NOTES ON THE TEXT OF JEROME,  
LETTERS 1 AND 107

I

These comments start, as they must, from the text of I. Hilbeg in the Vienna corpus.
This was the first properly critical edition of the Letters, and has not been superseded.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 Hilbeg 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. Hilbeg
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 MSS 3 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 Hilbeg’s
edition. 5 It is evident that much work remains to be done before a definitive edition
can be produced. Meanwhile Hilbeg’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 Hilbeg utilised.

In several of the notes 7 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 scriptorium 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
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.
Script without Insular Abbreviations: a Problem in Eighth-Century Palaeography’, Speculum
25 (1950), 483–90, examines the fragmentary MS m which Hilbeg 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 Hilbeg’s text as a whole.
6 I have not personally inspected the MSS employed by Hilbeg, 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 iuctus,
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  → R. G. Hall and S. M. Oberhel-
man, ‘Rhythmic Clausulae in the Codex Theodosianus and the Leges Novellae ad Theodotium
9 There are two major studies, both grossly inadequate: P. C. Knoek, 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)*

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: inmota mulier manet et a dolore corporis spiritu separato, dum conscientiae bono fruitur, vetuit circa se saevire tormenta.*

C. Schäublin 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 percursor 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.


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 specular exterritus et non credens ferro mucronem aptatbat 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 anaphoric (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:¹⁵ ‘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.¹⁶

¹² sacramentum is a complex word which has been much discussed: see in particular J. de Ghellinck, E. de Backer, J. Poukens, and G. Lebaçqz, Pour l’histoire du mot ‘sacramentum’: I. les Anténiééens (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense 3; Louvain and Paris, 1924), e⇒ 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 sacram and that of arcanum or mysterium.

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

¹⁶ So I. Martianay, Sancti Eusebi 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 Epistolarium 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 hoc beati Danielis 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 lions 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. Labourt18 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, 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 lictorium caterva glomeratur. e quibus medius, ad quem damnatorium cura pertinebat, erumpens et canitiem vidit 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 adventit. 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 (‘après de qui’).
20 Select Letters of St. Jerome (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1933), 13 (‘before whom’).
feminae palpitat pectus et oculis quarentibus lucem corpus animatur ad vitam.


misericordiam domini celaturna nox adventit is (we may infer) read by KL, two early MSS.

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 life – the variant readings, particularly celeriorem naturae and celeriore 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 celaturna, 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 adventit. 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 cellerature prepares us for further action, as we wait to find out exactly how God reveals his mercy. More recently Capponi has conjectured misericordia domini celeriorem <motu> matura nox adventit, which, while on the same lines, is less tempting, though celaturna and celaturna 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 adventit, 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 pusillanimously 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 sepulcro bellum et, si hoc parum est, avibus ferisque ianianda membra discerce; septies percussa debet aliquid morte plus perpeti.'

si licet KL; 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 adventit (1.7), which renders celaturna and celaturna less explicable as corruptions, and is rhythmically poor. The phrase matura nox is also used by Jerome at vita Malchi 6.
a plausible correction, particularly in this context of ironical utterance; but it seems better to follow $K\Sigma$ 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 Albini pontificis neptis de repromissione matris nascetur, ut praesente et gaudente avo parvulae adhuc lingua balbuttiens alleluia resonaret et virginem Christi in suo gremio nutriret et senex?

nutriret et (om. B) senex(K)x K$\Psi$B: senex (-s $\Sigma$ p.c.m 2 B) nutriret $\Sigma$DB

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 $K\Psi B$ being explained away easily as scribal dittography after nutriet, and senex nutriet, 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 nutriet 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.


27 Publilii 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 nutriet 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 $\Sigma$.

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 gremio nūtrīrēt sēnēx – molossus cretic – gives a better clausula, in this emphatic position, than gremio sēnēx nūtrīrēt (double spondee). On the other hand, senex nutriet is superior accentually (planus).
(b) 2.2 ante paucos annos propinquus vester Graccus...cum praefecturam regeret urbanam, nonne specu Mithrae et omnia portentuosa simulacra...subvertit, fregit, exussit...?

specum mitrae K, Ψ a.c.m2: specum mitrae Σ Β D: 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 aquea pugnat acie, quia pari religione confidunt.

pugnant Σ Β DB

With confidant 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 pugnānt ācilē: molossus tribach) significantly inferior to the resolved ditrochee of aquea pūgnāt ācilē. 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.


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


³⁰ R. Kühner and C. Steemann, 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 reppromissione, 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 σώματον est’. 
Hilberg’s solution to the difficulty was to emend to vestitus, thus allowing in typum paenitentiae to be defined by tortuosissimi…exuvii. 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 praedicatæ, 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 KΨ is an easy error after quorum, the correction to virtutem in Ψ being made subsequently in the interests of sense.

(f) 5.2 ‘tune ausa es vīri 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 Prætextata. 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 B a.c. is much better. After the rhetorical questions, the angel states Prætextata’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 offendid dominum ob vitia liberorum; episcopus fieri non potest, qui filios habuerit luxuriosos et non subditos. at e contrario de muliere scributur, quod salva fiet per filiorum generationem, si permanserit in fide et caritate et sanctificacione 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;23 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 B this is corrected in a second hand to permanserint.

23 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 μείωσις. 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*; 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 ΒΒ perducunt Σ: perducat ΒΒ

Pythagoras used the symbol Τ or Υ 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. Hilberg made clear in his apparatus that he understood *anni sapientiae* as the subject of *perducat*, 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 *perducat* should be read.

(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 queras.

As a *virgo dei*, Paula is to be kept on a very light and simple diet, and must not see what she is missing. All the MSS have *nec videat*, though in Β 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.


37 The singular also results in an improved clausula (cretic trirach against molossus trirach), 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* Σ'B.

(k) 9.1 Reddat tibi pensum cotidie scripturarum certum. ediscat Graecorum versusum 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’; 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 versusum ediscere dicuntur’, Jer. *epist.* 54.11.1 ‘de scripturis sanctis habeto fixum versusum numerum’. Consequently it appears sensible to take *certum* with *ediscat...numerum*, especially as *cotidie scripturarum* gives an excellent clausula (cretic double spondee, *velox*). *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 reddre nec ante quieti membra concedas, quam calathum pectoris tui hoc subtégmine inpleveris’.

(l) 11.2 mihi omnino in adulta virgine lavacra displicent, quae se ipsam debet erubesce et nudam videre non posse. si enim vigiliiis et ieiunis macerat corpus suum et in servitutem redigit, si flammam libidinis et incentiva ferventis aetatis extingue cunt continentiae frigore, si adpetitis sordibus turpare festinat naturalem pulchritudinem, cur e contrario balnearum fomentis sopitos ignes suscitat?

suscitet ignes B

Whether the subject of the sentence beginning at *si enim vigiliiis* 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 ingenii, 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
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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.