

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF JEROME, LETTERS 1 AND 107

I

These comments start, as they must, from the text of I. Hilberg in the Vienna corpus.¹ This was the first properly critical edition of the *Letters*, and has not been superseded. It is, however, not without its limitations. In establishing his text Hilberg considered only a few MSS for each letter: for *epist.* 1, seven, and for *epist.* 107, six, in one of which (*B*) the letter is represented twice, though in neither case is it complete. Hilberg promised a volume of prolegomena and indices to accompany his text;² but it seems that he died before it could appear, and we do not know how he assessed his MSS, or how many he consulted before making his choice. What we do know is that those on which he relied form a very small proportion of those which exist. B. Lambert's catalogue of Jerome MSS³ lists 138 for *epist.* 1 and 145 for *epist.* 107, of which ten and thirteen respectively are dated ninth-to-tenth-century or earlier – and Lambert is well aware that his list cannot pretend to be exhaustive.⁴ Furthermore, there is some reason to doubt the accuracy of the collations which form the basis of Hilberg's edition.⁵ It is evident that much work remains to be done before a definitive edition can be produced. Meanwhile Hilberg's text is the best we have, and where I cite MSS I follow the readings of his apparatus criticus.⁶ The phrase 'the MSS' refers, in this article, only to those which Hilberg utilised.

In several of the notes⁷ I appeal to prose-rhythm in support of a particular reading, or to dismiss another, or bring it into the discussion because it is relevant in considering a particular passage, even though its evidence may be equivocal or inconclusive. Considerations of prose-rhythm have an important part to play in textual criticism,⁸ but in the case of Jerome, as of other authors, we are handicapped by the absence of helpful studies of his practice.⁹ What is clear is that he sometimes

¹ Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (CSEL) 54–6 (3 vols., Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1910–18).

² Cf. CSEL 56, preface.

³ *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana manuscripta: la tradition manuscrite des oeuvres de saint Jérôme* (Instrumenta patristica 4; 4 vols., Steenbrugis, 1969–72).

⁴ Cf. vol. 1, pp. vii–viii. Indeed, he even misses some MSS in the British Library and the Bodleian; e.g., for *epist.* 107, British Library MSS Royal 6 C. XI, 6 D. I, 6 D. II, and 6 D. III, and Bodleian MS Bodl. 702.

⁵ Z. Stewart, 'An Eighth-Century Fragment of Jerome', *HLB* 4 (1950), 254–8, and 'Insular Script without Insular Abbreviations: a Problem in Eighth-Century Palaeography', *Speculum* 25 (1950), 483–90, examines the fragmentary MS m which Hilberg used in establishing his text of *epist.* 60. The fact that Stewart detects two certain errors and at least one important oversight in the collation of this MS, which witnesses to only a couple of pages of the letter, must undermine confidence in Hilberg's text as a whole.

⁶ I have not personally inspected the MSS employed by Hilberg, and have been obliged on occasion to infer the readings of particular MSS where they are not made explicit in his apparatus. It is, for example, reasonable to infer that at *epist.* 1.8.2 all the MSS except *s* read *tertius ictus*, though it cannot be held certain that where a MS is not mentioned as supporting a given variant it must support the text.

⁷ Letter 1 (*e*), with n. 23; Letter 107 (*a*), with n. 28, (*c*), (*d*), (*h*), with n. 37, and (*k*), with n. 40.

⁸ For a recent demonstration involving late-antique texts see R. G. Hall and S. M. Oberhelman, 'Rhythmical Clausulae in the *Codex Theodosianus* and the *Leges Novellae ad Theodosium Pertinentes*', *CQ* 35 (1985), 211–13.

⁹ There are two major studies, both grossly inadequate: P. C. Knook, *De overgang van metrisch tot rythmisch proza bij Cyprianus en Hieronymus* (Purmerend, 1932), and M. C. Herron,

writes with attention to quantity, sometimes with attention to accent, following the cursus, and at other times with attention to both or neither. In using prose-rhythm as a tool in this article I have assessed each passage on its merits, but, where it seems significant, I have also taken into account the rhythmical character of the context in which the passage occurs.

II

*Letter 1 (A.D. 375)*¹⁰

Although set in an epistolary framework, the main body of this letter could have been written as a piece complete in itself. It is the narrative account of a remarkable event which had taken place not many years previously at Vercellae in north Italy. A young man and a married woman were falsely accused of adultery and taken before the governor of the province. Under torture the young man confessed to the crime, but the woman, a devout Christian, refused to admit guilt despite suffering every kind of violence. The governor, however, did not believe that she was innocent, and had her taken to execution. After withstanding seven blows of the executioner's sword, she at last appeared to die, to prevent the officer in charge from being put to death in her place. A tomb was prepared for her, but, miraculously restored to the fullness of life, she was cared for and concealed from the authorities by Christian priests and virgins, the body of an old woman being buried in her place. At some time the deception and her escape were discovered, and it was only as a result of the intervention of Evagrius of Antioch with the Emperor that she was finally acquitted.

- (a) 5.1 crines ligantur ad stipitem et toto corpore ad eculeum fortius alligato vicinus pedibus ignis adponitur, utrumque latus carnifex fodit nec papillis dantur indutiae: inmotā mulier manet et a dolore corporis spiritu separato, dum conscientiae bono fruitur, vetuit circa se saevire tormenta.

C. Schäublin¹¹ objects to *vetuit*, which is read by all the MSS, on the ground that the perfect interrupts a series of verbs in the present (the next past tense is at 6.2 *suspirabat*), and that *vetare* itself is inappropriate when the woman has no power to forbid the tortures to rage about her; he suggests *patitur* or *perpetitur*. But in this letter Jerome shifts easily between past tenses and the historic present, sometimes using them together even within a single sentence (cf. e.g. c. 4 'consularis...duplicari tormenta iubet et saevum dentibus frendens similem carnifici minitatus est poenam', 7.2 'inbellem manum percussor expavit et victam dexteram gladio marcescente miratus in secundos impetus torquet', 7.3 'fibulam...in humum excussit ignarusque rei ensem librat [al. librabat] in vulnus', 8.1 'oculi gladium non videntes tantum fibulam vident et, ne parum esset, quod non formidabat interitum, praestabat beneficium saevienti',

A Study of the Clausulae of St. Jerome (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies 51; Washington, 1937). Knook's conclusions about Jerome's attention to rhythm, based on his own statistics, are roundly criticised by H. Hagendahl, *Gnomon* 15 (1939), 84–9. Herron's work suffers principally from her failure, in examining clausulae from the metrical viewpoint, to take proper account of the critical notion of relative frequencies established by A. W. de Groot, *A Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm: 1* (The Hague, 1919). We are in great need of detailed and methodologically sound investigations of the rhythmical practices of both Jerome and other writers of the period. The benefits of such studies would not be confined to the textual-critical field.

¹⁰ Or possibly late 374. Cf. my article 'Jerome, Antioch, and the Desert: a Note on Chronology', *JThS* 37 (1986), 117–21.

¹¹ 'Textkritisches zu den Briefen des Hieronymus', *MH* 30 (1973), 56.

8.2 'ad capulum gladius reflectitur et velut dominum suum victus aspiciens confessus est se ferire non posse'); and *vetuit* conveys very well the woman's psychological state as, conscious of her innocence, she refuses to let the tortures get the better of her.

- (b) 8.2 iam igitur et tertius ictus: sacramentum frustraverat trinitatis. iam speculator exterritus et non credens ferro mucronem aptabat in iugulum...

Text and meaning here are difficult. The woman taken to execution has survived two blows of the sword; now comes the third. All the MSS bar *s* have *tertius ictus*; *s* reads *tertium ictum*. *tertius ictus sacramentum frustraverat trinitatis*, however, will not do. *sacramentum trinitatis*, a somewhat obscure phrase, is most naturally understood as 'the mystery of the Trinity' or 'the sacred Trinity';¹² but 'the third blow had made vain the sacred Trinity', i.e. succeeded in killing the woman despite her divine protection,¹³ makes no sense in this context. Nor does it help to take *trinitatis* more generally, = 'threeness'. The only plausible meaning I can see in this case is that by striking the third blow the executioner had profaned the holiness of the number three; but, even if the Latin can properly be understood in this way (which I doubt), it gives no indication of the outcome of the blow. Furthermore, *et* makes no sense in either case. Hilberg attempted to solve the problem by punctuating with a colon after *ictus* and understanding *ictum* as the object of *frustraverat*.¹⁴ But *iam...iam* looks anaphoric¹⁵ (and the pluperfect *frustraverat*, which is otherwise odd, is then natural), suggesting that there is no room for a break in *iam...trinitatis*. It is much better to read *tertium ictum*:¹⁶ 'the sacred Trinity had made vain the third blow, too'. This leads easily into the second half of the anaphora, where the executioner (*speculator*) is *exterritus* and turns to a different method of execution. Hilberg's colon should be omitted, and a comma printed after *trinitatis*.¹⁷

¹² *sacramentum* is a complex word which has been much discussed: see in particular J. de Ghellinck, E. de Backer, J. Poukens, and G. Lebacqz, *Pour l'histoire du mot 'sacramentum': 1, les Anténicéens* (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 3; Louvain and Paris, 1924), and C. Mohrmann, 'Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens', *HThR* 47 (1954), 141–52 (= Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* (Storia e letteratura 65, 87, 103, 143; 4 vols., Roma, 1958–77), 1.233–44). Mohrmann is highly sensitive to the different nuances of the word in early Christian Latin, and warns against over-rigid classification of its usages (*HThR*, p. 151, = *Études*, pp. 242–3). It is, however, impossible in an English translation to represent satisfactorily both of its predominant semantic elements: the notion of *sacrum* and that of *arcanum* or *mysterium*.

¹³ Which is implicit throughout the letter and made explicit at c. 11 *stat victima Christo tantum favente munita*. ¹⁴ Cf. his apparatus. ¹⁵ As at 6.2.

¹⁶ So I. Martianay, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri operum tomus quartus* (Parisii, apud Ludovicum Roulland, 1706) (the fourth volume of five covering the complete works, 1693–1706), and D. Vallarsi, in J.-P. Migne's *Patrologia Latina* 22 (Migne reprinted, in nine volumes (PL 22–30), Vallarsi's complete, eleven-volume, Venice edition of 1766–72; his first edition, also in eleven volumes, was published at Verona, 1734–42). The other important pre-Hilberg editions of Jerome's *Letters* were those of D. Erasmus (complete works, 9 vols., apud Inclytam Basileam, 1516; the *Letters* were more conveniently available to me in *Opus Epistolarum divi Hieronymi Stridonensis* (3 vols., apud Inclytam Basileam, 1524), which I have followed) and M. Victorius, *Epistolae d. Hieronymi, Stridonensis, et libri contra haereticos* (3 vols., Romae, apud Paulum Manutium, 1564–5) (the first three volumes of nine, 1564–72). Where I use the phrase 'the earlier editors' all four are meant.

¹⁷ In a recent article, 'Nota ad Hieron., *Ep.* 1.8', *Koinonia* 4 (1980), 101–14, F. Capponi proposed a different solution: *iam igitur et tertius ictus sacramentum <non> frustraverat trinitatis*. But Capponi's arguments against *tertium ictum* and in favour of this rather desperate emendation are unconvincing, and I do not propose to offer a detailed refutation here.

- (c) 9.1 huc beati Danihelis revocetur historia, iuxta quem adulantibus caudis praedam suam leonum ora timuerunt.

The story of Daniel in the pit of lions (Dan. 6, esp. vv. 16–23; also Dan. 14 (Bel & Dr.). 30–40) is adduced as a parallel to the woman's situation, together with the episode of the young men in the fiery furnace (Dan. 3) and the story of Susanna (Dan. 13). In each case innocence and trust in God are justified.

Hilberg followed the earlier editors in printing *quem*, the reading of all the MSS except *Ds* (*quam*). *quam*, however, is clearly superior, the meaning then being '... the story of Daniel, according to which lions¹⁸ with wagging tails were afraid of their plunder'; for *iuxta* = 'according to' cf. e.g. Apul. *mund.* 21 'unumque ex omnibus et ex uno omnia iuxta Heraclitum constituit', ps. Acro, *Hor. carm.* 3.2.17 'iuxta Stoicorum sectam', Aug. *civ.* 22.26, Jer. *epist.* 18A. 2.3 'iuxta historiam tunc magis gaudere debuerint et ante suspirare, dum viveret', 66.11.2 (quoted at n. 36). Although the clause could conceivably bear the same sense with *quem*, which would then refer to Daniel as the author of the story, this is much less natural; and to take *iuxta* in any other way raises difficulties. J. Labourt¹⁹ and F. A. Wright²⁰ understand it (with *quem*) to carry its more usual meaning of 'near', but as *quem* and *praedam suam* must both refer to Daniel the sense is then immensely strained: 'near whom wagging their tails the lions were afraid of (him) their plunder'. Again, *iuxta* can hardly be adverbial here; and to delete it, *quem* then being the object of *timuerunt*, with *praedam suam* in apposition, makes the word-order unsatisfactory and is altogether too radical.

- (d) 10.1–2 Tandem ergo ad feminam vindicandam populus armatur. omnis aetas, omnis sexus carnificem fugat et coetu in circulum coeunte non credit paene unusquisque, quod vidit. turbatur tali nuntio urbs propinqua et tota lictorum caterva glomeratur. e quibus medius, ad quem damnatorum cura pertinebat, erumpens et canitiem inmundam perfuso pulvere turpans [cf. Virg. *Aen.* 12.611]: 'meum,' inquit, 'o cives, petitis caput, me illi vicarium datis! si misericordes, si clementes estis, si vultis servare damnatam, innocens certe perire non debeo.'

The earlier editors took '*meum... datis*' as a pair of questions, and supplied *quin* before *meum*. Hilberg rightly omits *quin*, which does not appear in the MSS and renders *meum* and *me* much less emphatic. Nevertheless, the first of these two clauses at least looks like a question – 'is it *my* life you are seeking, citizens?' reads much better in context than 'it is *my* life you are seeking, citizens!' – and in that case the second clause is likely to be intended as a question too. Without inserting *quin*, I would punctuate with a question-mark after *datis*.

- (e) 12.1–2 Clerici, quibus id officii erat, cruentum linteo cadaver obvolvunt et fossam humum lapidibus construentes ex more tumulum parant. festinato sol cursu occasum petit et misericordiam domini celatura nox advenit. subito

¹⁸ To convey better the idea of the fierceness of the lions and the sort of danger to be expected from them, Jerome makes *ora* the subject of *timuerunt* in a kind of synecdoche. *ora* is of course a particularly appropriate word to use in connection with *praedam suam*.

¹⁹ *Saint Jérôme: Lettres* (8 vols., Paris, 1949–63), 1.6 ('auprès de qui').

²⁰ *Select Letters of St. Jerome* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1933), 13 ('before whom').

feminae palpitat pectus et oculis quaerentibus lucem corpus animatur ad vitam.

misericordia s celatura Q, Σ p.c.: celeratura B (er exp.), Σ a.c.: celeriore naturae D: celeriore maturę s: celeriore cursu naturae Eras. Vict. Mart. Vall.

misericordiam domini celatura nox advenit is (we may infer) read by *KL*, two early MSS.²¹ While this gives good sense – ‘night came on to conceal the mercy of the Lord’, God’s mercy being seen in the restoration of the woman to life²² – the variant readings, particularly *celeriores naturae* and *celeriores maturę*, suggest corruption. Now as *festinato* in the previous clause is made emphatic by position and by the hyperbaton (*festinato sol cursu*), it would be no surprise if Jerome had repeated the idea of the day drawing to a quick end in this clause. The MSS offer some support for *celeratura*, which would be possible; but the right kind of approach seems to me to have been signalled by Labourt’s conjecture, *misericordia domini celer* (or *celerior*) *ac* (or *et*) *matura nox advenit*.²³ In this case God’s mercy is shown in his drawing a curtain over the unpleasant proceedings of the execution by causing night to fall swiftly. *subito* then has greater dramatic force: everything is dark and quiet and suddenly...; whereas *misericordiam cel(er)atura* prepares us for further action, as we wait to find out exactly how God reveals his mercy. More recently Capponi²⁴ has conjectured *misericordia domini celeriore <motu> matura nox advenit*, which, while on the same lines, is less tempting, though *celatura* and *celeratura* could be derived from it as easily as from Labourt’s reconstruction. More simply, *CQ*’s anonymous referee has suggested to me *misericordia domini celerata nox advenit*, which is highly attractive, but does not allow the readings of *Ds* to be explained away so easily. The true wording is unclear, and I would pussillanimously obelise.

(f) 13.2 recens a clericis caespes ostenditur et dudum superiecta humus cum his vocibus ingeritur flagitanti: ‘erue scilicet ossa iam condita, infer novum sepulchro bellum et, si hoc parum est, avibus ferisque lanianda membra discerpe; sepius percussa debet aliquid morte plus perpeti.’

si licet *KΣ*: sic licet *L*

After the body of an old woman has been buried in place of the heroine, the executioner – whom Jerome regards as a personification of the devil – returns to the scene in search of the woman, not believing that she could really die. The *clerici* show him the new tomb, suggesting that she is in fact dead.

The words of the *clerici* can scarcely be intended as a serious statement, encouraging the executioner to dig up the body; rather, they are spoken with biting sarcasm, apparent particularly in *si hoc parum est* (i.e. ‘if even to attack the tomb is not enough for you’). Whether *scilicet*, which might be thought to contribute to the sarcastic tone, can stand, however, is doubtful. It looks out of place with the imperative *erue*; the required sense would seem to be ‘by all means dig up...’, ‘go ahead and dig up...’, but I have noticed no other instances where *scilicet* is used in this way. *si placet* is

²¹ *misericordiam* is not *conjectural*, as Capponi (n. 24), p. 156, appears to believe.

²² I do not understand why *misericordia* should be an inappropriate word to use for this action (so Capponi, *ibid.*).

²³ *Op. cit.* 1.7, 161; better than his alternative suggestion, *misericordia domini celerior tunc nox advenit* (1.7), which renders *celatura* and *celeratura* less explicable as corruptions, and is rhythmically poor. The phrase *matura nox* is also used by Jerome at *vita Malchi* 6.

²⁴ ‘Nota ieronimiana’, *Maia* 33 (1981), 155–7.

a plausible correction, particularly in this context of ironical utterance; but it seems better to follow *KΣ* and read *si licet* – ‘dig up the bones, if it is permissible for you (i.e. if you have the authority)’.

III

Letter 107 (A.D. 401 or 402)²⁵

This letter falls into the tradition of ascetical literature which belonged to the early centuries of Christianity and continued into the Middle Ages. It gives advice to Laeta, wife of Toxotius, on the upbringing of their daughter Paula, who has been dedicated to a life of virginity in the service of Christ.²⁶ The letter, which deals with both intellectual and moral education, is not well structured, the precepts being set out in a rather haphazard fashion; but the underlying aim of the programme Jerome lays down for Paula is clear: it outlines the way in which her spiritual union with Christ, which is the object of her life, may successfully be achieved.

- (a) 1.3 quis hoc crederet, ut Albinus pontificis neptis de repromissione matris nasceretur, ut praesente et gaudente avo parvulae adhuc lingua balbutiens alleluia resonaret et virginem Christi in suo gremio nutriret et senex?

nutriret et (*om.* *ℬ*) *sene(iK)x KℬΨ*: *senex* (-s *Σ p.c.m2 B*) *nutriret ΣDB*

The point of this passage is to stress how remarkable it is that the pagan Albinus,²⁷ Laeta's father, ‘adhuc ambulantis in tenebris’ (1.2), should have a granddaughter born as the result of a vow made by a Christian mother, and dedicated to Christ's service; the images of the child singing alleluias in his presence and being held in his lap make the contrast strikingly. But what then is the force of *et* in *nutriret et senex*? Neither ‘even the old man’ nor ‘though an old man’ nor ‘the old man, too’ makes good sense here. What is required is simply: ‘who would believe that the old pagan would cuddle a virgin of Christ?’. We are left with a choice between *nutriret senex*, the reading of *ℬ* alone, *et KΨ* being explained away easily as scribal dittography after *nutriret*, and *senex nutriret*, read or suggested by the other MSS. The former is, I think, preferable. Though there is no compelling reason for Jerome to have moved the verb from the final position in the clause, to accept *senex nutriret* is to suppose that not one but two errors in transmission lie behind the reading of *K*, the earliest of the MSS (eighth century).²⁸

²⁵ For the date cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: his Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London, 1975), 273, with whom I am in agreement.

²⁶ For Laeta see A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, 1: AD 260–395 (Cambridge, 1971), 492, and *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie*, edd. A. F. von Pauly and G. Wissowa (Stuttgart, 1894–) (*RE*), s.n. *Laetus* 7; for Toxotius, Jones, p. 921, and *RE* s.n. *Toxotius* 3; for Paula, Jones, p. 675.

²⁷ Publius Ceionius Caecina Albinus, for whom see Jones, pp. 34–5, and *RE* s.n. *Ceionius* 30.

²⁸ I.e. the transposition of the words and the insertion of *et*. To read *nutriret senex* is to suppose, equally, that two errors lie behind the reading of *B* (transposition, *senes* for *senex*), but this is a much later MS (twelfth century); and only one error needs to be supposed in *D* and the original reading of *Σ*.

Considerations of rhythm are unhelpful in this case, where they might have been of use. First, in this chapter as a whole Jerome displays little interest in rhythm. Secondly, the evidence of the passage itself is equivocal. Metrically *gremiō nūtrirēt sēnēx* – molossus cretic – gives a better clausula, in this emphatic position, than *gremiō sēnēx nūtrirēt* (double spondee). On the other hand, *senex nutriret* is superior accentually (*planus*).

- (b) 2.2 ante paucos annos propinquus vester Graccus...cum praefecturam regeret urbanam, nonne specu Mithrae et omnia portentuosia simulacra...subvertit, fregit, exussit...?

specu mitrae *K*, *Ψ* *a.c.m2*: specum mitrae *Σ* *BD*: specum idrae *Ψ* *p.c.m2*: specum mitre *B*
specu Mithrae refers to the shrine of Mithras destroyed by Gracc(h)us, *praefectus urbis Romae* 376–7.²⁹ *specu*, however, is a doubtful neuter form of the regular *specus*, 4th declension masc. (occasionally fem. or neut.); its existence is attested chiefly by the passage at Prisc. *gramm.* 2.192 Keil ‘hoc specus specoris, hic specus specus, haec specus specus, hoc specu specu’. I would restore *specum* in the text; the final *m* in *KΨ* could easily have fallen out before *mitrae*.

- (c) 2.3 Getarum rutilus et flavus exercitus ecclesiarum circumfert tentoria et ideo forsitan contra nos aequa pugnat acie, quia pari religione confidunt.

pugnant *Σ* *BD*

With *confidunt* following, *pugnant* looks better than *pugnat*: the close connection between the *ideo*-clause and the *quia*-clause suggests that they should have the same subject. Rhythmically – and the sentence comes at the end of a passage in which Jerome has clearly paid some attention to quantity (and indeed to accent) – *pugnant* does not, I think, result in a clausula (*aequā pūgnānt āciē*: molossus tribach) significantly inferior to the resolved ditrochee of *aequa pūgnāt āciē*. Again, that *exercitus* is singular is no objection.³⁰

- (d) 3.3 hic fugit urbes, zona pellicia cingitur, lucustis alitur et melle silvestri et in typum paenitentiae praedicat tortuosissimi animalis vestitus exuviis.

praedicat ac *Σ*: praedicatae *K p.c.* *B*: praedicate et (*exp.*) *B*: praedicante *D*: praedicandae Eras. Vict. Mart. Vall. vestitus scripsit Hilberg: vestitur *codd.*

hic refers to John the Baptist, whose case Jerome has adduced as a parallel to Paula’s.³¹ Most of the details in this passage are drawn from Matt. 3.1–4 and Mark 1.2–6; see also n. 32.

Clearly, in *in typum...exuviis* there is room for only one main verb unless a connective word is inserted before *tortuosissimi*. But as Hilberg saw, to follow *Σ* or *B* and read *praedicat ac* (or *et*) ... *vestitur* makes no sense: the symbol of penitence is not the preaching but the wearing of the skin of the camel (*tortuosissimi animalis*).³²

²⁹ Cf. Jones, op. cit. 399. He is probably to be identified with one Furius Maccius (or Maecius) Gracchus; cf. Jones, p. 400, R. Syme, *Ammianus and the Historia Augusta* (Oxford, 1968), 162–3.

³⁰ R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, zweiter Teil: Satzlehre* (2nd edn., 2 vols., Hannover, 1912–14), 1.22–5, supply many examples of a singular collective noun followed by a plural verb or participle. What is unusual in the present case is that the noun first takes a singular verb (*circumfert*).

³¹ The main connection seems to be that, although the Biblical account of John’s birth (Luke 1.15–25) contains no explicit indication that John, like Paula (cf. (a) above), was born *de repromissione*, Jerome believed this to have been the case; cf. 3.2, where Jerome closely associates John with Samuel and Samson, both of whom fell into this category (cf. 1 Sam. 1.1–20, (for Samson) Jer. *adv. Iovin.* 2.15). It is also apparent that Jerome regarded him as a highly suitable model for the ascetic life.

³² Jerome is fond of describing the camel as *tortuosus*; cf. *epist.* 79.3.2, 120.1.8, *in Is.* 21.6. The notion that the camel’s-hair coat has this symbolic value belongs not to Scripture but to symbolic and allegorical exegesis. Jerome makes a similar comment at *in Matt.* 3.4 ‘zona autem pellicia qua accinctus fuit et Helias [cf. 2 Kgs. 1.8] mortificationis σύμβολον est’.

Hilberg's solution to the difficulty was to emend to *vestitus*, thus allowing *in typum paenitentiae* to be defined by *tortuosissimi...exuviis. paenitentiae praedicat*, however, gives a strong clausula (double cretic, *tardus*), marking a pause which seems inappropriate. It is far more satisfactory to retain *vestitur* and read *praedicatae*, to which most of the MSS can be seen to lend support. This makes perfectly good sense: 'as a symbol of the penitence he preached he wore the skin of the most twisted of animals'.

- (e) 4.7 proclivis est enim malorum aemulatio et, quorum virtutem adsequi nequeas, cito imitere vitia.

virtutum *K*, Ψ (um in em corr. m2): virtutes *cet*.

The plural *virtutes* looks better in view of *vitia* following. *virtutum K\Psi* is an easy error after *quorum*, the correction to *virtutem* in Ψ being made subsequently in the interests of sense.

- (f) 5.2 'tunc ausa es viri imperium praeferre Christo? tu caput virginis dei sacrilegis adrectare manibus? quae iam nunc arescent, ut sentias excruciata, quid feceris, et finito mense quinto ad inferna ducaris.'

As a warning to Laeta, whom he has instructed to keep Paula's dress and adornment simple, Jerome cites the case of Praetextata. This woman, at her husband's bidding, dressed and adorned his niece Eustochium in a manner inappropriate to her status as a *virgo dei*. In her sleep that very night, says Jerome, she saw a vision of an angel, who addressed her in the above words.

ducaris makes no sense as a verb expressing purpose after *arescent, ut*, and there is no other obvious way of taking it. *duceris* \mathfrak{B} *B a.c.* is much better. After the rhetorical questions, the angel states Praetextata's punishment: (i) her hands will wither, as a reminder of her misdeed ('in pain you will feel what you have done'), (ii) in five months' time she will die.

- (g) 6.1 Heli sacerdos offendit dominum ob vitia liberorum; episcopus fieri non potest, qui filios habuerit luxuriosos et non subditos. at e contrario de muliere scribitur, quod salva fiet per filiorum generationem, si permanserit in fide et caritate et sanctificatione cum pudicitia.

After stating the importance of parental responsibility for children in the matter of dress in c. 5, Jerome now moves on to more general consideration of the question, discussing the overall responsibility of parents for their children, particularly (6.4) in the case of those who have consecrated their child to Christ. The point is illustrated first by the case of the sons of Eli, whose sin against God rebounded on their father and caused the priesthood of his house to be brought to an end;³³ then Jerome presents the reverse side of the coin. *salva...pudicitia* is a version of 1 Tim. 2.15. All the MSS have *permanserit*, although in \mathfrak{B} this is corrected in a second hand to *permanserint*.

³³ Cf. 1 Sam. 2.12–36. For *episcopus...non subditos* cf. 1 Tim. 3.1–7, esp. 4 'filios habentem subditos cum omni castitate [sc. oportet episcopum esse]'; the parallelism between the OT priesthood, here typified by Eli, and the episcopate of the early Church is first witnessed to by 1 Clement 40–4, written near the end of the first century.

The Greek at 1 Tim. 2.15 is *μείνωσιν*.³⁴ At *epist.* 79.7.4 and *adv. Iovin.* 1.27 Jerome, citing the same verse, certainly wrote *permanserint*, and in the present case the quotation makes good sense only if the plural form is read: the mother is responsible for her children's actions, and if they live in a correct fashion, she will be saved. The false reading of the MSS, if not simply the result of careless copying, may be attributed to scribal misunderstanding, *mulier* presumably being taken as the subject of *permanserit*;³⁵ some of the MSS of *epist.* 121 show the same mistake at c. 4.6.

- (h) 6.3 qui autem parvulus est et sapit ut parvulus, donec ad annos sapientiae veniat et Pythagorae litterae eum perducant ad bivium, tam mala eius quam bona parentibus inputantur.

littera **BB** perducunt **Σ**: perducant **BB**

Pythagoras used the symbol Υ or \mathcal{V} to represent human life, the stem indicating childhood, when character was as yet undeveloped, the left-hand branch the easy path of vice, the right, the difficult route of virtue.³⁶ Hilberg made clear in his apparatus that he understood *anni sapientiae* as the subject of *perducant*, presumably taking *litterae* as a genitive after *bivium*. This, however, renders the word-order very strange, and is hardly credible. Equally, it makes poor sense to take *litterae* as a nom. pl. *littera* and *perducant* should be read.³⁷

- (i) 8.1 Non vescatur in publico, id est in parentum convivio, nec videat cibos, quos desideret. et licet quidam putent maioris esse virtutis praesentem contemnere voluptatem, tamen ego securioris arbitror continentiae nescire, quod quaeras.

As a *virgo dei*, Paula is to be kept on a very light and simple diet,³⁸ and must not see what she is missing. All the MSS have *nec videat*, though in **B** the *c* has been erased. The earlier editors, and Labourt, read *ne videat*, and indeed the purpose clause looks much better than a second jussive: it explains the *non vescatur* clause, the meaning of which is otherwise obscure.

³⁴ The Vulgate translation, which for 1 Tim. is almost certainly not Jerome's work (cf. e.g. H. F. D. Sparks, 'Jerome as Biblical Scholar', *The Cambridge History of the Bible, 1: from the Beginnings to Jerome*, edd. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), 519–20), is *permanserint*, though here too a number of MSS have the singular form.

³⁵ It is, I suppose, even possible that *generatio* was held to be the subject, as though *per filiorum generationem* (= διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας) referred not to the act of producing offspring but to the offspring themselves.

³⁶ For other instances of the notion cf. e.g. Pers. 3.56–7, 5.34, Auson. *comm. prof. Burd.* 11.5, *tech.* 13.9, Serv. *Aen.* 6.136, 295, 477, Jer. *epist.* 66.11.2 'Loth, quod interpretatur declinans, campestria eligat et iuxta Pythagorae litteram facilia magis et sinistra et peritura sectetur; tu in arduis et saxosis cum Sarra tibi monumentum para', and the poem of Maximinus, no. 632 in *Anthologia Latina* 1.2, ed. A. Riese (2nd edn., Lipsiae, 1906). The idea of the two ways itself is at least as old as Hesiod; cf. *Op.* 287–92.

³⁷ The singular also results in an improved clausula (cretic tribrach against molossus tribrach), though in this part of the letter Jerome is writing with less attention to metre than to accent, which is unaffected by the change proposed.

³⁸ Cf. cc. 8, 10. Fasting, and abstinence from certain kinds of food, were held by the Fathers to counteract lust, and thus to be particularly important for virgins; equally, as satiety was believed to blunt the mind (cf. e.g. Jer. *epist.* 52.11.1, *adv. Iovin.* 2.12), fasting was regarded as a good preparation for the essential ascetic activities of prayer and study.

- (j) **8.2** discat iam tunc et vinum non bibere, in quo est luxuria.

tunc looks to the past; the required sense is 'let her learn right now'. Read *iam nunc* ΣB .

- (k) **9.1** Reddat tibi pensum cotidie scripturarum certum. ediscat Graecorum versuum numerum.

cotidie pensum *B* script.] de scripturarum floribus (flor. *s.l.* Σ) ΣD et discat Σ

Hilberg seems entirely right to reject the alternative readings of ΣD , but his punctuation is dubious. Labourt translates *ediscat... numerum* 'Qu'elle apprenne le rythme des vers grecs';³⁹ but instilling a sense of rhythm is unlikely to have been uppermost on Jerome's list of concerns for Paula, and it does not in any case seem very appropriate in the study of the *LXX* and the Greek NT. It would be more natural for Jerome to say that Paula should learn by heart a number of verses in Greek, and *ediscat* certainly makes better sense with the notion of words than with that of rhythms. If understood in this way, however, *numerum* would be better if qualified by an adjective; cf. e.g. Caes. *Gall.* 6.14.3 'magnum ibi numerum versuum ediscere dicuntur', Jer. *epist.* 54.11.1 'de scripturis sanctis habeto fixum versuum numerum'. Consequently it appears sensible to take *certum* with *ediscat... numerum*, especially as *cotidie scripturarum* gives an excellent clausula (cretic double spondee, *velox*).⁴⁰ *pensum* is in no need of qualification; among many metaphorical instances cf. Cic. *de orat.* 3.119 'meque ad meum munus pensumque [i.e. task] revocabo', Jer. *epist.* 125.15.2 'non facias, quod vis, comedas, quod iuberis... operis tui pensa persolvas', and esp. 54.11.1 (continuing directly from the quotation above) 'istud pensum domino tuo redde nec ante quieti membra concedas, quam calathum pectoris tui hoc subtegmene inpleveris'.

- (l) **11.2** mihi omnino in adulta virgine lavacra displicent, quae se ipsam debet erubescere et nudam videre non posse. si enim vigiliis et ieiuniis macerat corpus suum et in servitutem redigit, si flammam libidinis et incentiva ferventis aetatis extinguere cupit continentiae frigore, si adpetitis sordibus turpare festinat naturalem pulchritudinem, cur e contrario balnearum fomentis sopitos ignes suscitatur?

suscitet ignes *B*

Whether the subject of the sentence beginning at *si enim vigiliis* is intended to be the hypothetical *adulta virgo* just referred to, or Paula herself when she has grown up, the sense required by the question is 'why *should* she rouse...?'. *suscitet* should be read.

- (m) **12.3** Cypriani opuscula semper in manu teneat, Athanasii epistulas et Hilarii libros inoffenso decurrat pede. illorum tractatibus, illorum delectetur ingeniis, in quorum libris pietas fidei non vacillet; ceteros sic legat, ut magis iudicet, quam sequatur.

vacillet *K a.c.m2* Ψ : v(b *D*)acillat *cet.*

³⁹ Op. cit. 5.153. He is in some doubt, however, suggesting at 5.212 'un certain nombre de lignes' as an alternative, though without explicitly proposing a punctuation change.

⁴⁰ Which also disposes of *cotidie pensum B*.

vacillet may be explained as a generic subjunctive – ‘let her delight in the intellectual gifts of those who are such that in their books the reverence of faith does not waver’ – or perhaps as a potential one – ‘could not waver’. But in a passage where Jerome is contrasting doctrinally sound writings with their opposite (he has just made a similar contrast between canonical Scripture and apocrypha), one might expect him to be more direct. *vacillat*, ‘definitely does not waver’, seems more appropriate.⁴¹

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

J. H. D. SCOURFIELD

⁴¹ I should like to thank Mr L. D. Reynolds, Professor P. G. Walsh, Dr M. Winterbottom, and *CQ*'s anonymous referee for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.