

52. Cf., e.g., Hyg. *Grom.* p. 79.25; Siculus Flaccus *Grom.* p. 129.4.

53. Jerome has just stated that *pubescenti corpori solita voluptatum incendia suggerebat* (sc. *diabolus*, 3.3), while the sentence which begins with *aselle* continues: *faciam ut non calcitres*. For *calcitrare* of "refractoriness," cf. *OLD*, q.v. (sec. 2).

54. Cf., e.g., Opelt, "Esel," 572–73 ("Eigenschaften"): "störrisch . . . lüstern."

55. *Carm.* 24.617–18: *sit fortis anima mortificans asinum suum, / pigri iumentum corporis*.

56. *Formulae spiritalis intelligentiae* 4 line 513. Cf. further Opelt, "Esel," 586. Weingarten also refers in the same connection to Jerome's mention of *hordeum* in *Vita Hilar.* 3.12: *abducta ab oratione mens nescio quid aliud cogitabat; insiliit dorso eius festinus agitator . . . cachinnansque desuper, si defecisset, an hordeum vellet accipere, sciscitabatur*. Here however *hordeum* merely picks up by an elegantly malicious ring composition the reference to the same term in the sentence containing the abovementioned self-alloquy: *nec te hordeo alam sed paleis* (3.4).

orationibus tuis memento mei decus ac dignitas virginum nonna Asella. Weingarten adopts the view of Mary McNeil that in these words we have a formal dedication of a first edition of the *Vita* to Asella.⁵⁷ Hence Weingarten concludes that when writing the *Vita* "Jerome was thinking of the woman whose name means 'little ass.'" It would seem, however, that the sentence at issue is not in fact a dedication *en règle*, which would more naturally have been incorporated into the work itself; instead these words were merely penned in Jerome's own hand at the front of the personal copy he presented to Asella.⁵⁸ If, therefore, the *Vita Hilarionis* was not dedicated to Asella, there are no grounds for supposing that while writing it Jerome's thoughts were engrossed by "asses." Finally Weingarten points to a parallel in the biographies of Apuleius and Jerome: while the former was charged with ensorcelling the affluent widow Pudentilla into wedlock, the latter was accused of indecent relations with the similarly pecunious widow Paula. Weingarten accordingly argues that this correspondence "could well have resulted in Jerome's identifying with Apuleius, whether consciously or not." The supposition would, however, seem unlikely. Apuleius describes these charges in his *Apologia*, with which Augustine was certainly acquainted; but Augustine himself admits that *Apuleius . . . nobis Afris Afer est notior* (*Ep.* 138.19). Jerome, on the other hand, who never set foot in "Africa," fails to make any mention of Apuleius among the numerous Latin writers he adds to his translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*.⁵⁹ There is accordingly no reason to believe that Jerome shared Augustine's knowledge of the *Apologia* and its account of the charges brought against its author. Jerome's acquaintance with Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* would appear to be similarly chimeric: the present article would seem to have shown that not a single one of the echoes detected in Weingarten's paper can in fact be regarded as authentic. There is no evidence that Jerome had read any work of Apuleius.

NEIL ADKIN

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

57. M. D. McNeil, "The Latin Manuscript Tradition of the *Vita S. Hilarionis*," in *Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's Vitae Patrum*, ed. W. A. Oldfather (Urbana, Ill., 1943), 259.

58. Cf. N. Adkin, "The *Historia Augusta* and Jerome Again," *Klio* 79 (1997): 466–67 n. 43.

59. The only reference that Jerome does make to Apuleius in his massive oeuvre occurs at *Tractatus in Psalmos* I, p. 89, line 230, which speaks of the miracles performed by Apollonius of Tyana and Apuleius. The passage is merely a citation of Porphyry.