

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XLVIII

HELSINKI 2014

INDEX

NEIL ADKIN	<i>Some Recent "Improvements" to the Text of Jerome's Letter 52, "On Sacerdotal Lifestyle"</i>	11
NECİP FİKİRİ ALİCAN	<i>Rethought Forms: How Do They Work?</i>	25
LUIGI ARATA	<i>Usi medici dell'Anagyris foetida nella medicina greca</i>	57
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>True Patriots? The Public Activities of the *Augustales of Roman Ostia and the summa honoraria</i>	67
GIUSEPPE CAMODECA	<i>Un nuovo consularis Byzacenae di tardo IV secolo e i Tannonii di Puteoli</i>	93
ANTONIO CORSO	<i>Retrieving the Style of Cephisodotus the Younger</i>	109
LEE FRATANTUONO	<i>Saevit medio in certamine: Mars in the Aeneid</i>	137
SEPPO HEIKKINEN	<i>Copy-paste Metrics? Lupus of Ferrières on Boethius</i>	165
PANU HYPPÖNEN	<i>4π = 12.5? – The Problems in the Vitruvian Hodometer</i>	185
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Two Greek Documents on Bronze (IG XIV 954; IG XIV 955 = IGUR 4)</i>	205
TUA KORHONEN	<i>Some Steps Towards Plato's Ecopolitics in the Laws</i>	211
ANTTI LAMPINEN	<i>Fragments from the 'Middle Ground' – Posidonius' Northern Ethnography</i>	229
JARI PAKKANEN	<i>A Reappraisal of the First Publication of Stirrup Jar Inscriptions from Tiryns by Johannes Sundwall: Photographs, Lost Sherds and the 'a-nu-to/no-di-zo Workshop'</i>	261
GIORGOS C. PARASKEVIOTIS	<i>Verg. ecl. 6,13–30. Mimic Humour in Silenus' Scene</i>	279
ELINA PYY	<i>In Search of Peer Support: Changing Perspectives on Sisterhood in Roman Imperial Epic</i>	295
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Some Published, But Not Very Well Known Latin Inscriptions</i>	319

HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CCXCII– CCCI</i>	347
PIETRO VERZINA	<i>L'esordio ἦν ὅτε (Cypria fr. 1,1 Bernabé) e le sue connotazioni narrative</i>	415
VILLE VUOLANTO	<i>Children in the Roman World: Cultural and Social Perspectives. A Review Article</i>	435
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	451
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	575
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	581
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	587

SOME RECENT "IMPROVEMENTS" TO THE TEXT OF JEROME'S *LETTER* 52, "ON SACERDOTAL LIFESTYLE"

NEIL ADKIN

Hilberg's edition of Jerome's *Letters* for the Vienna-corpus was fittingly done in "little Vienna", a. k. a. *k. und k.* Czernowitz, right now Ukrainian Chernivtsi.¹ Since however Hilberg's prolegomena to this edition were regrettably chomped up by the dogs of war, the text is far from being a *chose jugée*.² Just a century after Hilberg's war-bitten edition, Cain has produced a very substantial commentary on *Letter* 52, which teaches rookie Nepotian how to be the perfect parson.³ Cain also takes this opportunity to make a number of textual "improvements" (so p. 23) to Hilberg's CSEL.⁴ It would however seem possible to show that the majority of these Cainian *diorthomata* are in fact *paradiorthomata*.⁵

¹ I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae* I–III (CSEL 54–6), Vienna – Leipzig 1910–18.

² The "2nd ed." of "Hilberg" (Vienna 1996) just gives us the same one-eyedly prolegomena-less text; for a clear statement of the shortcomings of this new "edition" cf. the review by S. Rebenich, *Gymnasium* 106 (1999) 75–8.

³ A. Cain, *Jerome and the Monastic Clergy: A Commentary on Letter 52 to Nepotian, with an Introduction, Text, and Translation*, Leiden – Boston 2013. On the merits of this book cf. the review by N. Adkin, *Eirene* 50 (2014) 361–3. Cain himself qualifies this *Letter* as "one of Jerome's most famous and ... most influential writings" (ib. p. VII).

⁴ Cain's resultant "revised critical Latin text" (so his blurb) "will provide a reliable textual apparatus for future scholarship on this key writing".

⁵ The same would appear to be true of the similar "improvements" made by Cain to the text of the other Hieronymian *Letter* (108) to which he has likewise devoted a recent commentary: *Jerome's Epitaph on Paula: A Commentary on the Epitaphium Sanctae Paulae*, Oxford 2013. On this book cf. the review by N. Adkin, *JThS* 65 (2014) 304–6. Again the textual *Schlimmbesserungen* are treated in a separate article by N. Adkin (forthcoming).

The first passage at issue here occurs in the second chapter (2,2),⁶ when senescent David "gat no heat" and Abishag, the fair Shunammite *caliente*, was invited to hot her old King up: *omnes* (sc. *uxores eius*) *quasi frigidae repudiantur; in unius tantum grandaevus calescit amplexibus*. To this Hilbergian text Cain adds the *et* found after *repudiantur* in some of Hilberg's MSS: the reason Cain gives (p. 81) is "so as to eliminate the run-on sentence, which would seem awkward in a work of otherwise exceptional stylistic polish". Such "awkwardness" would however seem to be the last thing one can predicate of the Hilbergian asyndeton, which sets off initial antithesis (*omnes / unius tantum*)⁷ as well as overall adherence to Behaghel's Law.⁸ The Cainian *et* on the other hand impairs the gracefully hyperbatic frame (*in ... amplexibus*) as well as the clausulation.⁹ Cain's own "awkwardly" syndetic *et* should accordingly be rejected in favour of Hilberg's concinnous asyndeton, which is also the reading of his oldest MSS.

The next passage in question is found in the *Letter's* next chapter (3,3), where Hilberg prints *quod adulescentia ... quasi ignis in lignis viridioribus suffocetur*. Cain changes *viridioribus* to *viridibus*, because in his view (p. 92) "this sequence [viz. *quasi ... suffocetur*] with its parechetic wordplay (*ignis ... lignis*) has been inspired by Cic. *Verr.* 2,1,45: *ignem ex lignis viridibus atque umidis in loco angusto fieri iussit*". Imitation of Cicero is however insufficient ground for changing *viridioribus* to *viridibus*, since Jerome can be shown to be in the habit

⁶ Citation of Latin works follows *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum*, Leipzig 1990², and its online *Addenda* at <http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/pdf/addenda.pdf>.

⁷ The antithesis also extends to medial *frigidae / calescit* and to final *repudiantur / amplexibus* (for *amplecti* as the opposite of *repudiare* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* I, 1993,72–3).

⁸ While the first clause has twelve syllables, the second one has sixteen. On this feature cf. M. von Albrecht, *Masters of Roman Prose from Cato to Apuleius*, revised Engl. transl. by N. Adkin, Leeds 1989, 188 (index s. v. "law of increasing members"). This asyndeton also forms an elegant contrast with the immediately foregoing polysyndeton (*et reliquae uxores eius et concubinae*), which in turn contrasts with the asyndetic *disiunctio* (on which cf. Quint. *inst.* 9,3,45: *initia ... et clausulae sententiarum aliis sed non alio tendentibus verbis inter se consonant*) that starts this sentence (*vivebat adhuc Bersabee, supererat Abigea*).

⁹ The first colon ends with 1st paeon / spondee (= Ciceronian *esse videatur*), which contrasts nicely with the final dicretic. Like Chaucer's own Parson (cf. *Canterbury Tales*, *Prol.* 526), Cain does not make himself "a spiced conscience" when it comes to matters of clausular technique: on the contrary he turns such a strangely deaf ear to this important issue of auralty that it is missing altogether from his amplitudinous Indices.

of subjecting his borrowings to stylistic improvement:¹⁰ *viridioribus suffocetur* generates an elegantly cretic / dispondiac clausula,¹¹ whereas *viridibus* is cadentially blah.¹²

The question may however be raised whether Cain's categoric assertion that Jerome's wording in the *Letter* "has been inspired" by the afore-cited text of the *Verrines* is in fact right. Only one other passage from all the speeches *Against Verres* is listed in Hagendahl's magisterial study of Jerome's debt to Cicero.¹³ The single text identified by Hagendahl (*Verr.* 2,1,40) is moreover quoted as a canonical instance of the figure of *execratio* by Julius Rufinianus (*rhet.* 15 pp. 42,32–43,1 H.): here Jerome may therefore be quoting at second hand.¹⁴ Cain makes specific reference to the *Letter's* "parechetic wordplay" with *ignis* and *lignis*, which in his view has been appropriated from the Verrine intertext that he himself has now posited. However precisely the same "parechetic" link between the same two words had already been made explicit in Lucretius.¹⁵

At the same time the online *Library of Latin Texts* supplies no further prepatristic instance of Jerome's particular collocation *lignum / viridis* besides the above-mentioned passage of the *Verrines*. If however a source has to be sought, Christ himself would seem a more likely one than a pagan prosecutor: here the *Quellenforscher* should look to the Gospels rather than the *Verrines*.¹⁶ Luke 23,31

¹⁰ Cf. N. Adkin, *Jerome on Virginité: A Commentary on the Libellus de virginitate servanda (Letter 22)*, Cambridge 2003, 457 (index s. v. "stylistic enhancement, of borrowings").

¹¹ It corresponds accentually to *cursus velox*.

¹² It is presumably due to banalization. The opposite change to *viridioribus* is on the other hand more difficult to explain.

¹³ H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Göteborg 1958, 401, with id., "Jerome and the Latin Classics", *VChr* 28 (1974) 221–2.

¹⁴ For this possibility regarding Hieronymian citations in general cf. I. Opelt, rev. of Hagendahl, *Fathers* (above n. 13), *JbAC* 3 (1960) 147.

¹⁵ 1,912–4 (... *cum ligna atque ignis distincta voce notemus*); for Jerome's thorough knowledge of Lucretius cf. Hagendahl, *Fathers* (above n. 13) 274–6. *Lignum* is in any case regularly used in connection with "fire"; cf. the huge section in *Thes. Ling. Lat.* VII,2,2, 1385,78–1386,49 (s. v.).

¹⁶ For a similar case in which Cain is evidently wrong to posit the source of a Jeromian phrase in the classics rather than the Bible cf. N. Adkin, "A New Echo of Pliny the Younger in Jerome?", *Philologus* 155 (2011) 193–5.

reads in the Vulgate: *si in viridi ligno haec faciunt*.¹⁷ It may be observed that in both Luke and Jerome the "green wood" is figurative, whereas in Cicero it is literal. While moreover the preposition *in* is common to both Lukan and Hieronymian texts, Cicero by contrast employs *ex*.¹⁸

In addition to scripture, Jerome's wording may also have been influenced by a passage of Gregory Nazianzen:¹⁹ δύσληπτον μὲν τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσει, ὡσπερ καὶ πῦρ ὕλη τῇ ὑγροτέρῳ. A number of considerations may be advanced which would seem to favour the view that Jerome has in fact been influenced here by the Nazianzene.²⁰ In the first place Gregory had been Jerome's own "teacher" in Constantinople.²¹ Secondly the Gregorian *Oration* in question is concerned with the priestly office, which is also the subject of this Hieronymian *Letter*.²² Thirdly this *Letter* mentions Gregory by name shortly afterwards.²³ Fourthly Gregory matches Jerome in giving this same striking simile the same specific application to virtue. Finally there is also a close parallelism in both word-order and choice of language.²⁴

The next passage where a Cainian emendation calls for comment occurs in the next chapter but one (5,5), where Hilberg's text reads: *aegrotanti tibi sanctus*

¹⁷ This is the "revised" text which Jerome had produced a decade earlier. These words are conveniently glossed by his coeval Augustine (*in psalm.* 40,12) thus: *ignis ... cuicumque viridi ligno adhibetur, difficile accenditur*. The very next words of the biblical text (*in arido quid fiet?*) may have exercised some influence on Jerome's similarly ensuing *et suum non possit explicare fulgorem*.

¹⁸ Plural number and inverse order of Jerome's *in lignis viridioribus* vis-à-vis scripture resemble his comparative in making possible the elegantly cretic clausula. For the equivalence of collective singular to plural in this sense of *lignum* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* VII,2,2, 1386,32–3.

¹⁹ *Or.* 2,12. Cain does refer (p. 93) to this Gregorian text, but merely with a mouselike "cf."; he does not consider the possibility of direct influence.

²⁰ Cain fails to take account of any of these factors.

²¹ On this relationship cf. N. Adkin, "Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome: Some Remarks", in M. A. Flower – M. Toher (eds.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell*, London 1991, 13–24.

²² This *Oration* of Gregory is also one of the nine specially picked by Rufinus for translation.

²³ 52,8,2. For Jerome's habit of echoing the phraseology of an author whom he then proceeds to name cf. C. Kunst, *De S. Hieronymi studiis Ciceronianis* (Diss. Philol. Vindob. 12,2), Vienna – Leipzig 1918, 183 n. 5.

²⁴ *Quasi* = ὡσπερ (cf. *Gloss.* II 482,45); *ignis* = πῦρ (cf. *Gloss.* VI 539); *lignis* = ὕλη (both mean "firewood"; cf. *OLD*² 1133 (s. v., 1) and *LSJ* 1847 (s. v., II); *viridioribus* = ὑγροτέρῳ (in aforesaid Lk. 23,31 *viridis* translates ὑγρός).

quilibet frater adsistat et germana vel mater aut probatae quaelibet apud omnes fidei. Here Cain alters *et* to *vel*. The change would seem unwarranted for three reasons. Firstly *et* itself can be used with the same disjunctive sense as *vel*.²⁵ Secondly *et* here generates lexical *variatio* of some elegance: *et ... vel ... aut*. Lastly Cain's *vel* is found in only one Hilbergian MS, which is also his latest; the same MS also jumbles the word-order at this point.

Again the next passage at issue is to be found in the next chapter but one (7,3). Here the Hilbergian text runs: *quod Aaron et filios eius, hoc episcopum et presbyteros noverimus*. This time Cain inserts an *esse* after the *hoc*. Again however this would appear to be a case of ultracrepidarianism. Such ellipsis of the substantive verb in a *Nominalsatz* is common.²⁶ In particular the omission of *esse* in an A. c. I. with such a *verbum sentiendi* as *noverimus* is natural.²⁷ Besides these syntactic reasons there are also stylistic ones for the ellipse, since it fits the concision of such a *sententia*.²⁸ A further stylistic factor concerns prose rhythm. Cain's *esse* turns the words between initial *hoc* and the clausula (dichoree preceded by choriamb: *presbyteros noverimus*) into the second *hemiepes* of a dactylic pentameter: *esse episcopum et*.²⁹ Such poesy in prose is an elocutionary thou-shalt-not.³⁰ This Cainian *esse*, which is absent from Hilberg's earliest MSS, is evidently a later cobble-up in the interests of an ultracrepidating explicitness.

The very next chapter gives us Cain's next fix, which concerns Jerome's recipe for the peerless pulpiteer (8,1): *nolo te declamatorem esse ... sed mys-*

²⁵ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* V,2, 894,30–54 (s. v. *et*): "vi disiunctiva i. q. 'aut', 'vel'". For cases where, as in the present passage, *et* "variat c. particulis disiunct." cf. ib. 880,60–81.

²⁶ Cf. J. B. Hofmann – A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Munich 1972, 419–23.

²⁷ Cf. Hofmann – Szantyr (above n. 26) 422 (sect. "e").

²⁸ Cf. Hofmann – Szantyr (above n. 26) 420 (sect. "α"). This is especially true of a *sententia* consisting of two matching halves (*quod Aaron et filios eius, hoc episcopum et presbyteros*), where the homoeoptotic isocolon is further enhanced by *adiunctio* (*noverimus*), which (so *Rhet. Her.* 4,27,38 re *adiunctio*) suits the *brevitas* that is also served by the ellipse.

²⁹ For non-elision in Late Latin prose rhythm cf. M. G. Nicolau, *L'origine du "cursus" rythmique et les débuts de l'accent d'intensité en latin*, Paris 1930, 97.

³⁰ Cf. Quint. *inst.* 9,4,72: *versum in oratione fieri multo foedissimum est totum, sed etiam in parte deforme*. For Jerome's familiarity with this Quintilianic text cf. N. Adkin, "The Ninth Book of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* and Jerome", *Arctos* 32 (1998) 13–25. For avoidance of the particular elegiac hemistich at issue in the present passage of Jerome's *Letter* cf. Mart. Cap. 5,521.

terii peritum et sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum (thus Hilberg).³¹ Here Cain fine-tunes *mysterii* to *mysteriorum* "in order to restore the inflexional parallelism with the genitive plural *sacramentorum*" (p. 194). The objection may however be raised that the resultant succession of genitive plurals is a breach of rhetorical behest.³² Instead of such jangly "parallelism" Jerome achieves a concinnously auxetic *variatio*: the quadrisyllabically singular *mysterii* is capped by the quinquesyllabically plural *sacramentorum*.³³ Hilberg's earliest MSS have *mysterii*, which the later ones have evidently assimilated to *sacramentorum* by a species of *Perseverationsfehler*.

In the next chapter but one (10,1) Cain adhibits his next textual Band-Aid. In this vignette of churchly architecture Hilberg reads: *auro splendent lacunaria*. Cain emendates *lacunaria* to *laquearia*. The change is not favoured by clausular considerations: whereas *lacunaria* gives a very choice dicretic, the dactyl / cretic entailed by *laquearia* is an unremarkable cadence. There is however another reason besides clausulation for giving the thumbs-down to Cain's emendation, which he makes "on the basis of Jer.'s own documented usage" (p. 215): while Jerome employs *laquear* on no fewer than eighteen other occasions, *lacunar* is a Hieronymian *hapax legomenon*. The reason for this *hapax* would however appear to be a hitherto unidentified imitation of Horace, *Ode* 2,18,1–2:³⁴ *aureum /*

³¹ For Ciceronian influence (*orat.* 47 and *de orat.* 1,202) on the particular vocabulary of this Hieronymian formulation cf. N. Adkin, "Cicero's *Orator* and Jerome", *VChr* 51 (1997) 26–7.

³² Cf. (e. g.) Fortun. *rhet.* 3,11: *ne plures genitivi plurales iungantur*. Cain erroneously makes *peritum* precede instead of follow its dependent noun (*peritum mysteriorum et sacramentorum* ...), which makes the sequence of genitive plurals even worse.

³³ The same *auxesis* also marks the respective epithets (*peritum ... eruditissimum*), while the entire syntagm (*mysterii peritum et sacramentorum dei tui eruditissimum*) constitutes a parisonic instance of Behaghel's Law. The *delectus verborum* in Hieronymian *mysterii ... sacramentorum* finds a contemporary parallel in Ambrose (*in psalm. 118 serm.* 13,6,1): *si mysterium nescias, si sacramenta non noveris*.

³⁴ An echo of the immediately preceding *Ode* (2,17) is registered by Hagendahl, *Fathers* (above n. 13) 408. On the other hand the *Nachlese* by id., "Jerome" (above n. 13) is unable to add any Horatian text whatsoever. The dossier of Jerome's debt to Horace can nonetheless be augmented; cf. N. Adkin, "Hier., *Epist.* 53,1,2–3: Cyprian, Horace, Virgil", *Sileno* 23 (1997) 91–2; id., "*Biblia Pagana*: Classical Echoes in the Vulgate", *Augustinianum* 40 (2000) 81–2; id., "The Classics and Jerome's Prefaces to the Biblical Translations 'From the Hebrew'", *Helmántica* 60 (2009) 168–9, where the borrowing comes from the second Book of Horace's *Odes*, as in the Hieronymian passage currently at issue.

... *renidet* ... *lacunar*.³⁵ Horatian and Hieronymian texts match each other in both lexicon and word-order: *aureum* / *auro*,³⁶ *renidet* / *splendet*,³⁷ *lacunar*³⁸ / *lacunaria*.³⁹ The parallelism would also seem to involve the adjacent phraseology in each author.⁴⁰ The *laquearia* preferred by Cain is evidently a banalization of the *lacunaria* inspired by Horace.⁴¹ The status of *lacunaria* as a Hieronymian *hapax*

³⁵ The second of these two Horatian lines (... *renidet* ... *lacunar*) was of particular interest to *grammatici*. Servius quotes it twice (*Aen.* 1,726 and 8,25; on both occasions apropos of *laquearia*), while the same line also drew attention because of its unusual metre; cf. (e. g.) Prisc. *gramm.* III 460,9–11. The Horatian words in question occur at the very beginning of the antepenultimate poem of the Book; on Jerome's tendency to borrow from such conspicuously initial and final positions cf. P. Petitmengin, "S. Jérôme et Tertullien", in Y.-M. Duval (ed.), *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris 1988, 50: "des emprunts incontestables, faits souvent au début ou à la fin ... , c'est-à-dire aux passages qui restent le mieux gravés dans la mémoire".

³⁶ Jerome's nominal form (*auro*) is more graphically concrete than Horace's epithetic *aureo*.

³⁷ Horace's "vox fere poetica" (so Forcellini s. v. *renideo*), which requires explanation by Porph. ad loc., is regularly glossed with the Hieronymian *splendet*; cf. *Gloss.* VII 197.

³⁸ Horace's use of this lexeme is a *hapax* in all Augustan poetry.

³⁹ The Hieronymian plural is customary in prose; cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* VII,2,2, 859,3–11 (s. v.). Jerome ignores *mea* ... *in domo* (same Horatian line) as irrelevant. It is ironic that Jerome should use a pagan poem to describe a Christian church. Such insouciance is however typical of him; cf. Adkin (above n. 10) 453 (index s. v. "Jerome: indifferent to context").

⁴⁰ Both descriptions of the architecture consist of a tricollic *synathroesmus*, which Jerome has wotedly enhanced by making it asyndetically hypozeuctic (on which cf. Ps. Iul. Ruf. *schem. lex.* 4 p. 49,1–2 H.: ὑπόζευξις *est, cum singulis rebus sentiis singula debita verba iunguntur*): hence Jerome's trim *marmora nitent, auro splendent lacunaria, gemmis altare distinguitur* in contrast to Horace's somewhat straggly *non ebur neque aureum / mea renidet in domo lacunar, / non trabes Hymettiae / premunt columnas ultima recisas / Africa*. Jerome's first colon (*marmora nitent*) may also evince Horatian influence, since Horace's *trabes Hymettiae* are glossed as *marmora* by Ps. Acro ad loc., while Hieronymian *nitent* is a virtual homonym of Horatian (*re*)*nidet* (for synonymous alternatives to *niteo* cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 422,4–5 B.). Similarly Horace's *columnas* ... *recisas* immediately after *trabes Hymettiae* may have had some influence on Jerome's *columnas* ... *subtrahunt* immediately before *marmora nitent*, since besides a common object (*columnas*) *recido* and *subtraho* are also linked conceptually: both involve the idea of "removal". Finally both passages exhibit the same *schema kat' arsin kai thesin*: Horace's concluding *at fides* ... *est* (ll. 9–10) matches Jerome's similarly terminal *et* (= *at*; for such "adversative" *et* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* V,2, 893,4–894,3) *ministorum Christi nulla electio est*.

⁴¹ The alteration brings Jerome's wording into line with his usual practice. On the other hand there was no reason to change *laquearia* to unwonted *lacunaria*, which is also the reading of Hilberg's earliest MSS.

is accordingly a warrant for the soundness of this lection, not (as Cain diagnosticates) for its cachexy: to return ring-compositionally to the trope that opened this paragraph, here the Cainian Elastoplast (a. k. a. Hansaplast) is *fehl am Platz*.⁴²

Cain's next-off emendation, which occurs in the next chapter (11,3), likewise involves a hitherto undetected echo of the classics. Here Jerome warns the clergyman about booze. In this connection he pronounces excathedrally: *sicera Hebraeo sermone omnis potio nuncupatur, quae inebriare potest, sive illa fermento conficitur sive pomorum suco* (so Hilberg). Cain amends *fermento* to *frumento*, which is the reading of one Hilbergian MS. Cain's reasons are threefold (pp. 228–9). In the first place he requires "parallelism" with terminal *pomorum suco*. However in such a belletristic tract *variatio* would seem more appropriate than ho-hum sync. Secondly Cain objects that liquor is not made "out of" *fermentum*, but "with" it. This objection would appear too persnickety.⁴³ Finally Cain compares a passage from Jerome's *Commentary on Isaiah*.⁴⁴ This exegetic text is not however a legitimate *comparandum*, since here we have instead a precise enumeration that is appropriate to the quite different genre of the punditic commentary.⁴⁵

Jerome's *fermento* is evidently due to an unidentified reminiscence of Virgil's *Georgics* (3,379–80):⁴⁶ *pocula laeti / fermento atque acidis imitantur vitea*

⁴² There would seem to be a further unidentified echo of Horace earlier in this *Letter* at 6,1, where Cain misrenders the first two words of *quo mihi vulnus, ut indigeam cauterio?* as "how is it that I have ... ?" (p. 43). However the Horatian parallel (*epist.* 1,5,12: *quo mihi fortunam, si non conceditur uti?*) shows that the Hieronymian *quo* means rather "to what end or purpose?" (cf. *OLD*² 1722 [s. v. *quo*¹, 2]). Both texts also evince a directly succeeding *severus* (for ample synonyms that might have been used instead cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 414,5–6 B.).

⁴³ The *Thes. Ling. Lat.* article on *fermentum* includes under the section "ad efficiend[um] ... liquorem" (VI,1, 525,57–8) a sub-section with the rubric "de ipso liquore" (ib. 70).

⁴⁴ *In Is.* 9,28,5 ll. 50–2 G.: *sive illa* (sc. *sicera*) *frumento sive hordeo sive milio pomorumque suco et palmarum fructu et alio quolibet genere conficitur*.

⁴⁵ In quoting Jerome's Isaiah-commentary Cain has recourse here and elsewhere (cf. p. 282: "Bibliography of Ancient Authors") to Adriaen's *CC* instead of Gryson's properly critical edition. In the case of the Isaiah-commentary this reliance on *CC* is particularly unfortunate, since, if here *PL* evinces a consuetudinal grottness, Adriaen's *CC* one-ups even it by being grody to the max; cf. R. Gryson – P.-A. Deproost, *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isaïe: Livres I–IV*, Freiburg 1993, 119 ("la plus mauvaise de toutes").

⁴⁶ An echo of the previous Virgilian sentence but one (ll. 371–2) in Jerome's *C. Lucif.* 6 is identified by Opelt (above n. 14) 147.

sorbis.⁴⁷ Here Virgilian *fermento* is lexically and positionally identical with the Hieronymian lexeme: the same ablative singular in the same initial locus. In both texts this opening *fermento* is then linked by a medial conjunction (*atque / sive*) to terminal wording that again evinces a correlation: Virgilian *sorbis* corresponds to Hieronymian *pomorum suco*.⁴⁸ The welcome that Cain gives to the *frumento* of the one Hilbergian MS would accordingly seem to be injudicious: here we evidently have a gate-crasher from the Isaiah-commentary.

The Cainian emendation to come next comes in the same booze-based chapter (11,4), where Hilberg has: *quodsi absque vino ardeo et ardeo adulescentia*. Here Cain performs his text's only athetization by bleeping out *et ardeo* in accord with some Hilbergian MSS. Cain fails however to realize that the censured words are in fact an irreproachable instance of the figure of "explicative *geminatio*".⁴⁹ The same rhetorical figure had already occurred in this *Letter* at 5,7: *in clericis et in clericis monachis*.⁵⁰ This time Cain does not meddle with the text, but merely misunderstands it, since he translates (p. 43) as "in clergymen and in monks who are clergymen" instead of "in clergymen and in clergymen who are monks".⁵¹

⁴⁷ This is the only Augustan instance of *fermentum*. Moreover this particular application of the word ("ad efficiend[um] ... liquorem"; cf. above n. 43) is altogether rare.

⁴⁸ *Sorba* are glossed as *poma silvestria* (*Gloss.* V 245,10; cf. Jerome's *pomorum*), while the *sorbis* of this Virgilian passage is rendered by R. F. Thomas, *Virgil: Georgics II*, Cambridge 1988, 112 as "service-juice" (cf. Jerome's *suco*).

⁴⁹ Cf. P. Parzinger, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Entwicklung des Ciceronischen Stils*, Landshut 1910, 65–8. He gives as one example *inter alia* Cic. *inv.* 1,15: *peccasse et consulto peccasse*. For the similarly auxetic nuance of *adulescentia* in Jerome's own *ardeo et ardeo adulescentia* cf. *OLD*² 65 (s. v. *adulescentia*, 2: "pregn., w. ref. to the impulsiveness ... of youth"). It may accordingly be concluded that the wrongly reprehended and rhetorically immaculate *et ardeo*, which is present in Hilberg's three oldest MSS, has been omitted in the later ones by an errant haplography.

⁵⁰ Again most of Hilberg's MSS leave out the second *clericis*.

⁵¹ Here Cain's failure to grasp the "explicative *geminatio*" also leads him to misunderstand the ensuing clause (*quorum et sacerdotium proposito et propositum ornatur sacerdotio*), concerning which his commentary (p. 153) asseverates: "*sacerdotium proposito* corresponds to regular clergymen and *propositum sacerdotio* to monks who happen to be clergymen". In fact the reference of *sacerdotium proposito* and *propositum sacerdotio* is the same: both phrases refer to the same explicatively geminated "clergymen who are monks". This entire clause is accordingly an elegant instance of the figure of *antimetabole*; cf. (e. g.) Rut. Lup. 1,6, who gives the following example: *cuius et fortunae sapientia et sapientiae fortuna suppeditet*. Jerome's own *antimetabole* is further tricked out with chiasmically polyptotic *redditio* (*sacerdotium ... sacerdotio*), on which cf. (e. g.) Ps. Iul. Ruf. *schem. lex.* 9 p. 50,19–20 H. (*cum idem verbum in*

The same figure of "explicative *geminatio*" is also deployed at the very start of the *Letter* (1,1: *petis ... et crebro petis*), where Cain fails to identify not only any rhetorical figure but also these words' evident debt to the start of Cicero's *Orator* (3): *quaeris ... idque iam saepius*.⁵²

A similarly undetected echo of the classics is at issue in the next-but-one chapter (13,3), which is the next passage to attract Cain's blue pencil. Here the cardinal virtues are described in Hilberg's text as follows: *et ornamento tibi sunt et tutamini*. Cain jettisons *tutamini* in favour of the Hilbergian variant *munimini* because of Jerome's overwhelming preference for the latter lexeme.⁵³ The rightness of *tutamen* in this passage would however seem to be underwritten by the presence here of an unidentified reminiscence of Virgil (*Aen.* 5,262): *viro decus et tutamen*.⁵⁴ In both Virgilian and Hieronymian texts *tutamen* is the final element in a binary phrase. The wording of the initial element likewise evinces a correspondence: Virgilian *decus* is regularly glossed as Jeromian *ornamentum*.⁵⁵ In both authors the particle connecting this respective word for "ornament" with *tutamen* is the same: *et*.⁵⁶ Finally Virgil's datival *viro* matches the Hieronymian

eadem sententia et primum est et extremum). Apropos of this misunderstood Jeromian clause Cain also quotes a clause of Gregory Nazianzen (*or.* 21,9), which he likewise misunderstands, since he translates ὧν οὐχ ὁ τρόπος τὸν βαθμὸν, ὁ βαθμὸς δὲ τὸν τρόπον πιστεύεται as "whose way of life is not a credit to their ecclesiastical rank, and whose ecclesiastical rank is not a credit to their way of life" instead of "whose way of life is not made the guarantee of their ... rank, but whose ... rank is made the guarantee of their way of life"; for this sense of πιστεύω cf. Lampe s. v. L2.

⁵² Cicero's *quaeris* = Jerome's *petis* (cf. *Gloss.* IV 460,40), while Ciceronian *saepius* = Hieronymian *crebro* (cf. *Gloss.* V 149,10). Jerome's Tullian source has here been subjected to stylistic titivation à sa façon (cf. above n. 10): repetition of *petis* engenders not only "explicative *geminatio*", but also *reditio* (cf. above n. 51). This hitherto unidentified imitation of the opening of Cicero's *Orator* would appear to be especially important, since the *Letter's* own opening words thereby annex the *auctoritas* of the oratorical acharya-in-chief to Jerome himself as parsonological preceptor.

⁵³ P. 248 ("*tutamen* recurs only two other times in his works, and *munimen*, sixteen times").

⁵⁴ This Virgilian *tutamen* is a *hapax* in the whole of Augustan literature.

⁵⁵ Cf. *Gloss.* VI 310. A Hieronymian *decori* instead of *ornamento* would have produced an inconcinuous homoeoteleuton ("-i": *decori tibi ... tutamini*) as well as a no-no *hemiepes* (*et decori tibi sunt*; cf. above n. 30); *decori* is also pre-empted by paronymous *decoraris* in Jerome's immediately antecedent tricolon (*decoraris, cingeris atque protegeris*).

⁵⁶ A Jeromian *atque* would have given a better clausula: viz. dicretic corresponding to *cursus tardus* with agreement between metrical ictus and linguistic accent. For *et ... atque* = "both ... and" cf. *OLD*² 217 (s. v. *atque*, 11d). Jerome's preference for *et* may accordingly have been

tibi.⁵⁷ Cain would accordingly appear to be mistaken in deep-sixing *tutamen*, which occurs in Hilberg's earliest MSS: Jerome's preference elsewhere for *muni-men* accounts for its intrusion as a stowaway here.

The next intrusion of Cain himself into the text-criticism of this *Letter* is again found in its next-but-one chapter (15,1), which is also its antepenultimate. This time the topic is the comportment suitable to courtesy-calls by a man of the cloth: *officii tui est visitare languentes, nosse domos, matronas ac liberos earum et nobilium virorum non ignorare secreta. officii ergo tui sit non solum oculos castos servare, sed et linguam* (thusly Hilberg). Cain changes *sit* at the beginning of the second sentence to *est*, which in his view is "more sound" (p. 254), "because it restores the arresting anaphora". Better however than mere anaphora is the *geminatio cum variatione* entailed by *sit*.⁵⁸ here the *variatio* is an "arresting" (to use Cain's term) *amplificatio*,⁵⁹ since the discourse progresses from a dispassionate statement of fact (*est*) to an impassioned exhortation to virtue (*sit*).⁶⁰ This jussive *sit* is immediately preceded by *ergo*, which is regularly employed with such jussives.⁶¹

influenced by the occurrence of the same particle in the Virgilian intertext.

⁵⁷ Jerome's imitation of this verse of the *Aeneid* (*donat habere viro decus et tutamen*) suggests that he took *viro* with *decus*, not with *donat*. For the uncertainty felt here by editors of this Virgilian line cf. the *apparatus criticus* in M. Geymonat, *P. Vergili Maronis opera*, Rome 2008, 339. The phraseology of the *Aeneid* somewhat earlier in the same boat-race may have likewise influenced the *Letter's* choice of language a mere dozen words earlier: for Jerome's *velut aurigam* cf. *Aen.* 5,146 (*nec sic ... aurigae*), while for Hieronymian *metam* cf. Virgil's multiple use of the same lexeme (*Aen.* 5,129; 5,159; 5,171).

⁵⁸ This form of *geminatio* is related to the "explicative *geminatio*" which Cain failed to identify at 11,4 of this *Letter*; cf. above n. 49.

⁵⁹ For the desirability of such *auxesis* cf. (e. g.) Quint. *inst.* 9,4,23: *augeri enim debent sententiae et insurgere*.

⁶⁰ This jussive *sit* is then picked up by the similarly jussive subjunctives that follow immediately (*numquam de formis mulierum disputes nec alia domus, quid agatur in alia, per te noverit*); in particular *linguam* at the end of the *sit*-clause serves as a prelude to similarly lingual *disputes*.

⁶¹ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* V,2, 765,72–766,7; 768,25–66 (s. v. *ergo*: "cum imperativo et coniunctivo iussivo"). For a similar case in Jerome of *ergo* / *sit* used to articulate a similar *geminatio* cf. (e. g.) *Adv. Pelag.* 2,16 (*apud deum possibilia sunt. sit ergo et apud deum possibile ... donare ...*). For a comparable instance in Sallust, whose language has prescriptive value for Jerome (cf. N. Adkin, "Sallustius [Historiker]", forthcoming in *RAC*), cf. *Iug.* 85,18 (*invident honori meo: ergo invideant labori*).

Besides the aforesaid stylistic grounds of "arresting anaphora" Cain also buttresses his predilection for *est* by invoking Hieronymian usage "because Jer. has a documented preference for the impersonal construction *officium* (or *officii*) *est* + inf." Cain then proceeds to document this Jeromian preference with four texts, all of which however exhibit *officium* instead of the *officii* at issue.⁶² Such Jeromian use elsewhere of *officium est* is however beside the point, since evidence was adduced above to show that in the present context *sit* is a better fit. An exact parallel to such a jussive *sit* with *officii* as exactly parallel *genetivus proprietatis* is conveniently supplied by Jerome's own BFF, Rufinus: *tui sane sit officii ... praeberere* (*Basil. reg. praef.* 1,11). Cain's *est* is the lection of just one Hilbergian MS: it would accordingly appear that once again Cain's helpfully-meant textual "betterment" unhelpfully *schlimmbessert* the text.

Cain makes his next and last epiphany as a text-critical *Heinzelmännchen* in the next-but-one and very last chapter (17,2), where Jerome adjures the critics of his *Letter* and of its didactics thus (à la Hilberg): *quos obsecro quiescant*. Here Cain lightens our syntactic labours for us by inserting between *obsecro* and *quiescant* the *ut* found in some of Hilberg's MSS. Cain justifies this insertion with the affirmation (p. 270) that "on every one" of the occasions when Jeromian *obsecro* ushers in such a final clause, it does so with such an *ut* / *ne*. This is not true. An example to the contrary is provided by Jerome's *Letter* 22⁶³ (6,4): *non fiat obsecro civitas meretrix fidelis Sion*.⁶⁴ An exact analogue to the use of *obsecro* in the text of *Letter* 52 nit-picked by Cain is moreover to be found in Jerome's prologue to his *Commentary on Ephesians* (p. 440^A), where this verb is likewise preceded immediately by a *coniunctio relativa* and followed immediately by the verb of the dependent clause: *quibus obsecro respondeatis*. The wording of *Letter*

⁶² Moreover the first of this foursome is not in fact a case of the touted use "+ inf." at all, but on the contrary involves a gerund: *psallendi*. This text is referenced by Cain as follows: "*Comm. in Eph. lib. 3 p. 563*". Both here and in the "Bibliography of Ancient Authors" (p. 282) Cain accordingly fails to indicate whether he is quoting the original edition of 1845 or the later reprint, whose pagination differs substantially. In fact his "p. 563" refers to the latter; "563" is moreover a mis-citation for "562".

⁶³ Jerome mentions this *Letter* in the previous sentence but one (17,1).

⁶⁴ Here *non* was significantly replaced by *ne* in pre-Hilbergian editions. An example that does involve *ne* is adduced by Cain himself from an earlier passage of *Letter* 52 itself (5,3). The point should however be made that the *ne* there (in triple anaphora) is not in fact linked to *obsecrare*, but to *monere*: *obsecro itaque te et repetens iterum iterumque monebo ne ... putes, id est, ne ... quaeras ... , ne ... habeas ... et dicatur ...*. For *ne* with *monere* cf. (e. g.) the same sentence of ch. 17 as the one currently at issue (17,2): *ne peccent monuimus*.

52 (*quos obsecro quiescant*) can also be paralleled by two further Jeromian texts, in which *obsecro* similarly governs a direct object which then serves as subject of the paratactically ensuing verb: *unde obsecro te ignoscas*⁶⁵ (*epist.* 99,2,2) and *unde obsecro vos, o Paula et Eustochium, fundatis ... preces* (*praef. Vulg. Dan.* p. 10,58–9).

In the final chapter of *Letter 52* the effervescently colloquial parataxis of *quos obsecro quiescant* fits the fervour of a peroration.⁶⁶ Suppression of *ut* after *obsecro* also sidesteps an inconcinuous hiatus.⁶⁷ This *ut* is also absent from Hilberg's oldest MSS. It would appear therefore that this last Cainian emendation, like all the antecedent ones, is un-Heinzelmännchenly unhelpful. The foregoing attempt to show that all of these "improvements" are but *Verschlimmbesserungen* would also seem in the process to have shed new light on Jerome's idiom, on his rhetorical technique, and on his use of hitherto unidentified classical intertexts. It may accordingly be said in conclusion that the post-Hilbergian and still-WWI-scarred text of Jerome's *Letters* continues to afford ample scope for Aesculapianly clairvoyant *Textkritik*, which rather reminds one of a tristich from "The Times They Are A-Changin'": "Come writers and critics, / Who prophesize with your pen, / And keep your eyes wide" – thus Bob Dylan, whose own grandparents were, just like Hilberg himself, Ukrainian Jews.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

⁶⁵ One late Hilbergian MS inserts a banalizing *ut* before *ignoscas*.

⁶⁶ For such peppily confabulatory elements in Jerome's *Letters* cf. Adkin (above n. 10) 450 (index s. v. "colloquialism"). A similar animation marks the *asyndeton bimembre* of *Hierosolymam, sancta loca* (*epist.* 108,7,1), where Cain (above n. 5) 50 similarly wishes to insert a similarly deflatory *et*.

⁶⁷ On the particular undesirability of such a clash between "o" and "u" cf. Quint. *inst.* 9,4,33.