

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

VOL. XXXII

HELSINKI 1998 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Iiro Kajanto in memoriam</i>	9
NEIL ADKIN	<i>The Ninth Book of Quintilian's Institutio Oratoria and Jerome</i>	13
GÉZA ALFÖLDY	<i>Drei Bauinschriften aus Gabii</i>	27
E. BADIAN	<i>Two Numismatic Phantoms. The False Priest and the Spurious Son</i>	45
LILIANE BODSON	<i>Ancient Greek Views on the Exotic Animal</i>	61
CHRISTER BRUUN	<i>Missing Houses: Some Neglected Domus and other Abodes in Rome</i>	87
MIKA KAJAVA	<i>Visceratio</i>	109
WALTHER LUDWIG	<i>Martin Crusius und das Studium des Griechischen in Nordeuropa</i>	133
SILVIO PANCIERA	<i>Ancora nomi nuovi o rari da iscrizioni latine di Roma</i>	149
MARK POBJOY	<i>The decree of the pagus Herculaneus and the Romanisation of 'Oscan' Capua</i>	175
OLLI SALOMIES	<i>Three Notes on Roman Nomina</i>	197
W. J. SCHNEIDER	<i>Philologisch-kunstgeschichtliche Bemerkungen zu drei Stücken der Anthologia Latina</i>	225
HEIKKI SOLIN	<i>Analecta epigraphica CLXXIII–CLXXVI</i>	235
RISTO VALJUS	<i>An Oriental Baker at Ostia</i>	259
TOIVO VILJAMAA	<i>Participium coniunctum – Syntactic Definitions of the Participle in Ancient Grammars</i>	265
	<i>De novis libris iudicia</i>	277
	<i>Index librorum in hoc volumine recensorum</i>	319
	<i>Libri nobis missi</i>	321
	<i>Index scriptorum</i>	325

THE NINTH BOOK OF QUINTILIAN'S *INSTITUTIO ORATORIA* AND JEROME¹

NEIL ADKIN

Whereas Hagendahl's meticulous investigation of Jerome's echoes of classical literature registers a substantial debt to both the eighth and tenth books of the *Institutio oratoria*, the same scholar is unable to point to a single borrowing from book IX of Quintilian's treatise.² Such a complete absence of imitation is all the more surprising, since the ninth book is by far the longest of the whole work; most of it deals with the crucial issue of figures of thought and speech, while the remainder is devoted to the equally important subject of *compositio*, by which Quintilian means the arrangement of the words. It may be supposed that this particular book will have been subjected to a very careful study by someone as preoccupied as Jerome with rhetorical refinement.³ Jerome can moreover be demonstrated to have borrowed freely from whatever text came to his attention.⁴ One might therefore expect that the ninth book of Quintilian's *Institutio* should have left some traces on Jerome's *oeuvre* after all; it is the aim of the present article to suggest that such is indeed the case.

Almost a century before the appearance of Hagendahl's study Luebeck had in fact posited an echo of book IX in Jerome's commentary on

¹ Works are cited according to *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum*, 2nd ed., 1990.

² H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics*, 1958, 412.

³ Evidence can be adduced to show that Jerome regularly enhances the stylistic level of the material he appropriates from writers of even the most impeccable literary standards; cf. (e. g.) the present writer, *C&M* 46 (1995) 237–254.

⁴ Cf. the present writer, *Philologus* 136 (1992) 234–255.

Jeremiah;⁵ however it was ignored by Hagendahl. In the passage at issue Jerome glosses Jeremiah 4,12b (*'et nunc ego – sed loquar iudicia mea cum eis'*) as follows: ἀποσιώπησις *iuxta illud Vergilianum: 'quos ego – sed motos praestat componere fluctus'*.⁶ In this statement Luebeck identifies a debt to Quintilian's discussion of the figure of *aposiopesis*; for the sake of arguments to be adduced later the text may here be cited in full: ἀποσιώπησις *quam idem Cicero reticentiam, Celsus obticentiam, nonnulli interruptionem appellant, et ipsa ostendit adfectus, vel irae, ut 'quos ego – sed motos praestat componere fluctus', vel sollicitudinis et quasi religionis: 'an huius ille legis, quam Clodius a se inventam gloriatur, mentionem facere ausus esset vivo Milone, non dicam consule? de nostrum omnium – non audeo totum dicere' ... vel alio transeundi gratia: 'Cominius autem – tametsi ignoscite mihi, iudices'* (inst. 9,2,54). In a footnote (ib. 218, n. 2) Luebeck also referred to Donatus' commentary on Terence: *'egone illam quae illum': familiaris ἔλλειψις irascentibus ... nam amat ἀποσιωπήσεις nimia indignatio, ut Vergilius 'quos ego...'* (Ter. Eun. 65,1f.). Lammert then cited the same pair of texts in his own treatment of Jerome's gloss on Jeremiah.⁷ He also added a further passage from the Donatian commentary on the Eunuch: *'quae narravit': nimius affectus in utramque partem defectus orationis amat. ergo ἔλλειψις est: deest enim 'gaudia'* (1050,1f.). In addition reference was made to the note of Servius Danielis on Aeneid 1,135: *'quos ego': subauditur 'ulciscar'. ergo ἀποσιώπησις est.*

Here Donatus would seem on a priori grounds to be a more likely source than Quintilian, since in his capacity as Jerome's *grammaticus* the former had instilled into him a keen interest in precisely such grammatical technicalities. Jerome's dependence on Donatus in these matters had already been noted by Goelzer,⁸ who cited Jerome's treatment of pleonasm (in Dan. 11,17a ll. 1120–5) and *antiphrasis* (epist. 78,35,2). It may be noted that both

⁵ A. Luebeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit*, 1872, 217f.

⁶ In Ier. 1,77; the text of Vergil in question is Aen. 1,135.

⁷ F. Lammert, *De Hieronymo Donati discipulo*, 1912, 32.

⁸ H. Goelzer, *Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de saint Jérôme*, 1884, 34f. Cf. also the more recent discussion in L. Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical*, 1981, 37–46.

figures had also been discussed by Quintilian;⁹ however in neither case do Quintilian's examples tally with Jerome's. In the passage from Jerome's commentary on Jeremiah there are in addition a number of specific considerations which would appear to tell against an echo of the *Institutio oratoria*. In the first place Quintilian adduces several instances of *aposiopesis*, among which Aeneid 1,135 merely exemplifies the particular usage associated with anger in contradistinction to other applications of the same figure; in Jerome on the other hand the Vergilian text stands alone as an illustration of *aposiopesis* in general. Secondly Jerome's 'judicial' context (cf. *iudicia* in lemma and gloss) might have been better served by Quintilian's similarly 'judicial' examples from Cicero.¹⁰ Finally Quintilian employs a Latin equivalent for the term *aposiopesis*,¹¹ whereas Jerome does not. The conclusion may accordingly be drawn that Hagendahl was in fact right to dismiss Luebeck's identification of a debt to book IX of the *Institutio* in Jerome's exposition of Jeremiah.

If then Jerome's source is to be found in Donatus rather than Quintilian, Luebeck would also appear to have been mistaken in drawing attention in his footnote to the former's commentary on Terence's *Eunuch*. The scholia designated as Servius Danielis would seem more or less to preserve portions of Donatus' commentary on Vergil.¹² The annotation given by this material to the line of the Aeneid cited in Jerome's gloss on Jeremiah to exemplify *aposiopesis* runs as follows: '*quos ego*': *subauditur 'ulciscar'*. *ergo ἀποσιώπησις est*. It is clear from Jerome's remark at *Adversus Rufinum* 1,16 that he was familiar with the commentary on Vergil

⁹ He deals with *antiphrasis* at inst. 1,6,34 and with pleonasm at inst. 8,3,53–55 and 9,3,46f.

¹⁰ The texts at issue come from the *Pro Milone* and the *Pro Cornelio* respectively. The second would have been especially apposite: *Cominius autem – tametsi ignoscite mihi, iudices*. If these Ciceronian passages are less well-known than the one from Vergil, they could for that very reason have provided Jerome with a highly welcome opportunity to advertise his erudition.

¹¹ Cf. inst. 9,2,57 as well as 9,2,54; the later passage refers to the figure simply as *reticentia*.

¹² Cf. P. K. Marshall in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, 1983, 386.

by his teacher Donatus.¹³ Because this passage places Donatus' Vergil commentary after the one devoted to Terence, Holtz has inferred that the latter had left Jerome with 'un souvenir plus durable';¹⁴ such an assumption would seem however to be unwarranted.¹⁵ Since Jerome's borrowings from Vergil are far more extensive than those from Terence,¹⁶ it is reasonable to suppose that his debt to his teacher's commentary on Vergil is proportionately greater than to that on Terence. Servius Danielis would accordingly seem a more likely source for Jerome's gloss on Jeremiah 4,12b. Here a piece of corroborative evidence may be adduced which has hitherto been overlooked by investigators of this issue. The scholium in Servius Danielis to Aeneid 1,135 continues: *ergo ἀποσιώπησις est, hoc est, ut ad alium sensum transeat*. An epexegetic observation to this effect would appear to be absent from other treatments of *aposiopesis*. It is therefore noteworthy that Jerome's comment on Jeremiah 4,12b, which would not seem to be indebted to any other exegete, also continues with immediate mention of precisely such a transition *ad alium sensum: dicturus itaque prospera retinet se et tristibus iungit tristia*.

If Hagendahl turns out to have been correct in discounting a Quintilianic echo in the commentary on Jeremiah, he was nonetheless wrong to suppose that the ninth book of the *Institutio oratoria* had exercised no influence whatsoever on Jerome's literary output. A dry and highly technical section of this book addresses the question of rhythm (4,45–57). Here Quintilian has occasion to paraphrase a text of Cicero's *Orator* (234). The

¹³ The text reads in full: *puto quod puer legeris Aspri in Vergilium ac Sallustium commentarios, Vulcatii in orationes Ciceronis, Victorini in dialogos eius, et in Terentii comoedias praeceptoris mei Donati, aequae in Vergilium, et aliorum in alios, Plautum videlicet, Lucretium, Flaccum, Persium atque Lucanum*.

¹⁴ Holtz 26.

¹⁵ The sole reason for putting the Vergil commentary last would appear to be the circumstance that Vergil had also opened Jerome's enumeration (*Aspri in Vergilium ac Sallustium...*); hence by a species of appropriate 'ring-composition' the incomparable Vergil is made to occupy the key positions at both the beginning and end of the list of commentaries by named individuals. Moreover Jerome's specific mention of Terence's *comoediae* would seem to be merely due to the similar specificity of the immediately preceding references to the *orationes* and *dialogi* of Cicero.

¹⁶ Cf. Hagendahl 413–415.

Ciceronian original reads: *cuius* (sc. Demosthenes) *non tam vibrarent fulmina illa, nisi numeris contorta ferrentur*, which Quintilian adapts as follows: *'neque enim Demosthenis fulmina tantopere vibratura' dicit, 'nisi numeris contorta ferrentur'* (4,55). When Jerome wishes to express the inadequacy of human language to describe the thrill occasioned by Demetrius' decision to take the veil, he observes: *contortae Demosthenis vibrataeque sententiae tardius languidiusque ferrentur* (epist. 130,6,1). In these words Luebeck and Hagendahl merely detect an echo of Orator 234.¹⁷ It has however been argued recently by the present writer that instead Jerome is indebted to the Quintilianic formulation, which bears a somewhat closer resemblance to his own;¹⁸ moreover quotation in another work invests a text with a prominence which imprints it on the mind.

It would appear possible to identify a further borrowing from book IX. The preface to Jerome's translation of Job from the Hebrew discusses the metrical complexity which this work evinces in its original language. Here the following statement occurs: *interdum quoque rithmus ipse dulcis et tinnulus fertur numeris lege solutis* (praef. Vulg. Iob p. 71,13f.). Luebeck assumed that this wording had been taken straight from the fourth book of Horace's Odes,¹⁹ which speaks of Pindar in the same terms: *numerisque fertur lege solutis* (carm. 4,2,11f.). In a footnote Luebeck also mentioned that these lines were cited by Quintilian.²⁰ Again Hagendahl ignored the echo.²¹ This passage from book IV of Horace's Odes is however identified as Jerome's unique source by the Vatican edition of the preface to Job.²² The same identification is also found in the latest revision of the Stuttgart edition.²³

In this connection it may be observed that only one other debt to the fourth book of Horace's Odes has ever been detected in Jerome's *oeuvre*. His *Libellus de virginitate servanda* contains the following admonition:

¹⁷ Luebeck 133; Hagendahl, VChr 28 (1974) 221.

¹⁸ VChr 51 (1997) 27.

¹⁹ Luebeck 161.

²⁰ Ib. n. 2; the passage in question is inst. 9,4,54.

²¹ Hagendahl (1958) 408.

²² Biblia sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem, IX: Libri Hester et Iob, 1951, 71.

²³ R. Weber and R. Gryson, Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem, 4th ed., 1994, 731.

vestis nec satis munda nec sordida et nulla diversitate notabilis, ne ad te obvia praetereuntium turba consistat et digito demonstreris (epist. 22,27,3). Here scholars have seen an allusion to Ode 4,3,22f.: *quod monstror digito praetereuntium Romanae fidicen lyrae*.²⁴ It may however be questioned whether a specific debt to Odes IV is in fact involved here. In the first place being 'pointed out with the finger' is an extremely common locution.²⁵ Secondly Jerome's *digito* is in any case quite separate from *praetereuntium*, which instead occurs in the other half of his formulation (*ne ad te obvia praetereuntium turba consistat*).²⁶

²⁴ So Luebeck 161; Hagendahl (1958) 110; and most recently J. Blundell in *Thes. Ling. Lat.* X,2 col. 1013,42f. (s. v. *praetereo*) and M. Marin in R. Uglione (ed.), *Atti del convegno nazionale di studi su Orazio*, 1992, 265.

²⁵ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* V,1 coll. 504,38ff.; 505,10ff. (s. v. *demonstro*); ib. col. 1124,45ff., esp. 53ff. (s. v. *digitus*); ib. VIII coll. 1441,64ff.; 1442,5ff. (s. v. *monstro*); A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, 1890, 116 (s. v. *digitus*, 8); R. Häussler, *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer*, 1968, 102; 156. Erasmus' annotation to this text of the *Libellus* had instead posited a debt to Persius 1,28 (*at pulchrum est digito monstrari et dicier 'hic est'*); cf. *Omnium operum divi Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis tomus primus ... una cum argumentis et scholiis Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, 1516, fo. 61 B. It may be noted that the scholium to this text of Persius cites Odes 4,3,21f. (*Schol. Pers. 1,28*); if the possibility of a Horatian reminiscence were in fact to be entertained in this passage of Jerome's *Libellus*, such a scholium might well have been the source. At school Jerome had read Persius with a commentary (cf. n. 13 above); he quotes him extensively (cf. Hagendahl [1958] 410f.).

²⁶ Here Lucan 3,81f. would seem to be pertinent (*nec constitit usquam / obvia turba*): these words exactly match Jerome's own (*ne ... obvia ... turba consistat*). It is true that the collocation of *turba* and *obvius* is attested elsewhere; cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* IX,2 col. 319,68f. (citing *Mart. 4,53,6; 14,169,2; Suet. Claud. 10,2*). Jerome however shows no acquaintance with these other texts. On the other hand the juxtaposition of the three elements *turba*, *obvius* and *consistere* would seem to occur nowhere else at all; Lucan and Jerome concur in prefixing a paronymous negative to this triad, in which the adjective in each case precedes its noun. During his school-days Jerome had studied Lucan with the aid of a commentary (cf. n. 13 above); hence the present parallel, which has hitherto eluded scholars, may in fact be an authentic echo. The Lucanic phrasing would accordingly supply corroboration for the text of this letter of Jerome that is given by I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi epistulae I*, 2nd ed., 1996, 183. Here this editor adopts the lection *obvia* in preference to *obviam*, which is found in half his MSS; earlier editions had instead favoured the latter reading.

If then Jerome's supposed debt to book IV of Horace's Odes in his *Libellus de virginitate* would seem in fact to be chimerical, the same can be shown to obtain for the putative echo in the preface to his translation of Job from the Hebrew; since this is the only other borrowing from Odes IV to have been alleged in Jerome's work, the inference may be drawn that this final book has left no direct trace whatever on his writings.²⁷ The lines of Odes 4,2 to which scholars posit a debt in the preface to Job had already been quoted by Quintilian at the end of the sentence immediately preceding the one which contains his citation of Orator 234;²⁸ the case was advanced above that Jerome's own allusion to this Ciceronian formulation in fact draws on the *Institutio oratoria*. It would therefore be no surprise if the same Quintilianic passage should likewise prove to be the source of his reference to Odes 4,2,11f.: two arguments can be adduced in corroboration of such a premise. Firstly the context in both Jerome and Quintilian is a discussion of metre: the pertinent sentence of the preface to Job continues with the words *quod metrici magis quam simplex lector intellegunt*.²⁹ Secondly the Horatian phrase cited by Quintilian (*numerisque fertur lege solutis*) is prefaced in Jerome by mention of 'rhythm': *rithmus ipse dulcis et tinnulus fertur numeris lege solutis*. This term *rithmus* is found in only two other passages of Jerome's vast *oeuvre*; both belong to letter 28, which is a highly technical disquisition on the *diapsalma*.³⁰ It would seem moreover that each

²⁷ In Jerome's day the fourth book of Horace's Odes would generally seem to have received less attention than the other three. The late antique commentaries on Horace are unanimous in stressing the disconnection of Odes IV from what precedes: the first three books constitute a homogeneous ensemble, to which the fourth was then arbitrarily appended 'under duress' (cf. Porph. Hor. cant. 4,1; Schol. [= Ps. Acron], Hor. carm. 4,1). Moreover these commentaries allot substantially less space to Odes IV. By contrast Jerome's indebtedness to the first three books of the Odes is not inconsiderable; cf. Hagendahl (1958) 408.

²⁸ The quotation of Horace occurs at inst. 9,4,54; that of the Orator at 9,4,55.

²⁹ P. 71,15. The *Institutio* is concerned with metre throughout this final portion of book IX.

³⁰ This epistle was written a whole decade before the preface to Job; cf. H. J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel*, 4th ed., 1995, 514 and 520.

of these occurrences is in fact due to Origen.³¹ If then Jerome's employment of *rithmus* in the preface to Job is really a *hapax*, it becomes highly significant that Quintilian had opened the sentence containing his quotation of Odes 4,2 with exactly the same word.³² In associating the term with these Horatian lines Quintilian had retained the Greek form *rhythmoē*; such distinctive orthography will have stamped the word on Jerome's mind. A similarly incisive impact is generated by quotation of another writer's text; this point was made above in connection with Jerome's borrowing of the adjacent formulation from the Orator. The conclusion may accordingly be drawn that Quintilian's citation of Odes 4,2,11f. has likewise been the source of Jerome's allusion to these lines in his preface to Job.

It would seem that one further echo of the ninth book of the *Institutio oratoria* can be detected in Jerome's works; this time however quotation of another author is not involved. Shortly after the translation of Job from the Hebrew a wealthy Spaniard named Lucinus had despatched a number of scribes on the long journey to Jerome's monastery in Bethlehem for the sole purpose of transcribing all his writings published to date. The elaborate letter which Jerome sent to accompany these copies reflects the writer's anxiety to impress his new correspondent, who was evidently learned as well as rich. One instance may be cited. When Jerome apprises Lucinus that renunciation of wealth is insufficient, he employs language of ostentatious erudition: *fecit hoc Thebanus Crates, fecit Antisthenes* (epist. 71,3,3). Jerome had made use of exactly the same formulation shortly beforehand in a letter to Pammachius, who is known for certain to have been of both noble

³¹ The first passage runs: *quidam diapsalma conmutationem metri esse dixerunt, alii pausam spiritus, nonnulli alterius sensus exordium, sunt qui rhythmī distinctionem et, quia psalmi tunc temporis iuncta voce ad organum canebantur, cuiusdam musicae varietatis* (epist. 28,2,1). The second reads: *utrum autem cuiusdam musicae cantilenae aut rhythmī inmutationem, qui interpretati sunt 'diapsalma', senserint aliudve quid intellexerint, tuo iudicio derelinquo* (28,6,4). The latter text is a literal translation from Origen (cf. 28,5: *quid Origenes de diapsalmate senserit, verbum interpretabor ad verbum*). The similarity of its wording (*cuiusdam musicae cantilenae aut rhythmī inmutationem*) to that of the initial passage (*rhythmī distinctionem et ... cuiusdam musicae varietatis*) would appear to indicate that the phraseology of this first text is likewise indebted to Origen.

³² The term *rhythmus* is in fact used frequently throughout this particular segment of the ninth book (4,45–57). In one of the cases in question it is employed with direct reference to the text of the Orator which Jerome himself appropriates.

background and first-class education.³³ In view of such striving for effect it might have been expected that the letter to Lucinus would show evidence of Jerome's penchant for appropriating impressive phraseology from elsewhere.³⁴ However it has hitherto proved impossible to identify a single borrowing from any classical author in this epistle.

The aridly technical section of book IX of the *Institutio oratoria* to which Jerome is indebted for his citations of both the Orator and Odes IV is enlivened by one very striking formulation. Shortly before Quintilian begins his discussion of rhythm he notes with regard to the clash of consonants how the Elder Cato had substituted the forms *dicae* and *faciae* for *dicam* and *faciam* respectively. In this connection he then observes: *quae in veteribus libris reperta mutare imperiti solent, et dum librariorum insectari volunt inscientiam, suam confitentur* (inst. 9,4,39). The letter to Lucinus avers that Jerome has exhorted his correspondent's scribes to the utmost care in the performance of their task. He continues: *unde, si paragrammata reppereris vel minus aliqua descripta sunt, quae sensum legentis impediunt, non mihi debes inputare, sed tuis et inperitiae notariorum librariorumque incuriae, qui scribunt non, quod inveniunt, sed, quod intellegunt, et, dum alienos errores emendare nituntur, ostendunt suos* (epist. 71,5,2). This concluding antithesis has evidently been inspired by the Quintilianic *dum librariorum insectari volunt inscientiam, suam confitentur*. In both passages criticism of another's error entails disclosure of the critic's own. Each also evinces precisely the same structure: while the first clause opens with a *dum*, the second is characterized by a form of *suus*. The context too is identical: the shortcomings of copyists are at issue in both. Here it may be noted how Jerome's *librariorum ... incuriae* exactly matches the *librariorum ... inscientiam* of the *Institutio*, while his *inperitiae* corresponds to the Quintilianic *imperiti*.³⁵ The antithesis itself was bound to attract Jerome's notice: its impressiveness is enhanced by a very striking chiasmus (...*inscientiam, suam...*), which receives additional prominence from the homoeoteleuton.

Barely a year before his letter to Lucinus Jerome had employed a simpler form of the same idea in his commentary on the ten visions of

³³ The passage in question is epist. 66,8,3. For Pammachius' lineal and scholarly distinction cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*, 1975, 19.

³⁴ Cf. nn. 3 and 4 above.

³⁵ The *inveniunt* of the letter to Lucinus also reproduces Quintilian's *reperta*.

Isaiah: *ne quis scriptoris vitium putet et errorem dum emendare vult faciat, una urbs et per M et per B litteram scribitur, e quibus Dimon 'silentium' interpretatur, Dibon 'fluens'*.³⁶ Because Jerome had dictated this commentary, its style was unpretentious.³⁷ When however Jerome wished to impress shortly afterwards in his epistle to Lucinus, he availed himself of Quintilian's more elaborate formulation with its striking antithesis between censure of others' faults and divulgence of one's own. By a characteristic piece of self-imitation Jerome then reverts to the simple phrasing of the Isaiah commentary in the following decade, when he is once again extemporizing in his Tractates on the Psalms.³⁸ In the passage at issue here Jerome argues that Matthew 13,35 originally contained the name 'Asaph', which owing to its unfamiliarity was assumed to be erroneous; a scribe then rectified the 'mistake' by substituting 'Isaiah': *et quid fecit? ut dum errorem emendaret, fecit errorem* (tract. in psalm. I p. 67 ll. 90f.). Here the wording is even more prosaic: *errorem* is simply repeated.³⁹

³⁶ In Is. 5,15,9. While the epistle to Lucinus belongs to 398, the commentary on Isaiah 13–23 was written in 397; cf. F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son oeuvre* I,2, 1922, 45f.

³⁷ Cf. in Is. lib. 5 praef. ll. 47–51.

³⁸ For these tractates as 'improvisations orales' cf. G. Morin, *Études, textes, découvertes*, 1913, 249. This view has recently been restated by P. Jay in Y.-M. Duval (ed.), *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, 1988, 367–380. In his discussion of these tractates Kelly 136 speaks of 'their unadorned colloquialism, their crudities of style'. They were delivered between 401 and 410; cf. Morin 234.

³⁹ By way of appendix it may be observed that this idea finds one further echo in Jerome's *oeuvre*; however the text in question this time has subjected it to substantial modification. Jerome's 106th letter belongs to the same decade as his Tractates on the Psalms; for a date of 404–410 cf. B. Altaner, *VChr* 4 (1950) 246–248. This letter, which Kelly 285 qualifies as 'aridly fatiguing', elucidates the disparities to be found in Jerome's Gallican Psalter *vis-à-vis* the Septuagint. In connection with Psalm 85,14 (*et non proposuerunt te in conspectu suo*) Jerome observes: *et dicitis, quod in vestro codice 'te' non habeat. addite 'te' et emendato errore librarii vestrum quoque errorem emendabit* (epist. 106,56,1). Here the antithesis would seem to be largely redundant; it is significantly eliminated by one of Hilberg's codices, which reads simply *addite 'te' et emendabit errorum librarii vestri*. The otiose polarity is due merely to Jerome's inability to refrain from redeploing phraseology which has once caught his fancy.

Jerome's formulation in the self-conscious letter to Lucinus marks a stylistic improvement over that of the *Institutio oratoria*: such enhancement of his source is typical.⁴⁰ In the first place Jerome has taken over the alliterative collocation *errores emendare* from his own commentary on Isaiah. To *errores* the compendious epithet *alienos* has then been prefixed by a further self-imitation.⁴¹ Initial *alienos* is balanced by final *suos*: the result is a species of antithetic *reditio*,⁴² which is further accentuated by homoeoteleuton.⁴³ These contrasting direct objects in turn enclose the verbs, which are juxtaposed in the middle of Jerome's statement to form a graceful chiasmus; each is a trisyllabic molossus (*nituntur, ostendunt*).⁴⁴ The clausulae generated by these verbs are also notably elegant. While a cretic spondee concludes the first half, the second ends with a spondee cretic;⁴⁵ they accordingly evince a pattern that is identical, but in reverse. Finally it may be observed how the letter to Lucinus has expanded the simple *librariorum ... inscientiam* of the Quintilianic antithesis into an impressive *inperitiae*

⁴⁰ Cf. n. 3 above.

⁴¹ Jerome had similarly combined *alienus* and *error* at in Matth. 14,1. This work had been produced only a few months before the letter to Lucinus; cf. Cavallera 159f. Jerome had employed this locution only once before at epist. 34,3,2, which had been written some fourteen years earlier. The juxtaposition is not common; no example is cited by Thes. Ling. Lat. V,2 col. 819,48ff. (s. v. *error*; 'epitheta').

⁴² On the figure of *reditio* cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, 3rd ed., 1990, 317f.

⁴³ Not only does Jerome achieve a far more striking antithesis than that of the *Institutio*; his homoeoteleuton is also more elegant than Quintilian's immediately contiguous *inscientiam, suam*, which because of the shortness of the second term comes close to violating the precept enunciated in the very same passage of the *Institutio* (9,4,41: *videndum etiam ne syllaba verbi prioris ultima et prima sequentis idem sonet*). The Quintilianic juxtaposition unquestionably infringes the rule laid down by Julius Victor (rhet. p. 86,3–5): *inter nomina aut pronomina in eosdem casus cadentia nomen diversi casus interveniat*.

⁴⁴ On the other hand Quintilian employs verbs of two and four syllables respectively (*volunt ... confitentur*). Jerome's pair also shares an element of *adnominatio*: the sound *unt* is common to both.

⁴⁵ Cf. M. C. Herron, *A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome*, 1937, 12–16 and 36–40.

notariorum librariorumque incuriae,⁴⁶ which Jerome positions in advance of his own antithetical formulation. Again the arrangement is elaborately chiasitic; each half also contains exactly ten syllables. Inceptive *in-* lends a touch of *adnominatio* to the outer pair, while both are marked by a homoeoteleuton which is however neatly tempered in the case of the genitive plurals by the addition of *-que*; when taken with the adjacent *incuriae* the enclitic particle gives this word syllabic parity with the corresponding term *inperitiae*.

If then Jerome has outdone his source in stylistic finesse, the phrasing of the letter to Lucinus entails a slight but characteristic illogicality that is absent from the *Institutio*.⁴⁷ Jerome has intensified and concretized Quintilian's language: instead of merely 'wishing to censure the scribes' inexpertise' these pantologists now 'strive to correct their blunders'.⁴⁸ While therefore Quintilian's temperate phraseology had avoided the implication that an actual mistake was involved, the over-emphasis of the letter to Lucinus entails an explicit affirmation of precisely such error: *alienos errores emendare nituntur*. However Jerome himself has just made clear in the immediately antecedent words that there is in fact no 'error' to 'correct': *scribunt non, quod inveniunt, sed, quod intellegunt*.⁴⁹ Axelson has drawn attention to the kind of inconcinnity which results from inept exaggeration of a source's wording;⁵⁰ Jerome has made himself guilty of the same fault here.

A final point may be made. Jerome deprecates the habit of ending every paragraph with a clever and *ad captandum* apophthegm: *ne a me*

⁴⁶ Here *inperitiae* has been suggested by Quintilian's immediately preceding *imperiti*.

⁴⁷ For such inconcinnities in Jerome's work cf. the present writer (1992) 236–238.

⁴⁸ It may be noted that the abstract terminology corresponding to the Quintilianic *inscientia* has already been deployed by Jerome in the foregoing *inperitiae notariorum librariorumque incuriae*.

⁴⁹ The inconsistency is reflected in the translations, which attempt to patch it up; cf. (e. g.) L. Schade, *Des hl. Kirchenvaters Eusebius Hieronymus ausgewählte Briefe*, II. Briefband, 1937, repr. 1968, 380: 'während sie sich bemühen, die vermeintlichen Fehler anderer zu verbessern'. Such a flaw is absent from the analogous passages of the commentary on Isaiah and of the *Tractates on the Psalms* which were discussed above; both indicate clearly that there a 'mistake' is indeed being corrected.

⁵⁰ B. Axelson, *Das Prioritätsproblem Tertullian – Minucius Felix*, 1941, 70.

quaeras ... per fines capitum singulorum acuta quaedam breviterque conclusa, quae plausus et clamores excitent audientum (epist. 52,4,1). He is nonetheless highly partial to this practice himself: the formulation currently at issue constitutes a palmary example, since it provides a very striking and succinct conclusion to the section dealing with copyists' inadequacies.⁵¹ In the light of this observation it is accordingly necessary to modify the division into paragraphs adopted by Hilberg's edition, which erroneously postpones a new one until the mention of Jerome's translations of the Old and New Testaments some four lines later;⁵² hence the topic of scribal error is arbitrarily attached to the intervenient discussion of other translations by Jerome, which consist this time of his alleged renderings of Josephus, Papias and Polycarp together with his actual versions of Origen and Didymus (ll. 2–6). The new paragraph should however begin immediately after the arresting aphorism that rounds off his treatment of mistakes made by scribes (ll. 1f.);⁵³ all Jerome's activities as a translator are now neatly combined as a single unit, which forms the third paragraph of the chapter. The second consists of Jerome's strictures regarding copyists, while the first deals with the transcription of his works by Lucinus' scribes. In this way the chapter acquires a coherence and symmetry which it has hitherto lacked.

University of Nebraska–Lincoln

⁵¹ For a further instance cf. the present writer, WS 104 (1991) 157f. There too the phraseology in question had been appropriated from elsewhere; again Jerome had enhanced it.

⁵² P. 6, l. 6 of Hilberg's text.

⁵³ The first word of the following sentence, which initiates the subject of Jerome's translations, is significantly *porro* (l. 2). This term is regularly employed for the purpose of 'introducing a new consideration' (so Oxf. Lat. Dict. 1406; s. v. 6).