

U ARCA

Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs

42

General Editors

Neil Adkin (University of Nebraska – Lincoln)

Francis Cairns (The Florida State University)

Robin Seager (University of Liverpool)

Frederick Williams (Queen's University, Belfast)

Assistant Editor: Sandra Cairns

ISSN 0309-5541

JEROME ON VIRGINITY

A COMMENTARY ON THE
*LIBELLUS DE VIRGINITATE
SERVANDA* (LETTER 22)

NEIL ADKIN



FRANCIS CAIRNS

Published by Francis Cairns (Publications) Ltd
PO Box 296, Cambridge, CB4 3GE, Great Britain

First published 2003

Copyright © Neil Adkin 2003

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the Publisher, or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics rights association. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Publisher at the address above.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 0 905205 38 3

Printed in Great Britain by
Antony Rowe Limited, Chippenham, Wiltshire

Contents

Acknowledgments	vi
Abbreviations	vii
Works Cited	ix
INTRODUCTION	1
COMMENTARY	13
<i>Indexes</i>	
Latin Words	411
Greek Words	418
Hebrew Words	418
Passages: Scripture	419
Passages: Jerome	422
Passages: Ancient Authors	431
General Index	449

Acknowledgments

I should like to express my thanks to the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften for permission to use the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* text of Jerome's 22nd *Epistle* (ed. I. Hilberg, vol. 54), to the University of Nebraska–Lincoln for granting me sabbatical leave in 2001–2, and to Professor P. G. Walsh for first kindling my interest in patristics.

Neil Adkin

Department of Classics
University of Nebraska–Lincoln

October 2002

Abbreviations

<i>AAnthung</i>	<i>Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae</i>
<i>AAT</i>	<i>Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche</i>
<i>AC</i>	<i>Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>ACD</i>	<i>Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis</i>
<i>ACW</i>	<i>Ancient Christian Writers</i>
<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>AnnSE</i>	<i>Annali di Storia dell'Esgesi</i>
<i>AugMag</i>	<i>Augustinus Magister: Congrès international Augustinien. Paris, 21-24 Septembre 1954, I-III, Paris, 1954-5</i>
<i>BAC</i>	<i>Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos</i>
<i>BibAug</i>	<i>Bibliothèque Augustinienne</i>
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
<i>BKV</i>	<i>Bibliothek der Kirchenväter</i>
<i>BM</i>	<i>Benediktinische Monatschrift</i>
<i>BollClass</i>	<i>Bollettino dei Classici</i>
<i>BRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
<i>BStudLat</i>	<i>Bollettino di Studi Latin</i>
<i>CCL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</i>
<i>ChHist</i>	<i>Church History</i>
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i>
<i>CR</i>	<i>Classical Review</i>
<i>CSCO</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>CW</i>	<i>Classical World</i>
<i>DA</i>	<i>Dissertation Abstracts</i>
<i>DACL</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie</i>
<i>DHG</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie ecclésiastiques</i>
<i>DR</i>	<i>Downside Review</i>
<i>DSp</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité</i>
<i>DTC</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</i>
<i>ETHL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>FKDG</i>	<i>Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte</i>
<i>GB</i>	<i>Grazer Beiträge</i>
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller</i>
<i>GGA</i>	<i>Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen</i>
<i>GIF</i>	<i>Giornale Italiano di Filologia</i>
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Historisches Jahrbuch</i>
<i>HTHR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>ICS</i>	<i>Illinois Classical Studies</i>
<i>InvLuc</i>	<i>Invigilata Lucernis</i>
<i>JbAC</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>

<i>J ECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LCP</i>	<i>Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva</i>
<i>LSJ</i>	<i>Liddell-Scott-Jones, Greek-English Lexicon</i>
<i>LTK</i>	<i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>MBTh</i>	<i>Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie</i>
<i>MEFR</i>	<i>Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome</i>
<i>MH</i>	<i>Museum Helveticum</i>
<i>MSLC</i>	<i>Miscellanea di Studi di Letteratura Cristiana Antica</i>
<i>MSR</i>	<i>Mélanges de Science Religieuse</i>
<i>NPh</i>	<i>Neophilologus</i>
<i>OCP</i>	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
<i>OLD</i>	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
<i>PhW</i>	<i>Philologische Wochenschrift</i>
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina</i>
<i>PWK</i>	<i>Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Realencyklopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>RAM</i>	<i>Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique</i>
<i>RBen</i>	<i>Revue Bénédictine</i>
<i>RBPh</i>	<i>Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire</i>
<i>RDM</i>	<i>Revue des Deux Mondes</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des Etudes Anciennes</i>
<i>REAug</i>	<i>Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes</i>
<i>RecAug</i>	<i>Recherches Augustiniennes</i>
<i>RecSR</i>	<i>Recherches de Science Religieuse</i>
<i>REL</i>	<i>Revue des Etudes Latines</i>
<i>RFIC</i>	<i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i>
<i>RH</i>	<i>Revue Historique</i>
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique</i>
<i>RAM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum</i>
<i>RLAC</i>	<i>Reallexicon für Antike und Christentum</i>
<i>ROC</i>	<i>Revue de l'Orient chrétien</i>
<i>RPh</i>	<i>Revue de Philologie</i>
<i>RQA</i>	<i>Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>RSLR</i>	<i>Rivista di Storia e Letteratura religiosa</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Revue des Sciences Religieuses</i>
<i>RTAL</i>	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>
<i>RTPh</i>	<i>Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie</i>
<i>SBAW</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, Philos.-philol.-hist. Klasse</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources Chrétiennes</i>
<i>ScCat</i>	<i>Scuola Cattolica</i>
<i>SCO</i>	<i>Studi Classici e Orientali</i>
<i>SEAG</i>	<i>Sacris Erudiri, Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschappen</i>
<i>SH</i>	<i>Subsidia Hagiographica</i>

<i>SO</i>	<i>Symbolae Osloenses</i>
<i>SP</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
<i>SPAW</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Phil.-hist. Klasse</i>
<i>SSL</i>	<i>Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense. Etudes et documents</i>
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studi e Tesi</i>
<i>SVSL</i>	<i>Skrifter utgivna av Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund</i>
<i>TAPhA</i>	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>ThR</i>	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i>
<i>TLL</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i>
<i>TLL Index</i>	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index Librorum Scriptorum Inscriptionum, ed. 2, Leipzig, 1990</i>
<i>T&MByz</i>	<i>Travaux et Mémoires. Centre de recherche d'histoire et de civilisation byzantines</i>
<i>TrThZ</i>	<i>Trierer theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>TU</i>	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i>
<i>TWB</i>	<i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>VChr</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>VetChr</i>	<i>Vetera Christianorum</i>
<i>VetLat</i>	<i>Vetus Latina. Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel</i>
<i>VL</i>	<i>Vita Latina</i>
<i>VS</i>	<i>Vie Spirituelle</i>
<i>WHB</i>	<i>Wiener humanistische Blätter</i>
<i>WKPh</i>	<i>Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie</i>
<i>WS</i>	<i>Wiener Studien</i>
<i>WZRostock</i>	<i>Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Wilhelm-Pieck-Universität Rostock, Gesellsch.- und sprachwiss. Reihe</i>
<i>ZKG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
<i>ZNTW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZRPPh</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie</i>

Books of the Bible are cited as follows:

- O. T.:** Gen., Exod., Lev., Num., Deut., Jos., Jgs., Ruth, 1–4 Reg., 1–2 Paralip., 1–2 Esd., Est., Job, Ps., Prov., Eccles., Cant., Is., Jer., Lam., Ezek., Dan., Hos., Joel, Am., Obad., Jon., Mic., Nah., Hab., Zeph., Hag., Zech., Mal.
- Apoer.:** 3–4 Esd., Tob., Judith, Wisd. Sol., Sirach, Bar., S. of III Ch., Sus., Bel., Pr. Man., 1–2 Macc.
- N. T.:** Mt., Mk., Lk., Jn., Acts, Rom., 1–2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., 1–2 Thess., 1–2 Tim., Tit., Philem., Heb., Jas., 1–2 Pet., 1–3 Jn., Jude, Apoc.

For works of Philo the abbreviations employed are those of *TWB*.

Hilberg's text of the *Libellus* (CSEL 54) has been used: the reader is referred to his lineation and pagination. Citation of Latin works follows the *Index* to *TLL* (the lineation of Gryson [1993] is used for J.'s *in Is.*), while Greek patristic works are cited according to Lampe, 1, pp. xi–xlv. All modern scholarship to which reference is made has been arranged by author's name in the list of Works Cited.

Works Cited

- Abram: S. Abram, 'Brevity in Early Medieval Letters', *Florilegium* 15, 1998, pp. 23–35
- Achelis: H. Achelis, *Virgines Subintroductae: Ein Beitrag zum VII Kapitel des I. Korintherbriefs*, Leipzig, 1902
- Adams: J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London, 1982
- Adkin (1983): N. Adkin, 'An Unidentified Latin Quotation of Scripture Related to Is. 31,9', *RBen* 93, 1983, pp. 123–5
- Adkin (1984a): N. Adkin, 'Some Notes on the Style of Jerome's Twenty-second Letter', *RFIC* 112, 1984, pp. 287–91
- Adkin (1984b): N. Adkin, 'The Fathers on Laughter', *Orpheus* N. S. 6, 1985, pp. 149–52
- Adkin (1984c): N. Adkin, 'The Soldier and the King: A Common Antithesis in the Fathers', *RBPb* 62, 1984, pp. 56–8
- Adkin (1984d): N. Adkin, 'Pride or Envy? Some Notes on the Reason the Fathers Give for the Devil's Fall', *Augustiniana* 34, 1984, pp. 349–51
- Adkin (1984e): N. Adkin, 'A Common Patristic Paradox Based on Isaiah 40,12', *ETHL* 60, 1984, pp. 386–8
- Adkin (1985): N. Adkin, 'The Shadow and the Truth: An Unidentified Antithesis in the Fathers', *GIF* 36, 1985, pp. 245–52
- Adkin (1988): N. Adkin, 'Some Notes on the Content of Jerome's Twenty-second Letter', *GB* 15, 1988, pp. 177–86
- Adkin (1991): N. Adkin, 'Gregory of Nazianzus and Jerome: Some Remarks', in Flower-Toher (edd.), pp. 13–24
- Adkin (1992a): N. Adkin, 'The Date of St. John Chrysostom's Treatises on *Subintroductae*', *RBen* 102, 1992, pp. 255–66
- Adkin (1992b): N. Adkin, 'Ambrose, *De virginibus* 2,2,10f. and the "Gnomes of the Council of Nicaea"', *REAug* 38, 1992, pp. 261–70
- Adkin (1992c): N. Adkin, "'Filthy Manichees'", *Arctos* 26, 1992, pp. 5–18
- Adkin (1992d): N. Adkin, '*Istae sunt, quae solent dicere*: Three Roman Vignettes in Jerome's *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (Epist. 22)', *MH* 49, 1992, pp. 131–40
- Adkin (1993a): N. Adkin, 'Ambrose and Jerome: The Opening Shot', *Maemoryne* 46, 1993, pp. 364–76
- Adkin (1993b): N. Adkin, 'Falling Asleep over a Book: Jerome, *Letter* 60,11,2', *Eor* 81, 1993, pp. 227–30
- Adkin (1993c): N. Adkin, 'A Note on the Date of Ambrose's *De virginitate*', *Athenaeum* N. S. 81, 1993, pp. 644–7
- Adkin (1993d): N. Adkin, 'Three Unnecessary Emendations in Jerome's

- Libellus de virginitate servanda (Epist. 22)*, *RBPh* 71, 1993, pp. 96–106
- Adkin (1993e): N. Adkin, 'A Note on the Date of the Ps.-Augustinian Treatise *De sobrietate et castitate*', *ACD* 29, 1993, pp. 191–3
- Adkin (1993f): N. Adkin, 'Some Further Additions to Otto's *Sprichwörter*', *Sileno* 19, 1993, pp. 361–72
- Adkin (1993g): N. Adkin, 'Jerome, *Epist.* 22,28,5: "A Fat Old Man"', *BaltClass* N. S. 14, 1993, pp. 142–9
- Adkin (1993h): N. Adkin, 'The Date of the Dream of St. Jerome', *SCO* 43, 1993, pp. 263–73
- Adkin (1993i): N. Adkin, '*Hierosolymam militaturus pergerem*: A Note on the Location of Jerome's Dream', *Koinonia* 17, 1993, pp. 81–3
- Adkin (1993j): N. Adkin, '"Heretics and Manichees"', *Orpheus* N. S. 14, 1993, pp. 135–40
- Adkin (1993k): N. Adkin, 'Tertullian's *De idololatria* and Jerome', *Augustinianum* 33, 1993, pp. 11–30
- Adkin (1994a): N. Adkin, 'The Date of John Chrysostom's *De virginitate*', *OCP* 60, 1994, pp. 611–7
- Adkin (1994b): N. Adkin, 'A Note on the Date of Pacian of Barcelona's *Paraenesis ad poenitentiam*', *Prometheus* 20, 1994, pp. 73–6
- Adkin (1994c): N. Adkin, 'Plato or Plautus? (Jerome, *Epist.* 22,30,2)', *Emerita* 62, 1994, pp. 43–56
- Adkin (1994d): N. Adkin, 'How Long was Christ in the Womb? A Division of Opinion in the Fathers', *ETHL* 70, 1994, pp. 394–7
- Adkin (1995a): N. Adkin, 'Tobit and Jerome', *Helmantica* 45, 1995, pp. 109–14
- Adkin (1995b): N. Adkin, 'Jerome's Use of Scripture Before and After his Dream', *JCS* 20, 1995, pp. 183–90
- Adkin (1996a): N. Adkin, 'Tertullian's *De idololatria* and Jerome Again', *Mnemosyne* 49, 1996, pp. 46–52
- Adkin (1996b): N. Adkin, 'Augustine, *Sermon* 80,7: *Quando dormitar oratio?*', *Augustiniana* 46, 1996, pp. 61–6
- Adkin (1997a): N. Adkin, 'Some Alleged Echoes of Cyprian in Jerome', *WS* 110, 1997, pp. 151–70
- Adkin (1997b): N. Adkin, 'Tertullian and Jerome Again', *SO* 72, 1997, pp. 155–63
- Adkin (1999a): N. Adkin, 'Jerome on Marcella: *Epist.* 127,10,4', *BStudLat* 29, 1999, pp. 564–70
- Adkin (1999b): N. Adkin, 'Jerome's Vow "Never to Reread the Classics": Some Observations', *REA* 101, 1999, pp. 161–7
- Adkin (2000): N. Adkin, 'Jerome, Seneca, Juvenal', *RBPh* 78, 2000, pp. 119–28
- Adkin (2002a): N. Adkin, 'Jerome, *Epist.* 14,10,3: *fides famem non timet?*', *Mnemosyne* 55, 2002, pp. 503–5

- Adkin (2002b): N. Adkin, 'Tertullian, *De anima* 27,6 and Jerome, *Epist.* 54,10,5', *Hermes* 130, 2002, pp. 126–30
- Adnes: P. Adnes, 'Humilité', *DSp* VII, 1, 1969, pp. 1136–87
- Adriaen: M. Adriaen, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera. Pars I, 2: Commentariorum in Esaiam libri I–XI*, Turnhout, 1963 (CCL 73)
- Albrecht (1986): R. Albrecht, *Das Leben der heiligen Makrina auf dem Hintergrund der Thekla-Traditionen: Studien zu den Ursprüngen des weiblichen Mönchtums im 4. Jh. in Kleinasien*, Göttingen, 1986 (FKDG 38)
- Albrecht (1989): M. von Albrecht, *Masters of Roman Prose*, revised English edition by N. Adkin, Leeds, 1989 (ARCA 23)
- Albrecht (1992): M. von Albrecht, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I–II, Bern, 1992.
- Aldama: J. A. de Aldama, *Repertorium Ps.-chrysostomicum*, Paris, 1965 (*Doc., Et. et Répert. pub. par l'Inst. de Rech. et d'Hist. des Textes* 10)
- Allen: M. Allen, 'The Martyrdom of Jerome', *J ECS* 3, 1995, pp. 211–3
- Allenbach: J. Allenbach et al., *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique*, I–, Paris, 1975–
- Altaner: B. Altaner, 'In der Studierstube des hl. Augustinus', in Kleincidam-Kuss-Puzik (edd.), pp. 378–431
- Amand-Moons: D. Amand and M. C. Moons, 'Une curieuse homélie grecque inédite sur la virginité adressée aux pères de famille', *RBen* 63, 1953, pp. 18–69
- Antin (1947a): P. Antin, 'Le cilice chez S. Jérôme', *VS Suppl.* 1, 1947, pp. 58–61 (= Antin [1968], pp. 305–9)
- Antin (1947b): P. Antin, 'Le monachisme selon S. Jérôme', in *Mélanges bénédictins*, S.-Wandrille, 1947, pp. 71–113 (= Antin [1968], pp. 101–33)
- Antin (1951): P. Antin, *Essai sur S. Jérôme*, Paris, 1951
- Antin (1953): P. Antin, review of Arns, *Revue Mabillon* 43, 1953, pp. 150–1
- Antin (1956): P. Antin, *S. Jérôme: Sur Jonas*, Paris, 1956 (SC 43)
- Antin (1958): P. Antin, 'Jérôme, Ep. 22,6,3 et la Bible', *RBen* 68, 1958, p. 113 (= Antin [1968], pp. 365–6)
- Antin (1959): P. Antin, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera. Pars I, 1: Hebraicae quaestiones in libro Geneseos etc.*, Turnhout, 1959 (CCL 72)
- Antin (1960): P. Antin, 'Touches classiques et chrétiennes juxtaposées chez S. Jérôme', *RPh* 34, 1960, pp. 58–65 (= Antin [1968], pp. 47–57)
- Antin (1961a): P. Antin, 'Eustochium (sainte)', *DSp* IV, 2, 1961, pp. 1715–8 (= Antin [1968], pp. 321–5)
- Antin (1961b): P. Antin, 'La cigale dans la spiritualité', *RAM* 37, 1961, pp. 486–92 (= Antin [1968], pp. 283–90)
- Antin (1961c): P. Antin, 'Les sirènes et Ulysse dans l'oeuvre de S. Jérôme', *REL* 39, 1961, pp. 232–41 (= Antin [1968], pp. 59–70)
- Antin (1961d): P. Antin, "'Simple" et "simplicité" chez S. Jérôme', *RBen* 71,

- 1961, pp. 371–81 (= Antin [1968], pp. 147–61)
- Antin (1961e): P. Antin, 'Ecriture sainte et vie spirituelle, II, A, 3, 3^e: S. Jérôme', *DSp* IV,2, 1961, pp. 153–5 (= Antin [1968], pp. 279–81)
- Antin (1961f): P. Antin, 'Ailes et vol chez S. Jérôme', *Orpheus* 8, 1961, pp. 163–5 (= Antin [1968], pp. 163–8)
- Antin (1963a): P. Antin, 'S. Jérôme et le monde des sons, physiques et spirituels', *RPh* 37, 1963, pp. 189–213 (= Antin [1968], pp. 169–201)
- Antin (1963b): P. Antin, 'Autour du songe de S. Jérôme', *REL* 41, 1963, pp. 350–77 (= Antin [1968], pp. 71–100)
- Antin (1964): P. Antin, 'Solitude et silence chez S. Jérôme', *RAM* 40, 1964, pp. 265–76 (= Antin [1968], pp. 291–304)
- Antin (1968): P. Antin, *Recueil sur S. Jérôme*, Brussels, 1968 (*Collection Latomus* 95)
- Antin (1971): P. Antin, 'La vieillesse chez S. Jérôme', *REAug* 17, 1971, pp. 43–54
- Arbesmann (1954): R. Arbesmann, 'The Concept of *Christus-Medicus* in St. Augustine', *Traditio* 10, 1954, pp. 1–28
- Arbesmann (1958): R. Arbesmann, 'The *Daemonium Meridianum* and Greek and Latin Patristic Exegesis', *Traditio* 14, 1958, pp. 17–31
- Arbesmann (1969a): R. Arbesmann, 'Fastenspeisen', *RLAC* 7, 1969, pp. 493–500
- Arbesmann (1969b): R. Arbesmann, 'Fasttage', *RLAC* 7, 1969, pp. 500–24
- Arns: E. Arns, *La technique du livre d'après S. Jérôme*, Paris, 1953
- Assendelft: M. M. van Assendelft, *Sol ecce surgit igneus: A Commentary on the Morning and Evening Hymns of Prudentius (Cathemerinon 1, 2, 5 and 6)*, Groningen, 1976
- Aubineau (1955): M. Aubineau, 'Les écrits de S. Athanase sur la virginité', *RAM* 31, 1955, pp. 140–73
- Aubineau (1969): M. Aubineau, 'Une homélie grecque inédite attribuée à Théodote d'Ancyre sur le baptême du Seigneur', in *DIAKONIA ΠΙΠΕΤΕΣ (Mélanges J. A. de Aldama)*, Granada, 1969, pp. 6–30
- Aubineau (1971): M. Aubineau, 'Dossier patristique sur Jean, XIX, 23–24. La tunique sans couture du Christ', in *La Bible et les Pères: Colloque de Strasbourg, 1^{er}–3 octobre 1969*, Paris, 1971, pp. 9–50
- Aubineau (1978): M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*, I–II, Brussels, 1978–80 (*SH LIX*, 1–2)
- Audollent: A. Audollent, 'Les *veredarii*, émissaires impériaux sous le Bas-Empire', *MEFR* 9, 1889, pp. 249–78
- Austin: R. G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*, Oxford, 1964
- Axelson: B. Axelson, *Das Prioritätsproblem Tertullian-Mimicius Felix*, Lund, 1941 (*Svensk* 27)
- Bacht: H. Bacht, 'Einfalt', *RLAC* 4, 1959, pp. 821–40
- Bachrens (1921): W. A. Bachrens, *Origenes Werke. Siebenter Band*:

Homilien zum Hexateuch in Rufins Übersetzung, II, Leipzig, 1921 (GCS 30)

- Bachrens (1925): W. A. Bachrens, *Origenes Werke. Achter Band: Homilien zu Samuel I, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten: Kommentar zum Hohelied*, Leipzig, 1925 (GCS 33)
- Banterle: G. Banterle, *S. Ambrogio: Opere esegetiche I: I sei giorni della creazione*, Milan/Rome, 1979 (*Tutte le opere di S. Ambrogio*)
- Bardenhewer (1905): O. Bardenhewer, *Maria Verkündigung: Ein Kommentar zu Lukas I, 26–38*, Freiburg/B., 1905 (*Biblische Studien* X,5)
- Bardenhewer (1913): O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, I–V, ed. 2, Freiburg/B., 1913–32
- Bardy (1939): G. Bardy, 'La culture grecque dans l'Occident chrétien au IV^e siècle', *RecSR* 29, 1939, pp. 5–58
- Bardy (1948): G. Bardy, *La question des langues dans l'église ancienne*, Paris, 1948
- Bardy (1956): G. Bardy, 'Le souvenir d'Elie chez les Pères grecs', in *Elie le prophète*, I, Bruges/Paris, 1956, pp. 131–58
- Baraille: J. F. Baraille, *Oeuvres complètes de S. Jérôme*, I–XVIII, Paris, 1877–85
- Barr: J. Barr, 'St. Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew', *BRL* 49, 1966–7, pp. 281–302
- Bartelink (1980): G. J. M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57). Ein Kommentar*, Leiden, 1980 (*Mnemosyne Suppl.* 61)
- Bartelink (1982): G. J. M. Bartelink, 'Le diable et les démons dans les oeuvres de Jérôme', *SP* 18, 1982, pp. 463–71
- Bartelink (1986): G. J. M. Bartelink, 'Hieronymus über die Schwäche der *conditio humana*', *Kairós* 28, 1986, pp. 23–32
- Bartelink (1987): G. J. M. Bartelink, 'Tibi nomina mille (Vergilius, *Aeneis* 7,337): Een hoofdstuk uit de semantiek van het oudchristelijk Grieks en Latijn', *Lampas* 20, 1987, pp. 292–304
- Bartelink (1991): G. J. M. Bartelink, 'Quelques observations sur les dénominations du diable et des démons chez Ambroise et Jérôme', in Bartelink–Hilhorst–Kneepkens (edd.), pp. 1–10
- Bartelink–Hilhorst–Kneepkens (edd.): G. J. M. Bartelink, A. Hilhorst and C. H. Kneepkens (edd.), *Eulogia: Mélanges offerts à Antoon A. R. Bartsiaensen*, Steenbrugge, 1991 (*Instrumenta Patristica* 24)
- Baudot: J. Baudot, 'Bénédiction. IV. Bénédiction de la table ou des aliments', *DACL* 2, 1910, pp. 713–6
- Bauer (1975): J. B. Bauer, 'Hieronymus und Ovid', *GB* 4, 1975, pp. 13–9
- Bauer (1983): *Hieronymus: Briefe über die christliche Lebensführung. Deutsche Übersetzung v. L. Schade; Bearbeitet v. J. B. Bauer*, Munich, 1983 (*Schriften der Kirchenväter* 2)
- Baur: C. Baur, 'S. Jérôme et S. Chrysostome', *RBén* 23, 1906, pp. 430–6

- Baus: K. Baus, 'Das Gebet zu Christus beim hl. Hieronymus', *TrThZ* 60, 1951, pp. 178-88
- Bautista Valero: J. Bautista Valero, *S. Jerónimo: Epistolario. Edición bilingüe*, I-II, Madrid, 1993-5 (BAC 530, 549)
- Beatrice (1979): P. F. Beatrice, 'Il sermone *De centesima, sexagesima, tricesima* dello Ps. Cipriano e la teologia del martirio', *Augustinianum* 19, 1979, pp. 215-43
- Beatrice (1985): P. F. Beatrice, 'Le tuniche di pelle: Antiche letture di Gen. 3,21', in Bianchi (ed.), pp. 433-84
- Bernardi: J. Bernardi, *La prédication des Pères cappadociens*, Paris, 1968 (*Publ. de la Fac. des Lettr. et Sc. Hum. de l'Univ. de Montpellier* 30)
- Berthold: H. Berthold, *Makarios/Symeon: Reden und Briefe. Die Sammlung I des Vaticanus Graecus 694 (B)*, Berlin, 1973 (GCS)
- Bianchi (ed.): U. Bianchi (ed.), *La tradizione dell'enkrateia: Motivazioni ontologiche e protologiche*, Rome, 1985
- Bickel: E. Bickel, *Diatribes in Senecae philosophi fragmenta. I: Fragmenta de matrimonio*, Leipzig, 1915
- Bickersteth: E. Bickersteth, 'Edition and Translation of a *Hypapante* Homily ascribed to John Chrysostom', *OCP* 32, 1966, pp. 53-77
- Blaise: A. Blaise, *Dictionnaire latin-français des auteurs chrétiens*, Paris, 1954
- Blümner: H. Blümner, *Die römischen Privataltertümer*, ed. 3, Munich, 1911 (*Handbuch der Altertumswiss.* IV,2,2)
- Bodin: Y. Bodin, *Saint Jérôme et l'église*, Paris, 1966
- Bömer: F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen: Kommentar, Buch 8-9*, Heidelberg, 1977
- Boer (ed.): W. den Boer et al. (edd.), *Romanitas et Christianitas: Studia Iano Henrico Waszink ... oblata*, Amsterdam, 1973
- Bonnardière: A.-M. La Bonnardière, 'Les *Enarrationes in Psalmos* prêchées par S. Augustin à l'occasion de fêtes de martyrs', *Rec-Aug* 7, 1971, pp. 73-104
- Boon: A. Boon, *Pachomiana Latina*, Louvain, 1932 (*Bibl. de la RHE* 7)
- Booth (1979): A. D. Booth, 'The Date of Jerome's Birth', *Phoenix* 33, 1979, pp. 346-53
- Booth (1981): A. D. Booth, 'The Chronology of Jerome's Early Years', *Phoenix* 35, 1981, pp. 237-59
- Brakke (1994): D. Brakke, 'The Authenticity of the Ascetic *Athanasiana*', *Orientalia* 63, 1994, pp. 17-56
- Brakke (1995): D. Brakke, *Athanasius and the Politics of Asceticism*, Oxford, 1995
- Brandt: P. Brandt, *P. Ovidi Nasonis De arte amatoria libri tres*, Leipzig, 1902
- Braun (1976): R. Braun, *Opera Quodvultdes Carthaginiensi episcopo tributa*, Turnhout, 1976 (CCL 60)

- Braun (1977): R. Braun, *Deus Christianorum: Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien*, ed. 2, Paris, 1977
- Bremmer: J. N. Bremmer, 'Christianus sum: The Early Christian Martyrs and Christ', in Bartelink–Hilhorst–Kneepkens (edd.), pp. 11–20
- Brogliè: A. de Brogliè, *L'église et l'empire romain au IV^e siècle*, I–VI, ed. 3, Paris, 1867–8
- Brown: P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, New York, 1988 (*Lectures on the History of Religions* N. S. 13)
- Burstein: E. Burstein, 'La compétence de Jérôme en hébreu: explication de certaines erreurs', *REA* 21, 1975, pp. 3–12
- Burzacchini: G. Burzacchini, 'Note sulla presenza di Persio in Girolamo', *GIF* 27, 1975, pp. 50–72
- Butler: C. Butler, *The Lousiac History of Palladius*, I–II, Cambridge, 1898–1904, repr. Hildesheim, 1967 (*Texts and Studies* VI, 1–2)
- Byrne: R. Byrne, 'The Cenobitic Life: A Digression in Jerome's Letter Twenty-Two to Eustochium', *DR* 105, 1987, pp. 277–93
- Calboli: G. Calboli, *Cornifici Rhetorica ad C. Herennium: Introduzione, testo critico, commento*, ed. 2, Bologna, 1993
- Camisani: E. Camisani, *Opere scelte di S. Girolamo*, I, Turin, 1971 (*Classici delle Religioni*, Sez. 4)
- Canellis: A. Canellis, 'S. Jérôme et les passions: Sur les *quatuor perturbationes des Tusculanes*', *VChr* 54, 2000, pp. 178–203
- Caner: D. Caner, *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 2002 (*Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 33)
- Capanaga: V. Capanaga, 'La deificación en la soteriología agustiniana', in *AugMag* II, pp. 745–54
- Capelle: B. Capelle, 'De monastieke professie als tweede doopsel', *Horae Monasticae*, I, Tiel, 1947
- Capponi: F. Capponi, 'Cruces Hieronymianae', *InvLuc* 7–8, 1985–6, pp. 161–73
- Carroll: P. Carroll, *The Satirical Letters of St. Jerome*, Chicago, 1956
- Casey: R. P. Casey, 'Der dem Athanasius zugeschriebene Traktat Περὶ κοηβειαῖς', *SPAW* 33, 1935, pp. 1022–45
- Cavallera: F. Cavallera, *S. Jérôme: Sa vie et son oeuvre*, I, 1–2, Louvain/Paris, 1922 (*SSL* 1–2)
- Cazzaniga: I. Cazzaniga, *S. Ambrosii Mediolanensis episcopi De virginibus libri tres*, Turin, 1948 (*Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Patavianum*)
- Chaffin: C. E. Chaffin, 'Christ as Emperor: Interpretations of the Fourth Eclogue in the Circle of St. Ambrose', *SP* XIII, 2 (= *TU* 116), 1975, pp. 9–18
- Chastagnol: A. Chastagnol, *Recherches sur l'Histoire Auguste*, Bonn, 1970 (*Antiquitas* IV, 6)

- Ciccarese: M. P. Ciccarese, *Visioni dell'aldilà in occidente: Fonti, modelli, testi*, Florence, 1987
- Clark: E. A. Clark, 'John Chrysostom and the *Subintroductae*', *ChHist* 46, 1977, pp. 171–85
- Clarke: G. W. Clarke, *The Letters of St. Cyprian of Carthage*, I–IV, New York, 1984–9 (*ACW* 43–7)
- Classen: C. J. Classen, 'Satire – the Elusive Genre', *SO* 63, 1988, pp. 95–121
- Cola: S. Cola, *S. Girolamo: Le lettere*, I–IV, Rome, 1996–7
- Combès: G. Combès, *Oeuvres de S. Augustin. I^{er} sér., II: Problèmes moraux*, Paris, 1948 (*BibAug* 2)
- Conring: B. Conring, *Hieronymus als Briefschreiber: Ein Beitrag zur spätantiken Epistolographie*, Tübingen, 2001
- Cooper: K. Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge, Ma., 1996
- Coudreau-Miquel: C. Coudreau and P. Miquel, *Basile d'Ancyre: De la véritable intégrité dans la virginité*, Saint-Benoît, 1981
- Courcelle (1948): P. Courcelle, *Les lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*, ed. 2, Paris, 1948 (*Bibl. des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 159)
- Courcelle (1950): P. Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1950
- Courcelle (1972): P. Courcelle, 'Flügel (Flug) der Seele I', *RLAC* 8, 1972, pp. 29–65
- Cuendet: G. Cuendet, 'De l'ellipse du sujet dans la proposition infinitive', in *Mélanges de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes offerts à J. Marouzeau*, Paris, 1948, pp. 113–7
- Curtius: E. R. Curtius, 'Mittelalterstudien', *ZRPh* 63, 1943, pp. 225–74
- Dagron: G. Dagron, 'Les moines et la ville: le monachisme à Constantinople jusqu'au concile de Chalcedoine (451)', *T&MBz* 4, 1970, pp. 229–76 (= G. Dagron, *La romanité chrétienne en Orient*, London, 1984, pp. 229–76)
- Daniélou (1949): J. Daniélou, 'Rahab, figure de l'Eglise', *Irenikon* 22, 1949, pp. 26–45
- Daniélou (1955): J. Daniélou, 'La chronologie des sermons de Grégoire de Nysse', *RSR* 29, 1955, pp. 346–72
- Daniélou (1966): J. Daniélou, 'La chronologie des œuvres de Grégoire de Nysse', *SP* 7 (= *TU* 92, 1966), pp. 159–69
- Deferrari: R. J. Deferrari, *St. Cyprian: Treatises*, New York, 1958 (*Fathers of the Church* 36)
- Deichmann: F. W. Deichmann, 'Cella', *RLAC* 2, 1954, pp. 942–4
- Dekkers (1953): E. Dekkers, 'Les traductions grecques des écrits patristiques latins', *SEAG* 5, 1953, pp. 193–233
- Dekkers (1958): E. Dekkers, 'Profession-second baptême: Qu'a voulu dire S. Jérôme?', *HJ* 77, 1958, pp. 91–7

- Dekkers-Gaar: E. Dekkers and A. Gaar, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, ed. 3, Steenbrugge, 1995
- Deléani: S. Deléani, 'Présence de Cyprien dans les oeuvres de Jérôme sur la virginité', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 61–82
- Deroux (ed.): C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, VIII, Brussels, 1997 (*Collection Latomus* 239)
- Diehl: E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae veteres*, I–IV, Berlin, 1925–67
- Dihle: A. Dihle, 'Demut', *RLAC* 3, 1957, pp. 735–78
- Dölger (1934): F. J. Dölger, 'Das Lebensrecht des ungeborenen Kindes und die Fruchtabtreibung in der Bewertung der heidnischen und christlichen Antike', *AC* 4, 1934, pp. 1–61
- Dölger (1936): F. J. Dölger, 'Das Schuh-Ausziehen in der altchristlichen Tauf liturgie', *AC* 5, 1936, pp. 95–108
- Dölger (1950): F. J. Dölger, 'Hat Jesus Schuhe getragen?', *AC* 6, 1950, pp. 65–6
- Dölger (1958): F. J. Dölger, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens I', *JbAC* 1, 1958, pp. 5–19
- Dölger (1965/6): F. J. Dölger, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens VIII', *JbAC* 8/9, 1965/6, pp. 7–52
- Dörries-Klostermann-Kroeger: H. Dörries, E. Klostermann and M. Kroeger, *Die 50 geistlichen Familien des Makarios*, Berlin, 1964 (*Patristische Texte und Studien* 4)
- Doignon: J. Doignon, 'Clichés cicéroniens dans la polémique de Julien d'Eclane avec Augustin', *RhM N. F.* 125, 1982, pp. 88–95
- Dossi: L. Dossi, 'S. Ambrogio e S. Atanasio nel *De virginibus*', *Acme* 4, 1951, pp. 241–62
- Doutreleau: L. Doutreleau, *Didyme l'Aveugle: Sur Zacharie*, I, Paris, 1962 (SC 83)
- Dubedout: E. Dubedout, *De D. Gregorii Nazianzeni carminibus*, Paris, 1901
- Dublanchy: E. Dublanchy, 'Communion eucharistique (sous les deux espèces)', *DTC* III, 1, 1937, pp. 552–72
- Dumortier (1949): J. Dumortier, 'La date des deux traités de S. Jean Chrysostome aux moines et aux vierges', *MSR* 6, 1949, pp. 247–52
- Dumortier (1955): J. Dumortier, *S. Jean Chrysostome: Les cohabitations suspectes. Comment observer la virginité*, Paris, 1955
- Dunphy: W. Dunphy, 'On the Date of St. Ambrose's *De Tobia*', *SEJG* 27, 1984, pp. 27–36
- Duval (1970): Y.-M. Duval, 'Sur une page de S. Cyprien chez S. Ambroise: *Hexameron* 6,8,47 et *De habitu virginum* 15–17', *REAug* 16, 1970, pp. 25–34
- Duval (1972): Y.-M. Duval, 'S. Cyprien et le roi de Ninive dans l'*In Ionam* de Jérôme: La conversion des lettrés à la fin du IV^e siècle', in Fontaine-Kannengiesser (edd.), pp. 551–70

- Duval (1974a): Y.-M. Duval, 'L'originalité du *De virginibus* dans le mouvement ascétique occidental: Ambroise, Cyprien, Athanase', in Duval (ed. 1974b), pp. 9–66
- Duval (ed. 1974b): Y.-M. Duval (ed.), *Ambroise de Milan: XVI^e centenaire de son élection épiscopale*, Paris, 1974
- Duval (1974c): Y.-M. Duval, 'L'influence des écrivains africains du III^e siècle sur les écrivains chrétiens de l'Italie du Nord dans la seconde moitié du IV^e siècle', in *Aquileia e l'Africa: Atti della quarta Settimana di studi aquileiesi*, Udine, 1974 (*Antichità altoadriatiche* 5), pp. 191–225
- Duval (1975): Y.-M. Duval, 'La problématique de la *Lettre aux Vierges* d'Athanase', *Muséon* 88, 1975, pp. 405–33
- Duval (1985): Y.-M. Duval, *Jérôme: Commentaire sur Jonas*, Paris, 1985 (SC 323)
- Duval (ed. 1988): Y.-M. Duval (ed.), *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient: XVI^e centenaire du départ de S. Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem*, Paris, 1988
- Egan: R. B. Egan, 'Jerome's Cicada Metaphor (Ep. 22.18)', *CW* 77, 1984, pp. 175–6
- Eiswirth: R. Eiswirth, *Hieronymus' Stellung zur Literatur und Kunst*, Wiesbaden, 1955 (*Klassisch-philologische Studien* 16)
- Elm: S. Elm, *'Virgins of God': The Making of Asceticism in Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 1994
- Emonds: H. Emonds, 'Abt', *RLAC* 1, 1950, pp. 45–55
- Erasmus: D. Erasmus, *Omnia opera divi Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis*, I–IX, Basel, 1516
- Faller: O. Faller, *S. Ambrosii opera, VIII: De fide*, Vienna, 1962 (CSEL 78)
- Feder: A. Feder, 'Zusätze zum Schriftstellerkatalog des hl. Hieronymus', *Biblica* 1, 1920, pp. 500–13
- Fehrenbach: E. Fehrenbach, 'I. Cella', *DACL* II,2, 1910, pp. 2870–8
- Feichtinger (1991): B. Feichtinger, 'Der Traum des Hieronymus – ein Psychogramm', *FChr* 45, 1991, pp. 54–77
- Feichtinger (1997): B. Feichtinger, 'Nec vero sopor ille fuerat aut vana somnia ... (Hier., ep. 22,30,6): Überlegungen zum geträumten Selbst des Hieronymus', *REA* 43, 1997, pp. 41–61
- Ferrua: A. Ferrua, *Epigrammata Damasiana*, Rome, 1942 (*Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane* 2)
- Festugière: A.-J. Festugière, *Historia monachorum in Aegypto: Edition critique du texte grec et traduction annotée*, Brussels, 1971 (SH 53)
- Flower-Toher (edd.): M. A. Flower and M. Toher (edd.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell*, London, 1991 (*BICS Suppl.* 58)
- Fois-Monachino-Litva (edd.): M. Fois, V. Monachino and F. Litva (edd.), *Dalla Chiesa antica alla Chiesa moderna: Miscellanea per il cinquantesimo della Facoltà di storia ecclesiastica della Pontificia Università gregoriana*, Rome, 1983 (*Miscellanea Historiae Pontificiae*

- Fontaine (1966): J. Fontaine, *Q. Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De corona: Tertullien Sur la couronne*, Paris, 1966
- Fontaine (1974): J. Fontaine, 'L'apport de la tradition poétique romaine à la formation de l'hymnodie latine chrétienne', *REL* 52, 1974, pp. 318-55
- Fontaine (1977): J. Fontaine, 'Unité et diversité du mélange des genres et des tons chez quelques écrivains latins de la fin du IV^e siècle: Ausone, Ambroise, Ammien', in Fuhrmann (ed. 1977b), pp. 425-82
- Fontaine (1979): J. Fontaine, 'L'aristocratie occidentale devant le monachisme aux IV^e^{ms} et V^e^{ms} siècles', *RSLR* 15, 1979, pp. 28-53
- Fontaine (1988a): J. Fontaine, 'L'esthétique littéraire de la prose de Jérôme jusqu'à son second départ en Orient', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 323-42
- Fontaine (1988b): J. Fontaine, 'Un sobriquet perfide de Damase: *matronarum auriscalpius*', in Porte-Néraudau (edd.), pp. 177-92
- Fontaine-Kannengiesser (edd.): J. Fontaine and C. Kannengiesser (edd.), *Epiktasis, Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, Paris, 1972
- Forcellini: E. Forcellini, *Totius Latinitatis Lexicon*, I-VI, Prato, 1858-75
- Frank (1964): K. S. Frank, *ATTEAIKOE BIOE: begriffsanalytische und begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum 'engelgleichen Leben' im frühen Mönchtum*, Münster/W., 1964 (*Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Mönchtums und des Benediktinerordens* 26)
- Frank (1971): K. S. Frank, 'Vita apostolica: Ansätze zur apostolischen Lebensform in der alten Kirche', *ZKG* 82, 1971, pp. 145-66
- Frank (1976): K. S. Frank, 'Gehorsam', *RLAC* 9, 1976, pp. 390-430
- Franses: D. Franses, 'Maria nonna', in *Donum natalicium Schrijnen*, Nijmegen/Utrecht, 1929, pp. 719-23
- Frede (1975): H. J. Frede, *Epistulae ad Thessalonicenses, Timotheum*, Freiburg, 1975-82 (*VetLat* XXV, 1)
- Frede (1995): H. J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel*, ed. 4, Freiburg, 1995 (*VetLat* VI)
- Fredouille (1972): J.-C. Fredouille, *Tertullien et la conversion de la culture antique*, Paris, 1972
- Fredouille (1984): J.-C. Fredouille, *Tertullien: De la patience*, Paris, 1984 (*SC* 310)
- Fremantle: W. H. Fremantle et al., *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, Oxford, 1893 (*Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* II, 6)
- Fuchs: H. Fuchs, 'Bildung', *RLAC* 2, 1954, pp. 346-62
- Fuhrmann (1977a): M. Fuhrmann, 'Die Mönchsgeschichten des Hieronymus: Formexperimente in erzählender Literatur', in Fuhrmann (ed. 1977b), pp. 41-99
- Fuhrmann (ed. 1977b): M. Fuhrmann (ed.), *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en Occident*, Geneva, 1977 (*Entretiens Hardt* 23)

- Gain: B. Gain, 'Sommeil et vie spirituelle', *DSp* 14, 1990, pp. 1033–41
- Gallay: P. Gallay, *La vie de S. Grégoire de Nazianze*, Lyons/Paris, 1943
- Gamber: K. Gamber, 'Fragen zu Person und Werk des Bischofs Niceta von Remesiana', *RQA* 62, 1967, pp. 222–31
- Geerard-Glorie: M. Geerard and F. Glorie, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, I–V, Turnhout, 1974–98
- Gennaro: S. Gennaro, *Asterii episcopi Aesedunensis Liber ad Renatum monachum*, in *Scriptores 'Illyrici' Minores*, Turnhout, 1972 (CCL 85)
- Gillis: J. H. Gillis, *The Coordinating Particles in Saints Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose and Augustine*, Washington, 1938 (*Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* 56)
- Godel: R. Godel, 'Réminiscences de poètes profanes dans les Lettres de S. Jérôme', *MH* 21, 1964, pp. 65–70
- Goehring: J. E. Goehring, 'Through a Glass Darkly: Diverse Images of the *Apotaktikoi(ai)* of Early Egyptian Monasticism', *Semeia* 58, 1992, pp. 25–45
- Goelzer: H. Goelzer, *Etude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de S. Jérôme*, Paris, 1884
- Gorce (1925): D. Gorce, *La Lectio Divina des origines du cénobitisme à S. Benoît et Cassiodore. I: S. Jérôme et la lecture sacrée dans le milieu ascétique romain*, Wépion-sur-Meuse/Paris, 1925
- Gorce (1949a): D. Gorce, 'S. Jérôme dans son "affreuse demeure" (375–377)', *La Pensée Catholique* 12, 1949, pp. 34–66
- Gorce (1949b): D. Gorce, 'Comment travaillait S. Jérôme', *RAM* 25, 1949, pp. 117–39
- Gorce (1967): D. Gorce, '2. Eustochium', *DHG* 16, 1967, pp. 43–5
- Gordini (1953): G. D. Gordini, 'Forme di vita ascetica a Roma nel IV secolo', *Scrinium Theologicum* 1, 1953, pp. 9–54
- Gordini (1956): G. D. Gordini, 'Origine e sviluppo del monachesimo a Roma', *Gregorianum* 37, 1956, pp. 220–60
- Gordini (1983): G. D. Gordini, 'L'opposizione al monachesimo a Roma nel IV secolo', in Fois–Monachino–Litva (edd.), pp. 19–35
- Gori: F. Gori, *Sant'Ambrogio: Opere morali II, I. Verginità e vedovanza*, Milan/Rome, 1989 (*S. Ambrosii Episcopi Mediolanensis Opera XIV.1*)
- Gougaud: L. Gougaud, 'Les critiques formulées contre les premiers moines d'occident', *Revue Mabillon* 24, 1934, pp. 145–63
- Goulon: A. Goulon, "'Le malheur de l'homme à la naissance". Un thème antique chez quelques Pères de l'Eglise', *REA* 18, 1972, pp. 3–26
- Grimm: V. E. Grimm, *From Feasting to Fasting: the Evolution of a Sin: Attitudes to Food in Late Antiquity*, London/New York, 1996
- Gross: J. Gross, *La divinisation du chrétien d'après les Pères grecs*, Paris, 1938
- Grützner: G. Grützner, *Hieronymus: eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*, I–III, Leipzig/Berlin, 1901–8, repr. Aalen.

1969 (*Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und der Kirche* VI,3 and X,1-2)

- Gryson (1987): R. Gryson, *Esaias*, Freiburg, 1987-97 (*VetLat* 12)
- Gryson (1993): R. Gryson et al., *Commentaires de Jérôme sur le prophète Isale*, Freiburg, 1993-9 (*VetLat*, *Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 23, 27, 30, 35-6)
- Guillaumont: A. Guillaumont, 'Le nom des "agapètes"', *VChr* 23, 1969, pp. 30-7 (= id., *Aux origines du monachisme chrétien*, Bégrolles en Mauges, 1979, pp. 38-45)
- Haase: F. Haase, *Die koptischen Quellen zum Konzil von Nicaea*, Paderborn, 1920 (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums* X,4)
- Häussler: R. Häussler, *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer*, Hildesheim, 1968
- Hagendahl (1922): H. Hagendahl, 'Zu Ammianus Marcellinus', in *Sirena Philologica Upsalensis: Festskrift tillägnad P. Persson*, Uppsala, 1922, pp. 74-90
- Hagendahl (1947): H. Hagendahl, 'Methods of Citation in Post-Classical Latin Prose', *Eranos*, 45, 1947, pp. 114-28
- Hagendahl (1958): H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Göteborg, 1958 (*Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis* LXIV,2)
- Hagendahl (1967): H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, I-II, Göteborg, 1967 (*Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* XX,1-2)
- Hagendahl (1974): H. Hagendahl, 'Jerome and the Latin Classics', *VChr* 28, 1974, pp. 216-27
- Hagendahl (1983): H. Hagendahl, *Von Tertullian zu Cassiodor: Die profane literarische Tradition in dem lateinischen christlichen Schrifttum*, Göteborg, 1983 (*Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 44)
- Hall: S. G. Hall, *Melito of Sardis: On Pascha and Fragments*, Oxford, 1979
- Hamman: A. G. Hamman, *Origène: La prière*, Paris, 1977
- Hansen: G. C. Hansen, 'Molestiae nuptiarum', *WZRoStock* 12, 1963, pp. 215-9
- Harendza: W. Harendza, *De oratorio genere dicendi, quo Hieronymus in epistulis usus sit*, Breslau, 1905
- Harnack: A. Harnack, 'Tertullian in der Litteratur der alten Kirche', *SPAW* 1895, pp. 545-79 (= A. von Harnack, *Kleine Schriften zur alten Kirche. I: Berliner Akademieschriften 1890-1907*, Leipzig, 1980, pp. 247-81)
- Hartel: W. von Hartel, *S. Thasci Caecili Cypriani opera omnia*, Vienna, 1868 (*CSEL* III,1)
- Hermann: A. Hermann, 'Cilicium', *RLAC* 3, 1957, pp. 127-36
- Herron: M. C. Herron, *A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome*, Washington, 1937 (*Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* 51)
- Hervé de l'Incarnation: P. Hervé de l'Incarnation, 'Elie chez les Pères latins', in *Elle le prophète*, I, Bruges/Paris, 1956, pp. 179-207

- Herzog-Hauser: G. Herzog-Hauser, 'Trauerkleidung', in *PhW* 11,6, 1937, pp. 2225-31
- Hesbert: R.-J. Hesbert, 'S. Augustin et la virginité de la foi', in *AugMag.* 11, pp. 645-55
- Hickey (1983): A. E. Hickey, *Women of the Senatorial Aristocracy of Late Rome as Christian Monastics: A Sociological and Cultural Analysis of Motivation*, Diss. Vanderbilt, 1983
- Hickey (1987): A. E. Hickey, *Women of the Roman Aristocracy as Christian Monastics*, Ann Arbor, 1987 (*Studies in Religion* 1)
- Hilberg: I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi epistulae*, I-III, ed. 2, Vienna, 1996 (CSEL 54-56/1)
- Hofmann: J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Umgangssprache*, ed. 3, Heidelberg, 1951
- Hofmann-Szantyr: J. B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, neubearbeitet von A. Szantyr, Munich, 1965 (*Handbuch der Altertumswiss.* II,2,2)
- Holstenius: L. Holstenius, *Passio sanctarum martyrum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, Rome, 1663
- Holzapfel: H. Holzapfel, *Die sittliche Wertung der körperlichen Arbeit im christlichen Altertum*, Würzburg, 1941
- Hoppe: H. Hoppe, *Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Tertullians*, Lund, 1932 (*SFSL* 14)
- Horn: H.-J. Horn, 'Respicens per fenestras, prospiciens per cancellas: Zur Typologie des Fensters in der Antike', in *JbAC* 10, 1967, pp. 30-60
- Hritz: J. N. Hritz, *The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome*, Washington, 1939 (*Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* 60)
- Hummelauer: F. von Hummelauer, *Commentarius in librum Iosue*, Paris, 1903
- Hurter: H. Hurter, 'De arca Noe ecclesiae typo Patrum sententiae', in *Sanctorum Patrum opuscula selecta*, III, Innsbruck, 1868, pp. 217-33
- Ihm: M. Ihm, *Studia Ambrosiana*, Leipzig, 1890 (*Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplementband 17)
- Ingenkamp: H. G. Ingenkamp, 'Geschwätzigkeit', *RLAC* 10, 1978, pp. 829-37
- Janini Cuesta: J. Janini Cuesta, *S. Jerónimo y el ayuno*, Madrid, 1949
- Jannaccone: S. Jannaccone, 'Roma 384 (Struttura sociale e spirituale del gruppo geronimiano)', *GIF* 19, 1966, pp. 32-48
- Janson: T. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*, Stockholm, 1964 (*Studia Latina Stockholmiensia* 13)
- Janssen: H. Janssen, *Kultur und Sprache: Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian*, Nijmegen, 1938 (*LCP* 8)
- Jay (1973): P. Jay, 'Sur la date de naissance de S. Jérôme', *REL* 51, 1973, pp. 262-80

- Jay (1985): P. Jay, *L'éségèse de S. Jérôme d'après son Commentaire sur Isaïe*, Paris, 1985
- Jenal: G. Jenal, *Italia Ascetica atque Monastica: Das Asketen- und Mönchtum in Italien von den Anfängen bis zur Zeit der Langobarden (ca. 150/250-604)*, 1-II, Stuttgart, 1995 (*Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters* XXXIX,1)
- Jones: A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire*, Oxford, 1964
- Jürgens: H. Jürgens, *Pompa Diaboli: Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und das antike Theater*, Stuttgart, 1972 (*Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswiss.* 46)
- Jungmann: J. A. Jungmann, 'Tischgebet', *LTK*, ed. 2, 10, 1965, p. 208
- Juret: A. C. Juret, *Système de la syntaxe latine*, ed. 2, Paris, 1933
- Kech: H. Kech, *Hagiographie als christliche Unterhaltungsliteratur: Studien zum Phänomen des Erbaulichen anhand der Mönchsviten des hl. Hieronymus*, Göttingen, 1977 (*Göttinger Arbeiten zur Germanistik* 225)
- Keenan: A. E. Keenan, *Thasci Caecili Cypriani De habitu virginum: A Commentary, with an Introduction and Translation*, Washington, 1932 (*Catholic University of America Patristic Studies* 34)
- Kelly: J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies*, London, 1975, repr. Peabody, Mass., 1998
- Keydell: R. Keydell, review of Dumortier (1955), *Gnomon* 28, 1956, pp. 434-6
- Kissel: W. Kissel, *Aulus Persius Flaccus: Satiren*, Heidelberg, 1990
- Klauser: T. Klauser, 'Auswendiglernen', *RLAC* 1, 1950, pp. 1030-9
- Kleineidam-Kuss-Puzik (edd.): E. Kleineidam, O. Kuss and E. Puzik (edd.), *Amt und Sendung: Beiträge zu seelsorglichen und religiösen Fragen*, Freiburg, 1950
- Klostermann (1897): E. Klostermann, *Die Überlieferung der Jeremiahomilien des Origenes*, Leipzig, 1897 (*TU N. F.* 1,3)
- Klostermann (1911): E. Klostermann, review of Hilberg, I, *GGA* 173, 1911, pp. 192-7
- Klostermann-Berthold: E. Klostermann and H. Berthold, *Neue Homilien des Makarius/Symeon I. Aus Typus III*, Berlin, 1961 (*TU* 72)
- Koch (1907): H. Koch, 'Virgines Christi: die Gelübde der gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten', *TU* XXXI,2, 1907, pp. 59-112
- Koch (1926): H. Koch, *Cyprianische Untersuchungen*, Bonn, 1926 (*Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 4)
- Kötting (1954): B. Kötting, 'Blickrichtung', *RLAC* 2, 1954, pp. 429-33
- Kötting (1973): B. Kötting, 'Univira in Inschriften', in Boer (ed. 1973), pp. 195-206
- Kok: W. Kok, *Tertullianus: De cultu feminarum. Met inleiding, vertaling en commentaar*, Dokkum, 1934

- Kroymann (1893): E. Kroymann, *Quaestiones Tertullianae criticae*, Innsbruck, 1893
- Kroymann (1906): E. Kroymann, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani opera*, III, Vienna, 1906 (CSEL 47)
- Kunst: C. Kunst, *De S. Hieronymi studiis Ciceronianis*, Vienna/Leipzig, 1918 (*Dissertationes Philologicae Vindobonenses* XII,2)
- Labourt: J. Labourt, *S. Jérôme: Lettres*, I-VIII, Paris, 1949-63
- Labriolle (1920): P. de Labriolle, 'Le songe de S. Jérôme', in *Miscellanea Geronimiana*, Rome, 1920, pp. 227-35
- Labriolle (1921): P. de Labriolle, 'Le "mariage spirituel" dans l'antiquité chrétienne', *RH* 137, 1921, pp. 204-25
- Lammert: F. Lammert, *De Hieronymo Donati discipulo*, Leipzig, 1912 (*Commentationes Philologicae Jenenses* IX,2)
- Lampe (1950): G. W. H. Lampe, review of Courcelle (1948), *CR* 64, 1950, pp. 59-61
- Lampe (1961): G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford, 1961
- Lardet (1980): P. Lardet, *S. Jérôme: Apologie contre Rufin*, I-V, Diss. Paris, 1980
- Lardet (1981): P. Lardet, 'Culte astral et culture profane chez S. Jérôme: à propos d'une tournure suspecte [*errore combibimus*] et d'allusions non élucidées du *Commentaire sur Amos*', *VChr* 35, 1981, pp. 321-45
- Lardet (1983): P. Lardet, *S. Jérôme: Apologie contre Rufin*, Paris, 1983 (*SC* 303)
- Lardet (1993): P. Lardet, *L'apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin: Un commentaire*, Leiden, 1993 (*Suppl. VChr* 15)
- Laurence (1996): P. Laurence, 'Suicide et chasteté chez Jérôme', *Orpheus N. S.* 17, 1996, pp. 50-69
- Laurence (1997a): P. Laurence, *Jérôme et le nouveau modèle féminin*, Paris, 1997 (*Collection des Etudes Augustiniennes, Sér. Antiquité* 155)
- Laurence (1997b): P. Laurence, 'Jérôme et l'*Ancilla Christi*: Servitude et liberté', *Augustinianum* 37, 1997, pp. 411-29
- Laurence (1997c): P. Laurence, 'Les représentations de la *domina* chez Jérôme', *RecSR* 85, 1997, pp. 41-55
- Lausberg: H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, ed. 3, Stuttgart, 1990
- Lebon: J. Lebon, 'Athanasiana Syriaca. II: Une lettre attribuée à S. Athanase d'Alexandrie', *Muséon* 41, 1928, pp. 169-216
- Leclercq (1907): H. Leclercq, 'Agape', *DACL* 1, 1907, pp. 775-848
- Leclercq (1914): H. Leclercq, 'Commerce', *DACL* 3, 1914, pp. 2368-94
- Lefort (1929): L.-Th. Lefort, 'S. Athanase: Sur la virginité', *Muséon* 42, 1929, pp. 197-264
- Lefort (1935): L.-Th. Lefort, 'Athanase, Ambroise et Chenoute Sur la virginité', *Muséon* 48, 1935, pp. 55-73
- Lefort (1955): L.-Th. Lefort, *S. Athanase: Lettres festales et pastorales en*

copte, Louvain, 1955 (CSCO 151, *Scriptores Coptici* 20)

Leipelt: P. Leipelt, *Ausgewählte Schriften des hl. Hieronymus*, I–II, Kempten, 1872–4

Leisegang: H. Leisegang, *Indices ad Philonis Alexandrini opera*, Berlin, 1926–30

Lemarié-Tardif: J. Lemarié and H. Tardif, *Chromace d'Aquilée: Sermons*, I–II, Paris, 1969–71 (SC 154, 164)

Lewis-Short: C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1879, repr. 1956

Lieu: S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China: A Historical Survey*, Manchester, 1985

Lightman-Zeisel: M. Lightman and W. Zeisel 'Univira: An Example of Continuity and Change in Roman Society', *ChHist* 46, 1977, pp. 19–32

Löfstedt (1911): E. Löfstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*, Uppsala, 1911, repr. 1936

Löfstedt (1918): E. Löfstedt, *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Tertullians Apologeticum*, Lund, 1918 (*Lunds Universitets Årsskrift* N. F., Avd. 1, Bd. 1, Nr. 24)

Löfstedt (1942): E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins*, I–II, ed. 2, Lund, 1942–56 (*Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundenas* X, 1–2)

Löfstedt (1949): E. Löfstedt, 'Reminiscence and Imitation. Some Problems in Latin Literature', *Eranos* 47, 1949, pp. 148–64

Lorenz: R. Lorenz, 'Die Anfänge des abendländischen Mönchtums im 4. Jahrhundert', *ZKG* 77, 1966, pp. 1–61

Lorié: L. T. A. Lorié, *Spiritual Terminology in the Latin Translations of the Vita Antonii*, Nijmegen, 1955 (LCP 11)

Luebeck: E. Luebeck, *Hieronymus quas noverit scriptores et ex quibus auaserit*, Leipzig, 1872

Lumpe (1966a): A. Lumpe, 'Essen', *RLAC* 6, 1966, pp. 612–35

Lumpe (1966b): A. Lumpe, 'Exemplum', *RLAC* 6, 1966, pp. 1229–57

Lutterbach: H. Lutterbach, 'Der Fleischverzicht im Christentum: ein Mittel zur Therapie der Leidenschaften und zur Aktualisierung des paradiesischen Urzustandes', *Saeculum* 50, 1999, pp. 177–209

Mahé: J. P. Mahé, *Tertullien: La chair du Christ*, I–II, Paris, 1975 (SC 216–7)

Malone: E. E. Malone, 'Martyrdom and Monastic Profession as a Second Baptism', in Mayer-Quasten-Neunheuser (edd.), pp. 115–34

Marrou (1949): H. I. Marrou, 'La technique de l'édition à l'époque patristique', *VChr* 3, 1949, pp. 208–24

Marrou (1965): H. I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, ed. 6, Paris, 1965

Martianay: J. Martianay, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri*

opera, I–V, Paris, 1693–1706

- Mathieu: J.-M. Mathieu, 'Authenticité de l'*Exhortatio ad virgines* (*Carmen* I,ii,3)', in Mossay (ed.), pp. 145–58
- Mayer–Quasten–Neunheuser (edd.): A. Mayer, J. Quasten and B. Neunheuser (edd.), *Vom christlichen Mysticism: Gesammelte Arbeiten zum Gedächtnis von Odo Casel OSB*, Düsseldorf, 1951
- Mayer–Chelius (edd.): C. Mayer and K. H. Chelius (edd.), *Homo spiritualis: Festgabe für Luc Verheijen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, Würzburg, 1987 (*Cassiciacum* 38)
- Mayor: J. E. B. Mayor, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani Apologeticus*, Cambridge, 1917
- McDermott: W. C. McDermott, 'St. Jerome and Pagan Greek Literature', *VChr* 36, 1982, pp. 372–82
- Meershoek: G. Q. A. Meershoek, *Le latin biblique d'après S. Jérôme: Aspects linguistiques de la rencontre entre la Bible et le monde classique*, Nijmegen/Utrecht, 1966 (*LCP* 20)
- Memoli: A. F. Memoli, 'Diversità di posizioni e apparenti incoerenze degli scrittori latini cristiani di fronte alla *eloquentia classica*', *Aevum* 43, 1969, pp. 114–43
- Metz: R. Metz, *La consécration des vierges dans l'église romaine*, Paris, 1954
- Meyer: L. Meyer, *S. Jean Chrysostome, maître de perfection chrétienne*, Paris, 1933
- Micaelli (1979): C. Micaelli, 'L'influsso di Tertulliano su Girolamo: le opere sul matrimonio e le seconde nozze', *Augustinianum* 19, 1979, pp. 415–29
- Micaelli (1985): C. Micaelli, 'Ricerche sulla fortuna di Tertulliano', *Orpheus* N. S. 6, 1985, pp. 118–35
- Michel: A. Michel, 'Gloire', in *DTC* VI,2, 1947, pp. 1386–432
- Mierow–Lawler: C. C. Mierow and T. C. Lawler, *The Letters of St. Jerome*, I, Westminster, Md./London, 1963 (*ACH* 33)
- Miller (1993): P. C. Miller, 'The Blazing Body: Ascetic Desire in Jerome's Letter to Eustochium', *J ECS* 1, 1993, pp. 21–45
- Miller (1994): P. C. Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*, Princeton, 1994
- Moberly: R. B. Moberly, 'Jerome's Age: Some Further Thoughts', in Deroux (ed.), pp. 404–16
- Mohrmann (1946): C. Mohrmann, 'Quelques traits caractéristiques du latin des chrétiens', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, I, Vatican City, 1946 (*ST* 121), pp. 937–66 (= Mohrmann [1958], I, pp. 21–50)
- Mohrmann (1951): C. Mohrmann, 'S. Jérôme et S. Augustin sur Tertullien', *VChr* 5, 1951, pp. 111–2 (= Mohrmann [1958], III, pp. 387–8)
- Mohrmann (1958): C. Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, I–IV, Rome, 1958–77
- Mohrmann (1959): C. Mohrmann, 'Considerazioni sulle *Confessioni* di Sant'Agostino. III: La lingua e lo stile delle *Confessioni*', *Convivium* N

S. 2, 1959, pp. 129–39 (= Mohrmann [1958], II, pp. 308–23)

- Molager: J. Molager, *Cyprien de Carthage: A Donat et La vertu de patience*, Paris, 1982 (SC 291)
- Monceaux (1901): P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, I–VII, Paris, 1901–23
- Monceaux (1930): P. Monceaux, 'S. Jérôme au désert de Syrie', *RDM* 58, 1930, pp. 136–57 and 377–94
- Moreschini (1985): C. Moreschini, *Grégoire de Nazianze: Discours 32–37*, Paris, 1985 (SC 318)
- Moreschini (1988): C. Moreschini, 'Præceptor meus. Tracce dell'insegnamento di Gregorio Nazianzeno in Gerolamo', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 129–38
- Moreschini–Menestrina (edd.): C. Moreschini and G. Menestrina (edd.), *Motivi letterari ed esegetici in Gerolamo*, Brescia, 1997 (*Religione e Cultura* 9)
- Moricca: U. Moricca, *S. Girolamo*, I–II, Milan, 1922 (*Pensiero Cristiano* 1–2)
- Morin (1897): G. Morin, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus sive homiliae in Psalmos. in Marci evangelium aliaque varia argumenta*, Maredsous/Oxford, 1897 (*Anecdota Maredsolana* III,2)
- Morin (1903): G. Morin, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus sive homiliae in Psalmos quattuordecim*, Maredsous/Oxford, 1903 (*Anecdota Maredsolana* III,3)
- Morin (1913): G. Morin, *Études, textes, découvertes*, Maredsous/Paris, 1913
- Mossay (ed.): J. Mossay (ed.), *II. Symposium Nazianzenum*, Paderborn, 1983 (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums* N. F., 2,2)
- Munier: C. Munier, *Concilia Africae a. 345 – a. 525*, Turnhout, 1974 (*CCL* 149)
- Musurillo–Grillet: H. Musurillo and B. Grillet, *Jean Chrysostome: la virginité*, Paris, 1966 (SC 125)
- Nau (1907): F. Nau, 'Histoires des solitaires égyptiens', *ROC* 12, 1907, pp. 43–69; 171–81; 393–404
- Nau (1908): F. Nau, 'Histoires des solitaires égyptiens', *ROC* 13, 1908, pp. 47–57; 266–83
- Nau (1909): F. Nau, 'Histoires des solitaires égyptiens', *ROC* 14, 1909, pp. 357–79
- Nau (1912): F. Nau, 'Histoires des solitaires égyptiens', *ROC* 17, 1912, pp. 204–11; 294–301
- Nau (1913): F. Nau, 'Histoires des solitaires égyptiens', *ROC* 18, 1913, pp. 137–46
- Nauroy: G. Nauroy, 'Jérôme, lecteur et censeur de l'exégèse d'Ambroise', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 173–203
- Nautin (1972): P. Nautin, 'Études de chronologie hiéronymienne (393–397)', *REAug* 18, 1972, pp. 209–18

- Nautin (1979): P. Nautin, 'La date des commentaires de Jérôme sur les épîtres pauliniennes', *RHE* 74, 1979, pp. 5-12
- Nautin (1983): P. Nautin, 'L'activité littéraire de Jérôme de 387 à 392', *RTAPh* 115, 1983, pp. 247-59
- Nautin (1986): P. Nautin, 'Hieronymus', *ThR* 15, 1986, pp. 304-15
- Nautin (1988): P. Nautin, 'La lettre *Magnum est* de Jérôme à Vincent et la traduction des homélies d'Origène sur les prophètes', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 27-39
- Nazzaro: A. V. Nazzaro, 'Intertestualità biblico-patristica e classica nell'*Epistola* 22 di Gerolamo', in Moreschini-Menestrina (edd.), pp. 197-221
- Neue-Wagener: F. Neue, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, I-IV, ed. 3 by C. Wagener, Leipzig, 1892-1905
- Neumann: C. W. Neumann, *The Virgin Mary in the Works of Saint Ambrose*, Fribourg, 1962 (*Paradosis* 17)
- Niessen: J. Niessen, *Die Mariologie des hl. Hieronymus: Ihre Quellen und ihre Kritik*, Münster/W., 1913
- Nisbet-Hubbard: R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes. Book I*, Oxford, 1970
- Nock: A. D. Nock, 'Postscripts', *HTHR* 34, 1941, pp. 103-9
- Norden: E. Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom 6. Jh. v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, ed. 9, Stuttgart, 1983
- Oberhelman: S. M. Oberhelman, 'Jerome's Earliest Attack on Ambrose: On *Ephesians*, Prologue (*ML* 26, 469^D-70^A)', *TAPhA* 121, 1991, pp. 377-401
- Oehler: F. Oehler, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani quae supersunt omnia*, I-III, Leipzig, 1853
- Oepke: A. Oepke, 'δύω, ἐκ-, ἀπεκ-, ἐν-, ἐπενδύω, ἀπέκδυσις', *TWB* 2, 1935, pp. 318-21
- Oliver: R. P. Oliver, 'The First Medicean MS of Tacitus and the Titulature of Ancient Books', *TAPhA* 82, 1951, pp. 232-61
- Opelt (1973): I. Opelt, *Hieronymus' Streitschriften*, Heidelberg, 1973 (*Bibliothek der klass. Altertumswiss.* N. F. II,44)
- Opelt (1980): I. Opelt, *Die Polemik in der christlichen lateinischen Literatur von Tertullian bis Augustin*, Heidelberg, 1980 (*Bibliothek der klass. Altertumswiss.* N. F. II,63)
- Oppenheim: P. Oppenheim, *Symbolik und religiöse Wertung des Mönchskleides im christlichen Altertum*, Münster, 1932 (*Theologie des christlichen Ostens* 2)
- Orelli: J. K. von Orelli, *Inscriptionum latinarum selectarum amplissima collectio*, I-III, Zurich, 1828-56
- Otto: A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig, 1890
- Ottolini: A. Ottolini, *La retorica nelle epistole di Girolamo da Stridone*, Cremona, 1905

- Palanque: J.-R. Palanque, *S. Ambroise et l'empire romain*, Paris, 1933
- Paredi: A. Paredi, 'S. Gerolamo e S. Ambrogio', in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, V.2, Vatican City, 1964 (ST 235), pp. 183-98
- Pastè: R. Pastè, 'Un orientale latinista presso S. Eusebio di Vercelli (Evagrio di Antiochia)', *ScCatt* 60, 1932, pp. 341-58
- Paucker: C. Paucker, *De latinitate B. Hieronymi observationes ad nominum verborumque usum pertinentes*, Berlin, 1880
- Pavan: V. Pavan, 'Girolamo e l'interpretazione antica di *circumdanda varietate* (Sal. 44,10,14): La diversità dei carismi', *AnnSE* 5, 1988, pp. 239-52
- Pease: A. S. Pease, 'The Attitude of Jerome towards Pagan Literature', *TAPA* 50, 1919, pp. 150-67
- Penna: A. Penna, *S. Gerolamo*, Turin/Rome, 1949
- Perrin: M. Perrin, 'Jérôme lecteur de Lactance', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 99-114
- Petersen-Szemerédy: G. Petersen-Szemerédy, *Zwischen Weltstadt und Wüste: Römische Asketinnen in der Spätantike*, Göttingen, 1993 (FKDG 54)
- Petitmengin (1986): P. Petitmengin, review of Micaelli (1985), *REAug* 32, 1986, p. 281
- Petitmengin (1988): P. Petitmengin, 'S. Jérôme et Tertullien', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 43-59
- Petitmengin (1994): P. Petitmengin, review of Adkin (1992d) and (1993k), *REAug* 40, 1994, pp. 495-6
- Pétri: H. Pétri, *Caritas: Etude sur le vocabulaire latin de la charité chrétienne*, Louvain, 1948 (SSL 22)
- Piganiol: A. Piganiol, *L'empire chrétien (325-395)*, ed. 2, Paris, 1972
- Pitra (1852): J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, I-IV, Paris, 1852-8
- Pitra (1876): J. B. Pitra, *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, I-VIII, Paris, 1876-91
- Plumpe: J. C. Plumpe, *Mater Ecclesia: An Inquiry into the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity*, Washington, 1943 (*Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity* 5)
- Porte-Néraudau (edd.): D. Porte and J.-P. Néraudau (edd.), *Hommages à Henri Le Bonniec: Res Sacrae*, Brussels, 1988 (*Collection Latomus* 201)
- Preuschen: E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena: Die Reste der ausserkanonischen Evangelien und urchristlichen Überlieferungen*, ed. 2, Giessen, 1905
- Puech (1928): A. Puech, *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à la fin du IV^e siècle*, I-III, Paris, 1928-30
- Puech (1979): H.-C. Puech, *Sur le manichéisme et autres essais*, Paris, 1979
- Quacquarelli (1953): A. Quacquarelli, *Il triplice frutto della vita cristiana: 100, 60 e 30 (Matteo XIII - 8, nelle diverse interpretazioni)*, Rome, 1953

- Quacquarelli (1971): A. Quacquarelli, *Saggi patristici*, Bari, 1971 (*Quaderni di Vetera Christianorum* 5)
- Quadlbauer: F. Quadlbauer, 'Zur invocatio des Iuvenius (praef. 25–27)', *GB* 2, 1974, pp. 185–212
- Rapisarda: C. A. Rapisarda, 'Ciceronianus es, non christianus: Dove e quando avvenne il sogno di S. Girolamo?', *MSL* 4, 1953, pp. 1–18
- Rebenich (1992a): S. Rebenich, *Hieronymus und sein Kreis: Prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Stuttgart, 1992 (*Historia Einzelschriften* 72)
- Rebenich (1992b): S. Rebenich, 'Der heilige Hieronymus und die Geschichte – Zur Funktion der Exempla in seinen Briefen', *RQA* 87, 1992, pp. 29–46
- Recchia: V. Recchia, 'Verginità e martirio nei cofores di S. Girolamo (Ep. 24 Hilberg)', *VetChr* 3, 1966, pp. 45–68
- Reich: H. Reich, *Der Mimus: Ein literärenentwicklungsgeschichtlicher Versuch*, 1, Berlin, 1903
- Reifferscheid-Wissowa: A. Reifferscheid and G. Wissowa, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani De ieiunio adversus psychicos*, in *CCL* 2, Turnhout, 1954, pp. 1255–77
- Reitzenstein (1914): R. Reitzenstein, 'Eine frühchristliche Schrift von den dreierlei Früchten des christlichen Lebens', *ZNTW* 15, 1914, pp. 60–90
- Reitzenstein (1916): R. Reitzenstein, *Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca: Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker*, Göttingen, 1916 (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 24)
- Richard: M. Richard, *Asterii Sophistae commentariorum in Psalmos quae supersunt*, Oslo, 1956 (*SO Fasc. Supplet.* 16)
- Richter: K. Richter, 'Agape. II. Liturgisch', *LTK*, ed. 3, 1, 1993, pp. 222–3
- Rinetti: P. Rinetti, 'S. Agostino e l'«Ecclesia Mater»', in *AugMag*, II, pp. 827–34
- Roetzer: W. Roetzer, *Des hl. Augustinus Schriften als liturgiegeschichtliche Quelle*, Munich, 1930
- Rubio Fernández: L. Rubio Fernández, *S. Paciano: Obras*, Barcelona, 1958
- Ruinart: T. Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum sincera et selecta*, Paris, 1689
- Ruiz Bueno: D. Ruiz Bueno, *Cartas de S. Jerónimo. Edición bilingüe*, I–II, Madrid, 1962 (*BAC* 219–20)
- Rutzenhöfer: E. Rutzenhöfer, *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus Manicheorum libri duo: Über die Lebensführung in der katholischen Kirche und über die Lebensführung der Manichäer. Zwei Bücher: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Diss. Berlin, 1998
- Sabatier: P. Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum latinae versiones antiquae*, I–III, Reims, 1742, repr. Turnhout, 1991
- Sainio: M. A. Sainio, *Semasiologische Untersuchungen über die Entstehung der christlichen Latinität*, Helsinki, 1940 (*Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian*

- Saint-Martin: J. Saint-Martin, *Oeuvres de S. Augustin. 1^{re} sér., III: L'ascétisme chrétien*, ed. 2, Paris, 1949 (*BibAug* 3)
- Schade (1910): L. Schade, *Die Inspirationslehre des hl. Hieronymus*, Freiburg/B., 1910 (*Biblische Studien* XV,4–5)
- Schade (1936): L. Schade, *Des hl. Kirchenvaters Eusebius Hieronymus ausgewählte Briefe*, I. Briefband, Munich, 1936 (*BKV* II,16)
- Schäublin: C. Schäublin, 'Textkritisches zu den Briefen des Hieronymus', *MH* 30, 1973, pp. 55–62
- Schmid (1954a): J. Schmid, 'Brautgemach', *RLAC* 2, 1954, pp. 524–8
- Schmid (1954b): J. Schmid, 'Brautschafft, heilige', *RLAC* 2, 1954, pp. 528–64
- Schneiderhan: A. Schneiderhan, *Die exempla bei Hieronymus*, Diss. Munich, 1916
- Schöne: A. Schöne, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus*, Berlin, 1900
- Scholte: W. A. J. C. Scholte, *Q. S. Fl. Tertulliani De testimonio animae*, Amsterdam, 1934
- Schreckenberg: H. Schreckenberg, *Die Flavius-Iosephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*, Leiden, 1972 (*Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums* 5)
- Schrijnen-Mohrmann: J. Schrijnen and C. Mohrmann, *Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian*, I–II, Nijmegen, 1936–7 (*LCP* 5–6)
- Schulz-Flügel-Mattei: E. Schulz-Flügel and P. Mattei, *Tertullien: Le voile des vierges (De virginibus velandis)*, Paris, 1997 (*SC* 424)
- Schuster: M. Schuster, 'Zu Hieronymus und Eucherius', *PhW* 49, 1929, pp. 190–2
- Schwarz: F. F. Schwarz, 'Hieronymus flagellatus: Überlegungen zum literarischen Schlagschatten Ciceros', *Anthung* 30, 1982–4, pp. 363–78
- Scourfield: J. H. D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*, Oxford, 1993
- Scudamore (1875a): W. E. Scudamore, 'Grace at Meals', in Smith-Cheetham (edd.), I, pp. 745–6
- Scudamore (1875b): W. E. Scudamore, 'Hours of Prayer', in Smith-Cheetham (edd.), I, pp. 792–9
- Serrato Garrido: M. Serrato Garrido, *Ascetismo femenino en Roma: Estudios sobre S. Jerónimo y S. Agustín*, Cadiz 1993
- Severus: E. von Severus, 'Gebet I', *RLAC* 8, 1972, pp. 1134–1258
- Simon: P. Simon, *Sponsa Cantici: Die Deutung der Braut des Hohenliedes in der vorrätinischen griechischen Theologie und in der lateinischen Theologie des dritten und vierten Jahrhunderts*, I–II, Diss. Bonn, 1951
- Siniscalco: P. Siniscalco, 'Gerolamo', in *Enciclopedia Virgilliana*, II, Rome, 1985, pp. 714–6

- Smets-Van Esbroeck: A. Smets and M. Van Esbroeck, *Basile de Césarée: Sur l'origine de l'homme*, Paris, 1970 (SC 160)
- Smit: J. W. Smit, 'The Triumphant Horseman Christ', in *Mélanges Christine Mohrmann: Nouveau recueil*, Utrecht-Antwerp, 1973, pp. 172-90
- Smith: J. D. Smith, *The Ignatian Long Recension and Christian Communities in Fourth Century Syrian Antioch*, Diss. Harvard, 1986 (summary in *DA* 47, 1986, p. 1781-A)
- Smith-Cheetham (edd.): W. Smith and S. Cheetham (edd.), *A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, I-II, London, 1875-80
- Smolak: K. Smolak, 'Lecta Verba: Aspekte der Sprachästhetik im Latein der Spätantike und des Frühmittelalters', *WHB* 27, 1985, pp. 12-27
- Sneyders de Vogel: K. Sneyders de Vogel, 'Nasci', *NPh* 3, 1917-8, pp. 156-7
- Sofer: J. Sofer, 'Vulgo: Ein Beitrag zur Kennzeichnung der lateinischen Umgang- und Volkssprache', *Glotta* 25, 1936, pp. 222-9
- Solignac: A. Solignac, *Oeuvres de S. Augustin. 2^e sér., XIII-XIV: Les confessions*, Bruges, 1962 (*BibAug* 13-4)
- Souter (1908): A. Souter, *Pt.-Augustini Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII*, Vienna/Leipzig, 1908 (CSEL 50)
- Souter (1912): A. Souter, review of Hilberg, *LJThS* 13, 1912, pp. 148-51
- Spanneut: M. Spanneut, 'Évagre, évêque d'Antioche', *DHG* 16, 1967, pp. 102-7
- Stade: W. Stade, *Hieronymus in proemiis quid tractaverit et quos auctores quasque leges rhetoricas secutus sit*, Rostock, 1925
- Stählin-Früchtel-Treu: O. Stählin, L. Früchtel and U. Treu, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, III, Berlin, 1970 (GCS 17³)
- Steidle: B. Steidle, 'Das Lachen im alten Mönchtum', *BM* 20, 1938, pp. 271-80
- Steur: P. Steur, *Het karakter van Hieronymus van Stridon bestudeerd in zijn brieven*, Nijmegen/Utrecht, 1945
- Sugano: K. Sugano, *Das Rombild des Hieronymus*, Frankfurt/M., 1983 (*Europäische Hochschulschriften XV*, 25)
- Sutphen: M. C. Sutphen, 'A Further Collection of Latin Proverbs', *AJP* 22, 1901, pp. 1-28, 121-48, 241-60, 361-91 (= Häussler, pp. 124-230)
- Sychowski: S. von Sychowski, *Hieronymus als Literaturhistoriker*, Münster/W., 1894 (*Kirchengeschichtliche Studien* II, 2)
- Sykturis: J. Sykturis, 'Epistolographie', *PHK Supplementband* 5, 1931, pp. 185-220
- Tarulli: V. Tarulli, *S. Agostino: Esposizioni sui Salmi*, II, Rome, 1971 (*Opere di S. Agostino. Parte 3: Discorsi*; Vol. 26)
- Testard (1958): M. Testard, *S. Augustin et Cicéron*, I-II, Paris, 1958
- Testard (1983): M. Testard, 'Pour comprendre S. Jérôme', *FL* 89, 1983, pp. 14-24
- Testard (1984): M. Testard, *S. Ambroise: Les devoirs. Introduction: Livre I*,

Paris, 1984

- Testard (1988): M. Testard, 'Jérôme et Ambroise: Sur un "aveu" du *De officiis* de l'évêque de Milan', in Duval (ed. 1988), pp. 227–54
- Testard (1993): M. Testard, review of Vogüé (1991), I, *RThL* 24, 1993, pp. 201–5
- Thiel: A. Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae*, I, Braunsberg, 1868, repr. Hildesheim 1974
- Thierry (1963): J. J. Thierry, 'The Date of the Dream of Jerome', *VChr* 17, 1963, pp. 28–40
- Thierry (1967): J. J. Thierry, 'Some Notes on *Epistula XXII* of St. Jerome', *VChr* 21, 1967, pp. 120–7
- Tibiletti: C. Tibiletti, 'Un opuscolo perduto di Tertulliano: *Ad amicum philosophum*', *AAT* 95, 1960–I, pp. 122–66
- Tillemont: L. S. Le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, I–XVI, Paris, 1693–1715
- Trisoglio: F. Trisoglio, 'Note stilistiche sull'epistolario di Girolamo', *VetChr* 30, 1993, pp. 267–88
- Turcan: M. Turcan, *Tertullien: La toilette des femmes*, Paris, 1971 (SC 173)
- Vacandard: E. Vacandard, 'Carême (Jeûne du)', *DTC* 2, 1939, pp. 1724–50
- Vaccari (1920): A. Vaccari, 'Bollettino Geronimiano', *Biblica* 1, 1920, pp. 379–96
- Vaccari (1924): A. Vaccari, review of Cavallera, *Biblica* 5, 1924, pp. 82–4
- Vallarsi: D. Vallarsi, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri opera*, I–XI, ed. 2, Venice, 1766–72
- Vattioni: F. Vattioni, 'S. Girolamo e l'Ecclesiastico', *VetChr* 4, 1967, pp. 131–49
- Verbraken: P. P. Verbraken, 'Le Sermon 57 de S. Augustin pour la tradition de l'Oraison dominicale', in Mayer–Chelius (edd.), pp. 411–24
- Vidén: G. Vidén, 'St. Jerome on Female Chastity: Subjugating the Elements of Desire', *SO* 73, 1998, pp. 139–57
- Vitтори: M. Vittori, *Opera divi Hieronymi Stridonensis*, I–IX, Antwerp, 1578–9
- Vogels: H. Vogels, 'Ambrosiaster und Hieronymus', *RBen* 66, 1956, pp. 14–9
- Vogüé (1961): A. de Vogüé, *La communauté et l'abbé dans la règle de S. Benoît*, Bruges, 1961
- Vogüé (1991): A. de Vogüé, *Histoire littéraire du mouvement monastique dans l'antiquité*, I–V, Paris, 1991–8
- Vogüé–Neufville: A. de Vogüé and J. Neufville, *La règle de S. Benoît*, I–VII, Paris, 1971–7 (SC 181–6 = *Série des textes monastiques d'Occident* 34–9)
- Vretska: K. Vretska, *C. Sallustius Crispus: De Catilinae coniuratione*, Heidelberg, 1976
- Waldstein: W. Waldstein, 'quaestio 2', *PWK* 24, 1963, pp. 786–7

- Walther: H. Walther, *Carmina mediæ aevi posterioris latinae, II, 5: Proverbia sententiaeque latinitatis mediæ aevi*, Göttingen, 1967
- Waszink (1947): J. H. Waszink, *Q. S. F. Tertulliani De anima*, Amsterdam, 1947
- Waszink (1950): J. H. Waszink, 'Abreibung', *RLAC* 1, 1950, pp. 55–60
- Waszink (1954): J. H. Waszink, 'Beseelung', *RLAC* 2, 1954, pp. 176–83
- Waszink (1959): J. H. Waszink, 'Empfängnis: B. Christlich', *RLAC* 4, 1959, pp. 1252–5
- Waszink–Windens: J. H. Waszink and J. C. M. van Windens, *Tertullianus: De idololatria. Critical Text, Translation and Commentary*, Leiden, 1987 (Suppl. *VChr* 1)
- Weismann: W. Weismann, *Kirche und Schauspiele: Die Schauspiele im Urteil der lateinischen Kirchenväter unter bes. Berücksichtigung von Augustin*, Würzburg, 1972 (*Cassiciacum* 27)
- Wenger: A. Wenger, *Jean Chrysostome: Huit catéchèses baptismales*, ed. 2, Paris, 1970 (*SC* 50)
- Wessel: K. Wessel, 'Durchzug durch das Rote Meer', *RLAC* 4, 1959, pp. 370–89
- Westman: R. Westman, *M. Tullii Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia: Orator*, Leipzig, 1980
- Weyman (1893): C. Weyman, 'Studien zu Apuleius und seinen Nachahmern', *SBAW* 1893, pp. 321–92
- Weyman (1910): C. Weyman, review of Hilberg, I, *WKPh* 27, 1910, pp. 1003–13
- Wiesen: D. S. Wiesen, *St. Jerome as a Satirist: A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters*, Ithaca, 1964 (*Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* 34)
- Wilpert: J. Wilpert, *Die gottgeweihten Jungfrauen in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Kirche*, Freiburg/B., 1892
- Wissemann: M. Wissemann, *Schimpfworte in der Bibelübersetzung des Hieronymus*, Heidelberg, 1992
- Zehles–Zamora–Sicherl: F. E. Zehles, M. J. Zamora and M. Sicherl, *Gregor von Nazianz: Mahnungen an die Jungfrauen (Carmen 1,2,2)*, Paderborn, 1996 (*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums* N. F. II, 13)
- Zellinger: J. Zellinger, *Studien zu Severian von Gabala*, Münster, 1926 (*MBPh* 8)
- Zelzer: M. Zelzer, 'Symmachus, Ambrosius, Hieronymus und das römische Erbe', *SP* 28, 1993, pp. 146–57
- Zumkeller: A. Zumkeller, 'Propositum in seinem spezifisch christlichen und theologischen Verständnis bei Augustinus', in Mayer–Chelius (edd.), pp. 295–310
- Zycha: J. Zycha, *S. Aurelii Augustini De fide et symbolo etc.*, Prague/Vienna/Leipzig, 1900 (*CSEL* 41)

INTRODUCTION

Since biographies of Jerome and treatments of the theme of virginity are both legion, it would be pointless to rehash at length here what has already been said elsewhere. Jerome's *Libellus de virginitate servanda* is one of his earliest independent works. When Jerome published it at Rome in the spring of 384,¹ he would seem to have been already in his late thirties.² His literary production had so far consisted chiefly of translations from the Greek. The *Libellus* was therefore a very ambitious undertaking: in it Jerome was extremely keen to impress.

There was already an ample literature on the subject of virginity. Tertullian, Cyprian, Novatian and Methodius had written on it in the third century. The later fourth century witnessed a particularly keen interest. A large number of eastern Fathers produced works dealing with the topic: Athanasius, Basil of Ancyra, Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom. In the West Ambrose had produced his three books *De virginibus* in 377.³

Jerome's earlier sojourns in Antioch and Constantinople meant that he was thoroughly familiar with Greek as well as Latin treatments of the subject of virginity: his reading habits were ravenous.⁴ It is no

¹ Cf. Cavallera, I.2, p. 24; Vogué (1991), I, p. 236.

² On Jerome's date of birth cf. Jay (1973), p. 280 ('dans les années 345-347'); Booth (1979), p. 353 ('in the second half of 347 or early in 348'). For a defence of Prosper's statement that he was born in 331 cf. Kelly, pp. 337ff.; if this view is accepted, he will already have been in his early fifties when he composed the *Libellus*. Recently Moberly has argued for '340 ± 2'.

³ It may be noted that Jerome did not like Basil the Great, Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom or Ambrose: Jerome's *Libellus* will accordingly have been composed in a somewhat emulative spirit. For his hostility to Basil cf. *chron. a. Abr.* 2392; for his critical attitude to Gregory, who is generally considered to have been the object of his unqualified admiration, cf. Adkin (1991); for his animosity towards John and for arguments placing the latter's *De virginitate* before the *Libellus* cf. Adkin (1994a); finally for evidence that Jerome was already unsympathetic to Ambrose at the time of the *Libellus* cf. Adkin (1993a).

⁴ Cf. (e.g.) Jerome, *hom. Orig. in Ezek. prol.* p. 318,4 (assigned variously to 381 in Constantinople or 378-9 in Antioch: *oculorum ... dolore cruciatus, quem nimis impatiens lectione contraxi*); Sulpicius Severus, *diol.* 1.9.5 (the observation of someone who had stayed with Jerome for six months in Bethlehem: *totus semper in*

surprise therefore to find that Jerome should be heavily indebted to his predecessors.⁵ Grützmacher maintained that it was in the *Libellus de virginitate servanda* alone that Jerome had developed original ideas (I, pp. 253f.). His statement requires modification. Grützmacher cites two specific instances: the first is the notion that a virgin gives birth to Christ (38,3), while his second is the idea that marriage is the source of virginity (20,1). Both concepts however turn out to be no more than commonplaces.

Jerome's borrowings are not restricted to the stock-in-trade of the literature of virginity. As well as an omnivorous appetite for books Jerome also possessed a magpie mind and a vast memory.⁶ Flashy formulations or clever conceits that Jerome encountered in his voracious reading of other authors could accordingly be remembered and reproduced in the *Libellus*, where they are passed off as his own: hence Jerome's brilliance often turns out to be no more than the glitter of pilfered tinsel. The sneer which Jerome directs against Ambrose in fact fits his own method of composition perfectly: *exquisitis hinc inde odoribus pigmentatum*.⁷

It has already been demonstrated that Jerome's biblical commentaries are heavily derivative.⁸ The same has been shown to be true of his treatises.⁹ Hitherto the investigation of Jerome's sources has tended to proceed on the assumption that in a specific passage Jerome is following one particular source: he has the work from which he is borrowing open in front of him.¹⁰ It would seem however that in Jerome's case *Quellenforschung* should be prosecuted on a far more intensive scale. All his phrases must be subjected to individual examination, since they

lectione, totus in libro est: non die neque nocte requiescit: aut legit aliquid semper aut scribit).

⁵ Jerome is no less happy to borrow from authors who do not meet with his approval than from those who do; cf. n. 25 below.

⁶ The unusual retentiveness of his memory has long been recognized; cf. Antin (1960), p. 63: 'le créneau qu'est la mémoire de Jérôme'.

⁷ *Dydym. spir. praef.* Cf. also the attack on Ambrose at *in Eph. prol.* p. 440^b *super unaqueque materia testimonii scripturarum hinc inde quaesitis eloquentiam iungere saecularem et paene in communibus locis pompaticum loquere sermonem*. This too is an apt characterization of Jerome's own method. For Ambrose as the target in the second passage cf. most recently Oberhelman, who is unaware that Dunphy has already argued for this identification; the latter failed in turn to realize that the first to make it had been Wiesen, p. 241, n. 147. Oberhelman is similarly mistaken to affirm that these words are 'Jerome's earliest attack on Ambrose', which is in fact to be found in the present treatise; cf. Adkin (1993a).

⁸ Cf. (e.g.) Doutreleau, pp. 129ff.

⁹ Cf. (e.g.) Bickel, pp. 129ff.

¹⁰ Cf. Doutreleau, p. 132 ('un doigt sur le texte').

can often be demonstrated to have been taken from a vast range of sources which may have nothing whatever to do with his own particular theme: hence the works from which he is borrowing cannot have been consulted specially. Any meretricious formulation that caught Jerome's eye was memorized for redeployment later: there was no need for him to have 'his finger on the text'.

It may be asked why Jerome should have resorted to this technique. The present introduction began by noting that the *Libellus* belongs to the outset of Jerome's autonomous literary activity: hitherto he had been mainly engaged in translation of other people's work. The *Libellus* was also a bold enterprise on a very broad theme. It had to compete with a number of works on the same subject by eminent authors: in particular it had to match the three books of Ambrose's *De virginibus*, which had appeared just seven years earlier. At the same time Jerome recognized the limitations of his own intellectual ability: he knew that he was not really capable of independent and creative thought. This awareness of his own inadequacy made him all the more anxious to impress. Under these circumstances he could only do so by packing his work with such second-hand cleverness.¹¹

¹¹ In this connection it is possibly pertinent to mention an *obiter dictum ad adv. Rufin.* 1,30. Here Jerome makes the following admission: *et quo magis stupeas, nunc cono et recalvo capite saepe mihi videor in somnis, comatulus et sumpto toga, ante rhetorem controversialium declamare: cumque expectatus fuero, gratulor me dicendi periculo liberatum.* Kelly, p. 15, remarks: 'He writes as if these dreams were nightmares'. However Kelly proceeds to brush this impression aside as incompatible with Jerome's 'pride in his student-day triumphs'. Lardet (1993), p. 130, explains Jerome's anxiety as due to the presence in the audience of 'les condisciples ..., quelquefois des parents et amis' (referring to Marrou [1965], p. 415). Lardet finds a parallel in Augustine, *conf.* 1,17,27 *proponebatur enim mihi negotium animae meae satis inquietum premio laudis et dedecoris vel plagarum metu, ut dicerem verba Iunonis irascentis ...* Augustine however does not speak of recurrent nightmares in later life in connection with this experience. It would seem that in Jerome's admission we have a hint of his deep-seated sense of his own intellectual inadequacy. Here it may also be germane to cite the very last words of Kelly's biography: 'there is an unsolved enigma about the real Jerome' (p. 336). Kelly notes that Jerome was 'inordinately vain and petty, jealous of rivals, morbidly sensitive and irascible, hag-ridden by imaginary fears'. He attempts to explain these aspects of Jerome's personality by reference to his ill-health and the troubled awareness of his sensual nature. Kelly obviously finds such reasons unsatisfactory: he goes on to invoke 'more fundamental flaws of character which we can only surmise'. In fact no attempt is made to suggest any: Kelly merely concludes that 'the deeper springs of [Jerome's] psychology elude us'. It may nonetheless be possible to offer a solution to the 'enigma' of which Kelly speaks: Jerome's awareness of his own intellectual inferiority would seem to explain much that Kelly finds puzzling. This interpretation of Jerome's personality would not appear to have been advanced by previous commentators; for a summary of conventional views cf. Steur, pp. 1ff.

Although any predecessor may be laid under contribution, Jerome borrows from Tertullian with particular frequency. It is instructive to consider what may have been the reason for this preference. Mohrmann (1951) has argued for a temperamental affinity between Jerome and Tertullian. Petitmengin accordingly maintains that it is Jerome's fellow-feeling for 'cet autre lui-même' which explains his frequent indebtedness to him (1988, pp. 55f.). Perhaps it is more pertinent to reflect that no Father was a more brilliant coiner of striking phrases than Tertullian. One need only recall Vincent of Lérins' dictum: *cuius quot paene verba, tot sententiae sunt* (*comm.* 18,4).¹² At the same time Lactantius notes that because of the obscurity of his style Tertullian was very little known (*inst.* 5,1,23).¹³ It was therefore possible for Jerome to appropriate striking phrases from him without fear of detection.¹⁴

Jerome remarks that Tertullian possessed an *acre ingenium* (*vir. ill.* 53). Since this was just what Jerome lacked, Tertullian was indispensable to him. In particular Tertullian furnished an incomparable source for the kind of arresting formulations and clever *sententiae* which Jerome needed to conceal his own inadequacy.¹⁵ It tends in fact to be precisely such superficial frippery that Jerome takes over: Tertullian's deeper speculations on the other hand have little interest for him. Jerome was later to tell those who seek *flumen eloquentiae et concinnas declamationes* to look to Tertullian (*in Is. lib. 8 praef.* l. 11). This is just what he himself has done in the *Libellus*: a larger amount of striking material has been appropriated from Tertullian than from any other single author. Jerome is furthermore alone in these thefts: the phrases in question recur nowhere else.

It may be observed moreover that in this dependence on arresting formulations which have been borrowed from elsewhere Jerome goes far beyond what by ancient standards might be seen as permissible plagiarism. Hagendahl (1947), p. 118, has stated in this connection that 'originality of form, unity and beauty of style being essential claims, originality as regards matter became less indispensable, or even

¹² Jerome himself calls Tertullian *creber in sententiis* (*epist.* 58,10,1).

¹³ According to Jerome he is *difficilis in loquendo* (*epist.* 58,10,1).

¹⁴ When he refers to Tertullian at 22,3 of the *Libellus*, it is for a topic which Jerome chooses to avoid in this work.

¹⁵ One might again compare Jerome's tell-tale criticism of Ambrose: *nihil ibi dialecticum, nihil virile atque districtum, quod lectorum vel ingratis in assensum trahat* (*Didym. apur. praef.*).

insignificant'. However it is precisely originality of form which is often lacking in Jerome.

The initial impact of such indiscriminate appropriation is certainly dazzling. Closer inspection however reveals the inconcinnities which inevitably result from this scissors-and-paste technique.¹⁶ A particularly glaring example is found in the centre of the work (20,3ff.). There Jerome states that Elijah and Elisha had been virgins even under the old dispensation, when marriage was the norm. Later in the same chapter he affirms that virginity began with the Virgin Mary. Both ideas have been taken over from elsewhere: here they flatly contradict each other. Similar inconsistencies occur throughout the work: they are noted in the commentary.

It is furthermore significant that a tendency can be observed for the kind of striking cliché favoured by Jerome to be avoided by more fastidious writers. In Chrysostom for example such clichés are relatively rare; in the pseudo-Chrysostomic corpus on the other hand they abound. It is hardly an exaggeration to assert that the more second-rate an author, the more likely he is to say the same as Jerome.

At the beginning of the treatise (2,1f.) and again in the middle (23,1) Jerome proclaims that his theme is not praise of virginity but rather its preservation. In the second of these passages he makes an explicit claim of originality in this connection. Praise had certainly been the purpose of Ambrose's *De virginibus*. On the other hand it was something of a convention for authors writing on the subject to affirm that eulogy was not their object.¹⁷ In practice Jerome says little that had not been said before.

What can be identified as Jerome's own contribution to the debate is often tasteless and bizarre. Two examples may be cited. Jerome calls the virgin's mother 'God's mother-in-law' (20,1). Rufinus found this worse than anything in the pagan poets (*apof. adv. Hier.* 2,13). In the

¹⁶ Cf. Löfstedt (1949), p. 148: '... an expression, a phrase, a thought, which in its original place is natural, clear and well motivated, usually becomes somewhat peculiar, a trifle hazy or less suitable in the context, when borrowed or imitated by another author, especially if this author is not a very great artist'; Axelsson, p. 70: '... besondere Anstöße, nämlich teils das Auftreten von Gedankenelementen, die durch logische Störung irgendeiner Art (wie Mangel an organischem Zusammenhang mit der Umgebung, Widerspruch usw.) dem Text des einen Autors entschieden schlechter als dem des anderen entsprechen, teils gezwungene, unbeholfene oder eigentümlich übertriebene Ausdrucksweise, wie sie sich erfahrungsgemäss namentlich aus ungeschickter Variation bzw. "Übertragung" einer Vorlage leicht ergibt'. Neither of these scholars is referring to Jerome.

¹⁷ Such a disclaimer had occurred at the start of the treatises by Novatian (*puer.* 2,3) and by Basil of Ancyra (*iwg.* 1).

previous chapter Jerome had declared that the Virgin Mary resembled God by being 'fertile in oneness' (19.5). The phrase appealed so much to Jerome that he uses it again over twenty years later in his commentary on Hosea (13,14 l. 379): such self-repetition is characteristic. It is however significant that neither of these two ideas would seem to have been taken up by any other writer in the century or so following the publication of the *Libellus*. Both are rather superficial formulations, since Jerome had very little aptitude for abstract thought. Both are of course very striking: Jerome was always eager to impress.¹⁸

However by far the most impressive feature of the work is its lavish use of scriptural citation and allusion. Whole chapters consist of little else: Jerome refers proudly to his adeptness at 'weaving his discourse from the flowers of scripture' (*epist.* 117,12,2). This is where Jerome's real originality lies: Mohrmann's view that it was Augustine who in the *Confessions* first created a form of literary expression which based itself on the Bible must be rejected.¹⁹ The 'biblical' style of the *Libellus* is due ultimately to Jerome's famous dream. Its effect is universally assumed to have been a renunciation of the classics. Jerome himself however insists that the result was the conquest of his aversion to the uncouth language of the Bible and in consequence an intensive study of scripture. It is significant that Jerome recounts his dream in the *Libellus* itself (ch. 30): he thereby offers a species of apologia for the uniqueness of its 'biblical' style. At the same time this dazzling profusion of scriptural citation enabled Jerome to impress: it can accordingly be seen as a compensatory element offsetting the weakness of Jerome's capacity for careful argument.²⁰ Jerome's scriptural expertise was responsible for his celebrity in Rome, where study of the Bible was prosecuted with great intensity in ascetic circles.²¹ His immediate

¹⁸ In this connection one might also compare the way in which he incorporates two Hebrew etymologies (1,1 and 21,8) plus a reference to Aramaic (31,2) and goes out of his way to mention Plato and Livy (35,8) despite his disapproving remarks about the classics (29,7).

¹⁹ Mohrmann (1939), pp. 132, 134ff. The distinctive spacing which Hilberg's edition uses for scriptural citation is therefore inappropriate.

²⁰ Acquisition of such an exceptional knowledge of scripture was the kind of laborious and mechanical activity that Jerome was good at. Likewise the principal motive for Jerome's remarkable decision to learn Hebrew would not seem to have been the customarily adduced 'intellectual curiosity' (so [e.g.] Barr, p. 286; Kelly, p. 50), but rather the desire to achieve a distinction which he could not acquire by more conventional means owing to the limitations of his own ratiocinative ability.

²¹ Cf. Jordani (1956), pp. 240f.; Gorce (1925), pp. xiff., 196ff. Besides women of the Roman aristocracy Pope Damasus himself belonged to Jerome's biblical 'clientèle'.

audience in particular was therefore certain to appreciate this very striking feature of the *Libellus*.

Biblical quotation and allusion repeatedly take the place of exposition and argument altogether. The technique bulks especially large in the early chapters, where Jerome is particularly concerned to establish his matchless connoisseurship of the Bible. At other times scripture is employed to restate and reinforce a point (e.g. 4,1). Sometimes it is purely ornamental (e.g. chs. 25f.). Not infrequently it introduces a fresh topic (e.g. 20,2; 24,1). Quotation is often dramatic and dispenses with any form of introduction (e.g. 1,1). Rare texts abound (e.g. 5,2; 5,3). Such copious use of the Bible naturally invests Jerome's case with immense authority. The aesthetic value is also enormous. On occasion Jerome's application of scripture shows an extravagance and whimsicality that are characteristic (cf. 13,1; 19,3). Texts are often quoted simply for the sake of a *Stichwort*: at 19,4 the word 'root' for example leads from marriage as the source of virginity via a text of Isaiah to a description of the Virgin Mary. It is also clear that Jerome's vivacious imagination delights in the sheer colourfulness of scripture. Again inconcinnities are common: though Jerome is a very accomplished biblical centoist, his technique is far from flawless. Frequently Jerome's combinations of texts come from Origen.

The further point may be made that Jerome tends to place such quotations of scripture in direct juxtaposition with striking formulations that have been taken from elsewhere (e.g. 12,2; 13,1 [*bir*]; 13,4). His habit of combining biblical and classical citations has already been identified.²² A similar propensity to couple scripture with patristic borrowings has hitherto escaped notice. In this connection it may be remarked that the appropriation of striking phraseology from the Fathers had an important advantage over allusions to the classics: borrowings from patristic writers were much harder to identify.²³ By such surreptitious spoliation of the Fathers Jerome wishes to dazzle his audience with a second-hand cleverness that can be made to seem his own creation: juxtaposition with scripture means that the effect produced is doubly powerful. In consequence Jerome is able to pose simultaneously as the possessor of both a uniquely scintillating intellect and of an

²² Hagendahl (1958), p. 302; Antin (1960).

²³ The point is conveniently borne out by the slowness of modern scholarship to investigate the subject. Luebeck's book, which dealt exclusively with Jerome's debt to classical authors, appeared as early as 1872; it has since been supplemented by Hagendahl's work. However no comparable study of Jerome's borrowings from Christian writers has ever been made.

incomparable mastery of biblical scholarship. The reader of such a work cannot have failed to be impressed.

The language of these Old Latin quotations is always unliterary and often rough. It therefore creates a piquant counterpoint to the stylistic refinement of the rest of the *Libellus*. This distinctive chiaroscuro is particularly marked where Jerome indulges his afore-mentioned taste for directly juxtaposing such biblical citations with a rhetorically striking formulation which he has appropriated from elsewhere. The same clash of styles is however found throughout the entire *Libellus*, in which Jerome habitually presents himself as a consummate rhetorician. Even the striking material which he lifts from others invariably undergoes a stylistic enhancement: it is given greater concision and a more arresting rhetorical *allure*. Matters of style were clearly very important to Jerome: he would seem to be alone in his habit of finding fault with the diction of his opponents.²⁴ Elegant prose was one of the few areas in which Jerome did possess a genuine proficiency; his was pre-eminently an *elegans et rhetoricum ingenium*.²⁵ In view of this stylistic superexcellence it is noteworthy that the work should also be characterized by an unusually heavy incidence of colloquialisms.²⁶ The reason is perhaps to be sought in the youth of Jerome's addressee.²⁷

Julia Eustochium, to whom the work is addressed, has been variously said to be fourteen,²⁸ fifteen,²⁹ sixteen,³⁰ seventeen,³¹ eighteen³² and twenty.³³ Since her date of birth is unknown, this discrepancy is understandable. Jerome refers to her *parva adhuc aetas et rudis paene infantia* in November 384 (*epist.* 39,6,1).³⁴ Here however Jerome

²⁴ Cf. commentary on 28,6 ('*as barbarum*').

²⁵ This phrase is used by Jerome in the unusually disdainful notice devoted to Eusebius of Emesa at *vir.* III, 91 *Eusebius Emianus, elegans et rhetorici ingenti, innumerales et qui ad plausum populi pertineant confecit libros, magisque historiam secutus ab his qui declamare volunt, studiosissime legitur*. It is accordingly significant that in the *Libellus* Jerome himself reproduces a great deal that is to be found in Eusebius' homilies.

²⁶ Cf. Adkin (1984a), pp. 288f.

²⁷ He may also be professing scorn for rhetorical finesse (cf. 2,2 *nulla . . . rhetorici pompa sermonis*; 29,6 *nec tibi diserta multum velis videri*, with the subsequent account of the dream). Such affected indifference makes his own stylistic achievement in the *Libellus* all the more impressive.

²⁸ Wiesen, p. 70.

²⁹ Carroll, p. 17 n.

³⁰ Cavallera, I, I, p. 109.

³¹ Grätzmacher, I, p. 252.

³² Labriolle (1921), p. 215; Feichtinger (1997), p. 41.

³³ Penna, p. 100.

³⁴ For the date cf. Cavallera, I, 2, pp. 23 and 156.

wishes to stress Eustochium's vulnerability; he therefore accentuates her youth. In the *Libellus* he speaks merely of *adulescentia* (8,2). Eustochium was the daughter of the Roman aristocrat Paula, who had already dedicated herself to asceticism when Jerome became acquainted with her on his arrival in Rome from the East in 382. Eustochium lived at home with her widowed mother unaccompanied by other virgins; her two elder sisters married, while her aunt Praetextata and uncle Hymetius tried unsuccessfully to make her give up her ascetic resolve.³⁵

When Jerome addressed his *Libellus de virginitate servanda* to Eustochium, she had already decided to embrace the ascetic life: the purpose of Jerome's treatise is therefore to encourage her to persevere. Jerome notes that Eustochium had been 'nurtured in the chamber of Marcella' (*epist.* 127,5,2). Marcella had espoused asceticism long before Paula. Jerome records how she had been the first noblewoman in Rome to adopt a way of life resembling that of the Egyptian monks (*epist.* 127,5,1).³⁶ Interest in Egyptian monasticism was widespread; Jerome attempts to satisfy it with a long digression in the *Libellus* (chs. 34–6). On the other hand such strict asceticism also provoked opposition even among Christians.³⁷ Some months earlier Jerome had answered Helvidius' repudiation of Mary's virginity *post partum*; Helvidius' underlying motive had evidently been to deny the superiority of celibacy over the married state. In his *Libellus* to Eustochium Jerome now took the opportunity to champion the virgin's calling and set out the manner of life appropriate to her: the work is clearly intended for a much wider audience than its nominal addressee.³⁸ At the same time Jerome attacks those ascetics in contemporary Rome who fail to live up to his own exacting standards: his satiric treatment, to which the digression on Egyptian monasticism provides an effective foil, is characterized by tremendous power and verve owing to the rare

³⁵ Cf. Antin (1961a), p. 1715; Gorce (1967), p. 43; Jannaccone, pp. 40ff.

³⁶ On the diffusion of eastern monastic ideals in Rome cf. Gordini (1953; 1956); Lorenz; Fontaine (1979).

³⁷ Cf. (e.g.) Gougnud; Gordini (1983); Jenal, I, pp. 423ff.

³⁸ Kelly, p. 101, wonders why Eustochium 'should have needed such a massive exhortation'. In his letter to Nepotian on the priestly life Jerome says of himself *qui . . . per singulos gradus vivendi praecepta constituens in te ceteros erudiat* (*epist.* 52,4,3). Similarly his letter to Geruchia against second marriages concludes: *non tam tibi quam sub tuo nomine alius sum locutus* (*epist.* 123,17,2). Cf. further Scourfield, pp. 13f. The additional point may be made that a specific addressee like Eustochium invests Jerome's text with greater vividness, while simultaneously affording an opportunity to honour the daughter of his patroness.

combination of a vindictive temperament, a vivid imagination and a peerless command of language.³⁹

Besides the lengthy excursus on the monks of Egypt Jerome inserts two further διηγήματα:⁴⁰ both are autobiographical. They are placed in the middle of the first and second halves of the work respectively; this diptych accordingly has a structural function. The first passage describes how Jerome dealt with his own sexual temptations (ch. 7). The second tells how he overcame his distaste for the uncouthness of scripture (ch. 30). It would seem therefore that both texts are also intended to serve as a kind of authentication. The first of them establishes Jerome's credentials as an expert on asceticism: it accordingly certifies the content of the *Libellus*. The second one accounts for Jerome's scriptural virtuosity and thereby offers a key to the work's unique style. Both διηγήματα provide refreshing diversion, while from a technical standpoint they are models of their kind.

Apart from these elements the structure of the work is not very clearly articulated.⁴¹ The central chapters supply a theoretical justification of virginity (chs. 19–22). Otherwise precepts and prohibitions are issued in a somewhat disorderly fashion.⁴² They are interspersed throughout by satirical descriptions of contemporary Christian *mores*. Jerome starts by stressing how difficult it is for the virgin to resist sexual temptation. He accordingly counsels abstemiousness in food and drink. Such teaching was traditional; however the prominence and urgency which Jerome gives to it evidently reflect a private obsession.⁴³

The following schematic analysis helps to bring out such elements of structure as the work possesses:

First half. Temptation and how to combat it

1–2	Theme of the work: perseverance
3–7	Temptation
8–10	Food and drink
11–12	Dangers of lapse
13–14	Bad examples
15	Eustochium's own domestic situation
16	Bad examples

³⁹ Cf. Wiesen *passim*. On the partiality of the fourth century in general for satire cf. *id.*, pp. 3ff. It should be noted that many of Jerome's satiric themes are also found in Chrysostom; this may indicate that they were traditional.

⁴⁰ For the term cf. Lausberg, p. 164, n. 1.

⁴¹ Cf. further Vogel (1991), I, pp. 237ff.

⁴² The same stipulation about toilet is made twice (27,3 and 29,1). On the other hand nothing is said about baths; cf. Duval (1974a), p. 58, n. 242.

⁴³ Cf. Adkin (1988), p. 177 and n. 1.

17-18	Ways to combat temptation
19-22	Theoretical justification of virginity
Second half. General conduct	
23	Second exordium (23, 1st part)
23-26	Seclusion (23, 2nd part-26)
27	Vainglory (27, 1st part)
27-28	Bad examples: a) women (27, 2nd part); b) men (28)
29	Miscellaneous precepts
30	Excursus: dream
31-2	Avarice
33-6	Excursus: Egyptian monasticism
37-8	More miscellaneous precepts
39-40	Perseverance
41	Final Reward

Elements of ring composition may be observed not only in the overall structure (cf. the theme of perseverance in chs. 1-2 and 39-40) but also within the body of both the first and second halves of the work. A brief summary of the content of each chapter is given in the commentary.

The impact of the *Libellus* was immediate and dynamic. If the content was traditional, the vehemence and satiric verve with which Jerome presents it caused widespread offence among Christians,⁴⁴ while pagans were tickled pink.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Cf. Jerome, *epist.* 27.2.2 (*unum miser locutus sum, quod virgines saepius deberent cum mulieribus esse, quam cum masculis: totus oculus urbis offendi, cunctorum digitis notor. multiplicati sunt super capillos capitis mei, qui oderunt me gratis, et factus sum eis in parabolam*); 40.2.2f.; 52.17.1f.; 130.19.3f. (*qui sermo offendit plurimos, dum unusquisque in se intellegens, quod dicebatur, non quasi monitorem libenter audivit, sed quasi criminatorem sui operis aversatus est*); Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1.8.4ff.; commentary on 8.1 (*ut . . . vinum fugiat pro veneno*).

⁴⁵ Cf. Rufinus, *apol. adv. Hier.* 2.5.

COMMENTARY

Some MSS give the title *de virginitate servanda* (cf. 23,1 *virginitatem ... servamus*). The work is so named at *epist.* 123,17,3; 130,19,3; in *Gal.* 5,19 p. 417^D; in *Eph.* 5,18 p. 528^A; *vir. ill.* 135 (Rufinus, *apol. adv. Hier.* 2,5 has *conservanda*). On the other hand J. calls his work *de virginitate* at *vir. ill.* 134 (cf. the *explicit*). Cf. further Antin (1953), p. 151.

Dumortier (1949), p. 250 and n. 3 (cf. [1955], p. 23), maintains that the title *de virginitate servanda* is an echo of Chrysostom's πᾶς δεῖ φυλάττειν τὴν παρθενίαν (= *fem. reg.*);¹ he argues from alleged affinities with J.'s *Libellus* that Chrysostom's treatise had been published around 382. Keydell, pp. 435f., points out however that the *Ambrosianus*, on which Dumortier relies for the title of Chrysostom's work, is untrustworthy. For further rebuttal cf. Adkin (1992a).

On J.'s own use of titles cf. *epist.* 123,17,3; in *Mal.* 3,1 l. 32. On interference with them by copyists cf. *epist.* 112,3,2. The MSS add the author's name (which Hilberg omits). This was part of the *titulus*; cf. Sulpicius Severus, *Mart. praef.* 6. Cf. further Ams, pp. 109ff. (to which add Oliver).

Chapter 1

Ch. 1 introduces the theme of the work: Eustochium is being urged to persevere in her ascetic resolve. The whole ch. consists almost exclusively of scriptural citation, as texts are glossed by other texts in the manner of J.'s commentaries on the Bible. The effect of this agglomeration of scripture is foudroyant: the reader is overwhelmed by J.'s biblical erudition and by the artistry with which it is here deployed.² The letter begins with a verse from Ps. 44: the virgin must leave her father's house. There follows a deft piece of exegesis which shows that her father is the Devil. Then a contrast between the

¹ His argument is accepted by Antin (1961), p. 1717.

² J. had already opened letters 15 and 16 with a cluster of scriptural texts: in the present work the same technique is applied far more strikingly.

blackness of Cant. 1,4 and the whiteness of Cant. 8,5 marks the virgin's progress toward spiritual union with her spouse. Both ideas come from Origen; here J. has blended them with considerable skill to produce an exordium to his treatise that is as dazzling as it is derivative.

1,1

Audi, filia. While the opening citation of Ps. 44,11f. is both apt and arresting, it also prepares the reader for the lavish use of scripture which characterizes this work. A passage from the Bible is here employed to express the author's meaning; it is not being cited in order to prove a point. This method does away with argument and replaces it by quotation, while embellishing the work with scriptural texts and at the same time showing off the author's unique erudition: J. is extremely partial to it. The words used here (Ps. 44,11f.) are part of the consecration address for virgins at Ps.-Ambrose (= Niceta of Remesiana), *laps. virg.* 19.³ It is not therefore surprising that they are common in works dealing with virginity. Niceta repeats them *ib.* 28. Both the present work and the later *ad virg. dev.* of Ps.-Ambrose start with them, while they conclude Chrysostom, *fem. reg.* They had already occurred in Ambrose, *virg.* 1,7,36 and 1,10,61 as well as in the anonymous homily *περί παρθενίας* (106; Amand-Moons, p. 63), while they are found again at Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,14; in addition the beginning of v. 12 had been quoted in one of Athanasius' letters to virgins (Lebon, p. 191,18). Finally reference may also be made to a number of passages in which the text had been cited by Origen: Ps. 44,11; *hom. in Jer.* 6 pp. 636^c-637^a (PL 25 [1845]); Cant. 2 p. 114,3. For J.'s likely debt to the first two of these three passages in the present ch. cf. nn. on *secundum exemplum Abrahae* below and on *grande miraculum* at 1,3 below; for the possible influence of passages adjacent to the third cf. nn. on 1,5 *passim*.

deus ad animam loquitur. J. provides an allegorical gloss to make the afore-cited text fit his purpose: God is addressing the human soul. In *epist.* 65,16,5 he states that the Psalm concerns both the church and the soul. This alternative was traditional; cf. Schmid (1954b), pp. 548ff.⁴ As in the present passage, J. says at *epist.* 65,17,1 that it is God who speaks this verse. The same identification of speaker is also found later in Arnobius the Younger, *ad Greg.* 20 p. 428,6.

³ On Niceta's authorship cf. Gamber, p. 225, who suggests that he was born about 350 and died about 420 (pp. 223f.); the *De lapsu virginis consecratae* would seem to be a late work (p. 231).

⁴ On the other hand this particular verse had been referred to Mary by Athanasius, *ep. Marcell.* 6.

Ad also replaces the dative after a verb of speaking at 1,3; 4,3; 11,3; 11,4; 12,2; 25,1; 31,3 below. This is a rather unliterary form of expression, especially at 1,3 (*dicitur ad Iudaeos*); cf. Schrijnen-Mohrmann, I, pp. 105ff.

secundum exemplum Abrahae. The soul should imitate migrant Abraham. J. repeats this example often: *epist.* 39,5,1; 46,2,1; 58,3,1; 71,2,2; 108,31,2; 125,20,5; [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 55,38. Like the present passage *epist.* 65,16,3 links it with Ps. 44,11. The combination would seem to have been taken from Origen, if the commentary on this Psalm in Pitra (1876), III, p. 43, is indeed his.³ The two are also brought together by Cassian at *conl.* 3,6,2. Here J. makes the migration end in the 'land of the living', mentioned in Ps. 26,13; this same text is likewise connected with Abraham's departure somewhat later by the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* I p. 613.

Abraham is here a type of the soul. At *tract. in psalm.* I p. 34 l. 117 the order given him to leave is applied by J. to baptismal candidates; it had the same reference in Origen, *hom. in Le.* 22 p. 135,17 and in Ambrose, *Abr.* 1,4,23. Already Philo had allegorized the story at *migr. Abr.* 2, where he made it refer to carnal and material preoccupations. Such an interpretation was often given: it is to be found at Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 25; Ambrose, *Abr.* 1,2,4; Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 7,193; Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Cant.* 7 p. 917^B; Chrysostom, *catech.* (Wenger) 8,8; Cassian, *conl.* 3,6,2; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 81,4.

On the form of the name (*Abrahae*) cf. *TLL* I, 128,79ff. While it is declined here, at 19,3 below it is indeclinable (cf. *epist.* 39,5,1; 58,3,1 *ad exemplum Abraham*). In the ensuing phrase (*de terra sua et de cognatione sua*) the somewhat inconcinnous repetition of *de ... sua* comes from the Bible.

relinquat Chaldaeos, qui 'quasi daemonia' interpretantur. Immediately after the opening quotation of scripture J. inserts an erudite Hebraic etymology: he is clearly anxious to establish his status as an unrivalled biblical scholar at the very start. Here he has tried to derive דַּיְמוֹנִים from דָּ and דַּיְמוֹ. The same etymology is repeated at *in Is.* 6,13,19 l. 26; *in Ezech.* 12,10^b l. 1335; 16,28 l. 245; 23,11 l. 948; *in Hab.* 1,6 l. 220. *Daemones* on its own is the translation at *in Is.* 12,43,14 l. 20 and 13,48,12 l. 56. At *nom. hebr.* p. 4,22 J. gives *quasi daemonia vel quasi ubera aut feroces* (cf. p. 57,11). Origen, *sel. in Ezech.* 1,3 had thought the word meant πᾶς πόνοσ. Philo, *rer. div. her.* 97 had rendered it ὁμαλότης. On J.'s knowledge of Hebrew cf. Barr; Burstein; Wissemann.

³ Cf. Allenbach, III, p. 27.

The demons anticipate the identification of the father of the opening citation with the Devil. In general however J. is not much concerned with demons in the present work. They are mentioned in quotation from scripture at 3,3; 6,4; 29,7 below. At 8,2 J. speaks of *arma daemonum* (a common image; cf. n. ad loc.). Otherwise demons are absent from the *Libellus*. On J.'s demonology cf. Bartelink (1982), who notes a general preference on J.'s part for the form *daemon*, which was more literary than *daemonium* (p. 467; cf. id. [1987], p. 299 and [1991], pp. 2f.).

On the passive use of *interpretari* cf. *TLL* VII,1, 2257,77ff. J. has it frequently, e.g. *epist.* 18A,3,1; 18A,6,4; 18A,8,2; 21,8,1; 21,21,2.

J. follows Acts 7,3f. in making Abraham the one who leaves the Chaldees. In the Genesis account (11,31) it is Abraham's father who leaves them.

dicens. Since J. cites scripture with great frequency in this work, he is careful to vary the word that introduces it. *Dicere* is however by far the most common: it occurs altogether forty times, while there are in addition seven instances of its use in the impersonal passive. Thereafter come *audire*, which is used a dozen times (cf. *ausculta* 9,3), and *cantare*, of which half a dozen instances are found (cf. *conciniebat*, *canunt*, and *praeciniet* once each). *Loqui* occurs five times, *ait* four, and *respondere* and the imperative of *legere* thrice each. *Exclamat*, *clamitet*, *clamat* and *proclamabit* each come once, as do the following: *definitivit*, *effatur*, *ingemina*, *interrogat*, *intulerit*, *memorat*, *narrabis*, *psalle*, *reputans*, *scribit*, *erumpamus in vocem*, *sermo conveniet*, *vox resonet*.

credo videre. J. was partial to Ps. 26,13, which he uses elsewhere some eighteen times. The charming introductory phrase (*quam ... propheta suspirat dicens*) again precedes it at *in Is.* 17,60,21 l. 14 (where Gryson [1993] reads with a single MS *suspirans dicit*).

1,2

carne contempta sponsi iungaris amplexibus. J. uses the same kind of striking erotic oxymoron again at *in Am. lib.* 2 *praef.* l. 11 *dormit cum perpetua virgine Sunamite*. There is a similar example at Ps.-Chrysostom, *Thecl.* p. 748 μακαρίων γάμων ὧν ἡ στρωμνὴ παρθενία. Here the figure introduces the ascetic reference: leaving home means scorning the flesh. At the same time the sentence gives overt expression to the eroticism implicit in *concupiscet ... decorem tuum* (l. 1): the phraseology J. chooses here is characteristically concrete and explicit (both *iungi* and *amplexus* are sexual terms, cf. Adams, pp. 179f., 181; for the combination *amplexibus iungi* cf. *TLL* VII,2,2, 657,27ff. [with explicit sexual reference in Cicero, Apuleius and Petronius]; on *amplexus* cf. also 12,1 below *in Dalilae ... amplexibus*, and *epist.*

133,3,4 *inter colitum amplexusque*).⁶ Ironically therefore it is the same sentence which introduces both the theme of asceticism and also the note of prurience that pervades the work.

The same motif of Christ's embrace recurs near the end at 40,1. This concept is found elsewhere in the Fathers; however it is customarily applied with far greater restraint than one finds in J. Origen had already put forward the idea of spiritual 'embrace' at *hom. in Cant.* 1,2 p. 31,19; his *comm. in Rom.* 1,18 p. 866^D applied it to the soul (so at Prudentius, *psych. praef.* 64ff. and Augustine, *serm. REAug* 40, 1994 p. 183,296). Elsewhere a moderating epithet is added: *spirit(u)alis* (Augustine, *epist.* 188,1; *in psalm.* 122,5; *serm.* 191,4); *castus* (Ps.-Ambrose, *epist.* 1,3; Augustine, *in psalm.* 110,9; *serm.* 351,5 [-*issimus*]). J. on the other hand feels no need to tone the idea down; instead he accentuates its boldness by the addition of *iungi*. It is interesting that the idea is also used without qualification (though also without J.'s prurience) by Gregory Nazianzen (*carm.* 2,1,50,23f. ἐξέστε Χριστὸν ἀγκασόμεν): he was J.'s 'mentor'.

ne respexeris. Having dealt with the theme of ascetic renunciation J. now passes to his real theme of perseverance in it. On both occasions the theme is introduced very dramatically in the form of a command to Eustochium which is a quotation from scripture. The angel's words to Lot (Gen. 19,17) are now addressed to her. They serve to define further what J. means by forgetfulness of home: Eustochium must on no account turn back. Appropriately the point comes straight after the theme of chastity has been introduced. It is then reinforced by further scriptural allusion: Lk. 9,62 (l. 11 *adprehensio aratro*) and Mt. 24,17f. (ll. 12f. *de agro reverti ... tecta descendere*).

J. again adds Lk. 9,62 to Gen. 19,17 at *in Ezech.* 46,8 l. 547 (cf. *in Is.* 1,1,4 l. 27; 16,57,7 ll. 21 and 25; *in Ezech.* 1,12 l. 360). The same connection had already been made by Origen in a text recently translated by J. (*hom. Orig. in Ier.* 10 p. 662^C),⁷ which like the *Libellus* had also included a reference to Mt. 24,18 (= Mk. 13,16). J. again links Genesis and Matthew passages at *in Ier.* 2,27. The command to Lot had also been used to apostrophize the virgin by Gregory Nazianzen: *carm.*

⁶ J. repeats the phrase he uses in the present passage of the *Libellus* some five years later at *in eccles.* 1,1 l. 22 *iam consummatum virum ... in Cantico canticorum sponsi iungi amplexibus* (sc. *Salomon*). J. was highly partial to the repetition of phrases that took his fancy, even if the context did not quite fit: there is a bizarre clash here between *virum* and *sponsi*. Both passages achieve a very elegant double crotic clausula (cf. Herron, pp. 27ff.), which corresponds accentually to the *curtus tardus*.

⁷ The wording of J.'s rendering here (*non tibi sufficit nisi ... non expedit* ... pp. 662^D-663^A) may also have influenced his use of exactly the same language in this passage of the *Libellus*: *non sufficit tibi ... nisi ... non expedit* ... (ll. 6-11).

1,2,2,51ff.; 1,2,3,33f.; 1,2,6,58f.⁸ Augustine says later that if the virgin marries she resembles Lot's wife (*in psalm.* 75,16 and 83,4). At 2, 1 below Lot's wife is a warning example. It is appropriate that she should be introduced at the start, since temptation and lapse engross the chs. which follow.

inquit. On this impersonal usage cf. Löfstedt (1911), p. 229; Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 417f. 'fast wie ein Doppelpunkt oder Anführungszeichen'. It recurs half a dozen times in this work. *Dicat* and *ait* are used in the same way at p. 150,8 and 168,6. On six occasions *inquit* has a personal subject; it is *scriptura* at p. 207,5.

nec. This particle is discussed by Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 451f.; Löfstedt (1942), I, pp. 331ff.; 407; II, p. 287. By comparison *neque* was rarer and literary. Gillis, p. 18, puts J.'s preference for *nec* at 84% (Hilary 40%; Augustine 70%; Ambrose 73%). In this work it occurs 22 times and in biblical quotation six times. *Neque* on the other hand is used only six times and always in combination with either *enim* or *vero*. (These combinations had remained rather more common; cf. Löfstedt [1942], I, p. 333). In quotation it occurs thirteen times, though only in the form *neque ... neque*. This too was a survival; cf. Löfstedt (1942), I, p. 333.

adprehenso aratro. Putting hand to the plough (Lk. 9,62) and coming down from the rooftop to pick up one's clothes (II. 12f. *ad tollendum aliud vestimentum tecta descendere*; cf. Mt. 24,17f.) are again linked by J. at *epist.* 118,4,4 and *in Is.* 16,58,13 l. 32. It was noted above (on *ne respexeris*) that the combination of these texts goes back to Origen (cf. J.'s *hom. Orig. in Ier.* 10 p. 662^c). The same combination is used later by Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,6,13f.; cf. Cassian, *inst.* 4,36,2. J. cites Lk. 9,62 over a dozen times. It was popular; cf. Cyprian *testim.* 3,11; *Fort.* 7.

de agro reverti domum. Here J. has reversed the biblical order, since Mt. 24,17f. (= Mk. 13,15f.) puts descent from the housetop before return from the field. The clothes (l. 13) have also been transposed: according to J. it is not the field (as in Mt.) but the housetop that is quitted in order to collect them. This latter transposition had evidently fixed itself in J.'s mind, since it is repeated at *epist.* 71,1,4; 118,4,4; 145,3; *in Is.* 16,58,13 l. 33. Hilary had given an allegorical interpretation of the passage in his commentary on Matthew (25,5): v. 17 refers to the world and the flesh, while v. 18 signifies the old self.

post Christi tunicam. J. adds his own reason for not coming down

⁸ The *carmina moralia* were written in 382 according to Dubedout, pp. 20f. On the authenticity of *carm.* 1,2,3 cf. Mathieu, Zehles-Zamora-Sicherl, p. 6f.

from the roof to collect one's clothes: alone the 'garment of Christ' suffices. For this striking expression J. had a particular fondness. The form *tunica Christi* recurs only twice (*epist.* 49,5,2 and *in Is.* 2,3,7 l, 21); *vestimentum* however is used by him 13 times, *indumentum* six times, and *vestis* thrice. Rather fewer than half of J.'s instances refer to baptism (cf. Gal. 3,27 'putting on Christ'). Here however the reference must be to celibacy. Cyprian too had favoured the phrase *indumentum Christi*, cf. *TLL* VII,1, 1261,4ff. The idiom appears sporadically elsewhere. Origen, *fr. in Mt.* 39 has ἔνδυμα Χριστοῦ. In particular the form Χριστοῦο χιτῶν had occurred on a number of occasions in Gregory Nazianzen: *carm.* 1,2,1,658; 1,2,3,50; 2,2(epigr.),11,5.⁹ Christ's garment is mentioned again at 19,3 below; aprons of fig leaves are for those who have lost it. On the broader concept cf. Oepke, pp. 319ff.; Braun (1977), pp. 312; 708.

1,3

grande miraculum. J. returns to the text which had opened the work. The forgetfulness it enjoined was found to be something more than Abraham's abandonment of country: forgetting a father's house meant renouncing the flesh (p. 144,6ff.). Then there came the warning not to look back: hence the adjustment now of *obliviscere* to *ne memineras*. When J. used the text at the beginning, he had made God the speaker. For the sake of a show of cleverness however he now discovers in it a paradox: a father is urging forgetfulness of a father.¹⁰ The paradox is then resolved by making the Devil the father who ought not to be remembered. This explanation had already been given by Origen, *hom. in Ex.* 8,6 p. 233,3. Augustine also takes it over (*in psalm.* 44,25). The daughter is θυγάτηρ ... τῶν δαιμόνων according to Chrysostom, *Eutrop.* 2,15.

In order to prove his identification J. cites Jn. 8,44 ('ye are of your father the Devil'). He links the same text to Ps. 44,11 a second time at *epist.* 65,16,3. Once again it would seem to be Origen who had first made the connection (*hom. in Jer.* 6 p. 636^c [*PL* 25 (1845)] and *sel. in Jer.* 11,10; cf. also *hom. in Ex.* 8,6 p. 231,3 and 233,5). Later it recurs in Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 81,3.

To his proof J. adds 1 Jn. 3,8 ('he that committeth sin is of the Devil'). Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 6,3 p. 380,26¹¹ had already combined the text with Jn. 8,44 (cf. also *hom. in Jer.* 6 pp. 636^c-637^a [*PL* 25 (1845)] and *sel. in Jer.* 11,10). The combination of 1 Jn. 3,8 and Ps.

⁹ The epigrams were composed before 380 (Dubedout, pp. 118f).

¹⁰ J.'s wording is discussed by Thierry (1967), p. 120, who completely fails to see the characteristically playful paradoxicality.

¹¹ J. had translated this homily several years earlier.

44,11 had also occurred in Basil, *hom. in Ps.* 44,10. Since however exactly the same combination of I Jn. 3,8, Jn. 8,44 and Ps. 44,11 as in the present passage of the *Libellus* is also found in the afore-mentioned text of Origen's *hom. in Jer.*, which J. himself had translated some years before, it may be identified as his specific source here, where we accordingly have a further self-imitation from his own translation.

culmine virtutis. J. liked this striking phrase and used it a dozen times in his works (elsewhere the second word is always plural). Cassian has it four times, Ambrose five. For its Greek equivalent cf. (e.g.) Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 77,5 πρὸς τὴν κορυφὴν ... τῆς ἀρετῆς.

nigra sum et speciosa. After repentance and before perfection the child of the Devil is both 'black' and 'comely' like the woman of Canticles 1,4 (= 1,5 LXX); similarly Abraham's departure (p. 144,6f.) had also denoted an intermediate stage. J.'s gloss on this Canticles text (ll. 1f. *post paenitentiam necdum culmine virtutis ascenso*) comes from Origen, *hom. in Cant.* 1,6 p. 36,1 *paenitentiam egit ... necdum omni peccatorum sorde purgata*; J. had translated this work in the previous year.¹² On the same lines are Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 18,33,2 and Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Ps.* 83 1 (where the repentance is baptism). Origen had put forward a different explanation at *Cant.* 2 p. 114,22: ignoble race has caused the blackness. Various other interpretations are given by J.'s contemporaries. Didymus makes the speaker black through idolatry in *Ps.* 67,32; cf. Gregory of Elvira, *in cant.* 1,24 (where the text is applied to the church). Hilary had called her comely because the bride of Christ (*in psalm.* 119,21). Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 6,34 is rather different: the flesh has made her swarthy, virginity fair. Finally Caesarius of Arles says later on (*serm.* 95,2) that the darkness is due to nature, the beauty to grace.

1,4

renascor in Christo. J. recapitulates. The virgin has copied Abraham and done as the speaker of Psalm 44 said. Now she is reborn in Christ. This phrase generally signifies baptism (so *epist.* 60,8,2 *ab eo tempore censemur, ex quo in Christo renascimur*; also *epist.* 64,19,2; 75,2,2; 121,3,4; cf. Jn. 3,5 'born of water and of the spirit'). Here however it denotes the virgin's resolve (as does *conresurrexit* at 39,1 below; that phrase comes from Col. 3,1). Baptism and virginity are connected by J. on a number of occasions. The most striking instances are *epist.* 39,3,4 *secundo quodam modo se propositi baptismo laverit* (Dekkers [1958] thinks this means martyrdom) and 130,7,14 *secundo post baptismum*

¹² For the date cf. Cavallera, I,2, p. 26.

gradu (ib. *saeculum reliquisti*). The same connection also seems to be made in *epist.* 49,20,3; 125,20,1 (*renatum in Christo ... quasi pudicam virginem*); 147,6,2. A parallel is also drawn by Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 19; this example can be added to the instances of the correlation given in Capelle (first in Athanasius, v. *Anton.* 65) and Malone.

quid ... mercedis accipio? Thought of reward also ends the work (41,1). It recurs in between at 15,2; 20,3; 38,6. In the present work therefore the theme is unusually prominent: this is perhaps not surprising in view of J.'s definition of his programme at 2,1 (viz. to obviate backsliding). There are intermittent occurrences elsewhere: *epist.* 49,10,1 (*praemia castitatis*; cf. ib. 21,3); *adv. Iovin.* 1,8; 1,13; *adv. Pelag.* 2,13; in *Mich.* 6,8 l. 250; in *Matth.* 19,12 l. 820; *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 6 l. 92; p. 100 l. 154; p. 261 l. 1. On the subject in general cf. Wilpert, pp. 48ff. ('Lohn'). J. has a biblical model for his question in both Mt. 5,46 and (perhaps more pertinently, cf. ib. *ecce nos reliquimus omnia*) 19,27. Here J.'s answer to the question is the next verse of Psalm 44 ('the king shall desire thy beauty'); in this way he deftly reverts to the text which opened the ch.

propter hoc relinquet homo. The king's desire for the virgin's beauty is that great mystery whereby a man leaves parents for spiritual union with his spouse (cf. Gen. 2,24 etc.). *Relinquet ... patrem* looks back to forgetting a father (l. 4; cf. Ps. 44,11). *Adhaerebit uxori* looks forward to marrying the Ethiopic wife (l. 10). Ambrose (in *Luc.* 2,86) likewise uses this text of Genesis in combination with Ps. 44,11.

iam non ... in una carne, sed spiritu. Hilberg fails to note that *iam non* is taken from Mt. 19,6 ('no more twain, but one flesh'). The spiritual union comes from 1 Cor. 6,17. It had already been said to supercede carnal union at *virg. Mar.* 20. According to Origen, *comm. in Mt.* 17,33 p. 692,17 Christ the bridegroom destroys wedlock and makes the wedded not only one flesh but one spirit. Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,30 echoes J.'s striking phraseology here.

1,5

non est sponsus tuus adrogans, non superbus. J. now portrays the virgin's spouse. The next sentence mentions his Ethiopian wife and shows that this sentence is an allusion to Moses (Num. 12,1 'he [sc. Moses] had married an Ethiopian woman'; 12,3 'Moses was very meek'). J. repeats this erudite trick of teasing the reader by the withholding of identity at 25,2 (on Dinah). Moses' gentleness is a type of Christ at *epist.* 129,1,6; Christ himself had proclaimed his meekness in Mt. 11,29 (cf. Ps. 44,5 *propter mansuetudinem*, which describes the bridegroom). In the present context this 'gentleness' appears in the

spouse's willingness to pass on his knowledge (ll. 11f.). J.'s wording achieves an impressive effect through synonymy and the anaphora of *non*.

Aethiopiissam ducit uxorem. 'Ethiopian' fits the *nigra* of Cant. 1,4 (l. 2).¹³ At *in Os. prof.* l. 88 and *in Soph.* 2,12 ll. 523 and 526 J. makes the same connection, which again goes back to Origen: Cant. 2 p. 118,18 *ipsa est nigra haec et formosa, quae et Aethiopissa, quam Moyses ... qui ... Christus est, in coniugium sumit* (cf. *hom. in Cant.* 1,6 p. 36,20).¹⁴ It is also used later by Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 95,2. According to Irenaeus 4,20,12 (SC 100**) the Ethiopian had been the church (cf. Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,57). J. makes her husband the law at *in Soph.* 2,12 l. 526 (cf. Origen, *hom. in Cant.* 1,6 p. 36,25).

sapientiam veri audire Salomonis. Christ is the true Solomon according to Origen, *Cant. praef.* p. 84,3 and *ib.* 2 p. 118,29 (*audire sapientiam veri Solomonis et veri pacifici ... Iesu Christi*). In the present passage he replaces the Solomon of Canticles (*rex* in l. 12; cf. Cant. 1,1 LXX ὁ ἐστὶν τῷ Σαλωμῶν) and of Psalm 44 (*rex* in l. 5; cf. *in eccles.* 1,1 l. 11 *psalm[us] quadragesimus quartus ... super Salomone conscript[us est]*). J. uses the phrase *verus Salomon* again at *epist.* 74,2,2; *adv. Iovin.* 1,30; *in Is.* 18,66,22 l. 44; *in Hab.* 3,10 l. 750; *in Nah.* 2,8 l. 264. Ambrose has it at *epist.* 7,52,6; *inst. virg.* 16,97; *Job* 4,4,15; *off.* 2,10,52 (twice); *in psalm.* 1,45,1; *in psalm. 118 serm.* 7,26,1, while Augustine would seem to employ it only at *in psalm.* 71,1; 71,17; 126,2. Queen of the South and Ethiopian had already been brought together by Origen, *Cant.* 2 p. 118,23 *regina Saba et ipsa ... Aethiopissa* (cf. *hom. in Cant.* 1,6 p. 37,16). J. repeats this combination at *in Soph.* 3,10 l. 362.

confitebitur tibi cuncta. J. is thinking of 3 Reg. 10,3; Hilberg does not identify the allusion. Origen had applied the text to Christ at *Cant.* 2 p. 119,17.

Inducet te rex. It is again the virgin whom J. has the 'king bring into his chamber' (Cant. 1,3 [= 1,4 LXX]) at *epist.* 54,14,1 and 107,7,2. Athanasius had given this sense to the text in a letter to virgins (Lebon, p. 203,11) and in a sermon on virginity (Casey, pp. 1042f.). Ambrose had also followed him at *virg.* 2,6,42 and again at *inst. virg.* 1,5. This is not however the only interpretation which J. gives to the text. He uses it of the church at *epist.* 18A,8,1; 76,4,2; *in Matth. prof.* l. 20. It concerns the understanding of scripture at *epist.* 36,11,1; 121 *praef.* 3; *tract. in Marc.* p. 329,2; *in Os. prof.* l. 38. Finally in J.'s preface to Origen's

¹³ Cf. *tract. in psalm.* l. p. 22 l. 100 *Aethiops hoc est niger*.

¹⁴ Dumortier (1949), p. 251, wrongly compares Chrysostom, *fem. reg.* 7.

homilies on Canticles (p. 26,8) it had described the exhilarating effect of Origen's own exegesis. According to Origen himself (*Cant.* 1 p. 108,22) the bedchamber was Christ's arcane meaning (cf. Schmid [1954a], p. 527). J. connects the verse with Psalm 44 again at *epist.* 65,19,4. On the bride of Canticles in general cf. Schmid (1954b), pp. 548ff.; Simon (on the present passage cf. I, p. 174).

mirum in modum colore mutato. A similar change of colour marks the conversion to virtue at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 114 l. 154 and in *Os. prof.* 1. 82. The present phrase has been lifted with slight modification from a quite different context in J.'s earliest work, which had been written a decade before (*epist.* 1,10,3): *mirum in modum voluntate mutata.*

dealbata. The whiteness of perfection in *Cant.* 8,5 counterbalances and completes the intermediate blackness of *Cant.* 1,4 cited above (II, 2f.). Origen had linked these two verses at *hom. in Cant.* 1,6 p. 36,15; in the same passage he had also mentioned Ethiopian and Queen of the South. Here J. takes over all these combinations wholesale.¹⁵ Since J. had translated this homily of Origen only the previous year, his borrowings are in this case evidently meant to be recognized: this time the self-imitation is self-advertisement. At *in Soph.* 2,12 l. 523 J. again links *Cant.* 8,5 with 1,4. The combination had also occurred in Origen, *Cant.* 2 p. 125,9 and *hom. in Jer.* 7 p. 642^A (*PL* 25 [1845]). Ambrose too repeats it several times: *apol. Dav.* 1 12,59; *myst.* 7,35; *in psalm.* 118 *serm.* 16,21,2. J. connects *Cant.* 8,5 with Ps. 44,11 again at *epist.* 65,16,4. Augustine, *in psalm.* 44,26 does the same.

In the present context the *dealbata* of *Cant.* 8,5 is a particularly apt conclusion to the ch., since J. is speaking of marriage and a bride's dress was white (cf. [e.g.] *Hermas, vis.* 4,2,1 *παρθένος ... ἐκ νυμφῶνος ἐκπορευομένη, ὅλη ἐν λευκοῖς*). It is however a spiritual marriage and white is also the colour of virginity, cf. *epist.* 65,2,1 *candore pudicitiae* (*in Is.* 1,1,18^B l. 17 has *virginitatis*); also *adv. Iovin.* 1,29; *in Is.* 18,66,19^F l. 53; *in Zach.* 6,1 l. 104.¹⁶

The whole of this first ch. is a good example of J.'s skill in 'weaving his discourse from the flowers of scripture' (*epist.* 117,12,2). Scriptural allusion and citation are put together so as to form a thickly spun tissue:

¹⁵ It may be observed that Origen's treatment of the same material had extended over several pages. J. however has characteristically compressed it into a very small compass: the effect is dazzling. On the other hand what in Origen had been careful and serious-minded exegesis has in J.'s hands become largely ornamental. J. has further 'improved' on Origen by inserting additional references to scripture (cf. esp. the clever allusion to Moses in II, 9f.) as well as a striking *Selbststich* (I, 13).

¹⁶ Evidence indicating that virgins themselves sometimes wore white is adduced by Vogüé (1991), I, p. 146, with n. 9; however dark clothing was the norm (ib.).

the technique is in evidence throughout the work. J.'s immense biblical knowledge and rhetorical flair (as well as an intimate knowledge of Origen) enable him to use it so effectively. His predilection for this style of writing was further encouraged by his lack of interest in original speculation. Hence the technique is also a form of intellectual snobbery, since it made J.'s work uniquely 'hard' while saving him from intellectual effort. Here it fills the whole ch. Other particularly striking instances are chs. 4; 26, 1 f.; 38, 4 f.

Chapter 2

In ch. 2 J. discloses the purpose of the preceding: Eustochium must not falter. He will avoid praise of virginity, decrial of marriage and compliments. This short ch. contains hardly any scriptural citation: it thereby serves as a foil to ch. 1.

2,1

mi domina. In this letter J. uses *mi* for *mea* at 26,1; 29,5; 38,7. Caper, *gramm.* VII 102,7 condemns the habit. Cf. *TLL* VIII, 914,38ff. and Hofmann-Szantyr, p. 426. According to Donatus, *Ter. Phorm.* 254,1 '*mi*' *vim blandimenti habet.*

Eustochium. The MSS vary between *-ium* and *-ia* here and at 26,1. For the neuter cf. Donatus, *gramm. mai.* 2,5 p. 620,3. On J.'s later preference for this form cf. Vogüé (1991), I, p. 236, with n. 9.

dominam quippe debeo vocare. The title *domina* is *meriti nomen* at 26,1 below. Later Asella is so addressed at *epist.* 45,6,1.¹ It is similarly a term of esteem in Bachiarius (*epist.* 1 p. 294,26 *non soror sed domina nuncupanda*) and in Ps.-Ambrose (*ad virg. dev.* 3 p. 583^D *ut mihi ... domina nomineris*). J. himself with typical inconsistency twice expresses his disapproval of this usage: *epist.* 45,4,1 (*Baias peterent ... dominae vocarentur et sanctae*) and 117,6,3 (*omnes te. cum aliquid eorum, quae suadent, retractans feceris ... dominam ... conclamabunt*). As in the present passage, the title is a compliment paid to the young at Salvian, *epist.* 4,13 and *Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis* 5,5. In letters it is common: cf. *TLL* VI, 1938,47ff. (add Augustine, *epist.* 92; 126; 188; 208 etc. *in titulis*); it fits the fulsome and deferential style of the period. For the Greek equivalent cf. (e.g.) Chrysostom, *ep.* 3,2 δέσποιννα; *ib.* 39 κυρία.

Here J. feels 'obliged' to call the spouse of his Lord 'milady'. It was a characteristically whimsical habit of his to take such figurative language of family and kinship literally: in this work alone he does it again at 16,1; 18,3; 20,1; 25,1; 38,3. On the virgin as bride of Christ cf. Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,1 (*Christi sponsas virgines dicere ecclesiastica nobis permittit auctoritas*); and in addition Schmid (1954b), pp. 559ff. (first in Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 16,6; cf. Athanasius, *apol. Const.* 33). Christ as bridegroom is especially prominent in this

¹ On J.'s use of *domina* cf. also Laurence (1997c).

letter (cf. the use of Canticles in chs. 25f.): the reason is of course that J. is appealing here to Eustochium's affections.

For the parenthesis cf. Hritzu, p. 56. It recurs at 28,3; 30,6; 32,2. Its frequency in this work is perhaps to be seen as another conversational element.

non ... laudes virginittatis. Praise of virginity had been the substance of the *De virginibus* of Ambrose (cf. 22,3 below: *quidquid ad laudem virginum pertinet, exquisierit* [sc. *Ambrosius*]). Duval (1974a), p. 64, n. 270, supposes that here J. is referring specifically to Ambrose. At the same time it was something of a commonplace for the author of such works to state that praise was not his intention: cf. Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 2,3; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 1 (instead what contribution its successful practice can make to virtue); Cassian, *inst.* 6,14 (instead how to achieve and keep it).² In the middle of the work however J. repeats that his own purpose is not praise of virginity, but its preservation (23,1); since he there makes explicit reference to the laudatory aim of Ambrose's *De virginibus* (22,3, quoted at the start of the present n.), it would seem likely that the matching disavowal of *laudes virginittatis* here is indeed directed at Ambrose.³

eam cum secuta es. The words need not imply formal consecration and vow; cf. Basil, *ep.* 199,18 παρθένος ὀνομάζεται ἢ ... τὸν ἐν ἀγιασμῷ βίον προτιμήσασα. τὰς δὲ ὁμολογίας τότε ἐγκρίνομεν, ἂν ὡς κτλ.; Siricius, *epist.* 10,1,4 *puella quae nondum velata est sed proposuerat sic manere*; also Innocent, *epist.* 2,14,16; Leo the Great, *epist.* 167,15; *Inscr. christ. Rossi* II 6,7,8; Council of Vannes 4. A preliminary stage is recognized by Metz, pp. 88ff. It is not known when Eustochium had made up her mind.

molestias nuptiarum. At 22,3 J. repeats his decision not to discuss the topic and suggests works on it by others. At 22,1 the interested reader is referred to J.'s *virg. Mar.* The theme is mentioned in passing at 15,1; 18,3 (Gen. 3,16; cf. 21,6); 22,2 (1 Cor. 7,28). Nine years later at *adv. Iovin.* 1,13 J. calls these cursory references a full treatment. On *molestiae nuptiarum* cf. Hansen. There is a notable contrast between the moving description in Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,624ff. and J.'s egotism.

uterus intumescat. Bulging wombs are again paired with bawling kids at 13,1 below. The two recur together at *epist.* 50,5,4 and *adv.*

² On the other hand Gregory of Nyssa (*virg. proef.* 1) feels that praise is necessary, since advice on its own lacks the power to persuade.

³ Stade, pp. 64f., notes that it was customary to avoid mentioning a person's name when attacking him in the poem of a work.

Iovin. 1,12. They had already been combined by Tertullian, *monog.* 16,5 *uterus nauseantes et infantes pipiantes*. J. has evidently taken the combination from this passage; he would appear to borrow from it again at 21,5 below. At the same time Tertullian's participles have been characteristically replaced by the more graphic *intumescat* and *vagiat*. Swollen wombs are also mentioned again at *adv. Iovin.* 1,41 and *c. Vigil.* 18.

Pregnancy had been counted among the woes of marriage by Ambrose, *virg.* 1,6,25. When J. deals with the same topic, he typically appropriates striking phraseology from elsewhere.

infans vagiat. The wailing of children preoccupied J. to a remarkable degree. He speaks of it at 19,3 below and at *epist.* 49,18,2; 50,5,4; *virg. Mar.* 20; *adv. Iovin.* 1,12; 1,36; *c. Vigil.* 2; 16; *c. Ioh.* 32; *in Ier.* 5,52,2; 5,61,5; 6,22,7. The frequency of his complaints is without parallel.

cruciet paelex. Mention of the mistress does not harmonize with the spotless bed (l. 5); the inconcinnity is characteristic. The deleterious consequences of taking a mistress are something of a commonplace: Ambrose, *Abr.* 1,4,26; 1,7,65; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,3,76; Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,4; 7,15; cf. also Council of Elvira 5.

domus cura. At 21,8 below James and John abandon household cares; 38,1 deals with the financial side. *Damna domus* are again placed among the worries of matrimony at *epist.* 49,18,2; they had also been listed at *virg. Mar.* 20. According to Basil, *ep.* 2,2 care of the home is one of the disadvantages marriage has for the husband. Ambrosiaster, *in I Cor.* 7,28,2 ('trouble in the flesh') thinks that equipping a household is the trouble to which the Apostle refers.

J.'s enumeration has by now achieved a very elegant twofold chiasmus; cf. also 21,3; 29,2; 39,2.

mors extrema praecidat. Mortality is said to finish marriage at 18,3 below (cf. 18,2: wedded happiness is brief). J. makes the same point at *epist.* 54,6,3; *adv. Iovin.* 1,13; 1,22; 1,37. It had already been made by Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,3 and Chrysostom, *virg.* 57,6. On the other hand J. notes at *adv. Iovin.* 1,22 and 1,26 that death does not affect virginity.

habent enim et maritatae ordinem suum. At the start of the *Libellus* J. concedes the worth of marriage. The theme recurs intermittently throughout the work. A married woman is better than a fallen virgin at 6,3. At 18,3 marriage is said to have its merits, although J. prefers virginity. Finally wives attend the heavenly reception at the end (41,3). When later on J. defended his *adv. Iovin.*, he stressed that praise of virginity does not rule out respect for marriage (*epist.* 49,7,1). *Virg. Mar.* 21 had been less generous: there the only wives to achieve

saintliness are such as live like virgins.

According to *TLL* IX,2, 964,60f. (Keudel) *ordo* is being used in this passage *de ipso gradu (c. respectu ... dignitatis, honoris sim.)*: married women occupy a special rank within the church. Alone the apposition *honorabiles nuptias et cubile immaculatum* proves this interpretation to be wrong: marriage and a bed undefiled are not a rank. That something *ordinem suum habet* is a locution not uncommon at this period. The meaning is that it has its value or place. Notwithstanding the commonness of the phrase *TLL* fails to register it. The most significant instance is Augustine, in *psalm.* 148,9 *omnia ... ista ... sunt mutabilia ... tamen habent locum suum, habent ordinem suum, implent et ipsa universi pulchritudinem pro modo suo*. Augustine repeats the expression at *trin.* 14,8,11. It also occurs several times in Hilary (in *Matth.* 14,3; *trin.* 5,20; 6,40). J. uses it again at *adv. Rufin.* 1,23.

honorabiles nuptias. J. cites Heb. 13,4 often: *epist.* 66,3,2; 69,4,3; 79,10,2 (ib. *procul hereticorum calumnias: scimus ...*); 130,12,2; *adv. Iovin.* 1,3 (*non ignoramus ...*); in *Matth.* 13,20 l. 811. It is a convenient way to forestall a charge of Manicheism. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,5 the text is part of Jovinian's argument for marriage.

exeunti de Sodoma. Eustochium should beware the fate of Lot's wife: she must persevere. The command to Lot against looking back has already been given to her (1,2). At *epist.* 71,1,4 an ascetic also leaves Sodom.

2.2

nulla ... adulatio. J. is not going to flatter. Duval (1974a), p. 64, n. 270, plausibly surmises that here J. is criticizing Ambrose (cf. *virg.* 2,1,4 *nostri sermonis blanditiam ...; nos ... blandiamur*).⁴ The point should however be made that the disclaimer was something of a convention. It recurs in J. at *epist.* 79,4,3 and 130,7,11. Ambrose himself makes it in a letter addressed to emperors (*epist. extra coll.* 12,2). As in the present passage, Cyril of Jerusalem had combined such deprecation of flattery with the affirmation that he would also avoid rhetoric (*ep. Const.* 1). Flatterers are denounced in the *Libellus* at 13,5; 16,3; 24,1f. The ch.'s opening however belies J.'s declaration.

libello. J. calls the work a *libellus* again at 22,3 below and *epist.* 31,2,2; 52,17,1. So do Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,8,4 and Rufinus, *apol. adv. Hier.* 2,5; 2,6; 2,13. On the other hand it is a *liber* at *epist.* 49,18,3; 123,17,3; 130,19,3f.; *adv. Iovin.* 1,13; *adv. Rufin.* 1,30; in *Gal.* 5,19 p.

⁴ It may be added that such a twofold avowal of *blanditiae* at the very beginning of a book is highly conspicuous.

417^c; cf. Cassian, *c. Nest.* 7,26,1. On J.'s use of these terms cf. Arns, pp. 100f.; 106. On the lack of a clear distinction between 'treatise' and 'letter' cf. Marrou (1949), pp. 221f.; cf. also Altaner, pp. 393f.; Abram, p. 24.

adulator ... blandus inimicus. Hagendahl (1958), p. 111, and Nazzaro, p. 199, compared two separate passages of Seneca, *epist.* 45,7; however on the extreme tenuity of J.'s acquaintance with Seneca cf. Adkin (2000). It would seem therefore that J.'s wording here is indeed a self-imitation of his translation of *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 3,3 p. 351,17: this phraseology is accordingly due ultimately to Origen rather than Seneca.³ J. quotes the words again at *adv. Pelag.* 1,27. The flatterer is an enemy at *epist.* 58,6,2 and in *Gal.* 4,15 p. 382^D; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 21 agrees. In the present passage the suggestion that an *adulator* like Ambrose (cf. previous n. but one) is in fact an *inimicus* of the virgin constitutes a signally cutting affront to the author of the *De virginibus*.

nulla rhetorici pompa sermonis. Despite abundant colloquialisms, lavish citation of Old Latin texts and the warning against eloquence that is illustrated by the account of J.'s dream both Hagendahl (1958; pp. 111; 313) and Grützmacher (I, p. 251) admire the work's rhetorical finesse; both go so far as to speak of deliberate deception here.⁶ Two points may perhaps be made in this connection. The first is that strictly J.'s disclaimer refers only to praise of virginity: he plans to avoid such encomium and to concentrate instead on the problem of preservation. J. largely adheres to this plan, so that the *Libellus* does in fact contain relatively little by way of extravagant praise of the virgin. Secondly, insofar as J.'s words may be felt to have a general reference, Norden pointed out long ago that it was a *topos* of the introduction to affect modesty in matters of style (p. 595, n. 1). The convention is discussed by Janson under the heading 'incompetence' (pp. 124ff.); it was more common than he suggests. To his examples can be added Rufinus, *Orig. in Ios. praef.* p. 287,14; Ambrose, *off.* 1,9,29; Faustinus, *trin. praef.*; Paulinus of Milan, *vita Ambr.* 1; Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 1 p. 1105; Cassian, *conl.* 17,30,3; Vincent of Lérins, *comm.* 1,6; Eucherius, *instr.* 1 *praef.* p. 65,9; Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,1,1. In Greek Fathers the convention would seem to be somewhat less frequent. Examples are to be found at Gregory Thaumaturgus, *pan. Or.* 1,2; Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *sanct.* p. 1197^A; Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 2,3; Ps.-Hesychius of Jerusalem, *serm.* (Aubineau [1978]) 21,1; *Vita*

³ On J.'s partiality for such *Selbstironie* involving language which comes in the first instance from another author cf. Adkin (1993b).

⁶ Kelly (p. 101) reads J.'s words 'with a smile'.

Melaniae iunioris praef. In addition it is repeated thrice by Epiphanius: *haer. praef.* II 2,6; 76,54,14; 77,31,2 (referring to 2 Cor. 11,6 'though rude in speech'); cf. Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 5 p. 488^A. In his case however it may not be due entirely to modesty.

J. himself uses the device often: *epist.* 52,4,1; 108,32; 118,1,3; 120 *praef.* 3; 127,1,3; 127,14; 129,8; 140,1,2; *virg. Mar.* 2 (but cf. 22 *rhetorici sumus*); in *Ezech. lib.* 5 *praef.* l. 12; *hom. Orig. in Ezech. prol.* p. 318,11. The frequency with which he does so is in fact unique: no other Father approaches him. It is noteworthy on the other hand that both Augustine and Chrysostom appear to avoid the convention altogether. The reason for J.'s frequent recourse to it might seem to be that J. is a particularly expert and extravagant rhetorician, who is always eager to demonstrate his skill: in consequence he is correspondingly quick to affect modesty. At the same time a sense of insecurity and an awareness of his own intellectual inadequacy may also have been involved.

Though such disavowals of rhetorical pretension were a commonplace, it is significant that the particular phrasing which J. employs here (*pompa sermonis*) recurs shortly afterwards at *in Eph. prol.* p. 440^B: *pompaticum ... sermonem*. Since there the words refer indubitably to Ambrose (cf. Dunphy),⁷ it is likely that they have the same reference here: Duval (1974a), p. 64, n. 270, fails to note this apparent allusion to the *De virginibus*, which was eminently 'rhetorical'.⁸

iam inter angelos statuat. J. refuses to use rhetoric to set Eustochium among the angels. The virgin's likeness to an angel was a commonplace that was very heavily used. J. repeats it twice in the *Libellus* despite his disclaimer here (20,3; 21,7) and uses it frequently elsewhere: *epist.* 49,14,4; 49,14,8; 65,14,5; 107,13,2; 108,23,7; 130,10,5; 130,14,8; 130,19,7; *adv. Iovin.* 1,40; 1,41; *in Is.* 16,58,14 l. 61; *in Zach.* 3,6 l. 157; *tract. in psalm.* I p. 245 l. 164. The comparison would seem to start with Tertullian, *uxor.* 1,4 l. 25 *iam in terris non nubendo de familia angelica deputantur*:⁹ it had a biblical source in Mt. 22,30 *in resurrectione enim neque nubent neque nubentur sed sunt sicut angeli*. Ambrose refers to the text repeatedly when comparing virgins to angels: the reading *erunt* is preferred at *virg.* 1,3,11 and *virginit.* 6,27, while he uses the present tense in *epist.* 8,57,19 and

⁷ The collocation of *pompa* and *sermo* is otherwise rare: it would seem to have occurred earlier only at Arnobius, *nat.* 1,59.

⁸ Augustine chooses this Ambrosian treatise to illustrate the *genus grande* (*doctr. christ.* 4,132). J. himself refers explicitly to the work's rhetorical artifice at 22,3 below (*tanto se fudit eloquio*). While however the mention there of Ambrose's name precluded plain speaking, in the proem J. is free to vent his animosity: *pompa sermonis*.

⁹ Cf. also Clement of Alexandria, *poed.* 2,10,100,3 (referring to Lk. 20,34).

exhort. virg. 4,19 (*quae non nubunt et qui uxores non ducunt sicut angeli in terris sunt*). Eusebius of Emesa had also based himself upon this text (*serm.* 7,5); cf. Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 34 p. 70,16. Basil had gone so far as to think that abstinence from wedlock was the peculiar characteristic of an angel's nature (*ascet.* 1,2). This opinion is also shared by Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 13 and by the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 42 p. 870 (*ib. Mt.* 22,30).

As in the present passage, the virgin had also been set among the angels by Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 43,62. She had consorted with them in Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 7,5 and 7,13. The virgin had been an angel herself at Ambrose, *virg.* 1,8,52, Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 12,34, and Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 51. Her resemblance to one is frequently asserted. Such a statement occurs in the following passages: Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 22 (*ib. Lk.* 20,35f.); Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 7,2; Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 56,5; 63,8; 70,25; *fr. Lc.* p. 1393^B; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,7,3f.; Rufinus, *Basil. hom.* 7 p. 1786^C; Cassian, *inst.* 6,6; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 23,2. Ἰσαγγελος is often the word used to describe her: Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 4,24; 6,35; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 68; Ps.-Athanasius, *v. Syncl.* 75; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 1,181; Proclus of Constantinople, *hom.* 4,9. The virgin imitates the angel's way of life at Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,10,892; *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,6 p. 107,11; Chrysostom, *hom. in Gen.* 18,4; Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 38 p. 86,24. She is their earthly counterpart in Athanasius, *apol. Const.* 33; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,3,6; Ambrose, *inst. virg.* 17,104; Basil of Seleucia, *v. Thecl.* 1 p. 485^A. There exists an affinity between them according to Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *annunt.* 2 p. 1157^B; cf. Amphilochius of Iconium, *hom.* 2,1. In addition the idea is found at Methodius, *symp.* 8,2,175; Athanasius, *virg.* 24; Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 39; Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,3; 6,6; Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 16,14,1; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 37,10; 40,26; *carm.* 2,2 (*epigr.*),17,2; Augustine, *virg.* 13,12; Ammon of Egypt, *ep.* 23; Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 59 p. 162,14.¹⁰

Here J. will not use this commonplace in order to flatter his addressee. Others of the Fathers however did. Athanasius, *virg.* 10 for example had told the virgin she would stand in the third rank of angels. She would shine like one according to Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 15,23. In protesting against this habit J. was not alone. Gregory Nazianzen also objects (*carm.* 2,1,44,35f.) ἂν δὲ σολοικίζης καὶ πάντας ὁμοῦ καταλεύης, ἄγγελος.

¹⁰ All of the above examples concern only the virgin: emulation of the angels in general is discussed by Frank (1964).

Dumortier (1949), pp. 250f. and (1955), pp. 23f., maintains that here J. is criticizing Chrysostom, *fem. reg.* 9.¹¹ Duval (1974a), p. 64, n. 270, believes on the other hand that this is an attack on Ambrose's *De virginibus*. The evidence adduced above shows that comparison of the virgin to an angel was exceedingly common: J. is not the only one to complain. Moreover J. again stresses at 23,1 that his aim in this work is not praise of virginity, but simply its preservation. In view however of other apparent criticisms of Ambrose in this ch. (cf. nn. on *non ... laudes ...; nulla ... adulatio; adulator ...; nulla rhetorici ...*) it would seem probable that what J. says here is indeed directed likewise against the *De virginibus*. Duval identifies the Ambrosian description of the virgin's entry into heaven amid angels (*virg.* 2,2,17) as the target of J.'s attack in this passage.¹² It would appear more probable however that J. is in fact thinking of *virg.* 1,8,52f., where Ambrose draws a long comparison between the life of the virgin and the angel.¹³ J.'s *iam* points to her earthly existence, not to heaven (cf. also next n., where further criticisms of the same passage of *De virginibus* are identified).¹⁴ *mundum subiciat pedibus tuis*. This is evidently an allusion to Ambrose, *virg.* 1,8,52 (referring to virgins) *de hoc mundo estis et non estis in hoc mundo* (cf. also previous n. *sub fine*).¹⁵ J.'s immediately preceding *beatitudine virginitatis exposita* (ll. 9f.) would likewise appear to have been suggested by the arresting apostrophe which occurs some four lines later in Ambrose's *De virginibus: beatae virgines* (1,8,53).¹⁶ The present passage of the *Libellus* is closely reproduced by (Ps.)-Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 1,1 p. 130,18.

¹¹ For refutation of Dumortier's view cf. Adkin (1992a).

¹² Vogüé (1991), I, p. 250, n. 126, refers instead to the commendation of virginity at *virg.* 1,3,11.

¹³ Cf. esp. *cunitas etiam angelos fecit: qui eam servavit angelus est* (*virg.* 1,8,52).

¹⁴ This cluster of references would also appear to tell against Vogüé's view of J.'s specific target (cf. footn. 12 above).

¹⁵ At the same time J. may also have had in mind *virginis* 17,108ff., where Ambrose employs a thirteenfold anaphora of the phrase *supra mundum* to describe the virtues which pertain to the virgin. For evidence dating this treatise before the *Libellus* cf. Adkin (1993c).

¹⁶ It may be noted that J.'s attack on these two paragraphs of the *De virginibus* has not inhibited him from appropriating material from them: his combination of Noah, Lot and the Golden Calf episode at 8,4f. below has evidently come from *virg.* 1,8,53 (cf. n. ad loc.).

Chapter 3

Having urged perseverance J. now warns his reader against the dangers which beset her: these are described in general terms drawn largely from scripture. Only in heaven will she be safe. Comfort however comes from Elisha's assurance to his servant and the ch. ends with a song of triumph from the Psalms.

3,1

nolo tibi venire superbiam de proposito sed timorem. Not pride but fear should attend the virgin. St. Paul gave the same advice at Rom. 11,20 (*noli altum sapere sed time*); J.'s evident echo of this biblical text in the present passage is absent from Hilberg's *apparatus fontium*. Here the warning comes appropriately after the repudiation of flattery and rhetoric. At 27,5 J. is sure that pride has no place with either mother or daughter. On the other hand a holy pride is recommended towards worldly women at 16,1.

Pride was a vice against which virgins had frequently to be cautioned. Their pridefulness was part of Jovinian's criticism (*adv. Iovin.* 1,5). It is why virgin candidates for the priesthood are passed over (*ib.* 1,34). Already Origen had noted that chastity from childhood or a decade's abstinence made some people conceited (*hom. in Jer.* 9 p. 655^A [*PL* 25 (1845)]). Cyril of Jerusalem had felt obliged to warn the celibate against haughtiness towards husbands (*catech.* 4,25). Similarly Augustine fears pride in one who professes perpetual continence (*virg.* 34,34), while he states his preference for a humble wife over an arrogant virgin on no fewer than three occasions: *in psalm.* 75,16; 99,13; *serm.* 354,9. The same view is taken by Caesarius of Arles at *serm.* 155,3 and 237,4.

Propositum is here the intention to live as a virgin. As in this passage, it is often virtually a synonym for the mode of life itself. The word recurs in the *Libellus* with such a sense at 14,2 and 29,3 (cf. 13,3; 15,1). J. calls it *sanctum* in *epist.* 45,4,2; 108,34; 130,4,3; 130,19,7 (so also Augustine, *bon. viduit.* 10,13; *epist.* 211,14; 212; *virg.* 47,47).¹ J. adds the epithet *virginale* at *epist.* 66,3,2 and 130,6,7. He also uses the word with a wider sense. A Christian *propositum* is mentioned at *epist.* 39,4,8. He speaks of a widow's at *epist.* 123,4,2. In *epist.* 58,5,2 the word refers to generals, philosophers, poets, historians, orators, bishops

¹ On *propositum* in Augustine cf. further Zumbeller.

and priests (for secular usage of the term cf. *OLD* s.v. 2a).

It would seem that *propositum* is first applied to the virgin at Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 18. J. qualifies it by the addition of *continentiae* at *epist.* 55,20; so also Ambrose, *hex.* 3,5,23 and Augustine, *bon. viduit.* 8,11. *Castitatis* is added by Ambrose, *vid.* 14,84; Augustine, *bon. viduit.* 8,11; Maximus of Turin 26,2. *Virginittatis* is added at Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,12; 2,19; Maximus of Turin 7,2; Quodvultdeus, *cant. nov.* 4,9 (*sancto*). It is called *deo devotum* by Ambrosiaster, in *1 Cor.* 7,34,2. For a Greek equivalent cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 4,24 διὰ τὴν πρόθεσιν τῆς σωφροσύνης. For further discussion cf. Lardet (1993), p. 145.

onusa incedis auro, latro vitandus est. J. now combines the foregoing echo of scripture (cf. previous n.) with a proverb; on the latter cf. Otto s.v. *nudus* 3 and Häussler, p. 194. To the examples they give should be added (besides the present passage) Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 44 (cf. ib. 18) and Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 25. The material in Otto and Häussler may also be supplemented by reference to four passages from Greek Fathers of the same period: Basil warns against the Devil, for gold attracts thieves (*renunt.* 6; cf. Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 3,12), while Chrysostom twice says that just as pirates leave empty ships alone, so the Devil harms the just (*hom. in Is.* 6,1 4,4 and *hom. div.* 4,1).²

On J.'s unusual partiality for proverbs cf. Otto, p. XXXV. Economical use of them was recommended as an ornament in letter-writing (cf. Sykutris, p. 194); J. on the other hand often accumulates several proverbial formulations in one passage (cf. [e.g.] in the present paragraph ll. 12 and 13f.; in 6,3ff. p. 151,12ff. and p. 152,7f.; in 8,2 ll. 18f. and 19f.). Their frequency in J. is to be seen in the light of his habit of taking over any kind of striking language from elsewhere: in particular his very heavy debt to Tertullian springs from the same taste for second-hand sententiousness. As here, the proverbial expressions he employs also resemble these borrowings of impressive phraseology from other writers by often being combined with scripture.

stadium est haec vita. Ambrose says the same at *epist. extra coll.* 14,72 *haec ... vita in stadio*. The idea is a commonplace. J.'s translation of Theophilus (*epist.* 100,6,1) has *stadium vitae istius* and his rendering of *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 4 p. 23,16 has *stadium huius vitae*. A similar phrase occurs in Chromatius, *serm.* 28,1; Augustine, *vera relig.* 197;

² Chastagnol, p. 96, believes that this passage of J. is being parodied at *Historia Augusta, quatt. tyr.* 2,2. He also detects allusions to 8,1ff. of the *Libellus* at ib. 4,4 and 14,4f. (pp. 82ff.), to 13,1 at ib. 12,7 (p. 83), and to 16,1f. at ib. 15,8 and *Hellog.* 4,3f. (pp. 15, 85f.).

Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* I l. 30. *Agon* is used instead at Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,32; Rufinus, *Orig. in Ios.* 3,1 p. 300,20; 15,6 p. 391,4; *Orig. in Rom.* 3,2 p. 932^D; 7,6 p. 1118^B. St. Paul had employed the same image at 1 Cor. 9,24 (*qui in stadio currunt*).

hic contendimus, ut alibi coronemur. This idea is a favourite of J.'s. He repeats it at *epist.* 130,7,4; *adv. Pelag.* 3,13; *in Ion.* 2,4^B l. 152 D. (*hic militamus ut alibi coronemur*); *tract. in psalm.* I p. 100 l. 144; II p. 393 l. 106; p. 393 l. 117 (the last three passages are possibly by Origen). It occurs infrequently elsewhere: Ps.-Ignatius, *Polyc.* 3 (ἄλλε ... ἐστὶ τὸ στάδιον, ἐκεῖ δὲ οἱ στέφανοι); Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 14,91 (*hic ... luctamur sed alibi coronamur*); Chrysostom, *hom. in Phil.* 12,2.³ The crowning motif recurs in the *Libellus* at 5,2; 15,2; 29,3; 39,4; 40,4 (the last being a citation of 2 Tim. 4,8). It had also occurred in 1 Cor. 9,25 (*qui in agone contendit ... ut corruptibilem coronam accipiant*). There was an allusion to the previous verse (9,24) immediately above (ll. 12f.).

nemo inter serpentes et scorpiones securus ingreditur. In his discussion of this sentence Nazzaro, p. 200, registers an allusion ('sfuggita, a quanto mi risulta, agli studiosi'; however it had already been identified by Adkin [1993f], p. 362) to Lk. 10,19 (*dedit vobis potestatem calcandi supra serpentes et scorpiones*). Nazzaro does not observe that on several occasions J. quotes a proverb which says that no one sleeps securely near a snake: *epist.* 117,3,3; 128,3,5; c. *Vigil.* 16. In the present passage of the *Libellus* the proverb has been combined with biblical reminiscence. It is omitted by Otto and Häussler.⁴

inebriatus est gladius meus in caelo. J. was very partial to Is. 34,5, which recurs eight times in his works. The same *a fortiori* argument accompanies it at *epist.* 125,7,4 (*multo amplius in terra, quae spinas et tribulos generat*) and *adv. Pelag.* 2,25. Elsewhere the verse is seldom quoted: Ambrose and Augustine both ignore it.

terra, quae tribulos generat ... quam serpens comedit. If God's sword is bathed in heaven, how much worse is the earth, which is the *mise-en-scène* of the Fall. Gen. 3,18 (*spinas et tribulos germinabit*) is again echoed at 19,2 below. For the connection with Gen. 3,14 (*terram comedes*) cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 99 l. 124 *quae ... spinas generat, quae cibus serpentis est*. Serpents were mentioned in l. 14 above.

non est nobis conluctatio. Eph. 6,12 was a very popular text. J. himself quotes it often, in particular the final section (*spiritalia nequitiæ in*

³ Eusebius of Emesa had been more optimistic in this connection (*serm.* 7,14): *sine labore habet coronam, sine arrumna fructus pudicitia*

⁴ For a medieval echo cf. Walthier, p. 424 (no. 32016).

caelestibus). Cyprian had already recommended the verse for citation at *testim.* 3,117. In the present passage of the *Libellus*, where these words are intended to express the unique hazardousness of the virgin's struggle, the quotation is not quite *à propos*. Eustochium has just been told to anticipate danger on earth: however this text now locates the antagonist *in caelestibus*. According to it the struggle is not against the flesh: at the start of the next ch. however another text of scripture (Gal. 5,17) says it is. Both inconcinnities are characteristic: they are the result of J.'s preference for scriptural citation in place of coherent argument.

3.2

magnis inimicorum circumdamur agminibus. For the image cf. Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 5,2 p. 316,20 (Rufinus' translation) *vides quantus et qualis exercitus hostium tuorum adversum te de tuo corde procedit?*

plena sunt omnia. J. uses a stock phrase here. *OLD* s.v. *plenus* cites five instances; cf. also Hofmann, p. 90. At a later period the phrase is also quite common. J. has it again himself at *epist.* 125,3,1. In addition it occurs at Lactantius, *inst.* 1,16,6; *ira* 1,6; Arnobius, *nat.* 6,24; Hilary, *in psalm. 118* aleph 7 p. 363,14; Augustine, *c. acad.* 1,1,2; *conf.* 8,3,7; *serm.* 14,8; *vera relig.* 117; Innocent, *epist.* 28,3; Vincent of Lérins, *comm.* 6,3; Leo the Great, *serm.* 58,4. *Sunt* is omitted at Lactantius, *mort. pers.* 23,4 and Juvencus 4,112. The *variatio* between *inimicorum* (l. 2) and *hostium* (l. 3) is recorded by Bartelink (1982), p. 467; (1987), p. 299 (read '22,3,2'); (1991), p. 10 (read '22,3').

caro fragilis. Cf. Mt. 26,41 ('the flesh is weak'). At 4,1 below *caro* is the enemy. Here however it stands for the Christian: J. has overlooked the discrepancy. On human weakness in J. cf. Bartelink (1986).

3.3

cum ... venerit princeps mundi istius et invenerit in ea nihil. Fremantle, p. 23, (but not Hilberg) compared Jn. 14,30 (*venit enim princeps mundi huius et in me non habet quicquam*). The text is one of J.'s favourites: he has it a dozen times elsewhere. Here the prince of this world comes to the soul after death. This had already been the case on two occasions in Origen: *hom. in Jud.* 7,2 p. 507,21^b and *in psalm. 36 hom.* 5,7 (both in Rufinus' translation). On *mundi istius* cf. *TLL* VII,2, 508,80ff.

^b For the reading *invenerit* cf. Sabatier, III, p. 462. In J. the paronomasia (*venerit ... invenerit*, it is noted by Hritzu, p. 32) has been further accentuated by the initial position of both words.

^c Here Bishrens (1921), p. 507, wrongly refers to Jn. 12,31.

secura audies. The epithet describes the dead at Tertullian, *test. anim.* 4 p. 138,27 *securos vocas defunctos*; cf. Oehler's n. ad loc. To it can be added Ambrose, *vid.* 6,35; Augustine, *serm.* 16,2; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 160,5; Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 20 l. 554: in these four examples the Christian idea of reward predominates. J. again uses the word in this sense at *epist.* 23,2,1; 75,2,2; *in Am.* 2,13 l. 441; *in eccles.* 4,2 l. 37 (*qui ... mortem obierint, iam esse securos*). For the congratulatory announcement to the dead cf. 41,1 below.

non timebis a timore nocturna. Ps.-Chrysostom (= Hesychius of Jerusalem), *hom. in Ps.* 90,1 makes the nocturnal fear in Ps. 90,5ff. the pleasures of the flesh, which in the dark are especially troublesome. Acedia had been the noon demon (*daemonio meridiano*) according to Origen, *sel. in Ps.* 90,6 and Ps. 90,5; cf. Cassian, *inst.* 10,1. (Cf. further Arbesmann [1958]). Verse 7 (*cadent a latere tuo mille ...*) is quoted by Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 25. In the present passage it is strictly inappropriate, for the virgin is now in heaven.

3,4

quodsi ... coeperis aestuare. J. gives further advice on the way to combat incipient temptation at 6,4; 6,5; 17,3 below. The same predicament is described at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 238 l. 100 (perhaps by Origen) *si quando fuerimus in angustia et coeperit nos cogitatio captivare in peccatum*. At 6,4 J. makes the sexual reference explicit (*statim ut libido titillaverit sensum*).

dixerit ... cogitatio. For this typically striking expression cf. *TLL* III, 1448,42f. (two examples from the Latin translations of Palladius' *Lausiaca History*). To them can be added Macarius of Egypt, *ad fil. dei* 4 and 5 (also a translation from the Greek). In the *Libellus* thought is again personified at 6,5 (*crescere*), at 6,6 (*interficii*), and at 27,6 (*subrepat*). Cf. also *tract. in psalm.* II p. 429 l. 156 (perhaps another translation from the Greek) *si quando venerit cogitatio et apposuerit*.

quid faciemus. With characteristic fancifulness Eustochium is now cast in the role of Elisha's servant when the Syrians came to capture his master: his perplexity was relieved when he had a vision of the mountain full of chariots. In the present work J. makes the chariots singular to accommodate Elijah. Elisha's revelation is again set beside Elijah's ascent at *in Is.* 18,66,15 l. 46; 18,66,19^f l. 31; *in Ezech.* 27,20 l. 1228; *in Hab.* 3,8 l. 514. It would seem that J. was the first to combine these two episodes: there appears to be no earlier instance of their juxtaposition and he evidently found no immediate imitator. This uniqueness is all the more remarkable, since the story of Elisha and his servant turns up with reasonable frequency. Ambrose had already cited it at *virg.* 1,8,51 as an assurance to the virgin. He also promises his

reader a similar vision at *epist.* 10,77,11 and in *psalm. 118 serm.* 1,11,1 (cf. *ib.* 1,11,2): both were written shortly after the *Libellus*. Somewhat later the *Commonitiones sanctorum patrum* uses Elisha's assurance in a ch. 'against the spirit of fornication' (2,4; = *Vitae patr.* 3,10). It would appear therefore that J. has taken a cue from Ambrose's *De virginibus* and developed it with typical whimsicality by the addition of Elijah's chariot. In this passage *plures nobiscum* answers *sola cum pluribus* in l. 4. J. uses the sequel of the episode in order to point another moral at 9,3 below.

ad exemplum Heliae. Eustochium will soar like Elijah. His ascent had already been an example in the following passages: Basil, *hom.* 13,3 (concerning baptism); Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 27,9; *carm.* 2,2 (*epit.*), 100,1f. (concerning prayer); Gregory of Nyssa, *beat.* 6 p. 1272^D (for the καρδία);⁷ *laud. Bas.* p. 808^B. It is also used later in the same way at Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Cant.* 10 p. 980^B (for the διάνοια); v. *Ephr.* p. 845^B; *Historia monachorum* 2,9; Hyperechius, *mon.* 16 (concerning virginity: παρθενία ἀρματηλάτην ποιούσα εἰς οὐρανοῖς σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἡλίῳ). In western authors on the other hand the idea would seem to be largely absent (Ambrose, in *psalm. 118 serm.* 2,33,3 does not specify Elijah): the present passage of the *Libellus*, where Elijah serves as a model for escaping the enticement to sin, is therefore particularly notable. J. refers to the event again at 18,2 below.

On 'translation to the stars' (*in astra sustollat*; in Elijah's case the Bible speaks simply of 'heaven') cf. *TLL* II, 973,25ff. and 77ff.; it had also happened to Elijah at Juvenecus 3,267 (*astris inseruit*).

anima nostra quasi passer. This picturesque verse (Ps. 123,7) appealed to J.: he subsequently quotes it another eleven times. It had occurred in Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 13,4 p. 449,14 and *hom. in Cant.* 2,12 p. 58,5; J. had recently translated both works. The sparrow recurs at 18,1 below (where it again comes from a Psalm).

⁷ This homily is assigned to 378 by Daniélou (1966), p. 162.

Chapter 4

Ch. 4 stresses that while the Christian is in the body, the Devil will try to catch him. Satan's preference for the better sort is illustrated with examples from scripture. The last example is the Devil's own fall. This ch. is particularly dense with biblical citation.

4,1

fragili corpusculo. J. uses this homely diminutive again in the *Libellus* at 8,2; 27,3; 37,2 (cf. 30,3 *pectusculo*). *Fragile* is once again added to it at *in Ezech.* 40,44 l. 1129 and *in Eph.* 4,13 p. 502^A (cf. Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 5,4). J. spoke of *caro fragilis* at 3,2 above.

thesaurum istum in vasis fictilibus. *Tract. in psalm.* I p. 69 l. 156 mentions the usual interpretation of 2 Cor. 4,7 in terms of body and spirit (cf. l. 5 below), although it is there made to refer instead to the uncouth language of scripture: that is also the meaning given to it *ib.* p. 131 l. 121. Over thirty years after the appearance of the *Libellus* J.'s *adv. Pelag.* (1,19) again combines this verse with a similarly exegetical phrase (*et fragili carne circumdamur*; cf. l. 3 here *fragili corpusculo continemur*).

spiritus adversus carnem. J. uses Gal. 5,17 on fifteen other occasions. It was widely quoted; cf. Cyprian, *testim.* 3,64.

nulla est certa victoria. J. was fond of making this point. Exactly the same words occur thirty-one years later at *adv. Pelag.* 2,5. A similar phrase expresses the idea at *in Ier.* 6,29,12; *in Ezech.* 26,15 l. 638; *in Gal.* 6,1 p. 426^B; *in Eph.* 4,13 p. 502^B; cf. also *tract. in psalm.* I p. 116 l. 220; p. 116 l. 224 (both perhaps by Origen). According to Origen, *princ.* 3,4,2 in the fight between flesh and spirit there is no sure victory. Apart from the afore-mentioned passages this particular point would not appear to have been made elsewhere: perhaps there is accordingly a possibility that here again J. is indebted to Origen.

adversarius noster diabolus. J. cites 1 Pet. 5,8 with great frequency, particularly in his commentaries. The idea of swallowing (*devorare*) contained in it is picked up in l. 14 (*devorato Iuda*); cf. also the references to food in l. 10 (*escam*) and l. 13 (*escae*). This decorative and somewhat self-indulgent technique whereby a passage is built around a *Stichwort* is one to which J. is very partial; cf. 17,3 ('burning'); 19,3 ('stones'); 19,4 ('root'); 26,1-4 ('doors and windows').

posuisti tenebras. *In psalm.* 103 gives an allegorical interpretation of

this text (Ps. 103,20f.): the night of this world is meant and the beasts that go about in it are adverse powers (cf. also Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Ps.* 103,5 and Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 136,4). The same commentary says further that these beasts take food from God because they prefer the saints as prey; cf. *tract. in psalm.* l p. 186 l. 146 (perhaps Origen's) and *in Hab.* 1,15 l. 538 (their prey is prophets and apostles). In the present passage the Devil takes his food from Christ's church (l. 12); cf. ll. 6f. (1 Pet. 5,8 'seeking whom he may devour'). This text of 1 Pet. had already been attached to Ps. 103,20f. by Origen: *hom. in Jer.* 5,16 (GCS 6)¹ and *fr. in Jer.* 28 (cf. later Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 136,4).

This negative interpretation was not however the only one given to Ps. 103,20f. It could also have a good sense and be taken to signify divine provision of subsistence. (This is in fact the sense of verse 27). Such an interpretation is found at Origen, *Ps.* 103,19; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 32,9; Chrysostom, *exp. in Ps.* 144,4; Theodoret, *Ps.* 103,21; cf. Julian of Eclanum (= Theodore of Mopsuestia), *epit. in psalm.* 103,21. J. however does not give it this meaning: for him it always denotes evil.

Caesarius of Arles (*serm.* 136,1) records that in his time Psalm 103 was universally recited at the twelfth hour and most people knew it by heart.

4,2

non quaerit diabolus homines infideles, non eos, qui foris sunt. For the argument cf. Ps.-Augustine (= Ambrosiaster), *quaest. test.* 2,6 *gentiles non quaerit (sc. diabolus), Iudaeos non quaerit, malae vitae et conversationis non quaerit, sed quaerit dei servos et Christi.* These words of Ambrosiaster are a gloss on 1 Pet. 5,8; J. has just cited the text himself (ll. 6f.). Whereas however Ambrosiaster had deployed the argument without incorporating scriptural echoes, it is characteristic that J. should introduce them: for *non eos, qui foris sunt* cf. (e.g.) 1 Cor. 5,12 and 13; cf. also next n.

quorum carnes rex in olla succendit Assyrius. The reference here is obscure. J. makes the same allusion nine years later at *in Mich.* 3,1 l. 53 *carnes et ossa miserunt in ollam ferventem, quam rex succendit Assyrius.* Fremantle, p. 23, compared Jer. 29,22 (LXX 36,22) οὓς ἀπετηγόνισεν βασιλεὺς Βαβυλωνος ἐν πυρὶ (as does Hilberg in his 'Corrigenda et addenda' at the end of the first volume of his edition; ad loc. he compared Am. 4,2). This text of Jeremiah concerns Nebuchadnezzar's treatment of false prophets (cf. l. 11 above *homines infideles*). J. refers to the same text again at *epist.* 54,10,3 and 65,2,1. In

¹ This homily is not one of those translated by J.

both places however he uses *sarrago* and calls the king Babylonian. Even so it is still possible that in the present passage J. is thinking of Nebuchadnezzar, although he calls him an Assyrian here: this monarch is king of Assyria according to the book of Judith (1,5; 1,10; 2,1).²

J. may in any case have been influenced by more than one text. Possibly also relevant to his choice of words are Jer. 50,17 (LXX 27,17) and 2 Macc. 7,3: in the former the king of Assyria devours Israel and the king of Babylon breaks his bones, while the second has the king heating both *sartagine*s and *ollas*. Flesh is also boiled in a pot at Ezek. 11,3 and 24,3. Antin (1958) notes that 'il peut y avoir plus d'une réminiscence sous chaque ligne d'une lettre de S. Jérôme au style particulièrement travaillé: c'est le cas pour l'Ép. 22. Il ne faut pas avoir peur de piocher ses concordances si l'on veut aligner des parallèles valables'. Antin is thinking of multiple sources that are deployed one after the other. It would seem however that here various sources have contributed to a single formulation: given J.'s inordinate passion for citing texts of scripture, it is no surprise that on occasion he should become confused.

de ecclesia Christi rapere. J. uses the same phrase in combination with Ps. 103,20f. (ll. 7ff.) and Hab. 1,16 (l. 13) nine years later at *in Nah.* 2,11 l. 400 and again some twenty-two years later at *in Am.* 3,3 l. 110: such remarkable self-repetitions are characteristic. Initially J. would seem to have taken his cue from Cyprian, *unit. eccl.* 3 *rapit* (sc. *diabolus*) *de ipsa ecclesia homines* (cf. *homines* in l. 11 of the *Libellus*).³

escae eius secundum Ambacum electae sunt. The Devil's food is choice because he is after the Christian. Hab. 1,16 is cited no fewer than ten times in J.'s works: otherwise it is extremely rare.⁴ As here, J. combines it with Ps. 103,20f. at *in Hab.* 1,15 l. 538; *in Am.* 3,3 l. 106; *in Nah.* 2,11 l. 396. The same pair of texts also occurs at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 186 l. 145: possibly therefore the combination is not J.'s own, but goes back to Origen. This text of Habakkuk is explicitly referred to the Devil at *in Ezech.* 16,15 l. 1425. On his 'food' cf. (e.g.) Basil, *ep.* 288 ἕς ... γένηται ... κατάβρωμα τοῦ διαβόλου. The form

² The designation 'Assyrian' is taken over by a number of eastern Fathers: (e.g.) Clement of Alexandria, *str.* 1,21,127,1; Origen, *fr. in Jer.* 58 (N. τος Ἀσσύριος); Eusebius of Caesarea, *Is.* 8,7 (ib. 7,18 however calls him king of the Babylonians); Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 5,3; Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. opif.* 13; Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Ec.* 2,1 l. For references in Latin Fathers to Nebuchadnezzar as an 'Assyrian' cf. Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 23,19; Cassian, *conf.* 5,12,4.

³ For another borrowing from the same ch. of this Cyprianic treatise cf. n. on *Chrismus mentitur* ... at 38,7 below.

⁴ It is found again in J.'s pupil Philip (*in Job rec. long.* 39 p. 780^b).

Ambacum is repeated at 9,4 below. In the preface to his commentary on Habakkuk (l. 2) J. points out that it is a corruption.

devorato Iuda. Judas again illustrates the Devil's preference for saints at *in Ezech.* 16,15 l. 1426 (he will not ensnare just anyone; he wants Judas and Saul). Judas is also adduced to prove the same point at *tract. in psalm.* l p. 186 l. 146 (with David, Solomon and Peter): both passages add Hab. 1,16. Perhaps therefore J. is again dependent on Origen. However Job (to whom J. also refers) would not seem to be mentioned elsewhere in this connection.

ad cribrandos apostolos. J.'s only other reference to Lk. 22,31 occurs at *adv. Iovin.* 2,3. Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Ps.* 103,5 also uses it in conjunction with Ps. 103,20f.

non pacem mittere. Christ was speaking of the divisive impact of his coming: J. applies his words to the struggle against the Devil. J. is partial to the text (Mt. 10,34), which recurs upwards of a dozen times elsewhere in his works.

4,3

cecidit lucifer. Up to this point the ch. has been concerned with the Devil's onset. Now his own fall from heaven serves as a warning (cf. 3,1 above, where God's sword was said to revel in heaven). The Devil's fall is used in the same way at *adv. Iovin.* 2,4, which connects the event with Job 7,1 (*tentatio est vita hominis*; Job has been mentioned at l. 14 above). As in the present passage (cf. p. 149,4ff.), Ps. 81,7 is set beside Satan's apostasy at *tract. in psalm.* l p. 87 l. 144 (perhaps by Origen). Use of the Devil's downfall as a warning example is not rare elsewhere; there are instances at Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 5,10 p. 1052^c (with Ezek. 28,13; cf. next n.); *mart.* 18; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ps.* 81,6; Basil, *ep.* 44,1 (to a fallen monk; *ib.* 1 Reg. 3,11 'both the ears of every one that heareth it shall tingle'); Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 28,12. A similar caveat had been attached to Lk. 10,18 ('Satan falling like lightning') by Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 60. J. recapitulates the point at p. 149,6 below.

in paradiso deliciarum nutritus. J. is still speaking of the Devil. (Hilberg, Labourt and Mierow-Lawler think he means Adam). Vaccari (1920), p. 389, correctly detected an allusion here to Ezek. 28,13; Thierry (1967), pp. 120ff., makes the same identification without mentioning Vaccari. For the reference of this text to the Devil Thierry adduces Jerome, *in Ezech.* 28,11 l. 232; *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 13,1 p. 440,6; *tract. in psalm.* l p. 87 l. 149; Augustine, *civ.* 11,15 p. 482,20. The verse had already been given the same application in the following additional passages: Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 2,10 p. 348,18; Origen, *princ.* 1,5,4; Ambrose, *parad.* 2,9. Thierry cites his same four passages

for the combination of Ezek. 28,13 with Is. 14,12 (*cecidit lucifer*); to them can be added Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 1,3 p. 326,8; *comm. in Rom.* 5,10 pp. 1052^C and 1054^B; *princ.* 1,5,4; 4,3,9; Jerome, *adv. Iovin.* 2,4; *in Ezech.* 31,1 l. 134; Chrysostom, *hom. div.* 8,4; Cassian, *conf.* 8,8,1ff. The particular wording which J. uses here (*in paradiso deliciarum nutritus*; Ezek. 28,13 reads ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου) has been taken over from his translation of Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 13,1 p. 440,9; he repeats it later at *adv. Iovin.* 2,4.

si alte feraris. Here J. leaves out the middle of Obad. 4 (*si inter sidera posueris nidum tuum*) because of its similarity to Is. 14,13, which is cited immediately below. J. again combines Obad. 4 with Is. 14,13 at *in Is.* 6,14,13 l. 39; *in Dan.* 7,4 l. 471; *in Os.* 8,1 l. 71. The combination had also been made recently by Tyconius, *reg.* 7 p. 72,18. There are further references in J. to Obad. 4 at *in Hab.* 1,12 l. 361; *in Eph. lib.* 3 *praef.* p. 515^D (where Vallarsi misidentifies the allusion); *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 185 l. 119. Outside his works the text is extremely rare.

super sidera caeli ponam sedem meam et ero similis altissimo. In the Vulgate Is. 14,13f. runs *in caelum conscendam, super astra dei* (LXX has οὐρανῶν) *exaltabo* (Θῆσω) *solium meum; sedebo in monte testamenti, in lateribus aquilonis; (14) ascendam super altitudinem nubium, similis ero altissimo.* It quickly came to be abbreviated: cf. Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 13,1 p. 441,25 *ascendam super sidera caeli et nubes et reliqua et ero similis altissimo.* When J. cites the text (which he does frequently), he repeats the abridged form used in the present passage (generally adding *in caelum ascendam*): *epist.* 133,1,1; *vita Hilar.* 3,2; *adv. Pelag.* 3,14 (*sup. sid. ascendam, pon. in caelo ...*); *in Is.* 11,37,26 l. 26; *in Ezech.* 18,5 l. 341; 28,1 l. 70 (*sup. sid. asc. et ero ...*); *in Dan.* 7,4 l. 471; *in Am.* 2,6 l. 201; *in Zach.* 10,8 l. 271; *in Mal.* 4,1 l. 54; *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 90 l. 24; p. 252 l. 174. The same abbreviation occurs with some frequency elsewhere: Origen, *exp. in Pr.* 2,17; 25,6; Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Cant.* 14 p. 1081^A; Chrysostom, *hom. in Rom.* 20,4; *hom. div.* 8,4 (twice); Philip, *in Iob rec. long.* 24 p. 684^B (cf. 41 p. 796^C).

A common variant of the above form replaced *super sidera* with the *super nubes* of v. 14; this is found at Origen, *hom. in Ios.* 15,3 p. 384,13; *pasch.* 43 (interposing εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι); Asterius the Sophist, *hom.* (Richard) 25,15; Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Cant.* 5 p. 881^A; Ambrose, *in psalm.* 35,11,1; 36,77,1; *in psalm. 118 serm.* 3,34,1; 7,8,2; Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *annunt.* 2 p. 1168^B. *In nubibus* had already been used in this position at Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 5,11 p. 613,19 (where the *ero ...* clause comes first) and 5,17 p. 635,1. Instead of either *sidera* or *nubes* Athanasius, *virg.* 5 has ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ;

(Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* 3 p. 332^A gives ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τοὔτεστιν ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν.

The passage is abbreviated quite differently by Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 14,278 ἀναβῆσομαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἕσομαι ὁμοίος τῷ Ὑψίστῳ; Chrysostom, *hom. in Is.* 6,1 3,3 is similar. There is a further modification at Ambrose, *fid.* 5,19,238 *ponam thronum meum, ascendam super nubes et ero sim. alt.* Finally when Cassian, *conf.* 5,7,2 quotes the text, he omits only *sedebo ... aquilonis*.

The words which J. uses here to introduce the text (*dixerat enim ...*) also come from *Is.* 14,13. The preceding verse has just been cited (*cecidit lucifer*; p. 148,16). Cf. also Gryson (1987), pp. 399ff.

per scalam ... descendunt. As the Devil fell, so a Christian can lose his likeness to God. J. makes sinners go down Jacob's ladder at *epist.* 54,6,5; 108,13,1; 118,7,2; 123,14,4; *tract. in psalm.* I p. 248 l. 75 (perhaps by Origen). Tertullian had ventured the same interpretation at *adv. Marc.* 3,24 p. 421,5; cf. *fug.* 1,4.

dii estis. It is the saints who are called gods in *Ps.* 81,6 according to *in Gal.* 1,11 p. 322^B; *tract. in psalm.* I p. 58 l. 117 (*sancti dii dicuntur*); p. 242 l. 60 (the last two perhaps Origen's); cf. also Faustinus, *trin.* 7,2 (*quilibet sancti dii vocantur*). J. gives the verse a broadly similar reference at *in Mich.* 2,11 l. 520 and *in Soph.* 1,2 l. 155; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 293 l. 11 (Cyprian, *testim.* 2,6 had said that the just were meant). At *tract. in psalm.* I p. 86 l. 109 the point is made that we are not gods by nature but by grace: the same explanation had been given by Origen, *hom. in Ex.* 6,5 p. 196,21.⁵

At *in Is.* 6,14,16 l. 15 on the other hand J. says that *Ps.* 81,6 is addressed to the Devil and his confederates. Origen had named the fallen angels as addressees at *hom. in Ex.* 8,2 p. 220,17. His *comm. in Rom.* 3,1 p. 925^C however applied the text to the entire human race. J. has it describe those whom sin turns from gods into human beings at *in Math.* 6,14 l. 793; cf. *in Gal.* 1,11 p. 322^B. The most significant passage for the present context is Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 53: here the text had referred to virgins who see the daughters of men and descend to carnal pleasures. Christ himself had applied it to recipients of God's word at *Jn.* 10,34f.

'One of the princes' is the Devil according to *tract. in psalm.* I 87 l. 144; cf. Origen, *hom. in Ex.* 8,2 p. 220,19 (ib. *princeps omnium factus est ad ruinam*). This interpretation fits the present context perfectly: J. continues with *cecidit enim primus diabolus* (l. 6), which picks up p-

⁵ Later in the *Libellus* at 40,5 J. defines the virgin's struggle as *esse, quod deus est*.

148,16ff. (*cecidit lucifer ...*). At *in psalm. 81* J. gives Adam as an alternative to the Devil.

4,4

cum stet deus in synagoga deorum. These words (Ps. 81,1) are the setting for the reprimand given in l. 4 (*ego dixi ...*; Ps. 81,6f.). The gods mentioned in Ps. 81,1 are angels or saints according to *in psalm. 81* and *quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 11,26; cf. Origen, *Cont. praef.* p. 71,7.⁶ The polyptoton in *deus, deos* and *dii* is noted by Hritzu, p. 39.

nonne homines estis. *Homines estis* (1 Cor. 3,3) balances *dii estis* (l. 4 above). The Apostle is comparing carnal and spiritual; here however J. addresses the verse to those who sin and cease to be gods. *Dissensiones et aemulationes* is strictly inappropriate in this context, which concerns the fallen virgin. J. again joins 1 Cor. 3,3 to Ps. 81,6f. (*dii estis ...*) at *in Zach. 13,3* l. 77; cf. *tract. in psalm. 1* p. 242 l. 56. The combination goes back to Origen, who uses it often: *comm. in Mtr.* 16,29 p. 574,4; 17,19 p. 638,29; *Ps. 81,1*; *ser. in Ps. 4,3*. Didymus has it too at *Ps. 88,49*; cf. *Zach. 13,3*.

⁶ They were the judges according to Julian of Eclanum (= Theodore of Mopsuestia), *epist. in psalm. 81,1*^b (v. 6 is applied to the priests by Theodor, *Maf. 2,8ff.*; cf. *Jr. in Lc. 3,22*).

Chapter 5

After the Devil's warning example comes that of St. Paul and his struggle with fleshly temptation. Virginity once lost is irrecoverable. Even thought can destroy it.

5.1

Paulus apostolus, vas electionis et praeparatus in evangelium Christi.

An arresting tricolon crescens opens the ch. (the same figure is employed to describe Lot at 8,5 below). The last part of the present example echoes Rom. 1,1 (Hilberg merely compares Eph. 6,15). The first four words recur at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 249 l. 97. There is a striking parallel to this tricolon at Chrysostom, *hom. suppl.* 4 p. 444 Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, τὸ σκεῦος τῆς ἐκλογῆς, ὁ τὸν Χριστὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ λαλοῦντα.

incentiva vitiorum. J. was very partial to this phrase, which recurs a score of times in his works. Other Fathers were more sparing. Hilary has it some seven times, Ambrose four. It occurs once each in Paulinus of Nola and Cassian. Augustine would seem to avoid it altogether.

reprimat corpus suum. J. turns a text (1 Cor. 9,27) that is about self-discipline into a profession of self-mortification by talking about the 'pricks of the flesh' (l. 12). He also adds Rom. 7,23 ('another law in my members'). The same combination of texts is repeated at *epist.* 125,7,5; *tract. in psalm.* I p. 249 l. 97; p. 303 l. 71 (the last two perhaps by Origen); cf. also Ambrose, *paenit.* 1,13,61. After a parenthesis J. appends the next verse of Romans (7,24 'wretched man that I am'): he was much attached to this text, which he quotes over thirty times elsewhere. Though J. is speaking about self-mortification, in the catalogue which makes up the parenthesis only the fasts are a self-imposed austerity. (For this list Souter [1912], p. 150, compared 2 Cor. 6,4f.; there is a much longer one from another passage of 2 Cor. at 40,3 below). Hritzu, p. 47, notes the asyndeton.

For *in semet versus* cf. 30,2 below and *epist.* 47,1,1; 69,2,4; 77,4,1. In the previous two chs. J. has been speaking in general terms of the dangers to be faced: in this one he returns to the particular case of the virgin.

tu te putas securam esse debere? Warnings against complacency are very frequent in J.: they occur at *epist.* 14,6,2; 30,14,2; *adv. Pelag.* 1,12; 2,23; *in Ezech.* 39,1 l. 1868; *in Mich.* 6,8 l. 260; *in eccles.* 3,8 l. 144; *in Matth.* 12,29 l. 468; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 147 l. 175; p. 193 l.

40; p. 252 l. 175; p. 291 l. 260. J. uses the same *a fortiori* argument from the experience of St. Paul at *epist.* 79,7,5 and *adv. Iovin.* 2,3;¹ as in the present passage, this argument is combined with citation of I Cor. 9,27 and Rom. 7,24 at *epist.* 125,7,5 and *tract. in psalm.* I p. 249 l. 102 (ib. *si Paulus apostolus, vas electionis ...*): if the last passage is by Origen, J. has appropriated this section of ch. 5 from him. The *Libellus* has already made the point that no one can be *securus* while still alive; cf. 3,1 and 3,3 above.

5,2

ne quando de te dicat deus. For such divine reproach cf. Origen, *hom. in Num.* 27,7 p. 265,23 (*ne forte dicat et nobis dominus*) and Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,29,45 (μη σε θεός τοιοῦται ἀμειψήται χαλεπήνας); and the later examples at Chrysostom, *theatr.* 4, (Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* 1 p. 321^A and Benedict, *reg.* 2,14. In the *Libellus* God also arraigns at 4,3 and 14,2: the device is characteristic of J.'s vivid style. Here it also signals a rare text (cf. the introductory formula before another rarely quoted text in ll. 6f.).

virgo Israhel cecidit. J. quotes Am. 5,2 nowhere else: it was very seldom cited. Here J. exploits his unique biblical expertise to make a clever point.² *Israhel* is used indeclinably again at 8,5 and 25,2: it is declined at *epist.* 53,8,19 and 55,1,2.

suscitare virginem non potest post ruinam. A fallen monk had received just the opposite assurance at Basil, *ep.* 45,2. Kelly, p. 21, n. 16, detects 'a note of personal regret' in J.'s statement: he himself had lost his virginity.

valet quidem liberare de poena sed non valet coronare corruptam. The same distinction had already been made by Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 59; it is made later by Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 36. On *corruptam* cf. J.'s comment at *in Eph.* 6,24 p. 554^C *consuetudo et sermo vulgaris incorruptos virgines vocat easque qui coitum nesciant feminarum; corruptos vero eos qui istiusmodi degustaverint voluptatem*; there is a similar definition at *in Tit.* 2,6 p. 583^A. *TLL* s.v. omits both these passages.

5,3

virgines bonae deficient. J. distinguishes the good virgin from the

¹ As in *Gal.* 6,1 p. 426^B Christ's temptation is our warning.

² Bauer (1975), pp. 15f., comments on this passage: 'dem H. wird ein Ovidtext vorgeschwebt sein: Heroid. 5,103f. (Oenone Paridi): *nulla reparabilis arte / laeso pudicitia est: deperit illa semel*'. Such an assumption is unlikely. Striking phraseology is what impressed itself on J.'s mind: there is no verbal echo here.

bad. Characteristically the idea is introduced with a citation from scripture (Am. 8,13): in his passion to make a point J. gives the text twice over. He chooses the rendering *bonae* to fit his argument; LXX however has καλοί and the Vulgate translates *pulchrae* (so J. in his translations at *in Am. ad loc.*). There is a similar variance in Rufinus' version of Origen, *Cant.* 2 p. 141,17, which renders Cant. 1,8 (where LXX again has καλή): *bona — sive pulchra — inter mulieres*. J. repeats his distinction between good and bad virgins at *in Am. ad loc.* There the good are holy in body and spirit, whereas the bad are foolish virgins with no oil for their lamps. The 'good' virgin is also described in the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 52 p. 929 (*à propos* of fornication of soul) and at Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 6,7 (she is also a virgin in heart). On 'bad' virgins cf. Jerome, *epist.* 107,11,1 and Augustine, *in psalm.* 99,13. The Amos verse used here (which concerns punishment of idolaters) would not seem to be quoted again, either by J. or by anyone else. It is the second rare text of this prophet that is cited in the present ch. in order to register a clever point.

perit ... et mente virginitas. The bad virgin is one who commits adultery in her heart (Mt. 5,28). *Mente nubere* is the phrase J. uses to express this at *virg. Mar.* 20, *adv. Iovin.* 1,41 and *in Matth.* 25,1 l. 704; cf. Tertullian, *orat.* 22 p. 196,15 *praenups(it) ... mens per voluntatem*. The idea is commonplace in the Fathers.³ Origen had expressed the view that a person could possess virginity in body and by receiving the darts of passion in his heart lose chastity of soul (*hom. in Gen.* 10,4 p. 98,9). Incontinence of the mind is described in the following passages: Lactantius, *inst.* 6,23,36; Basil, *ep.* 42,4 (τὴν ... ἐμαυτοῦ παρθενίαν ἐμῶλυνε κατὰ διάνοιαν καρδίας); Augustine, *in psalm.* 75,16 (if one is drunken, proud, litigious or talkative); Ps.-Ambrose, *ad virg. dev.* 2 p. 582^B; Ps.-Chrysostom, *virg. corrupt.* p. 744 (ib. Mt. 5,28); Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 7 l. 219. Thought must be virgin (παρθενευέτω καὶ ἡ διάνοια) according to Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 37,10. The soul too commits fornication in Athanasius, *fr. Lc.* p. 1396^D (ib. Mt. 5,28); Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 13; 43 (it impinges on the body as well); *Aprophthegmata Patrum* p. 153^A (Gerontius says τῶν σωματίων παρθένων φυλαττομένων κατὰ ψυχὴν ἐκπορνεύουσι); ib. 63 (Nau [1907], p. 393).

This unchastity of the mind is particularly damaging. The assertion is often made that if virginity of heart is lost its bodily counterpart becomes worthless: *Sententiae Nicaeni synodi* 38 p. 53 (Haase); Augustine, *in psalm.* 90, *serm.* 2,9; 99,13; (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 7,6,9; (Ps.)-Eusebius Gallicanus, *hom.* 39,4

³ Cf. also (e.g.) Seneca, *epist.* 88,8 *doce me quid sit pudicitia ... in corpore an in animo parita sit*.

(referring to malice, anger, pride, lies and slander); Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 155,3. For this opinion Ps.-Cyprian, *tract.* 21 alleged the authority of St. Paul: *vas electionis ... dicens: 'si corpore castus et mente corruptus <es>, nihil prodest'* (Reitzenstein [1914], p. 81, suggested *Acta Pauli* as the source). In a discussion of heretical virgins Augustine says that the heart's fornication is worse than the body's (*in euang. Joh.* 13,14); he also distinguishes between *puclicitia* as a thing of the mind and *virginitas* as a thing of the body and asserts that the one can exist without the other (*c. Julian.* 4,8,48; cf. 4,8,50). Chrysostom goes further and says that the uncorrupted in soul is a virgin even if she has a husband: corporal virginity is therefore only a shadow and concomitant of this real virginity (*hom. in Heb.* 28,7). The same argument recurs in the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 52 p. 929.

At 7,2 below J. himself describes how despite bodily mortification his brain had burned with desire.

virgines carne, non spiritu. The bad virgins J. has been describing are virgins only in flesh and not in spirit. J. repeats that some folk are virgins in flesh but not spirit at *adv. Iovin.* 1,13 and in *Zach.* 14,15 l. 579: in the first passage the body is said to be pure but the soul is debauched. Origen had made the same distinction with reference (as here) to the foolish virgins at *hom. in Lev.* 1,5 p. 288,2.

On the other hand J. is confident that Feliciane enjoys virginity of both flesh and spirit at *epist.* 30,14,1 (cf. 1 Cor. 7,34 'holy both in body and in spirit'; the text is quoted at 21,9 below; cf. also 38,2). J. adds virginity in heart and body to the source he is translating at *Victorin. Poetov. in apoc.* 20,1: at 20,2 of the same work there are said to be virgins not only in body but also in tongue and thought.⁴

virgines stultae. J.'s bad virgins are the foolish virgins of the parable at Mt. 25,1–12. These are mentioned again at 25,4 and 26,2 below. There was some variety in the exegesis of this parable. Here the virgins are virgins only in body. The same explanation had been twice given by Origen: *comm. in Rom.* 8,10 p. 1189^C and *hom. in Lev.* 1,5 p. 288,9. Later on it is taken up by Chrysostom, *virg.* 77 (ib. θεῖ καὶ τῆς ψυχικῆς ἀρνησίας); *poenit.* 4,3; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 3,298; Cassian, *conf.* 22,6,9; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 69,4.

Although this is the interpretation which J. gives here, fourteen years later in his commentary on Mt. ad loc. it is mentioned only to be discarded: instead J. surmises from the context of the parable that it

⁴ Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 18 had observed that for the virgin to attend a wedding might not entail loss of virginity in body and mind, but would impair it in eyes, ears and tongue.

applies not just to virgins but to all humankind. He is followed by Augustine, who speculates that the whole church is meant (*serm.* 93,1). The same view is expressed at Anon., *de decem virg.* p. 37 and in Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 156,4.³

Elsewhere J. makes the foolish virgins lack the oil of good works: *epist.* 125,20,1; 130,11,3; *in Zach.* 8,23 l. 669. The same explanation is found in Orsiesius' *Doctrina* (20), which J. had translated several years before composing the three works just mentioned. It is also taken over by Gaudentius (*serm.* 18,26). More often hardness of heart is named as the disqualifying defect: this is the reason given by Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 78,1; Ps.-Chrysostom, *virg. parab.* 1; Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra, *perist.* 9,3; Salvian, *eccl.* 2,30; cf. Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 36 p. 76,23. The hardheartedness is engendered by greed according to Nilus, *exerc.* 73. Want of humility is added to it by Chrysostom (*hom. in Mt.* 47,4). Finally Gregory of Nyssa, *instit.* p. 83,13f. says the foolish virgins lacked energy of spirit.

There is an allusion to the parable in the consecration rite for a virgin in the Gelasian Sacramentary (790).

³ By way of a footnote J.'s Mt. commentary also mentions the possibility of referring the five virgins to the five senses.

Chapter 6

Physical lapse is even more grievous than mental: the shame it entails is described by means of lavish citation of scripture. Further biblical texts are recommended for recital as an antidote to temptation: prurient thoughts must be nipped in the bud. The ch. is saturated in scripture and bursting with sensuality.

6,1

ob alias ... culpas virginitate corporum non salvantur. J. recapitulates the situation of virgins who are unchaste in mind before he proceeds to deal with those who have lost even physical chastity. He had already asserted that bodily continence alone was not sufficient at *epist.* 14,9,2; he does so again at *adv. Iovin.* 1,34 (on candidates for the priesthood). The same point had been made by several of his predecessors: Origen, *comm. in 1 Cor.* 37; *hom. in Lev.* 1,5 p. 288,12; Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 5; Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon), p. 190,30 (ib. 1 Cor. 7,34 'holy both in body and in spirit'). In the same year as the *Libellus* it was made in *Collectio Avellana* 2,103 (the complete virgin must also avoid heretical company). Basil had stated the view of some that physical purity on its own was the essence of virginity: he disagrees (*ascet.* 1,1f.). Similarly Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian) had denied that it could save the flirt (*puhic.* 12,3). Pride, greed and calumny disqualify according to Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 9,1 p. 1205^B. After J.'s *Libellus* the idea that virginity of the body is by itself inadequate is repeated by the following: Ambrose, *epist.* 8,56,6;¹ the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 52 p. 929 (on the foolish virgins); Cassian, *conf.* 12,2,5; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 155,3. Gaudentius (*serm.* 5,5) adds a list of invalidating vices.

prostituerunt membra Christi et mutaverunt templum sancti spiritus in lupanar. J. is paraphrasing 1 Cor. 6,15 (*tollens ergo membra Christi, faciam membra meretricis?*) and 6,19 (*an nescitis quoniam membra vestra templum est spiritus sancti?*). However he would seem to have borrowed the phrase *prostituerunt membra Christi* from Cyprian, *laps.* 6;² there would appear to be a further echo of this Cyprianic passage at *adv. Iovin.* 1,10.

¹ A date of 395–6 is suggested by Palanque, p. 554.

² Since the formulation is as striking as it is scabrous, it naturally drew J.'s attention. This reminiscence is overlooked by Deléani, pp. 70f. (for 'laps. 5' read 'laps. 6').

6,2

descende. J. omits ἀνακόλυσαι τὰς κοιλίας after 'grind meal'. Is. 47,1f. is again used of the penitent Fabiola at *epist.* 77,5,2; otherwise the text is very seldom cited. J. returns to the theme of lapsed virgins in c. 13.

post oscula fratruelis. Such explicitly erotic vocabulary recurs in the *Libellus* at 25,1; 25,4 (Cant. 1,13); 38,4. Athanasius had also employed Cant. 1,2 (φιλησάτω με ἀπὸ φιλημάτων στόματος αὐτοῦ) in his *Sermon on virginity* (Casey), p. 1043; there it was quoted directly. Cyprian too speaks twice of *complexus et osculum domini* (*epist.* 6,4 and 37,3,1); he uses the singular. J.'s use of the plural and avoidance of direct quotation invest his formulation with a characteristic lasciviousness.

Elsewhere the erotic element is largely eliminated. Origen had interpreted the text to signify divine teaching: Christ puts the words of his mouth into our mouth (*Cant.* 1 p. 90,26). At *schol. in Cant.* 1,1 he had said that the bridegroom's lips have kissed us whenever we grasp sacred doctrine. Chrysostom identifies the divine kiss as angelic hymns (*hom. in Eph.* 14,4). At *in Is.* 17,63,8 l. 40 J. applies the verse to Christ's salvation of his people: the Word becomes flesh and kisses one by dwelling in one.³

Fratruelis is repeated at 25,4 (Cant. 1,13; LXX ἀδελφιδός; Vulg. *dilectus*) and at 26,2 (Cant. 5,2). On *dei filii thalamos* (l. 6) cf. Cant. 1,4 (εἰσηνεγκέν με ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὸ ταμίειον αὐτοῦ; it is quoted at 1,5 above).

sermo propheticus. As in the present passage, *sermo propheticus* had denoted the Psalter at (e.g.) Hilary, *in psalm.* 64,19; 65,22; 67,21; 67,32; 68,30; 118,4; 118 aleph 3 p. 360,17; 118 lamed 7 p. 460,27; 119,8; 120,16 etc. At *in psalm.* 122,7 Hilary uses *propheta* to designate the Psalms in a list mentioning Genesis, Gospels and Apostle. David had been called a *propheta* at Acts 2,30. For ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος in the same sense cf. (e.g.) Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ps.* 21,17; 45,2; 64,10.

adstitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato, circumdata varietate. The golden vesture of Ps. 44,10 fits ll. 3f. (*velamentum*) and l. 9 (*nudabitur*). The next verse of this Psalm had opened the work. J. connects Ps. 44,10 with the ceremony of veiling virgins at *epist.* 130,2,3. It had already been quoted by Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 26 and Ambrose, *virg.* 1,7,36; cf. Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon), p.

³ J. says that Canticles is a repository of virginity's mysteries, although Jovinian thought it a defence of marriage (*adv. Iovin.* 1,30). Understood spiritually, it refers to the church or the soul's union with the Word according to Origen, *Cant.* 1 p. 89,10.

190,25. Cant. 1,4 ('the king hath brought me into his chambers'; cf. l. 6) had also been linked to it by Origen, *Cant.* 1 p. 110,7 and *schol. in Cant.* 1,3.

J. uses Ps. 44,10 with reference to the church at *epist.* 49,5,2; 65,15,3; in *Ezech.* 48,16 l. 1725; in *Zach.* 14,13 l. 546. The final *varietate* signifies diversity of gifts or deserts at *adv. Iovin.* 1,8; 2,22; in *Is.* 13,49,14 l. 94 (cf. further Pavan). *Tuis* refers to Christ; cf. Origen, *sel. in Ps.* 45,10 ἐκ δεξιῶν Χριστοῦ.

6,3

nudabitur. The harlot is stripped at Ezek. 16,39 (cf. in *Ezech.* 16,35 l. 458 *adulterarum te lege nudabo*) and at Apoc. 17,16; cf. also Jer. 13,26 (cited in next n.). J. may have had all three passages in mind.

posteriora eius ponentur in facie ipsius. Fremantle identified the source as Jer. 13,26 (so Antin [1958]) ἀποκαλύψω τὰ ὀπίσω σου ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν σου. One might also compare Nah. 3,5, which is the same (cf. in *Nah.* ad loc. *in facie*). For the use of *ponere* here cf. in *Gal.* 1,6 p. 319^B *posteriora ponit in faciem* (on distortion of the Gospel). For the superfluous pronoun cf. Goelzer, pp. 408f.

sedebit ad aquas solitudinis. Hilberg compares Apoc. 17,1 (*meretricis magnae quae sedet super aquas multas*)⁴ and 17,16 (*et desolatam facient illam*). For *solitudinis* Antin (1958) suggested Jer. 2,15 εἰς ἔρημον.⁵ Hos. 2,3 (LXX 2,5) is perhaps also relevant, since it combines nakedness and solitude with a reference to water: ὅπως ἂν ἐκδύσω αὐτήν γυμνήν ... καὶ θήσομαι αὐτήν ὡς ἔρημον καὶ τόξω αὐτήν ὡς γῆν ἄνυδρον.

posita base divaricabit pedes suos omni transeunti. For J. this prurient text had an enormous appeal: he quotes Ezek. 16,25 over a dozen times. It would not seem to be cited by any other author. Origen had offered an allegorical interpretation: the leg symbolized the movement of the mind (*sel. in Ezech.* 16,25). *Posita base* fits the biblical context (which concerns Jerusalem), but not the fallen virgin.

usque ad verticem polluetur. Antin (1958) believed J.'s source to be Jer. 2,16 (Vulg. *filii quoque Memfeos et Tafnes constupraverunt te*

⁴ The verse had been cited by Cyprian, *hob. virg.* 12 *à propos* of adornment (cf. also *tearim.* 3,36). Reference might in addition be made to Jer. 51,13 (LXX 28,13) κατασκευοῦσα ἐπὶ ὕδασι πολλοῖς (of Babylon). The phrase *traxit flumina* had occurred in l. 4 above.

⁵ Antin detects an echo of the next verse in ll. 11f. below and of another Jeremic text in the immediately preceding clause; cf. also l. 16. He makes the following comment on Apoc. 17,16, which is adduced by Hilberg: 'où rien n'est ad rem sauf le mot er'. Apoc. 17,3 has *desertum*; however this word is absent from Cyprian's citation at *hob. virg.* 12.

usque ad verticem; however LXX has simply κατέραυζόν σου; J. has *polluere* at *in Jer.* 1,26,3 ad loc.). J. uses the same words later at *in Ezech.* 16,32 l. 396; *in Os.* 1,2 l. 106; *in Zach.* 8,1 l. 23 (in the last passage again in combination with *Ezek.* 16,25).

rectius fuerat homini subisse coniugium. At 29,4 below J. cites 1 Cor. 7,9 ('better to marry than to burn') in order to make this point. The same view was expressed at Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 19 and Chrysostom, *fem. reg.* 4; cf. Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon), p. 199,32.

ambulasse per plana. Ambrose notes later that the path of matrimony is flat and straight and reaches the camp of the saints by a longer route (*epist. extra coll.* 14,40). J. himself (*epist.* 66,3,2) reports that Pammachius' wife preferred to go safely on low ground.

quam ad altiora tendentem in profundum inferi cadere. The proverb which lies behind J.'s statement (*quanto altius ascendit homo, lapsus tanto altius cadet*) has been documented by Otto (p. 17) and Häussler (p. 300); the present passage should be added to their dossier. At the same time it would seem that here J. is doing more than merely echo a proverbial expression. In *virg.* 26 Chrysostom had glossed 1 Cor. 7,2 ('nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife') with the following strikingly similar comment: φοβοῦμαι σε, φησί, εἰς τὸ τῆς πορνείας ὑποσ ἀναγαγεῖν μὴ καταπέσης εἰς τὸ τῆς κορνεῖας βάραθρον. This Chrysostomic formulation would seem to have influenced J.'s own: he characteristically introduces a biblical locution with *in profundum inferi* (cf. *TLL* VII,1, 1373,2; also *Vulg. Is.* 7,11).

6,4

non fiat ... civitas meretrix fidelis Sion. Basil had used *Is.* 1,21 of a lapsed virgin at *ep.* 46,3.⁶ The text is seldom quoted elsewhere: Ambrose and Augustine do not have it. In his commentary on this verse (*in Is.* 1,1,21 l. 33) J. explains that Sion becomes a harlot if murderous demons replace God as tenant of the soul.

post trinitatis hospitium. J. repeats his striking formulation *trinitatis hospitium* over twenty years later at *in Zach.* 7,8 l. 217. For the idea cf.

⁶ This letter was one of the works selected for translation by Rufinus. Deléani, p. 70, notes that the phrase *civitas meretrix* had been used by Cyprian, *hob. virg.* 12; she therefore surmises that its occurrence there inspired J. to quote *Is.* 1,21 in the *Libellus*. Such a prompt was hardly necessary. For an imagination as prurient as J.'s own the language of harlotry in *Is.* 1,21 understandably held an irresistible appeal: this verse is only one of a number of similarly salacious Old Testament texts to be quoted in the present ch. of the *Libellus*. Moreover J. himself had already used the phrase *civitas meretrix* at *vita Pauli* 8 (*vae tibi, civitas meretrix*); here the antecedent *vae* shows that he is thinking of Revelation (cf. *Rev.* 17,1: 17,15; 17,18; 18,10; 18,16 etc.), not Isaiah.

24,6 below (*Christum hospitem habeant*).

daemones saltent et sirenae nidificent et hircii. The Trinity is matched by three creatures selected from the longer list at *Is.* 13,21f. All these beasts are renegade angels or demons and agents of punishment according to J.'s commentary on the passage (*in Is.* 6,13,19 l. 75). Similarly Ps.-Basil remarks at *Is.* 13,276 (ad loc.) that the soul no longer inhabited by God must become the home of evil spirits.

Sirens are envisaged by J. as demons, monsters or large crested snakes that fly (*in Is.* 5,13,20^f l. 20); he gives a similar explanation at *in Is.* 6,13,19 l. 58 and *in Jer.* 2,95,2. Likewise Ps.-Basil thinks that here 'Sirens' is a name for demons (*Is.* 13,274); cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Is.* 13,21 (treacherous ones). On the other hand at *Is.* 13,276 Ps.-Basil thinks they stand for flattery; cf. also Ambrose, *in psalm.* 43,75,2. Origen had made them malign spirits (*fr. in Lam.* 95). They signify pleasure and vice according to Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 16,7 and Maximus of Turin 37,2.

Their pagan provenance is noted by several Fathers: Origen, *fr. in Lam.* 96 (κατὰ ... τὸν ἔξω μῦθον); Ambrose, *in psalm.* 43,75,1; Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 13,274. J. himself calls the record of their melodiousness an error of the heathen (*in Is.* 6,13,19 l. 60). He discusses the Septuagint's habit of borrowing names from pagan mythology at *in Is.* 6,13,3^b l. 21 and *in Gal.* 3,1 p. 348^A (cf. also Lardet [1981]). Gregory of Nyssa takes the view that it helps the reader (*Ewn.* 2,438). Paulinus of Nola expresses a similar opinion (*epist.* 16,7): taking material from meaningless fables is like quoting proverbs. J. mentions Siren songs himself at 18,2 below.

non solvatur fascia pectoralis. In these words there is perhaps an echo of *Jer.* 2,32 *nunquid obliviscetur ... virgo fasciae pectoralis suae* (this is the form in which J. quotes the text at *adv. Iovin.* 1,32; he refers to it again in *epist.* 65,19,5). According to Methodius, *symp.* 4,6,106 the text had signified loosening the knot of chastity.

voluptatis incendium. The fire metaphor again describes the passions at 7,2 and 8,2; cf. 6,6. There are further striking examples at *epist.* 107,11,2; *vita Hilar.* 3,3; *in Am. lib.* 2 *praef.* l. 32; *in eccles.* 10,4 l. 72; *in Eph.* 5,5 p. 521^B; *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 200 l. 149. In the present passage J. describes temptation in strikingly physical terms; however shortly afterwards (p. 152,5ff.) it is a purely intellectual matter.

erumpamus in vocem. J. uses the same words again at *epist.* 43,3,3; *in Gal.* 4,29 p. 392^C; *in Eph.* 2,19 p. 476^B; *praef. Vulg. evang.* p. 1,7; cf. also *TLL* V,2, 840,73ff.

dominus auxiliator meus, non timebo, quid faciat mihi caro. Ps. 117,6 ends with *homo*; Hilberg fails to note that J. has introduced *caro*

from Ps. 55,5 (*non timebo quid faciat mihi caro*). The two verses are cited together at *in Is.* 14,51,12 l. 81. Ps. 117,6 was popular; cf. Cyprian, *testim.* 3,10; *Fort.* 10. J. himself quotes it on four other occasions.

6,5

interior homo. The Apostle speaks of the inner man at Rom. 7,22, Eph. 3,16 and 2 Cor. 4,16; the last passage contrasts him with the outer man, to whom J. himself refers at 17,3 below. The inner man is the soul and the outer the flesh according to Tertullian, *resurr.* 40,2 and Augustine, *in euang. Ioh.* 86,1. Generally it is the outer man that inclines to viciousness (so 17,3 below and St. Paul). In a number of passages however it is (as here) the inner man who is subject to temptation and depravity: Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 2,13 p. 913^B; Gregory of Nyssa, *ep.* 2,17 (εἰ δὲ πλήρη ἔχεις τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον λογισμῶν κοληπῶν); *res.* 3 p. 677^D; Ps.-Chrysostom, *ascet. facet.* p. 1056.

inter vitia atque virtutes ... fluctuare. J. repeats this phrase at *in Is.* 14,51,20 l. 31 and *in Gal.* 5,25 p. 422^D. He remarks at *in Abd.* 12 l. 437 that the soul is placed midway between vice and virtue, to either of which it can incline at any moment; cf. *epist.* 79,9,3; *in Gal.* 5,17 p. 411^B.

atque. *Atque* was more literary than *ac*; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, p. 477; Löfstedt (1942), II, p. 341. Gillis' statistics are inconclusive. J. has *atque* another eight times in this work; *ac* occurs five times. *Atque utinam* (25,3) was standard; cf. Rufinus, *Orig. in gen.* 10,1 p. 93,5 *et atque utinam* (the same collocation is found at Rufinus, *Orig. in Jos.* 12,2 p. 368,19; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 52,5; cf. also *TLL* V,2, 906,29ff.).

quare tristis es. J. uses this text (Ps. 41,6f.) again at *epist.* 108,19,2 and *in Is.* 1,2,2^A l. 28.

nolo sinas cogitationem crescere. The phrase *cogitationem crescere* is repeated at *in Eph.* 4,27 p. 511^C. As in the present passage, J. again uses it in conjunction with Ps. 136,8f. at *in psalm.* 136 and *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 306 l. 134. It is taken over by Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 12 l. 380 (*nolo, ut sinas in te crescere cogitationes malae [sic]*). *Adolescat* and *parvus* (l. 7) carry on the picturesque image of growing up. In expositions of Ps. 136 the same concept of not giving time for growth is found often: Origen, *Cont.* 3 p. 240,26; *fr. in Jer.* 26; *hom. in Num.* 20,2 p. 190,7; Ambobius Junior, *in psalm.* 136 l. 56; Hilary, *in psalm.* 136,14; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 44,3; Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 13,272.

nihil Babylonium, nihil confusiois. The daughter of Babylon is

addressed at 6,2 and 6,6. The etymology whereby Babylon means confusion goes back to Gen. 11,9; cf. *TLL* II, 1654,21ff. and IV, 268,59ff. (in l. 66 for 'Hier.' read 'Ambr.'). For J. add *epist.* 21,8,2; in *Is.* 1,1,6^o l. 15; 2,5,8 l. 18; 4,10,5 l. 33; 6,13,17 l. 7; 6,13,19 II. 22, 30, 88; 7,21,8 l. 22; 13,48,12 l. 55; 13,48,20 l. 29; in *Jer.* 5,46,4; in *Ezech.* 12,10^b l. 1335; 47,6 l. 1195; in *Mich.* 7,8 l. 440; in *Zach.* 5,9 l. 209; *sit. et nom.* p. 41 l. 5; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 71 l. 205; p. 295 l. 6; II p. 387 l. 67. Here these words show off J.'s erudition and prepare the way for citation of Ps. 136,8f. (*filia Babylonis ...*; l. 8).

dum parvus est hostis, interfice. The same precept regarding the children of Ps. 136 had been given by Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 15,3 p. 387,3 and *hom. in Num.* 20,2 p. 190,4; cf. also Cassian, *inst.* 6,13,2.

elidatur in semine. J. now inserts the second proverbial expression of the ch. (for the first cf. n. on *quam ad altiora tendentem ...* at 6,3). Both Otto and Häussler fail to record the present proverb. Again it would seem that J.'s choice of language has been influenced by his propensity to borrow from others. Ps. 136,9 (l. 10) had been combined with *Jer.* 27,16 (LXX ἐξολεθρεύσατε σπέρμα ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος) by Origen, *fr. in Jer.* 26 and (very recently) by Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 45,15; cf. also Nilus of Ancyra, *praest.* 8. The occurrence of the word 'seed' in this Jeremicanic verse has evidently prompted J.'s use here of a proverbial locution which contained the same term.

6,6

parvulos. The little ones of Ps. 136,9 are wicked thoughts according to Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 15,3 p. 387,1; cf. *sel. in Ps.* 136,9. At *Cels.* 7,22 he specifies that they are confused thoughts of recent origin. The same identification is made later by Ambrose, *paenit.* 2,11,106. This exegesis is also echoed in Evagrius Ponticus (*sent. mon.* 45), who without explicit reference to Ps. 136,9 says that eliminating evil thoughts is like dashing children against a rock; cf. also Benedict, *reg.* 4,50; *Regula magistri, them. psalm.* 24; 3,56.

It was a common principle of exegesis to equate 'children' with thoughts; cf. Origen, *hom. in Jer.* 5,7 (GCS 6) πολλάκις εἶπομεν ... ὅτι τὰ νοήματα ... εἰσὶν υἱοί. This principle is applied to Ps. 136 in J.'s *tract. in psalm.* I p. 298 l. 81 (*parvuli dicuntur cogitationes*) and p. 306 l. 135 (*parvuli autem minores et parvae cogitationes antequam crescant*); both passages may be by Origen. At *in psalm.* 136 J. makes the saints dash 'incipient unclean thoughts' against the rock.

On the other hand Paulinus of Nola identifies the little ones of Ps. 136 as faults of confusion and worldly pride (*epist.* 44,3). They are heterodox tenets according to Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 13,272, while in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ps.* 136,8 they are seeds of evil.

impossibile est. J. summarizes: it is impossible to escape temptation. He notes again in *epist.* 79,9,2 that nobody can avoid the *antepassionēs*. At *in Gal.* 5,22 p. 421^B he similarly observes that thought is importunate; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 53 l. 111; p. 200 l. 149; p. 239 l. 134. Origen had already made the same point at *exp. in Pr.* 5,20: it is quite impossible to avoid sinful thoughts. Later on Cassian distinguishes between *ἐγκρατῆς* and *ἀγνός*, while leaving it to the reader's discretion whether the second state is actually attainable (*inst.* 6,4,1f.). At *conf.* 1,17,1 he quotes the saying of abbot Moses that thoughts are inevitable but can be rejected; cf. Evagrius Ponticus, *vit. cog.* 1. The same view had been expressed in the 370's by Epiphanius (*haer.* 64,57,1; quoting Rom. 7,15 'what I would, that do I not').

In the following ch. J.'s own desert experience illustrates the point (cf. also 5,3 and 8,1). His choice of vocabulary here combines feeling (ll. 11f.) and thought (l. 13); the slight inconcinnity is due to the attempt to combine an echo of Vergil (l. 12 *notum medullarum calorem*; cf. *Aen.* 8,389) with an arresting climax (ll. 13f.) that is based on the standard exegesis of Ps. 136,9 (the children are thoughts).

interficit cogitatus. Thoughts are again 'killed' at *in Is.* 2,5,11 l. 52 and *in psalm.* 136; cf. *in Is.* 6,14,20^f l. 21. J. uses this typically audacious phrase twice in his translation of Origen, *hom. in Lc.* 17 p. 107,17, where the original has the less vivid ἀφαινεῖν. It may be noted however that Rufinus also says *cogitationes necare* at *Orig. in Jos.* 15,3 p. 387,7 and *Orig. in num.* 25,6 p. 241,22. For the personification cf. 3,4 (*dixerit tibi cogitatio tua*).

petra autem est Christus. 1 Cor. 10,4 had been combined with Ps. 136,9 by Origen, *hom. in Num.* 20,2 p. 190,1; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ps.* 136,8; Hilary, *in psalm.* 136,14. J. makes the connection again himself at *in psalm.* 136; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 298 l. 86 and p. 306 l. 134. It recurs later at Paulinus of Milan, *vita Ambr.* 41 and Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 13,272. In addition the children of Ps. 136 had been 'struck against Christ' at Origen, *fr. in Jer.* 26 and *hom. in Jos.* 15,3 p. 387,5. The same statement is made later in the following passages: Ambrose, *paenit.* 2,11,106; *in psalm.* 118 *serm.* 8,34,3; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 44,3; Prosper of Aquitaine, *in psalm.* 136,8; Eucherius, *instr.* I p. 102,26. At Ambrosius Junior, *in psalm.* 136 l. 51 the children are struck against the rock on which the church was founded.

J.'s entirely derivative conclusion to this ch. is a very good example of the technique of achieving *per fines capitum singulorum acuta quaedam breviterque conclusa*, to which he refers disdainfully (*epist.* 52,4,1) along with *pueriles declamationes, sententiarum flosculi* and *verborum lenocinia*. J. again ends a ch. with a biblical text that serves as a key to the foregoing at 25,6 and 26,4.

Chapter 7

J. illustrates the impossibility of suppressing lascivious thoughts by describing his own experience as a hermit in the Syrian desert during the mid-370's. Despite all his austerities J.'s mind still seethed with lust. Only intensified self-mortification produced occasional respite and rapture.

This impressive *δύστυχα* provides variety, as exciting narrative description now succeeds the precepts and prohibitions of the foregoing chs. It is a masterpiece of rhetorical virtuosity. Scriptural citation is scarcely discernible except at the end, where it creates a dazzling climax (p. 154,7f.); in this respect too the ch. accordingly offers a contrast to what precedes.

The ch. is discussed by Thierry (1963); Brown, pp. 375f.; Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 272ff.; Grimm, pp. 160f.; Vidén, pp. 144f. On the medical aspect cf. Janini Cuesta, pp. 44f.

7,1

O quotiens. The account begins impressively with the figure of *exclamatio*.

vasta solitudine. Here Nazzaro, p. 201, detects a biblical reminiscence: Num. 14,3 and Deut. 32,10. However the collocation at issue also occurs in pagan texts (cf. *OLD* s.v. *solitudo*); moreover while Sabatier is unable to supply an Old Latin text of the first passage, that of the second is quite different (cf. Sabatier, I, pp. 289f. and 386f.).

exusta solis ardoribus. Hilberg identified the phrase as a borrowing from Sallust, *Jug.* 19,6. For the historian's popularity in this period cf. Norden, p. 583. On J.'s interest in him cf. Hagendahl (1958), pp. 292; 294. The phrase in question had already been echoed by Lucan (9,382). It recurs at Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,13,2; *chron.* 1,43,2 (*adusta*). Testard (1983), p. 17, suggests that J. has deliberately chosen this Sallustian echo in order to give a resonant opening to his account.

horridum monachis ... habitaculum. Bonosus' retreat had been described in similar terms (*epist.* 3,4,4) as *horroris carcerem* (cf. *ib.* 3,4,2). Here J. achieves an elegantly chiasmic antithesis in *horridum monachis ... Romanis ... deliciis*.

Romanis deliciis. Rome contrasts with the desert. It was also the scene of the licentious escapades of J.'s youth. On J.'s attitude to Rome cf. Sugano. At 35,7 below J. notes that the sick cenobite does not look for urban *deliciae*.

sedebam solus, quia amaritudine repletus eram. Hilberg detected an allusion to Ruth 1,20 *quia valde me amaritudine replevit Omnipotens* (Vulg.); LXX has ὅτι ἐπικράνθη ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ ἰκανὸς σφόδρα. Vaccari (1920), p. 389, then suggested Lam. 1,20 *quoniam amaritudine plena sum* (Vulg.; LXX ὅτι παραπικραίνουσα παρεπικράνα). In fact however J.'s sentence is the LXX version of Jer. 15,17: κατὰ μόνος ἐκάθημην, ὅτι πικρίας ἐνεπλήσθην.¹ This Jeremianic text was a favourite of J.'s: he quotes it another half dozen times. At 36,2 below the anchorite also sits alone (Lam. 3,28).

horrebam sacco membra deformis. These words are a *Selbstzitat* of *epist.* 3,4,3 (*horrent sacco membra deformi*), which would seem in turn to be an imitation of Pacian, *paraen.* 9,4 (*sacco ... horrente deformis*); cf. Adkin (1994b). On sackcloth cf. *epist.* 44,2 *saccus orationis signum atque ieiunii est.*

squalida cutis situm Aethiopicae carnis adduxerat. Here J. is describing a change of both colour and texture; cf. Rufinus, *Orig. in cant.* 2 p. 128,13 *infuscat et obdurat ardore (sc. sol)*. On *situs* of unwashed skin cf. Cyprian, *epist.* 76,2,4. J. had pictured a similar effect in the desert at *epist.* 14,10,3 *scabra sine balneis adtrahitur cutis?* Sackcloth produces *situs* at *epist.* 24,4,3 *non sacco asperata cutis ... situm ... contraheret.* On 'Ethiopian flesh' cf. Jer. 13,23 ('Can the Ethiopian change his skin?').

si quando repugnantem somnus ... oppressisset. Vigils are mentioned in the account of J.'s dream at 30,2 below (cf. l. 16). Fasting (l. 9) also recurs in the same account at 30,1.

nuda humo vix ossa haerentia conlidebam. This phraseology is a self-imitation of *epist.* 14,10,3, which is itself inspired by Cyprian, *epist.* 76,2,4:² in the *Libellus* J. improves in turn on his 14th letter by also incorporating an echo of Vergil, *ecl.* 3,102 *vix ossibus haerent* (cf. 30,3 below). On sleep in such conditions cf. *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,3 p. 102,26 *aut sine fulcris humo corpuscula decubant aut saxo paulisper delecta durantur, ut somnus non agi videatur iniuriosa brevitate, sed pelli.* Presumably J. conceives the bones as hardly

¹ Testard (1993), p. 204, posits in addition an echo of 3 Reg. 19,3f.

² Cyprian had stated *à propos* of the mines: *humi iacenti fesso laboribus viscera, sed porno non est cum Christo iacere.* This antithesis is then applied to the hermit in J.'s 14th letter: *super nudam metuis humum exesa ieiunium membra conlidere? sed dominus arcum iacet.* Here J. has streamlined the second half of the Cyprianic formulation, while making the language of the first more graphic. In doing so he would appear to have had in mind a phrase of his 3rd letter (5,1 *fesso ieiunium membra*), which would itself seem to have been suggested by Cyprian's *fesso laboribus viscera*; letter 14 replaces *fesso* with the more vivid *exesa*.

sticking to the skin: this is the case at Theodoret, *h. rel.* 30 p. 1493^A λεπτότατον ... τὸ δέρμα ... λεπτοῖς τοῖς ὀστέοις περικείται καὶ πιμελῆς καὶ σαρκῶν ... δαπανηθεισῶν; cf. also Job 19,20 and Lam. 4,8 (at Gregory of Nyssa, *Ps.* 6 p. 612^D on the other hand the bones no longer stick to each other).

7,2

de cibis vero et potu taceo. The narrator interposes himself: the effect is to slow down the pace. Here the description is also couched in communal terms (*languentes*), which contrast with *sedebam solus* and *solus ... penetrabam* at the beginning and end of the ch. The same *praeteritio* had occurred in Athanasius, *v. Anton.* 7 περὶ γὰρ κρεῶν καὶ οἴνου περιττόν ἐστι καὶ λέγειν, ὅπου γε οὐδέ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις σπουδαίοις ἠγρίσκετό τι τοιοῦτον: this is evidently J.'s source here. Food was a matter of great importance to J. (cf. 30,1 below).

languentes. Sc. 'sick'; cf. *in Is.* 8,26,14 l. 30 *medici ... cupiunt sanare languentes* (not in *TLL* s.v.). The detail anticipates the fuller description of monasticism in chs. 33ff.

aqua frigida. The ascetic drinks cold water at *epist.* 24,3,1; 45,5,1; 54,10,1. According to Athanasius St. Antony had restricted himself to water (*v. Anton.* 7). Nilus of Ancyra (*Alb.* p. 708^B) reports that on cold days it was warmed in the sun.

coctum aliquid accepisse luxuriae sit. The *Lausiac History* (86 M.) speaks of ἡ πολιτεία ἡ ἀνευ πυρὸς ἐπιματος; in the same passage a monk declares that since moving into the desert he has touched no cooked food. Cf. further Epiphanius, *exp. fid.* 23,5; *Historia monachorum* 1,17; *Apophthegmata patrum*, p. 160^C; *Vitae patrum* 5,8,21; Palladius, *h. Laus.* 45; *Vita Pachomii* A 29. This was the practice of virtually all the brothers according to *Vita Pachomii* A 15.

ob gehennae metum. Fear of hell and love of Christ had actuated the monk in *epist.* 14,3,3. At *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 232 l. 28 the point is made that if love of God rather than fear of hell is the motive for not committing fornication, the reward is greater. The dream takes J. to hell in ch. 30.

carcere. J. had called Bonosus' island haunt a prison at *epist.* 3,4,4. The little house built by Marcianus that was smaller than himself is a voluntary prison according to Theodoret, *h. rel.* 3 p. 1328^A; cf. *ib.* 4 p. 1344^A.

scorpionum tantum socius et ferarum. The monk also has snakes for company in Asterius of Ansedunum, *ad Renat.* 1. 256. Testard (1983), p. 17, compares Mk. 1,13 (*erat in deserto ... eratque cum bestiis*). The scorpions and wild beasts form a vivid contrast to the succeeding

puellae; again the antithesis is underlined by chiasmus (*scorpionum ... socius ... choris ... puellarum*; cf. p. 152, 16f.).

choris intereram puellarum. These words provide a closer definition of *Romanis interesse delictis* at the beginning of the ch., which also ends with a third *interesse*: there J. consorts with angels.

On this kind of embarrassing admission cf. J.'s remarks at *epist.* 54,10,5 *malo apud te, filia, verecundia parumper quam causa periclitari.*³

pallebant ora ieiunium. Pallor characterized the ascetic. The virgin herself is pale at 13,3 below; her companion is also pale at 17,1 (contrast the ruddy cheeks of the worldly at 16,2). Paleness is commended at *epist.* 45,5,2 (along with thinness); 79,7,7 (along with fasts and shabbiness); 107,9,3. It is a sign of continence at *epist.* 24,5,1 and *c. Vigil.* 13. As in the present passage, it is the consequence of fasting at *epist.* 54,6,2 and *in Gal.* 5,26 p. 424^A; cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 218 l. 280.⁴ Pallor is also mentioned at *epist.* 39,1,3; *adv. Iovin.* 2,21; 2,36. On the other hand at *epist.* 24,5,1 and *in Gal.* 5,26 p. 424^A J. condemns paleness that is mere ostentation.

The phrase which J. uses in the present passage is repeated a quarter of a century later at *in Is.* 16,58,2¹ l. 71; on the other hand *epist.* 60,9,2 has *lurida ieiunium ora.*

mens desiderium aestuabat in frigido corpore. At *epist.* 125,12,1 J. refers again to his plight at this time: *mens tamen cogitationibus aestuabat.* He reports at *adv. Pelag.* 2,24 that some monks are still tormented by desire when shut in their cells out of sight of women. Athanasius had similarly described how the Devil used to appear to Antony at night in woman's shape (*v. Anton.* 5). Later both *Apophthegmata Patrum* 163ff. (Nau [1908], pp. 53ff.) and Cassian, *inst.* 6 deal at length with the struggle against sexual temptation.

For the same antithesis of body and mind cf. Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,11,2 (*arebant membra ieiunio sed deficere mens caelo intenta non poterat*); Augustine, *epist.* 91,1 (*frigescentibus membris fervere animum*). According to Thierry (1963), p. 30, the reference here to *frigidum corpus* and in the next l. to *sola libidinum incendia* shows that J. is describing a nocturnal situation: 'so his body is cold because he made no fire in the evening for ascetic reasons'. However it would seem that these phrases are due rather to literary considerations: J.'s aim is to create an effective contrast between bodily cold and mental incandescence.

³ This wording is due to Tertullian, *anim.* 27,b, cf. Adkin (2002b).

⁴ In this connection Scourfield, p. 143, compares Bömer, p. 253.

ante hominem suum iam carne praemortua. This phrase has caused much perplexity to scribes, editors and translators alike.⁵ Here *homo suus* is in fact being employed to denote the whole person as against a part or aspect of it. Although this usage has been omitted from *TLL* s.v. *homo* (Brink), it can nonetheless be documented from a number of texts: Hilary, in *psalm.* 142,5 *cor ... hominem suum in memoriam primae suae constitutionis ... convertit*; Philip, in *Iob rec. long.* 9 p. 639^c (on Job 9,13 [*sub quo curvantur qui portant orbem*]) *qui portant orbem, id est totum hominem suum*; ib. 39 p. 777^a *in interiore sensu hominis sui.*

Here J. is using a form of the conceit 'dead before death': it occurs with some frequency in this period.⁶ J. himself had already employed it at *epist.* 10,2,3 *adhuc viventes praemoriuntur in carne*; cf. also *epist.* 66,5,2 and in *Am. lib.* 2 *praef.* l. 22. Further instances are found at Ambrose, *paenit.* 1,16,91; Sulpicius Severus, *Mart.* 16,2; 16,4. In Greek the idea occurs in Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 43,63 (*ἀνθρώποι νεκροὶ πρὸ θανάτου*) and Chrysostom, *hom. div.* 5,3.

In this sentence of the *Libellus* the persistence of lust in a lifeless body has been expressed in two co-ordinate clauses (*mens desiderii aestuabat in frigido corpore et ante hominem suum iam carne praemortua sola libidinum incendia bulliebant*), in which the structure is chiasmic: *in frigido corpore* matches *ante hominem suum iam carne praemortua*. At the same time each element in the second clause is longer than the corresponding section of the first:⁷ Schaublin's deletion of *ante hominem suum* would accordingly spoil the artistic balance of J.'s sentence. The wording here is packed, lurid, artful and typically Hieronymian.

7,3

ad Iesu lacebam pedes, rigabam lacrimis, crine tergebam. J. applies to himself the actions of the penitent Magdalen. Such a striking image naturally had a strong appeal for him. J. represents himself as performing the same action in a similar tricolon at *c. Lucif.* 15, while it is an exhortation at *tract. in Marc.* pp. 338,11 and 368,9.⁸ This application of the biblical episode is also quite common elsewhere.

⁵ Cf. the *conspicuum* in Adkin (1993d), pp. 96ff. According to Schaublin, pp. 56f., the words *ante hominem suum* must be suppressed as 'eine unmögliche Ausdrucksweise'. Baur (1983), p. 171, attempts to exemplify this use of *homo suus*; however none of the parallels he adduces is really pertinent, since they all denote Christ's manhood in contradistinction to his godhead.

⁶ It goes back to classical literature; cf. (e.g.) Seneca, *epist.* 93,4 *alter ante mortem perit.*

⁷ On this important compositional principle cf. Albrecht (1989), index s.v. 'law of increasing members'.

⁸ J. has a further half dozen references to the Magdalen's deed.

Paulinus of Nola shows an even greater fondness for it than J. himself; he employs it at *epist.* 18,8; 23,24; 23,35; 23,37; *carm.* 31,533f.; 31,543f. In Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 1,22 it is the church that washes and wipes Christ's feet with her hair; Ambrose himself does it at *poenit.* 2,8,67. Sulpicius Severus (*dial.* 2,6,3) describes the empress herself as behaving in this way towards Martin.

J. was not the first to make such use of the Magdalen's action: he has evidently taken his cue from elsewhere. Already Athanasius (*Letter to virgins* [Lebon], p. 192,5) had said that a virgin should copy the sinner who washed Christ's feet. Similarly Ps.-Basil (= Eusebius of Emesa), *poenit.* 4 had recommended imitation.

Baus, pp. 187f., sees J.'s words in this passage as springing from an 'Atmosphäre ganz spontaner, unreflektierter, volksfrommer Gebetshaltung'. It would seem however that J.'s reason for introducing this literary reminiscence is rather to embellish further an already highly wrought passage.⁹ The chiasmus is registered by Harendza, p. 53.

repugnantem carnem ebdomadatum inedia subiugabam. On weekly fasting in the desert fathers cf. *Apophthegmata Patrum* 242 (Nau [1909], p. 363) οἱ Σκητιῶται ἐνήστευον τὴν ἐβδομάδα; 314 (Nau [1912], p. 207; for seventy weeks together); Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra, *narr.* 3,7; Theodoret, *h. rel.* 26 p. 1468^C; *Vitae patrum* 5,10,44. For the same practice among cenobites cf. Cassian, *conf.* 5,12,3. Arbesmann (1969b), pp. 507f., mentions the name *ebdomadarii*.

J. himself notes that Asella's fasts in Rome lasted for a week in Lent (*epist.* 24,4,2), though he disapproves at *epist.* 107,10,2 *displicent mihi ... ieiunia, quibus iunguntur ebdomades*; daily fasting is said to be best at 17,2 below. The biographer of the younger Melania reports that she was modest about her weekly fasts (v. *Mel. iun.* 62). Similarly Ps.-Athanasius, *syntag.* 5,1 warns against ostentation. As in the present passage, fasting for a week is a way of combatting temptation at *Vita Eupraxiae* 19.

J. again uses similar wording at *adv. Iovin.* 2,7.

non erubesco infelicitatis meae. Rufinus was shocked by J.'s self-exposure in the *Libellus* (*apol. adv. Hier.* 2,5). *Infelicitas* is also used of the story of his dream at 29,7 below.

plango non esse quod fuerim. J. would appear to mean that he regrets no longer being capable of the same ascetic exertions (cf. the

⁹ Vogt (1991), I, p. 409, explains *crine tergebam* by reference to the long hair of Syrian monks (cf. *epist.* 17,2,3); however the frequent occurrence of the theme in non-Syrian contexts would seem to make this supposition unnecessary. In *rigabam lacrimis* Testard (1993), p. 204, detects an echo of the *lacrimae* in l. 3 (cf. also p. 154,5).

next sentence).¹⁰

clamantem diem crebro iunxisse cum nocte. J. has *dies noctesque iungere* at *epist.* 108,15,3; in *Is.* 1,1,15^c l. 9 (in both passages the reference is to prayer); 11,38,14 l. 11 (weeping and groaning); cf. also Chrysostom, *hom. in Is.* 6,1 4,1 παννυχίδας ... ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὶ συνασπείσας. In Nilus of Ancyra (*ep.* 3,324) the troubled ascetic is similarly recommended to shout for long periods by day and night.¹¹

a pectoris ... verberibus. The publican had beaten his breast in Lk. 18,13. Gregory Nazianzen places the practice in a catalogue of mortifications along with vigils, fasting, prayer, tears and callous knees (*or.* 6,2). Augustine refers to it often: to the list in Roetzer, pp. 245ff., add *conf.* 10,42,67; *discipl.* 10,11; *epist.* 188,9; c. *Parmen.* 2,7,13; 2,10,20; in *psalm.* 38,14; 48, *serm.* 2,4; 69,3; 128,9; 148,16; *serm.* 112A,5 *coll. Morin* p. 258,19; 113B,3 *coll. Morin* p. 290,13; 136,2. Augustine observes that when you beat the breast you are angry with your heart (*serm.* 19,2), while at in *psalm.* 146,7 he says that it shows you are punishing it. On the other hand in Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra (= Evagrius Ponticus), *mał. cog.* 11 the action is not penitential but preventive; according to Nilus, *ep.* 3,129 beating the breast is like praising God with a drum.¹²

Vita Eupraxiae 34 includes the face. Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 3,243 mentions beating of the breast and face together with kneeling and spreading the hands. The *Admonitio Augiensis* (= *Epist. Migne suppl.* 1,1701) disapproves of the practice: *quid prodest si pectus tundis, si peccata intus inclusa non respuis?*; cf. also *Regula magistri, them. or. dom.* 69 (*tundenda sunt nobis corda quam pectora*). There are further references to beating the breast at Commodian, *instr.* 2,18,11; 2,21,13; Niceta of Remesiana, *vigil.* 3 l. 12; Orientius, *comm.* 1,401; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,303; 3,288.

domino rediret increpante tranquillitas. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compared Mk. 4,39 (he wrongly gives '4,29') *exurgens comminatus est* (Lk. 8,24 has *increpavit*) *vento ... et facta est tranquillitas magna*. On *tranquillitas* cf. also Lorié, pp. 121ff.

cellulam. Gorce (1949a), p. 39, thinks it was cut out of the rock; he refers to *epist.* 17,2,3 *de cavernis cellularum*. One might compare further *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,3 p. 102,17 *cavaris in habitaculum saxis*. Cf. also Deichmann; Fehrenbach.

¹⁰ He means the loss of his virginity according to Müller (1993), p. 33.

¹¹ Vogüé (1991), I, p. 276, suggests that in the present passage J. is thinking of Mk. 5,5 *semper nocte ac die in monumentis et in montibus erat clamans et concidens se lapidibus*.

¹² In Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 2 p. 461^A it is a sign of astonishment.

iratus et rigidus. J. uses the same words fourteen years later at *in Math.* 21,13 l. 1354; they are reversed at *in Gal.* 6,1 p. 425^B.

7,4

sicubi concava vallium, aspera montium, rupium praerupta cernebam. For the elevated form of expression cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 2,332 *angusta viarum* with Austin's n. J. uses it again at *epist.* 117,6,4 *silicium dura*; *in Ezech.* 3,12 l. 964 *excelsa terrae ... et inferiora vallium*; *in Ioel* 1,19 l. 534 *plana camporum aut pratorum florentia*. Cf. further Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,67 *alta et condensa montium, invia rupium, speluncarum horrida, fovearum vadosa*; *in psalm.* 1,24,4 *concava rupium, praerupta montium*. On the collocation *aspera montium* cf. *TLL* II, 808,29ff. The phrase *rupium praerupta* is also found in Rufinus, *Basil. hom.* 2,6 (J. has *praeruptas rupes* at *in Ezech.* 3,22 l. 1101). J.'s language in the present passage is clearly meant to provide a grandiloquent finale to this impressive ch.: the chiasmic parison is noted by Harendza, p. 57. The ellipse of the verb in the main clause (*ibi meae orationi locus, illud miserrimae carnis ergastulum*) contributes further to the effect.

For the monk's mobility cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 185 l. 116 *monachus non habet cellam sed ubicumque invenerit ibi et manet*. On his liking for mountains cf. Chrysostom, *poenit.* 5,1 πρὸς τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων ἀναδραμόντες (οἱ μονάζοντες).

carnis ergastulum. Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 40,7 has *ergastulum cellulae*. The term *ergastulum* more often denotes the body as prison of the soul; cf. *TLL* V, 757,69ff. (add *in eccles.* 4,2 l. 37). Cf. 7,2 (*carcere*).

testis est dominus. J. was very fond of this invocation, which fits his vivacious style: he has it again at *epist.* 39,6,4; 72,2,3; 81,1,1; 85,6; 99,2,2; 108,9,3; 108,15,6; [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 57,105. Similarly he calls Jesus to witness at *epist.* 1,3,3; 17,3,1; 39,2,2; 108,21,5; 108,30,1; *adv. Rufin.* 3,9; cf. *epist.* 39,5,4 (*Christo teste*). It is God whom he calls to witness at *epist.* 108,15,1 and 143,1,2.¹³

In other authors by contrast appeals to the Lord's testimony occur with much less frequency: Tertullian, *bapt.* 12,2; *spect.* 26 p. 25,21 (*anim.* 9,4 God); Cyprian, *epist.* 33,2,1 (21,3,2 God); Hilary, *in psalm.* 118 phe 3 p. 507,25; *syn.* 80; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 6,2; 31,1; Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 1,14. In Greek the formula would seem to be even less common: for μάρτυς ὁ κύριος cf. Asterius the Sophist, *hom.* (Richard) 25,5 and Ps.-Chrysostom, *theoph.* I p. 805. The phrase had

¹³ *Testis est deus* is an 'everyday phrase' according to Ps.-Augustine (= Ambrosiaster), *quest. test. app. vet.* 2,3.

been used in the LXX at 1 Reg. 12,5; 12,6; 20,23; 20,42; for μάρτυς ... ὁ θεός cf. Rom. 1,9; Phil. 1,8; 1 Thess. 2,5 (Θ. μ.).

post multas lacrimas. At the end of the ch. J. recapitulates the tribulations described earlier in it. He uses the same device in the account of his dream (p. 191,11–3).

interesse agminibus angelorum. On occasion J. succeeded in overcoming the flesh and achieving ecstasy: *agmina angelorum* replaced *chori puellarum*. A band of angels again fills the ascetic's cell at [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 57,134. On the monk's angelic company cf. (?) Chrysostom, *comp.* 3 τὸν μοναχὸν ... ἀγγέλους συμβιοτεύοντα; Asterius of Amvedunum, *ad Renat.* l. 191 *erigi se putavit ad caelum chorisque angelicis iungi* (sc. *monachus*). Cassian records that Pafnutius was thought to enjoy the company of angels every day in remote parts of the desert (*conf.* 3,1,3), while Tertullian had described how a member of the congregation had visions and consorted with angels, sometimes even with the Lord (*anim.* 9,4; Waszink [1947] ad loc. compares Nemesius, *nat. hom.* l. p. 533^B). Martyrs too had been said to 'stand among the angels' at the time of their passion (Cyprian, *epist.* 31,3). At Ps.-Chrysostom, *prec.* 2 p. 779 the experience of being among angels is the consequence of prayer; it comes from fasting according to (Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* l. p. 317^D. It had also been mentioned at Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 2,7.¹⁴

laetus gaudensque. For the phrase cf. *TLL* VI,2, 1710,65ff. (add Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 20 l. 562). On *-que* cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 473ff.; Löfstedt (1942), II, p. 341 *-que* war ... in der Kaiserzeit der volkstümlichen Sprache fremd'. According to Gillis, pp. 22ff., it occurs less frequently in J.'s letters than in his other works. J. has *-que* in the *Libellus* another 16 times (it nowhere connects two clauses). Harendza, p. 60, observes that in the present passage it has been chosen for the sake of the clausula: *gaudensque cantabam*.

post te in odorem. The account concludes on a note of exaltation. Citation of Cant. 1,3 at the end of a ch. which is almost free of biblical quotation produces a particularly effective climax.¹⁵ J. uses this verse rather sparingly elsewhere: *in Is.* 7,19,18 l. 28; *in Matth.* 25,1 l. 725; *tract. in Marc.* p. 366,29; cf. *tract. in psalm.* l. p. 277 l. 45. The same sequence of background, tribulation and relief which marks this ch. is also found in the account of J.'s dream (ch. 30).

¹⁴ In connection with J.'s statement in the present passage Simon, l. p. 173, observes: 'es erscheint zumindest als äusserst zweifelhaft, ob er ... echte mystische Erlebnisse schildert'.

¹⁵ Testard (1993), p. 204, notes with reference to J.'s use of this text that Canticles 'apparaît chez les Pères ... comme le sommet de l'Écriture'.

Chapter 8

Having demonstrated the power of temptation J. now proceeds to offer practical advice on the way to combat it. The virgin must accordingly avoid wine, which is uniquely dangerous as an inciter of the passions. Paul's apparent endorsement of the use of wine is dismissed and the ch. concludes with three episodes from the Old Testament which illustrate how insobriety leads to lust.

In the next ch. J. deals with food (cf. also 8,4). Food and drink were a personal preoccupation of J.'s (cf. 30,1); hence their prominence in the *Libellus*. At the same time they had also come first in Liberius' exhortation to the virgin (Ambrose, *virg.* 3,2,5ff.; cf. also n. on 8,2 *non sic avaritia quatit ...*).

8,1

exeso corpore. There is a detailed and extensive description of this process in Basil, *ep.* 45,1.

quid patitur puella, quae deliciis fruitur? Here J. repeats the sequence of thought and sentence structure of the beginning of ch. 6.

vivens mortua est. J. refers to 1 Tim. 5,6 again at 38,2 below. He cites the text often: it recurs ten times in his *oeuvre*. Cyprian, *testim.* 3,74 also quotes it.

si experto creditur. J. mentions his gourmet past at 30,1 below. Hagendahl (1958), p. 110, thinks the words are a reminiscence of Vergil, *Aen.* 11,283 *experto credite*; the idea was however common (cf. *TLL* IV, 1143,49ff.). J. cites this verse of the *Aeneid* at *epist.* 50,4,2 and 84,3,5.

hoc ... moneo, hoc obtestor. J. also adjures the reader at 6,4 (*obsecro*) and 23,2 (*obtestor*). On this combination of *moneo* and *obtestor* (or cognate forms) cf. *TLL* VIII, 1408,29; IX,2, 281,21ff. (add Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 54,1; 66,1; 73,5; 189,4; 201,2; 209,4). At *epist.* 23,4,1 J. himself has *moneo et ... contestor*.

ut ... vinum fugiat pro veneno. This statement created a furore among the opponents of asceticism, who charged J. with rashness and heresy for making it (cf. *in Eph.* 5,18 p. 528^A): wine was after all a part of every Roman's daily diet (cf. Janini Cuesta, pp. 14ff.). At *in Gal.* 5,19 p. 417^D J. insists that he had been referring to the effect of wine rather than to God's creature. Wine is again poison at *epist.* 52,11,4; this time however J. tones his language down considerably: *quodsi absque vino ardeo ... libenter carebo poculo, in quo suspicio veneni*

est. J.'s striking paronomasia (*vinum / venenum*) is copied by several writers: Ambrose, *Hel.* 14,51 (*vinā praetendis, venena suffundis*);¹ Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 1 pp. 1106 and 1107;² Orientius, *comm.* 2,52 *ne ... vina venena fiant*.³ J. himself would seem to have taken a hint from Tertullian, *ieiun.* 3 p. 277,19 *cibum ... pro veneno deputarem*; his own paronomasia has enhanced his source in characteristic fashion.

The sentence in which J. issues this admonition is very carefully written. It starts with twofold anaphora (*si ... si; hoc ... hoc*). In each case the two clauses are of decreasing length; the first one also contains an impressive hyperbaton (*si quid ... consilii*), which generates an elegant cretic tribrach clausula.⁴ To this are added the paronomasia of *vinum / venenum* and what may be a Vergilian echo (*si experio creditur*). J.'s opening precept could not have been given a more powerful formulation.

8,2

arma ... daemonum. Military vocabulary is again applied to demons at *adv. Iovin.* 1,35 and in *Eph.* 3,13 p. 485⁵. Chrysostom is notably partial to this imagery. At *hom. in I Cor.* 3,4 he speaks of δαιμόνων ὀπλιζομένων; at *exp. in Ps.* 45,3 he refers to πόλεμον ... τὸν τῶν δαιμόνων. He mentions δαιμόνων φάλαγγες at *exp. in Ps.* 109,6; 139,1; 147,4; *hom. in Rom.* 15,4; *hom. div.* 5,2; 5,3; 7,1; cf. Ps.-Chrysostom, *Petr. et Paul.* 1; *ador.* 2 p. 752 (φ. καὶ παράταξις). In the present passage Hritz, p. 79, notes the hyperbaton, which this time produces a very graceful double cretic clausula.

non sic avaritia quatit, inflat superbia, delectat ambitio. The same priority had been given to teetotalism at Basil, *ascet. disc.* 2 καὶ πρὸ γε πάντων χρή μοναχὸν ἐγκρατεῦσθαι ... ἀπὸ οἰνοποσίας; cf. also Cassian, *inst.* 5,11,1 *gastrimargia ... contra quam nobis primus conflictus est*. J. deals with avarice at 31,1 below, with pride at 27,5 (cf. 3,1), and with ambition at 16,1 (cf. 41,5). All these vices have nothing to do with sexuality and are therefore in J.'s opinion less serious: he can accordingly postpone discussion of them until later.⁶ His priorities were not accepted universally: Chrysostom (*hom. in Rom.* 13,10) asserts that insobriety is less serious than greed.

¹ Ambrose is careful to add a justificatory gloss: *omne enim quidquid nocet venenum est*.

² This tract has been tentatively assigned to the fourth century: the twofold echo in question here would appear to supply a *terminus a quo* of 384; cf. Adkin (1993c).

³ Cf. also Isidore of Seville, *orig.* 20,3,2.

⁴ It corresponds accentually to the *cursus tardus*.

⁵ J. remarks at *epist.* 54,9,2 that greed can be put away with the purse.

For J.'s wording here Deléani, p. 69, detects a source in no fewer than four passages of Cyprian: *tenacibus semper inlecebris necesse est ... vinolentia invitet, inflat superbia, iracundia inflammet, rapacitas inquietet, crudelitas stimulet, ambitio delectet, libido praecipitet (ad Donat. 3); cum avaritia nobis, cum impudicitia, cum ira, cum ambitione congressio est ... si avaritia prostrata est, exurgit libido; si libido compressa est, succedit ambitio; si ambitio contempta est, ira exasperat, inflat superbia, vinolentia invitat (mortal. 4); aut enim superbia inflatus es aut avaritia rapax es aut iracundia saevus ... aut vinolentia temulentus (Demetr. 10); superbia inflat (unit. eccl. 16). She might have added *zel. 6 inflatur superbia, exacerbatur saevitia* (Hartel, p. 423, reads *inflat ... exacerbat* with some MSS), *perfidia praeviticatur, impatientia concutit, furit discordia, ira fervescit*.*

It may be remarked in the first place that enumerations like J.'s comprising a nominative with its attendant verb are conventional; cf. (e.g.) Augustine, *lib. arb.* 1,78 *quaquaversum potest coartare avaritia, dissipare luxuria, addicere ambitio, inflare superbia, torquere invidia, desidia sepelire, pervicacia concitare, adflictere subiectio*. As far as J.'s specific phraseology is concerned, Deléani's four Cyprianic passages supply no parallel for the first element of his list: *avaritia quatit*. The second is *inflat superbia*; while this phrase is found in Cyprian, it must be said that the collocation of these two words is exceedingly common. Augustine alone provides the following instances: *bapt.* 5,17,23; *enchir.* 9,30; *epist.* 140,77; 155,4; *in euang. Ioh.* 1,15; *c. Julian.* 5,1,1; *lib. arb.* 1,78; *in psalm.* 1,4; 17,43; 73,24; 85,3; *serm.* 50,2; 53A,2 *coll. Marin* p. 627,30; 77,11; 348,1; 353,1. The particular nominative construction found in the *Libellus (inflat superbia)* is also well attested elsewhere; cf. (e.g.) Augustine, *lib. arb.* 1,78; *in psalm.* 1,4; *serm.* 348,1. The wording of the final component of J.'s tricolon (*delectat ambitio*) occurs in one of the passages from Cyprian. It may however be noted that J. also employs the same phrase in a quite different context elsewhere in the *Libellus* (41,5). Moreover the formulation is already found as early as Seneca (*dial.* 10,17,6). Hritzu, p. 88, notes the chiasmic parison of J.'s elegant sentence.

facile aliis caremus virtis. This point had already been made by Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *pudic.* 11,3 *malum omne facilius vincitur quam voluptas*. J. says the same of vainglory at 27,4 below.

hic hostis intus inclusus est, quocumque pergimus, nobiscum portamus inimicum. Wine is an 'enemy within'. J. has lifted this statement from Cyprian, *zel.* 9, where envy had been discussed in the following terms: *ubicumque fueris, adversarius tuus tecum est, hostis semper in pectore est, pernicies intus inclusa est, ineluctabili catenarum nexu ligatus et vinctus es, zelo dominante captivus es, nec*

solacia tibi ulla subveniunt. J. has transformed Cyprian's graceful sequence of parallel clauses into a characteristically incisive formulation: he ignores the latter half of the sentence from *ineluctabili* onwards, reverses the order of the remainder, sharpens the wording of Cyprian's first two clauses and compresses the next two into one. The effect is unquestionably dazzling. Unfortunately the passage which J. has appropriated does not quite fit its new context. What J. says applies to an innate vice: however it is inappropriate to wine, which we do not 'carry with us wherever we go'. Such inconcinnities which result from the incorporation of striking material from elsewhere typify J.'s work.⁶

The idea of the 'enemy within' was something of a commonplace. It is used of bodily passions by J. himself at *epist.* 14,6,3; 54,9,3 (ib. 1 Cor. 6,18); 66,12,2; and also at Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 5,2 p. 316,16; Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *pudic.* 11,2; Lactantius, *inst.* 6,20,3; Ambrose, *hex.* 1,8,31;⁷ *Iac.* 2,6,29; *in Luc.* 10,11; *in psalm.* 43,1,2; *in psalm. 118 serm.* 11,24,2; Augustine, *epist.* 145,4; *in psalm.* 70, *serm.* 1,6; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 23,17; Cassian, *inst.* 5,21,1; Epiphanius Latinus, *in ewang.* 21 p. 29,5; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 119,3. The 'enemy within' is wealth at Cyprian, *laps.* 11. It is again envy at Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 90,5. Ps.-Basil has perhaps been inspired by the present passage when he applies the idea to wine: *ebriosus intra se per vinum suscipit inimicum* (*ad fil.* 14 l. 426).

On 'carrying your enemy around with you' cf. further Clement of Alexandria, *q. d. s.* 25,5 τὸν γὰρ ἐχθρὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιάγει πανταχοῦ; Stählin *ad loc.* compares Plato, *Soph.* 252c τὸ λεγόμενον οἰκοθεν τὸν πολέμιον καὶ ἐναντιωσόμενον ἔχοντες, ἐντὸς ὑποφθεγγόμενον ... περιφέροντες. Later Chrysostom applies the idea to the virgin at *poenit.* 3,3; cf. also 'Eusebius Gallicanus', *hom.* 38,2 *quocumque loci vadis, te tecum portas*.

For the pleonasm *intus inclusus* cf. *TLL* VII,1, 956,47ff.

vinum et adulescentia duplex incendium voluptatis. J. would appear to have taken this statement from Ambrose, *virg.* 3,2,5 *incendant* ...

⁶ At *epist.* 14,6,3 J. had stated *intus inclusum est periculum, intus est hostis*. These words have been lifted verbatim from Cicero, *Catil.* 2,11. In J. they now refer to the body's innate lasciviousness. Again however he has failed to integrate his borrowing satisfactorily into the new context: hence editors and translators connect it with what precedes (*licet in marem stagni fuscum aequor adrideat* ...) and think the meaning is 'there is danger in its (sc. the sea's) depths, the foe is lurking there' (Fremantle, p. 15). The idea of a submarine Satan is of course absurd! It would seem that *Catil.* 2,11 has also had some influence on J.'s wording in the *Libellus*.

⁷ The phrasing of this Ambrosian text would likewise appear to have been influenced by *Catil.* 2,11; the same is evidently true of the two Augustinian passages cited below, which should accordingly be added to the dossiers of borrowings in Testard (1958) and Hagendahl (1967).

pariter duo. vinum et adolescentia. Again he has enhanced the rhetorical impact of the material he has appropriated. Ps.-Basil, *const.* 1,4 also connects wine and youth: ἐπεβλήθη τῇ νεότητι οἶνος, ἀπόλετο ἡ σωφροσύνη.

J. notes that wine generates lasciviousness at *epist.* 69,9,1; *adv. Iovin.* 1,34; *in Gal.* 5,19 p. 417^c (*vino ... libido succenditur*; the maxim occurs in the same form at Ambrose, *paenit.* 1,14,76); cf. also Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,18.⁸ J. remarks further that chastity and drink are incompatible (*in Tit.* 2,3 p. 581^A). The same view is expressed by Ambrose, *vid.* 7,40 and Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 3 p. 1110.

quid oleum flammae adicimus? For the proverbial expression cf. Otto, p. 253 s.v. *oleum* 2, and Häussler, p. 316 (no. 1283). J. uses it again at *epist.* 77,7,1 (of Fabiola's thirst for knowledge) and 125,11,1 (on dainty food). It may be noted that Ps.-Basil gives this proverb the same application as in the present passage: wine sets the passions burning as oil to a flame (*Is.* 5,156, which should be added to the dossier in Otto and Häussler).

ardenti corpusculo fomenta ignium ministramus. The foregoing proverb (cf. previous n.) is now immediately followed by a second one. For the proverbial *ignis in igne* cf. Otto, p. 170 s.v. *ignis* 3, and Häussler, p. 310 (no. 844), to which should be added Lucan 7,559 as well as the present passage and the first three patristic texts to be adduced below.

Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 8 had already warned against stoking the body's heat with wine and adding fire to fire. Likewise Eusebius of Emesa had declared *puellae ... iuvenes cum vino — flamma cum flamma* (*serm.* 6,9). Ps.-Basil also notes that inside the flesh the fire of wine inflames the fiery darts of the enemy (*Is.* 5,156). In addition wine is tinder to the passions according to (Ps.-)Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,32,105f. and Chrysostom, *catech.* (Wenger) 5,3.⁹

8,3

vinum modicum utere. J. proceeds to deal with the apparently conflicting testimony of 1 Tim. 5,23. At *in Gal.* 5,19 p. 417^d he refers

⁸ The same idea is given fourfold expression by Isidore of Seville, *synon.* 2,15.

⁹ Cf. also Isidore of Seville, *synon.* 2,15. Deléani, p. 69, n. 29, suggests that J.'s wording in the present passage of the *Libellus* is due to Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 18 *temeritate convivio quibus libidinum fomes accenditur*; since however the evidence adduced above shows the idea to have been commonplace, such a supposition would appear to be unwarranted. In particular Deléani traces J.'s *fomenta ignium* to the Cyprianic *libidinum fomes*; however both collocations are attested elsewhere (on *fomenta ignium* cf. *TLL* VI,1, 1019,63ff. [s.v. *fomentum*] *paratum*; for *libidinum fomes* cf. *ib.* 1021,22f. [s.v. *fomes*]).

to the text in order to rebut criticism of the present work; it serves a similarly apologetic purpose at *epist.* 52,11,4. Elsewhere J. tries to qualify the text. When he mentions it at *epist.* 54,10,1 and in *Ezech.* 44,17 l. 1574, J. stresses the therapeutic value (*propter stomachum*); he does the same in the present passage. In applying the verse to Marcella, he speaks of *vini odor magis quam gustus* (*epist.* 127,4,2). It shows Timothy drank water (*adv. Iovin.* 2,15). J. finds the precept suitable for youth at *epist.* 107,8,2. Only on one occasion however does he quote the text with unqualified approval (in *Ezech.* 44,6 l. 1321).

This Pauline text had already occurred in the following works on virginity: Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 12 (lest physical infirmity impede the service of the good); Athanasius, *virg.* 12; Ambrose, *virg.* 3,2,5 (because of ill-health); cf. also Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,18.¹⁰ The medicinal use of wine is permitted at Basil, *ascet.* 1,4; Sulpicius Severus, *Mart.* 10,7; (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 62,16; cf. also 35,4 below.

In this quotation *uti* is used with the accusative. J. himself employs this construction at *epist.* 60,12,4 and *tract. in psalm.* II p. 423 l. 119; it also occurs at *epist.* 133,5,4 (a Pelagian quote; cf. 133,5,3 *per soloecismorum ... spineta*). The accusative after *uti* tends to occur chiefly in writing of the less fastidious kind. Examples are found at Tertullian, *fug.* 6,1; *test. anim.* 4 p. 140,8; Cyprian, *epist.* 72,1,3; *Vita Antonii* 28 pp. 43,9 and 43,15; Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira), *tract.* 4,29; 15,29; 19,14; Gregory of Elvira, *in cant.* 5,4; Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 26,20; *Didascalia apostolorum* 4,21; 55,4; 56,10; 56,13; Ps.-Pacian, *sim. carn.* p. 109,13; Rufinus, *Adamant.* 1,9; 1,22; *Orig. in gen.* 13,3 p. 117,8 (most MSS have abl.); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *in Gal.* 1,1; 4,24; 4,26; *in Eph.* 4,8; 4,14; 5,9; 5,15; *in Phil.* 2,19; *in 2 Tim.* 4,2; Origen, *comm. ser. in Mt.* 50 p. 111,24; Commodian, *apol.* 359; Ambobius Junior, *ad Greg.* 8 p. 397,22; 19 p. 427,9; Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 15 p. 10,20; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 42,4.

licet et apostolus sit medicus spiritalis. The idea is a cliché. J.'s inability to resist inserting it here has weakened his own argument, since it blurs the distinction he is making between 'doctor' and 'apostle' (*medici potius consilio quam apostoli*).

As in the present passage, *medicus spiritalis* had recently been used to describe St. Paul in several passages of Ambrosiaster: *in I Cor.* 3,2,1; 9,20; 10,24; *in Rom.* 6,19,2; for the same application later cf.

¹⁰ In the present passage of the *Libellus Vidén*, p. 145, believes that 'the juxtaposition of the word *aqua* with the words that denote fire is conspicuous and perhaps not due to chance'. Such a view would seem unlikely: it is clear that both igneous metaphor and biblical verse are mere commonplaces in such contexts.

Cassian, *instr.* 10,7,1 and Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 182,1. Jesus Christ had already been a fleshly and spiritual doctor in Ignatius, *Eph.* 7,2; cf. later the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 21 p. 748 and Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 100,1. The priest is a *medicus spiritualis* according to Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 2,23,2; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 5,5 (*nos*; cf. 59,7); 43,9; 57,1. The name is given to the monk by the following: Cassian, *conl.* 22,6,2; *instr.* 12,20; *Commonitiones sanctorum patrum* 2,7. A correspondent is called *medicus spiritualis* by Paulinus of Nola at *epist.* 29,3 and 45,4. The title also occurs several times in Chrysostom: *catech.* (Wenger) 7,5 (on martyrs); 7,9; *hom. in Mt.* 23,10. J. himself uses the formula again at *tract. in Is.* p. 97,4 and *in Mal.* 3,13 l. 389; on both occasions it denotes the prophets (cf. also the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 46 p. 895). J. also speaks of *chirurgici spirituales* (*epist.* 40,1,3) and ironically of *spiritualis Hippocrates* (c. *Ioh.* 38). On Christ as *medicus caelestis* cf. *TLL VIII*, 551,62f. (add Gaudentius, *serm.* 8,30). On the idea cf. further Arbesmann (1954).

evangelii praedicandi ... habere discursus. On the gerundive cf. *TLL V*, 1,2, 1369,38 (s.v. *discursus*). For the phrase which J. uses here cf. *tract.* p. 504 l. 52 *habent diversas discursus* (sc. *pedes*).

vinum, in quo est luxuria. J. tendentiously omits the two words that precede: *nolite inebriari vino, in quo est luxuria*. He cites Eph. 5,18 often: it is found in his works on no fewer than sixteen occasions. Ambrose and Augustine on the other hand quote this text only four times each.

bonum est homini vinum non bibere et carnem non manducare. Rom. 14,21 is not a general precept but concerns the observation of food taboos. At *epist.* 79,7,6 J. combines it again with Eph. 5,18. He cites it in conjunction with Exod. 32,6 and 1 Tim. 5,23 as well as Eph. 5,18 at *in Ezech.* 44,17 l. 1570; the same collocation occurs here.¹¹

8,4

Noe vinum bibit. J. turns to exemplification from the Old Testament: the cases he adduces are Noah, Lot and the Golden Calf episode. All three examples had already been combined by both Basil (*renunt.* 7) and Ambrose (*virg.* 1,8,53); in view of J.'s apparent references to the latter passage at 2,2 above (cf. nn. on *inter angelos ... and mundum subiciat ...*), it has evidently been his source here.

At *epist.* 69,9,1 J. regrets that an hour's drunkenness made Noah bare the thighs he had kept covered in abstemiousness through six

¹¹ On avoidance of meat in early Christianity cf. Lutterbach.

centuries. Elsewhere J. takes a positive view of Noah's intoxication: in *Am.* 9,13 l. 436; in *Mich.* 2,11 l. 479; in *Agg.* 1,6 l. 260; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 267 l. 181, where Noah drinks spiritual wine. Noah is a type of Christ at *epist.* 73,3,1 and *c. Lucif.* 22; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 77 l. 44 and Cyprian, *epist.* 63,3; Augustine, *civ.* 16,2 p. 123,2.

rudi adhuc saeculo. J.'s striking phrase is taken over by Eucherius, *instr.* I p. 75,9.

inebriare vinum forsitan nesciebat. This excuse had already been made on Noah's behalf in the following passages: Origen, *sel. in Gen.* 9,20; Eusebius of Emesa, *fr. Gen.* 9,23; Basil, *hom.* 1,5; Ambrose, *Abr.* 1,6,58; cf. also Ambrose, *Hel.* 5,10; [Ps.]-Ambrose, *apol. Dav.* II 3,18. According to Epiphanius, *haer.* 63,3,8 Noah was tired and depressed.

scripturae ... sacramentum. This impressive formulation had already occurred in Ps.-Cyprian, *adv. Iud.* 5,4. J. himself repeats it at *in Gal.* 4,24 p. 390^B; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 263 l. 63. It is found later in Augustine (*c. Adim.* 12; *serm.* 2,6; 2,7) and Cassian (*inst.* 5,34).

margarita quippe est sermo dei. Exactly the same arresting metaphor is used by Chrysostom, *hom. div.* 7,2 μαργαρίτης ... ἔστιν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, διὰ πάντων ἀπολάμπων. It was customary to identify the pearls of Mt. 7,6 ('neither cast ye your pearls before swine') with the word of God. Such an interpretation of the text had been given by Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 21,2 p. 430,5; cf. also *sel. in Ps.* 20,4 (λόγοι) and *comm. ser. in Mt.* 71 p. 168,8 (scriptural exegesis). It had also occurred in Athanasius, *virg.* 9; cf. later Chrysostom, *hom. in Jo.* 1,3; Augustine, *in psalm.* 16,13; Isidore of Pelusium, *ep.* 4,181. Because they are hard to fish up, the pearls of Mt. 7,6 are the divine mysteries of scripture according to the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 17 p. 728. A similar exegesis was applied to Mt. 13,45 ('the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls'). At *in Matth.* 13,45 l. 1026 J. identifies the goodly pearls as the Old Testament, while the New Testament is the 'one pearl of great price' which the merchant found. His explanation derives from Origen, who had equated the pearls of this passage with the prophets (*comm. in Mt.* 10,8 p. 9,21; cf. also *fr. in Mt.* 308 and later Proclus of Constantinople, *or.* 4,2). Caesarius of Arles appears to echo the present passage of the *Libellus* when he observes *divinae scripturae margarita multis modis intellegi vel aptari potest* (*serm.* 119,2). Eucherius, *form.* 7 p. 47,11 lays down the general principle: *margarita doctrina evangelica.*

Here the point of J.'s comparison of God's word to a pearl is that it can be approached from different angles: he is referring of course to the multiple senses of scripture (cf. next n.). Again it is Chrysostom who uses the metaphor of the pearl in a similar fashion: in connection with

scripture's various senses he observes (*hom. in Ps. 115,1-3* [Haidacher] p. 355,16) δεῦρο πάλιν τρέψωμεν τὸν μαργαρίτην τοῦ λόγου. The way in which a pearl can be rotated suggests a further metaphorical application at *hom. in Jo. 88,3*, where Chrysostom likens spiritual things to a pearl: whichever way you turn them, they delight the eye. A final passage may be cited from this author: at *hom. in 1 Tim. 14,6* he sees a resemblance between the diversity of pearls and the many paths of virtue.

J. is particularly fond of using the imagery of pearls. He compares virginity itself to a pearl at 20,1 of this work. The metaphor occurs frequently in his letters. At *epist. 10,3,2* he had spoken of pearls with reference to the commentaries of Fortunatian. He had compared papal authority to one in 15,1,2. At a later date the death of Paulina means that a precious pearl has been shattered (66,1,2). Widowhood is a pearl in 79,7,8. Finally at 107,8,3 he uses the image in connection with the fasting of a Christian virgin.

J.'s very striking phraseology in the present passage so impressed Cassiodorus that he quotes it at *in psalm. praef. l. 119* (*de quo pulchre pater Hieronymus ait: margaritum ...*). Gorce (1925), p. 177 notes its aptness: 'une gracieuse image, bien faite pour frapper une imagination féminine'. J. achieves a similar effect in his treatise on widowhood when he says that the widow's ears should be pierced with the word of God (*epist. 54,11,2*); this charming image is copied by Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg. 2,3,11*. Such bold and captivating language is not however unique to J. Augustine declares that the treasure of scripture contains precious necklaces (*discipl. 2,2*); the same metaphor had already been used by Origen (*hom. in Gen. 8,1 p. 77,17*).

ex omni parte forari potest. Because it is like a pearl the word of God can be pierced from all sides. J. is referring to the multiple (generally threefold) interpretation of scripture: literal, moral, anagogical. Here he has in mind the moral lesson to be drawn from Noah's undressing through insobriety: this is the *scripturae ... sacramentum* mentioned at the beginning of the sentence.

At *epist. 120,12,8* J. states that exegesis is threefold according to history, tropology and spiritual understanding: the triple division is mentioned again at *in Or. 2,2 l. 54* and *in Gal. 5,19 p. 414^C*. Its terms vary: *in Ezech. 16,30 l. 317* has *iuxta litteram ... per tropologiam ... mystica*; *in Am. 4,4 l. 196* classifies *secundum litteram ... iuxta allegoriam, id est intellegentiam spiritalem ... secundum futurorum beatitudinem*.¹² The division goes back to Origen: cf. *hom. in Gen. 2,6*

¹² For J.'s own practice cf. most recently Jay (1985).

p. 36,21; *hom. in Lev.* 5,5 p. 344,8 (historic, moral, mystic); *hom. in Num.* 9,7 p. 64,11 (ib. Prov. 22,20 τρισσῶς); *princ.* 4,2,4 (in terms of body, soul and spirit).

Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira), *tract.* 5,1 distinguishes the prophetic, historical and figurative. At *util. cred.* 3,5 Augustine gives a fourfold classification according to history, aetiology, analogy and allegory. Cassian, *conf.* 14,8,1 makes a distinction between historical and spiritual understanding, while suggesting three subdivisions of the second: *tropologia*, *allegoria*, *anagoge*. Eucherius repeats Origen's human analogy in terms of body, soul and spirit (*form. praef.*); he also mentions a school that adds allegory as a fourth.

On the piercing of precious stones cf. J.'s comment at *in Is.* 15,54,11 l. 23 *foratarum caelatarumque gemmarum*. According to Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 1,6 l. 7 they are painstakingly (*artē*) pierced in order to hang. J. would seem to be alone in applying this characteristically bold image to the exegesis of scripture.

post ebrietatem nudatio femorum subsecuta est, libido iuncta luxuriae. For the connection of insobriety and lust cf. Tertullian, *spect.* 10 p. 12,19 *duo ista daemonia* (sc. *Venus et Liber*) *conspirata et coniurata inter se sunt ebrietatis et libidinis*; Chrysostom, *hom. in Col.* 12,6 ὄπου γὰρ μέθη, ἀκολασία. It would seem that J. is alone in putting this interpretation on Noah's behaviour. Ambrose instead exculpates Noah somewhat later at *Hel.* 5,10: he undressed through ignorance, not intemperance.

J.'s form of expression is elegantly chiasmic. At the same time it would seem that once again he has borrowed material from elsewhere. In the following sentence J. quotes Exod. 32,6. Tertullian had cited the same verse at *adv. Marc.* 2,18 p. 360,3; there he had commented *agnosce simul et comitibus gulae, libidini scilicet atque luxuriae, prospectum*. The striking collocation *libido atque luxuria* would appear to be the source of J.'s *libido iuncta luxuriae*. While however in Tertullian the two nouns are virtually synonymous, J. tries to use them antithetically. The attempt is not wholly successful.¹³ Again J. has failed to achieve an entirely satisfactory integration of material he has appropriated from elsewhere.

prius venter et statim cetera. These very striking words have been lifted almost without modification from Tertullian, *ieium.* 1 p. 274,9 *prior venter et statim cetera*.¹⁴ J. gives no indication that the words

¹³ *Libido* and *luxuria* are used synonymously with very great frequency; cf. *TLI* VII.2.2. 1337,12ff. It may be noted that J. later makes *luxuria* the 'mother' of *libido* (*epist.* 55,2,3; cf. Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,26).

¹⁴ Moreschini (1988), p. 134, n. 9, observes: 'Il passo di *epist.* 22,8 (*libido iuncta*

have been borrowed; they are clearly meant to appear as a brilliant formulation of his own. They were too concise for one branch of the manuscript tradition (Hilberg's Σ, D and B), which expands as follows: *prius venter extenditur et sic cetera membra concitantur* (so *PL* 22, p. 399). J.'s theft is all the more significant, since not one of his predecessors or contemporaries would seem to have appropriated these words.¹⁵

Again the incorporation of this impressive dictum has led to a slight inconcinnity. In this ch. J. is dealing with the problem of insobriety. An aphorism about the *venter* on the other hand applies properly to food; this is how it is used in Tertullian. Accordingly in the present context it is not quite *à propos*.¹⁶

The borrowing shows that Petitmengin (1988), p. 55, is mistaken to say that J. does not cite the *De ieiunio* before 386. It also proves that the punctuation of this passage of the Tertullianic treatise in the latest critical edition (Reifferscheid-Wissowa, p. 1257) is likewise wrong: *prior venter, et statim cetera saginae substructa lascivia est*. Here Kroymann (1893), p. 95, wished to insert a semicolon after *cetera*. He failed to adduce the *Libellus*; however J.'s imitation shows that Kroymann's suggestion is correct.¹⁷

manducavit enim populus et bibit, et surrexerunt ludere. Whereas Tertullian's *prior venter et statim cetera* (*ieiun.* I p. 274,9; cf. previous n.) had been followed by two further restatements of the same point (*saginae substructa lascivia est; per edacitatem salacitas transit*), J. on the other hand combines a direct quotation of scripture (Exod. 32,6) with the *bon mot* he has borrowed from the *De ieiunio*. Such linkage of a biblical citation to rhetorically striking material that has been appropriated from elsewhere is another characteristic feature of J.'s method of composition in the *Libellus*.

Iustitiae. prius venter et statim cetera ...) richiama Tert., *ieiun.* I (... *ipso prius ventris pudenda non adhaerent. specta corpus et una regio est*). Moreschini merely registers a similarity of thought and overlooks a verbatim theft. Such inattention to J.'s partiality for lifting flashy phrases from elsewhere is normal.

¹⁵ The statement holds for Greek as well as Latin Fathers. There is no explicit evidence that the *De renunio* was translated into Greek, as were other works of Tertullian (cf. Dekkers [1953], p. 196). However J.'s *Libellus* was available in Greek within a few years of its publication; cf. *vir. ill.* 134. It may be noted that in Greek the formulation *πρωτὴ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μέλη τῆς σαρκὸς ἐκταναίονται*, which is of course rather different, was a commonplace; cf. n. on *nullo illis nisi ventris cura ...* at 29,5 below.

¹⁶ *Manducavit* in the subsequent citation of Exod. 32,6 softens the inconcinnity; however J. at once resumes his discussion of inebriety.

¹⁷ At the same time J.'s use of these words suggests that Kroymann is wrong to explain *cetera* as signifying *pudenda*. The term would seem rather to be a euphemism for *lascivia*.

J. quotes Exod. 32,6 half a dozen times; at *in Gal.* 5,19 p. 418^a he adds the gloss *semper ebrietati iuncta luxuria est*. Already Tertullian had remarked that the sport would not have been censured if it had not been immodest (*ieiun.* 6 p. 280,12; cf. also *adv. Marc.* 2,18 p. 360,1). On *ludere* of sexual activity cf. Adams, pp. 162f. (and *TLL* VII,2,2, 1773,81ff.). The text had been included in Cyprian's *testimonia* (3,60). Souter (1912), p. 150, points out that it is cited already at 1 Cor. 10,7. Ambrose quotes the verse with even greater frequency than J.; it was noted above (on *Noe vinum bibit*) that in *virg.* 1,8,53 he had combined it with Noah and Lot.

8,5

Loth ... inebriatur. J. concludes the ch. with a very impressive description of the case of Lot. In this final example J. avoids an explicit statement that intoxication led to licentiousness and that Lot actually lay with his daughters.¹⁸

At *epist.* 69,9,1 J. observes that wine defeated the man whom Sodom did not (Origen had made the point at *hom. in Gen.* 5,3 p. 61,5); in the same passage J. also mentions Noah. The stories had already been linked at Basil, *renunt.* 7 and Ambrose, *virg.* 1,8,53; both add Exod. 32,6. Noah and Lot are again combined in Ambrose, *Hel.* 5,10; *in psalm. 118 serm.* 16,11,2; [Ps.]-Ambrose, *apol. Dav.* 11 3,18.

amicus dei. Hilberg compared Jas. 2,23 (of Abraham; cf. Judith 8,22). The phrase *amicus dei* is also used at *Wisd. Sol.* 7,27. The offspring of Lot's match are *inimici Israel* at the end of the account (p. 156,6). Here *amicus dei* opens a striking tricolon crescens, which forms a fittingly impressive introduction to the story.

de tot millibus populis. In fact five cities were affected; so (e.g.) *sit. et nom.* p. 43 l. 9. However the population of the district is again said to have been enormous at Ps.-Ambrose *laps. virg.* 41 (*in totis quinque civitatibus innumerabiles ... habitabant populi*). Instead of *populis* some of Hilberg's MSS have *populi* (for this locution cf. *Vulg. psalm.* 3,7 *milia populi circumdantis*). For the abl. *populis* cf. *epist.* 82,7,2 (*sex milia ... tomos*); *in Is.* 9,30,23^s l. 37 (*quattuor milia viros*); and also *TLL* VIII, 977.69ff.

solus iustus inventus. This cliché is applied to Noah at Gregory of Elvira, *de arca* 5; *Collectio Avellana* 2,69; Rufinus, *Orig. in Is.* 1,1 p. 288,7; *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 1,17 p. 20,3; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 5; it is used of Abraham at Ps.-Augustine, *vit. Christ.*

¹⁸ Avoidance of express mention of the deed entails twofold use of *hoc* and threefold repetition of *facere* in the space of three lines (p. 156,2-4).

7.

licet putarent genus hominum defecisse. J. gives the same reason at *quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 30,16. It goes back to Philo, *quaest. in Gen.* 4,56 and is repeated in the following passages: Irenaeus 4,31,2 (SC 100**); Origen, *Cels.* 4,45; Ps.-Chrysostom, *synops.* p. 319; Sulpicius Severus, *chron.* 1,6,7. On similar lines Origen says at *hom. in Gen.* 5,4 p. 62,2 that Lot's daughters wanted to replenish the human race; according to Ambrose they wanted to save it from annihilation (*Abr.* 1,4,24 and 1,6,56).

An alternative explanation of their behaviour is also found: they feared extinction of the clan and obscurity according to Chrysostom, *hom. in Gen.* 44,4; cf. also Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Gen.* 19,31.

liberorum magis desiderio quam libidinis. Hilberg failed to note that this is evidently an echo of Tob. 6,22 *amore filiorum magis quam libidinis ductus*; cf. Adkin (1995a). J. gives no hint that these words are a quotation of the Bible. Here he has simply appropriated a striking phrase, which in typical fashion he proceeds to improve stylistically: an arresting paronomasia (*liberorum / libidinis*; cf. Harendza, p. 17) now encloses the whole phrase, while the central position of *desiderio* produces an elaborately chiasmic structure in which short adverbs alternate with polysyllabic nouns (abcba). It is noteworthy that J. would appear to be alone in feeling the need to append this arresting conceit to the traditional exculpation of Lot's daughters (cf. previous n.); while moreover in the Bible these words had formed part of the angel Raphael's prediction of Tobias' chaste union with his wife, J. nonchalantly applies them to the most horripilant incest.

vrum iustum sciebant hoc nisi ebrium non esse facturum. Similarly Chrysostom observes that since they knew their father would not even listen to such a plan, Lot's daughters made him drunk (*hom. in Gen.* 44,4); cf. also Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Gen.* 19,32.

quid fecerit ignoravit. Cf. Gen. 19,33 and 35 ('he perceived not when she lay down, nor when she arose'). The same point had already been made by Ambrose, *Abr.* 1,6,56 and Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Eccl.* 3 p. 660^B.¹⁹ J. makes it again himself at *adv. Pelag.* 1,35.

quamquam voluntas non sit in crimine, error in culpa est. J. repeats this impressive formulation over thirty years later at *epist.* 140,11,2. The antithesis it contains between *in crimine* and *in culpa* is also found at Maximus of Turin 107,1 (on the relative gravity of the two cf. Paulinus of Pella, *euch.* 167 *reus culpa potius quam criminis esse*

¹⁹ Gregory's homily belongs to 381 according to Daniélou (1966), p. 163, n. 3.

praeponens). For the contrast of *crimen* and *error* cf. *epist.* 57,1,2 and 57,5,1 (cf. also *TLL* V,2, 817,19 and 818,13). J. uses it again of Lot at *adv. Pelag.* 1,35 (*non habet crimen conscientiae et tamen error in vitio est*).

Ambrose makes the same judgment on Lot's behaviour at *in psalm.* 118 *serm.* 11,25,3 *veniabilis quidem ignorantiae, pudendae tamen commixtionis non evasit incestum*. J. himself takes a less generous view later at *quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 30,15 *illud ... quod pro excusatione dicitur filiarum, eo quod putaverint defecisse humanum genus et ideo cum patre concubuerint, non excusat patrem*. Origen had found him partly to blame and partly not (*hom. in Gen.* 5,3 p. 60,19). According to Chrysostom (*hom. in Gen.* 44,4) he was innocent because unwitting.

inde nascuntur Moabitae et Ammonitae. Origen had remarked that some thought Lot's deed impious and that therefore the races which sprang from it were accursed (*Cels.* 4,45). At *epist.* 108,11,5 J. urges avoidance of wine on the ground that the Moabites and Ammonites are its product.

ad quartam et decimam progeniem. J. again asserts that the Moabites are shut out *ad quartam generationem et decimam* at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 205 l. 136 (the work may be a translation of Origen). Deut. 23,3 however speaks of ten generations (so J. himself at *in Is.* 6,16,1 l. 22). At *in Gal.* 1,4 p. 317^A J. says the Moabites and Ammonites are barred *ad quintam et decimam generationem* (cf. Gal. 1,18 'I abode with him fifteen days'). At *hom. in Gen.* 5,5 p. 63,7 Origen had made the third and fourth generation the limit of their exclusion (cf. Exod. 34,7 'visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children ... unto the third and to the fourth generation'): he is followed by Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ps.* 59,8; *qu. Steph.* 9,1; Ambrose, *in Luc.* 4,53; *in psalm.* 48,26,2. Finally Basil makes the exclusion last *ἕως τρίτης καὶ ἕως δεκάτης γενεᾶς* (*hom. in Ps.* 59,4).

Chapter 9

J. shifts the emphasis from wine to food as he now assembles four scriptural passages which he takes to be a commendation of simple fare. This picturesque ch. gives J. further scope to show off his biblical erudition.

9,1

sub quercu. At 3 Reg. 19,5 (Elijah's rest on his flight from Jezebel) the LXX reads ὑπὸ φυτῶν, while the Vulg. has *in umbra iuniperi*; when J. paraphrases the text at *adv. Pelag.* 2,21, he says *sub arbore*. The oak of the present passage may come from Gen. 18,1 πρὸς τῇ δρυὶ τῇ Μουβρῇ (cf. J.'s wording when referring to this text at *in Hab.* 3,3 l. 172: *sub quercu*): the contexts of 3 Reg. 19,5 and Gen. 18,1 are similar (cf. Gen. 18,4f. καταψύξατε ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον ... καὶ φάγεσθε).

panis olyrae. On *olyra* cf. J.'s remark at *in Ezech.* 4,9 l. 1401 ὄλυραν quam alii 'avenam' alii 'sicalam' putant. According to the same passage such food is a sign of persecution and penury. Already Clement of Alexandria (*paed.* 3,7,38,1) and Tertullian (*ieiun.* 9 p. 285,4) had pointed out that Elijah's refectio was humble fare; the same point is made later by Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,28 (on fasting; ib. Daniel and Elisha); 14,75; *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,4 p. 104,1. J.'s ensuing sarcasm (cf. next n.) indicates that here he had the afore-mentioned passage of Tertullian's *De ieiunio* (9 p. 285,4) specifically in mind.

revera non poterat. Tertullian had concluded his treatment of Elijah's picnic (cf. previous n.) with the following sarcasm: *defecerant corvi, qui eum liberalius pascerent, an difficile angelo fuerat aliquem alicunde de convivio regis ministrum cum instructissimo ferculo raptum ad Heliam transferre?* (*ieiun.* 9 p. 285,7). These remarks are evidently the inspiration of J.'s similar sarcasm here.

conditum merum. J. has apparently lifted this arresting phrase from Tertullian, *ieiun.* 12 p. 291,4: it is not attested elsewhere according to *TLL* IV, 142,75 and VIII, 849,57f. Tertullian had used the words in connection with a Catholic martyr whom he asserts to have been made so drunk by his co-religionists that he did not feel the pain: the rabidly anti-Catholic context of the original has clearly not put J. off.

ex oleo cibos. For the locution cf. *TLL* IX,2, 547,71 ff. J. says that the ascetic avoids oil in *epist.* 52,12,1; 107,10,2; 108,17,3; *vita Hilar.* 5,3; *adv. Iovin.* 2,13; cf. further Ps.-Athanasius, v. *Syncl.* 53; *Vita Melaniae*

junioris 22; 24; 62; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 18 (*abstinere a vino carnibusque, ipso quoque etiam oleo*). Chrysostom had asserted that John the Baptist ate no cereals, wine or oil (*virg.* 79,2). Monks do however use oil at 35,4 below.

carnes contusione mutatas. J. uses the same words again at *epist.* 100,6,5 (at *adv. Iovin.* 1,40 he says *elaboratas carnes*). Both terms are explained by Janini Cuesta, p. 9.

9,2

Hellseus filios prophetarum invitat ad prandium. J. omits the poisonous colocynths that in 4 Reg. 4,38ff. had been inadvertently gathered as food for the prophetic community and instead turns the whole episode into a warning about the fatal consequences of gluttony. *Non iratus est cocis ...* (l. 16) is a rather awkward attempt to accommodate the tropological sense. J. would seem to have been the first to treat the story in precisely this way; accordingly he has no one to imitate here.

Origen had cited the text simply to prove that there is also harmful food (*Jo.* 13,33,210). That the meal was a simple one had already been pointed out both by Basil (*hex.* 9,1 [cf. Ambrose, *hex.* 6,2,5]; *hom.* 1,6) and by Gregory Nazianzen (*carm.* 1,1,16,22); cf. also later Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,30 and *Hel.* 6,18 (ib. *propheticae munere abstinentiae veneni vires evacuans*). The episode recurs at Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 23,7 and Ps.-Nilus, *perist.* 11,20. J. himself does not refer to it again.

spiritus virtute. The phrase is something of a cliché. It is also found in Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira), *tract.* 14,24; *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,9 p. 116,19; Augustine, *quaest. hept.* 4,48; Ps.-Augustine (= Ambrosiaster), *quaest. test. app. vet.* 2,1; Cassian, *conf.* 24,21,3; *inst.* 1,11,3; 1,12,13.

Moses mutaverat Merra. J. takes the opportunity to introduce a further item of biblical erudition. Moses had sweetened the bitter waters of Marah by throwing a tree into them; cf. (e.g.) *epist.* 78,7,1 *Mara, quae interpretatur 'amaritudo'*. J. generally identifies the tree with the cross. It had been used to signify 'appeasement' in Cyprian, *zel.* 17; cf. Augustine, *serm.* 352,6.

9,3

oculis pariter ac mente caecatos. The same idea of blindness in eyes and mind is expressed by Amphilochius at *mesopent.* p. 125 (συνετυφλοῦντο τοῖς σωματικοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τὸ ψυχικὸν βλέμμα). It was something of a cliché. Epiphanius had already spoken of impairment of the eyes of soul and body (*haer.* 33,3,6). Similarly mental and physical

eyes close at Chrysostom, *hom. in Heb.* 24,1, while Augustine says in one of his sermons (136,3) that men are blind neither in flesh nor heart. Finally Ps.-Chrysostom, *caec.* 4 describes recovery of sight in soul and body.

qualibus epulis. Here 4 Reg. 6,23 speaks of *ciborum magna praeparatio* (LXX παράθεσιν μεγάλην); cf. Ambrose, *off.* 3,14,86 *epularibus refecti copiis*. J. does not use this *exemplum* again; he would seem to have been the first to do so.

9,4

potuit et Danihelo de regis ferculis opulentior mensa transferri. Hilberg failed to note the reference to Dan. 1,8 (*proposuit autem Danihel in corde suo ne pollueretur de mensa regis*). J. alludes to Daniel's rejection of royal fare in favour of simple food again at *adv. Iovin.* 2,15; cf. also his translation of a letter of Theophilus (*epist.* 100,7,1). The same point had been made by Tertullian (*ieiun.* 9 p. 284,18): *leguminum pabulum et aquae potum ferculis et oenophoris regis praefereutes*. This phrase has evidently influenced the present passage of the *Libellus*: in particular Tertullian's *ferculis* would seem to have inspired J.'s use of the same striking term, for which LXX and Theodotion have simply τράπεζα and δεῖπνον (Dan. 1,5–16).¹

Ambacum messorum prandium portat, arbitror, rusticorum. J. mentions Habakkuk's errand to Daniel again at *epist.* 3,1,2; *adv. Iovin.* 2,15; in *Hab. prof.* l. 57; the last two passages recall that the story is not in the Hebrew. Tertullian had also referred to it at *ieiun.* 9 p. 285,10: this is the passage from which J. borrows his sarcasm at 9,1 above (cf. n. on *revera non poterat*). There Tertullian asks whether an angel could not have done for Elijah what Habakkuk did for Daniel in the lions' den: *an difficile angelo fuerat aliquem alicunde de convivio regis ministrum cum instructissimo ferculo raptum ad Heliam transferre, sicut Danieli in lacu leonum esurienti prandium metentium exhibitum est?* It would seem that recollection of these words has led J. to conflate Habakkuk's errand with Daniel's rejection of royal fare (cf. previous n.): in particular the phrase *de convivio regis* of this Tertullianic passage (where it is used hyperbolically in connection with Elijah) will have facilitated such a conflation. The result is a scenario that is not quite consistent: when Daniel lands in the lions' den at the end of the biblical book's final ch. and receives his visit from Habakkuk, the royal food which he had rejected in the opening ch. of the book is no longer in point. The emphasis on the rusticity of Habakkuk's fare would seem

¹ Similarly J.'s *transferri* has evidently been suggested by Tertullian's use of the same word in connection with Daniel at *ieiun.* 9 p. 285,10 (cf. next n.).

to be J.'s own.

desideriorum vir. Daniel is addressed with these words at Dan. 9,23; 10,11; 10,19. Here J. asserts that they are applied to him because he did not 'eat the bread of desire' or 'drink the wine of concupiscence'. This striking interpretation κατ' ἀντιφράσιν appears to have been specially devised by J. for the present passage: he does not use it again himself and it seems not to occur in any predecessor. At *in Dan.* 9,23¹ l. 118 J. gives a quite different explanation: *sive 'amabilis' et 'dei amore dignus' ... sive 'vir desideriorum' quod pro desiderio tuo dei secreta audire merearis*; cf. *epist.* 47,2,1 and *in Dan.* 10,11¹ l. 689. There J. is following Origen (cf. *comm. in Rom.* 7,17 p. 1147^c). At *adv. Iovin.* 2,15 he has the variant *homo miserabilis*.

Several other interpretations of the title *desideriorum vir* were given. Orsiesius thought that Daniel's erudition was the reason for it (*doctr.* 52). Pelagius uses the text to show there is also a good desire (*in Col.* 3,5 p. 464,20). Finally Bachiarus (*epist.* 2 p. 300,3) offers a curious interpretation whereby desires are our wives.

panem desiderii non manducavit. At Dan. 10,3 the LXX has ἄπρον ἐπιθυμιῶν (Vulg. *panem desiderabilem*). For the explanation κατ' ἀντιφράσιν cf. *epist.* 40,2,3 (*lucus ideo dic(i)tur, quod minime luceat*); 78,35,2; and Donatus, *gramm. mai.* 3,6 p. 672,8. J. makes the sexual reference explicit with the succeeding *vinum concupiscentiae* (LXX has simply οἶνος): he thereby reverts neatly to the theme of the previous ch. at the end of this one. On these genitives cf. (e.g.) *Vulg. prov.* 4,17 *panem impietatis et vinum iniquitatis*.

J. reports that the Jews believed Daniel to have been a eunuch (*adv. Iovin.* 1,25; *in Is.* 11,39,3 l. 48; *in Dan.* 1,3 l. 51). Origen had recorded the same tradition: *fr. in Reg.* 22; *hom. in Ezech.* 4,5 p. 366,12; *comm. in Mt.* 15,5 p. 360,12 (cf. also Ps.-Epiphanius, *v. proph.* 10 p. 404^a). That Daniel was delivered to the chief eunuch proves it according to Origen, *sel. in Ezech.* 14,16.

Chapter 10

J. concludes his discussion of food and drink by observing that scripture is full of warnings against gastronomical intemperance. Three further cases are selected for compendious treatment in the form of a *praeteritio*. In this short ch. the shift from drink to food is complete.

10,1

innumerabilia sunt scripturis respersa divinis. The statement is repeated at 32,5 below (cf. n. ad loc.). J. had also made it recently at *virg. Mar.* 15 (*innumerabilia sunt istiusmodi libris inserta divinis*), where the phrasing has clearly influenced the present passage. Similar remarks are found again in Augustine, *epist.* 185,3 and in Caesarius of Arles at *serm.* 37,6 and 48,3.

Here J. is not exaggerating. Palladius (v. *Chrys.* 12) later enumerates as warnings against culinary excess the cases of Eve, Cain, Job, Esau, Saul, Israel, the sons of Eli, Jacob, the men of Sodom, Isaiah, Dives and the priests of Bel.

universa exsequi sui est tituli et voluminis. J. again says that topics require a separate volume at *in Ezech.* 28,11 l. 302 and *in eccles.* 12,1 l. 7. Such statements would seem to be characteristic of him. At 33,1 of the present treatise a special work is promised on greed. At 36,2 he announces his intention to describe the anchoritic life elsewhere. Neither of these studies ever materialized.¹

J. saves space at 39,4 below by telling the reader to find his own examples.

haec sufficient pauca de plurimis. The same phrase is also used in Sulpicius Severus, *Mart.* 19,5; Ps.-Augustine, *vit. christ.* 13; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 113,4. On the *topos* in general (*e pluribus pauca*) cf.

¹ It would seem legitimate to identify these frequent affirmations that J. will write a treatise on this or that subject and his equally frequent failure to do so as again due to his sense of intellectual inadequacy. Biblical commentaries on the other hand presented less of a problem: he could always plagiarize. Also to be viewed from the same perspective are J.'s repeated claims to have written a work in just a few days, the off-hand arrogance of (e.g.) *Didym. spir. praef.* (*cum in Babylone versarer ... volui garrere aliquid de spiritu sancto*), and his braggadocio about his 'teachers' Donatus and Gregory Nazianzen (for the view that J.'s association with Gregory was in reality neither close nor cordial cf. Adkin [1991]), about his personal contacts with eminent savants (cf. [e.g.] *vir. ill.* 109; 117; 125; 128; 132; 133; 134), and about his expertise in philosophy (cf. [e.g.] *epist.* 50,1,3), for which he had no aptitude whatever: hence he was proportionately anxious to conceal the fact.

Curtius, p. 269; Adkin (1999a), pp. 568f.

10,2

poteris tibi ipsa colligere. J. had given the reader the same advice at *virg. Mar.* 6 and 13; cf. also in *Gal.* 5,3 p. 396^B. This sort of remark had been very common in Origen: examples are to be found at *hom. in Jer.* 2,4 p. 294,9 (GCS 33); 3,1 p. 305,9 (GCS 33); 5 p. 629^C (PL 25 [1845]); *hom. in Is.* 5,3 p. 266,25; *comm. in Mt.* 12,22 p. 119,19; 12,35 p. 149,27; 16,19 p. 540,11; *comm. ser. in Mt.* 77 p. 181,8.² There are further instances at Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 14,4 and at Gaudentius, *serm. praef.* 50.

quomodo. *Quomodo* in place of *Acl* recurs at 24,6 below. On this rather unliterary form of expression cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 650f., and Löfstedt (1911), pp. 116f. There are a dozen instances of *quod* instead of *Acl* in this work; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 576ff. *Quoniam* replaces *Acl* at 29,3; cf. 31,3 (Old Latin). The more vulgar *quia* occurs only once at 39,2: it is a quotation from the Old Latin.

delectus est ... temptaverit. Indicative and subjunctive alternate again at *epist.* 118,5,6 (*quod omnia dimiserint et secuti sunt*); in *Ezech.* 12,10^B l. 1313; in *Soph.* 1,11 l. 451; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, p. 539.

ventri magis oboediens quam deo. Moerschini (1988), p. 134, describes this impressive phrase as 'nello stile e nel modo di ragionare tipici di Gerolamo'. In fact it comes straight from Tertullian, who uses it twice. At *ieiun.* 3 p. 277,10 the formulation had likewise been applied to Adam: *facilius ventri quam deo cessit*. At 5 p. 279,8 of the same treatise it had been used of the Israelites who hankered after the fleshpots of Egypt: *prorior ventri quam deo*. In the first of these passages Tertullian had proceeded to make the same point with two further striking aphorisms: *facilius ventri quam deo cessit, pabulo potius quam praecepto annuit, salutem gula vendidit*. J. by contrast typically pairs the arresting expression he has copied with a biblical text (cf. next n.). Again it is noteworthy that J. would seem to be alone in his theft of this clever conceit.³

On this Tertullianic plagiary J. has grafted another borrowing: his *ventri ... oboediens* comes from Sallust, *Catil.* 1,1 (*ventri oboedientia*). This debt escaped both Luebeck and Hagendahl (1958); (1974). It is significant that J. should have sought to enhance the phraseology even of a stylist as striking and sententious as Tertullian; it is also notable

² It belonged to the didactic style; cf. (e.g.) Lucretius 1.402ff.

³ There is a certain similarity of thought in Basil, *hom.* 9,7 τὴν κληρονομίαν τῆς γαστρὸς τῶν πνευματικῶν ἀπολαύσεων τιμιώτερον ἔθετο (sc. Adam).

that borrowings from two quite different authors — a pagan historian and a Christian heretic — should be found in so small a compass.

Gluttony is also said to have been the reason for the Fall at *adv. Iovin.* 1,4. At 2,15 of the same work J. makes Adam's stay in paradise coterminous with his fast.

in hanc lacrimarum ... vallem. Ps. 83,7 is a verse of which J. is extremely fond: he refers to it on some fifteen other occasions. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,4 it is again linked to the expulsion from paradise.

dominum fame satanas temptaverit. J. juxtaposes Christ's temptation with Adam's fall. The combination was a traditional one. Origen had said that the Devil thought to trick Christ with food as he had done Adam (*fr. in Mt.* 62 and *fr. in Lc.* 96; cf. *fr. in Lc.* 95 [= Eusebius of Emesa, *fr. Gen.* 3,1]). The same idea is repeated by Cassian at *cont.* 22,10,1 (cf. 5,4,2). In particular it was customary to argue that when the Devil tempted both to eat, Christ's refusal redressed Adam's acquiescence. This argument would seem to be first found in Irenaeus 5,21,2 (SC 153). It also occurs in Tertullian (*ieiun.* 8 p. 283,33) and at a later date in *Passio Bartholomaei* 4 p. 136,12. Like J. here, Basil had used the Devil's temptation of both as a lesson at *renunt.* 6. In the present passage J. does not make the connection explicit.

Christ's encounter with the Devil had been employed on its own by Tertullian (*bapt.* 20,4) in order to show that abstemiousness can scout the temptations of repletion. It had also been discussed recently by Gregory Nazianzen (*carm.* 1,2,2,211ff.; 1,2,3,81f.) and by Ambrose at *Cain et Ab.* 1,5,16 (cf. also *Hel.* 1,1).

J. repeats the wording he uses here at *in Matth.* 4,5 l. 340 *quem fame temptaverat.*

esca ventri. 1 Cor. 6,13 occurs frequently in J.'s *oeuvre*: he has the text another ten times. As here, it is quoted together with Phil. 3,19 at *epist.* 64,2,2.

deus venter. J. was exceedingly partial to Phil. 3,19, which is found almost thirty times in his works. Cyprian had included it in his *Testimonia* (3,11).

Id enim colit. There is a similar gloss on Phil. 3,19 at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 80 l. 142. J. has evidently taken it from Origen; cf. *comm. in Rom.* 1,9 p. 854^D, where Origen glosses the text as follows: *quidquid enim unusquisque supra cetera colit, hoc illi deus est* (cf. also Ps.-Basil, *hom. in Ps.* 28,1). In the *Libellus* J. appends similar explanatory comments to texts of scripture at 12,2 and 17,5.

solicite providendum. These words are a self-imitation of *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 1,13 p. 338,12, where they had likewise concluded the ch. J. evinces a certain fondness for this particular formulation, which he uses

again at *epist.* 31,3,3 and *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 29 p. 169,7. It would not seem to be attested elsewhere.

quos saturitas de paradiso expulit, reducat esuries. With mention of the Fall J. neatly returns by way of conclusion to his first example in this ch. The same idea is repeated later at *adv. Iovin.* 2,15. That this was something of a commonplace is suggested by the way in which it is employed in slightly modified form at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 298 l. 74 *'beatus qui retribuet tibi retributionem tuam quam retribuisti nobis' ... verbi gratia, elecit me de paradiso (sc. filia Babylonis, who is here identified as the anima ... quae semper in motione est): ego illam per abstinentiam reduco ibidem.* The idea had recently occurred twice in the same form as in the *Libellus*. Athanasius had used it at *virg.* 6^a ὡσπερ ... διὰ βρωμάτος καὶ παρακοῆς ἐξεβλήθη ὁ Ἀδάμ ἐκ τοῦ παραδείσου, οὕτως πάλιν διὰ νηστείας καὶ ὑπακοῆς ὁ θέλων εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὸν παράδεισον. Basil had also employed it at *hom.* 1,4 ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐνηστεύσαμεν, ἐξεπέσομεν τοῦ παραδείσου· νηστεύσομεν τοίνυν, ἵνα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπανέλθωμεν. When J. appropriates the idea in the *Libellus*, he streamlines the formulation significantly: in particular he uses abstract nouns as the subjects of his two antithetical clauses. Here J. would seem to have taken a hint from Tertullian, *ieiun.* 3 p. 277,31 *ut ... salutem aemulo modo redaccenderet inedia, sicut extinxerat sagina.*⁵

At the same time J. again improves on his model: he has introduced a more refined vocabulary (*saturitas* for *sagina*), an elegant chiasmus and a favourite cretic tribrach clausula. It is not therefore surprising that Ambrose should in turn imitate J.'s impressive formulation: *gula de paradiso regnantem expulit, abstinentia ad paradysum revocavit errantem* (*Hel.* 4,7). The idea is also used later by Amobius Junior, *ad Greg.* 14 p. 408,9. J.'s employment of it in the *Libellus* is another good example of a *sententia* used to round off a passage (cf. Quintilian, *inst.* 8,5,2): here it brings this ch. to a resounding conclusion.

⁴ On the question of authenticity cf. Aubineau (1955), pp. 144ff. A date around 370 would seem likely.

⁵ J. is indebted just five lines earlier to the same ch. of the *De ieiunio* (cf. n. on *veniri magis obediens ...*). In a study of J.'s borrowings from Tertullian Petráňková (1988), p. 52, notes that *adv. Iovin.* 2,15 instead imitates the present passage of the *Libellus*: he makes the point in order to support his view that 'In Quellenforschung trovano sûrement un jour les sources autres que Tertullien où J. a puist'. However he fails to perceive that in this case J. is evidently drawing on Tertullian himself.

Chapter 11

Avoidance of wine and an austere diet are necessary in order to combat sexual temptation: here J. looks back to the theme of chs. 3–7. The sexual organs are the means whereby the Devil exercises his power over us. The point is proved by an impressive array of scriptural texts; elucidatory argument is absent. Only half of J.'s texts are in fact strictly apposite: J. simply wishes to dazzle the reader with a display of erudition. The passage is a 'véritable tour de force' (Gorce [1925], p. 317 and n. 6).¹

Following Ciceronian principle Augustine recommends a plain style for such a didactic purpose (cf. *doctr. christ.* 4,104).² J. however has taken some pains to achieve a number of rhetorically striking effects in this ch.

11,1

quodsi volueris respondere. This sentence is adduced as an example of *hypophora* by Hritzu, p. 76. There is a further imaginary objection at 31,3 below. This lively device also occurs at *epist.* 107,13,1; 117,4,1; 120,1,11; 123,13,2. Here it introduces the justification for fasting.

in plumis. Feather-beds seem to have caused J. a certain amount of concern. At *epist.* 79,7,7 they are said to be unsuitable for youth. Demetrias is commended for doing without them in *epist.* 130,4,4. J. describes reproachfully how before her conversion the voluptuous Blesilla had found even feather-beds too hard (*epist.* 38,4,2). One might also compare the injunction to the penitent at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 148 l. 182 to sleep instead on a mat of reeds.

Other Fathers too pronounce upon this topic. Feather-beds debilitate according to Ps.-Chrysostom, *saft. Herodiad.* I. Already Clement of Alexandria had thought them bad for health as well as sybaritic (*paed.* 2,9,77,2). Their avoidance accordingly became part of any strict regimen: Chrysostom twice reports how ascetically-minded young women abandon feather-beds for the floor (*hom. in Eph.* 13,3 and *stat.* 13,2),³ while beds of the same type are the occasion for self-castigation at Prudentius, *hom.* 328f. and again later at Caesarius of Arles, *serm.*

¹ Gorce does not discuss it further.

² Cf. also Harendza, p. 66.

³ Cf. also Philo, *spec. leg.* 2,20.

20,3. It is not therefore surprising that Orsiesius (*doctr.* 46) and Basil (*renunt.* 4) both prohibit them. Philo too (*som.* 1,123) had disapproved.

On the form of expression which J. uses here cf. Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 20,3 *nos in plumis*. For the preceding *semper in deliciis* cf. n. on *at dices: puella sum delicata* at 31,3 below.

vivere districtius, respondebo. Hilberg's punctuation requires modification. Petitmengin (1988), p. 48, n. 38, points out that here J. is imitating Tertullian, *idol.* 5,1 (cf. next n.). There Tertullian had said *iam illa obici solita vox 'non habeo aliud, quo vivam' districtius reperi potest: 'vivere ergo habes?'* Accordingly J.'s *districtius* must go with *respondebo*. Hilberg's comma should be moved forward: *vivere, districtius respondebo*. Petitmengin also cites in *Eph. prol.* p. 439^A *quibus cum possim districtius respondere*.

vive ergo lege tua, quae dei non potes. Petitmengin (1988), p. 48, n. 38, has identified the source of this striking repartee as Tertullian, *idol.* 5,1 *quid tibi cum deo est, si tuis legibus vivis?*; there the words are addressed to makers of idols. Petitmengin does no more than merely register J.'s imitation: he is concerned exclusively with the single word *districtius*. It may however be added that J. has again enhanced the rhetorical forcefulness of his model: both clauses are given an exactly parallel structure, while the twofold ellipse of *lege* and *vivere* in the second creates a very compact and powerful formulation.⁴ The further point may be made that exactly the same sentiment had recently been expressed by Basil (*hom.* 7,8) οὐκοῦν οὐχ ὁ Κύριός σου διδάσκαλος οὐδὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ρυθμίζει σοῦ τὸν βίον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς σὺ νομοθετεῖς σεαυτῷ. Evidently therefore the idea was something of a commonplace. Accordingly it is particularly noteworthy that J. should have had recourse to Tertullian in order to give it expression.⁵

non quo deus. J. is anxious to forestall a charge of Manicheism (cf. 13,3 below): the creator's work is accordingly good (cf. 20,3; 37,1; 38,7). J. issues a similar caveat at *epist.* 52,11,4; 54,9,1; *adv. Iovin.* 1,3. The same point had been made by Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 11): abstention from the belly's pleasures is not in itself good, but helps in achieving what is.

⁴ For the double cretic clausula cf. Herron, pp. 27ff.

⁵ Though Petitmengin's initial purpose in examining J.'s echoes of Tertullian was to exploit them for possible clues to the constitution of the latter's text (1988, p. 44), he fails to observe that this particular reminiscence has precisely such a bearing. The *vivir* which concludes the Tertullianic formulation is omitted by Mesnart and subsequent editions. However J.'s imitation supplies conclusive evidence that the word belongs in Tertullian's text. Waczink-Wänden, p. 125, simply refer to the meaning and the clausula in order to support the reading; they do not record J.'s borrowing.

universitatis creator et dominus. God cannot hate his own creation. Here the argument requires that J. should simply speak of 'the creator'. Instead he says *universitatis creator et dominus*; he thereby inserts a second element which in this passage is strictly superfluous. He has done so because the combination was once again a cliché. The expression 'maker and master of the universe' would seem to go back to Plato, *Tim.* 28c τὸν ... ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντός. It is very common in the Fathers. At the same time there is considerable variety in the particular wording used. The impressive formulation of the *Libellus* is repeated by J. over twenty years later at *in Is.* 12,42,5 l. 21; *in Zach.* 11,8 l. 194; 12,1 l. 40. It is also imitated by Leo the Great at *serm.* 23,1. Tertullian had used *dominus et conditor universitatis* at *adv. Marc.* 2,2 p. 334,2. To *universitatis* Augustine adds *conditor et rector* (*conf.* 1,20,31; *vera relig.* 44) and *creator et rector* (*conf.* 3,8,16; *trin.* 4,17,23). Some writers had employed *mundi*: Cyprian used it with *factor et dominus* (*epist.* 58,6,3), while Lactantius adds to it *effector et gubernator* (*inst.* 5,8,5) and *conditor rectorque* (*ira* 10,53). Ambobius the Elder says *constitutor moderatorque cunctorum* (*nat.* 3,2), Rufinus of Aquileia *pater et conditor omnium* (*Clement.* 4,36,1), and the *Passio Petri et Pauli longior* (37) *pater et conditor rerum*. It may be noted that J. has characteristically chosen to use the striking word *universitas*, which had occurred in Tertullian (it goes back to Cicero's translation of the Platonic passage quoted above [*Tim.* 6] *illum quidem quasi parentem huius universitatis*).

In Greek one finds that Justin Martyr already has three different formulations: πάντων πατὴρ καὶ δημιουργός (*I apol.* 8; so also *Homiliae Clementinae* 4,13,3), παντοκράτωρ καὶ ποιητής (*dial.* 16,4), ποιητής ... καὶ πατὴρ (*dial.* 7,3; 56,1; 60,2; the reverse order occurs at *dial.* 117,5 and also in Theophilus of Antioch, *Autol.* 2,4). Hippolytus has ποιητής καὶ κύριος (*haer.* 10,32; so also Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Am.* 1,1; 9,4; 9,11 [twice]; *Zach.* 14,8; with reverse order at *Homiliae Clementinae* 10,5,4 and at Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Am.* 4,11; 9,4; *Abd.* 18). Asterius the Sophist uses δεσπότης καὶ δημιουργός (*hom.* [Richard] 7,19; so also Epiphanius of Salamis, *haer.* 43,2,3 and in reverse order *Homiliae Clementinae* 17,8,9). In the *Apostolic Constitutions* one finds κτίστης καὶ πρότασις (8,9,8). Basil has ποιητής καὶ δεσπότης (*hom.* 10,7; so Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 147 and Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Os.* 2,21; in reverse order at Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Jon. prof.* p. 317^c and *Jon.* 1,3). Finally κύριος καὶ κτίστης occurs in (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt (*hom. typ. II* [Dörries-Klostermann-Kroeger] 15,43) and γενεσιουργός καὶ κύριος in Cyril of Alexandria (*hom. pasch.* 12,2). Philo had used such formulae with great frequency: he has the combination ποιητής καὶ πατὴρ at *Abr.* 9; 58; *conf. ling.* 144;

decal. 105; *fug.* 177; *leg. Gaj.* 293; *praem. poen.* 24; 32; *rer. div. her.* 236; *spec. leg.* 2,6; 2,256; 3,178; *virt.* 34; 64; 77; *vir. conf.* 90. He substitutes κτιστής for ποιητής at *virt.* 179 and ἡγεμών for πατήρ at *praem. poen.* 41. At *som.* 1,93 he says κτιστής καὶ ἡγεμών.

Intestinorum nostrorum rugitu et inanitate ventris pulmonumque delectetur ardore. J.'s arresting phraseology has this time been taken from Tertullian, *ieiun.* 2 p. 276,28 *non in pulmonum et intestinorum meorum inanitate* (sc. *pendet lex*). In two adjacent lines he has accordingly juxtaposed borrowings from two quite different Tertullianic treatises (cf. n. on *vive ergo lege* ... above). Again J. has 'improved' his source in characteristic fashion: twofold chiasmus and a choice cretic spondee clausula invest his words with considerable formal elegance. At the same time the prominent addition of *rugitus* gives them a gross and vulgar flavour which contrasts oddly with their stylistic finesse.

quo aliter pudicitia tuta esse non possit. Food is again said to incite lust at 17,2 below. J. is very fond of this idea: he repeats it at *epist.* 54,8,3; 54,9,1; 54,10,4; 108,17,3; 117,6,4 (*difficile inter epulas servatur pudicitia*); *adv. Iovin.* 2,7; in *Tit.* 1,7 p. 567^A; cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 275 l. 6. It had of course occurred in proverbial form at Terence, *Eun.* 732 *sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus*; J. quotes this verse himself at *epist.* 54,9,5 and *adv. Iovin.* 2,7.

The idea is also common elsewhere in the Fathers: no one however gives it such frequent expression as J. It is found in the following passages: Tertullian, *ieiun.* 1 p. 274,5 (*monstrum ... haberetur libido sine gula*); 17 p. 296,26; Origen, *comm. ser. in Mt.* 44 p. 89,5 (*excitatrices seminis escas*); *comm. in Rom.* 10,3 p. 1254^B; *Sentences of Sextus* 108a; 240; 510; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 2,1,1,66f. (γαστέρα ... μαχλοσύνης μήπειραν); Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,244; 3,33a; Ps.-Nilus, *narr.* 3,12f.; Ps.-Nilus (= Evagrius Ponticus), *vir.* 2 (γαστριμαργία πορνείας μήτηρ); Maximus of Turin 50a,2; Cassian, *conf.* 5,10,1; *inst.* 5,6.⁶ Basil of Ancyra explains the chemistry at *virg.* 7: *παινομένης γάρ ταύτης* (sc. *τῆς γαστρούς*) *ὑπὸ τῆς γεύσεως ἀνάγκη τὰ ὑπ' αὐτὴν μόρια ὑπὸ τοῦ πλημμυροῦντος ὑγροῦ βρασσομένου ἐν βάθει πρὸς τὰς φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας κινεῖσθαι.*

Fasting is therefore frequently said to be the foundation of chastity: statements to this effect are found at Origen, *hom. in Lev.* 10,2 p. 445,9; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 7; Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1108; cf. also Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 1,31. This idea is often expressed aphoristically: Eusebius of

⁶ The idea receives fourfold expression at Isidore, *synon.* 2,14. It had also occurred in Philo, *spec. leg.* 1,192.

Emesa, *serm.* 6,9; Basil, *hom.* 1,6 (νηστεία ... σεφοσύνης δημιουργός); 2,5 (νηστεία ... καρθενίας τροφός); Ambrose, *Hel.* 3,4; 8,22 (*ieiunium continentiae magisterium est, pudicitiae disciplina ... castigatio carnis*); Chrysostom, *hom. in 2 Thess.* 1,2; Ps.-Chrysostom, *serm. jej.* 1 p. 787; p. 790; Cyril of Alexandria, *hom. pasch.* 1,4; Peter Chrysologus, *serm.* 8,3.⁷

11,2

deo carus. J. uses this phrase again at *epist.* 36,15,5 and 79,2,5; cf. 35,2,6 (Damasus). It was something of a cliché: there are instances of it at Cyprian, *epist.* 38,1,2; Lactantius, *inst.* 4,7,1; 6,25,13; 7,24,3; *epit.* 33,6; *ira* 17,5; Hilary, *in Matth.* 5,11; Lucifer of Cagliari, *Athan.* 2,34 1. 41 *carissimus* (so also Gaudentius, *serm.* 8,36); Ps.-Augustine (= Ambrosiaster), *quaest. test.* 46,3; Sulpicius Severus, *chron.* 1,2,6 *carus acceptusque* (so 1,25,2); *Tractatus Pelagianus* 4,14,4 p. 93 *cariores*; 6,11,1 p. 149; Amobius Junior, *ad Greg.* 5 p. 391,25.

testimonio ipsius immaculatus et simplex. For *immaculatus* cf. the Old Latin version of Job 1,1 quoted by J. at *epist.* 121,8,18 (cf. 122,3,14) *erat homo ille ... immaculatus*. For *simplex* cf. Job 1,8 and 2,3 (Vulg.). Hilberg adduces Job 33,3 (*simplici corde*), which is however a description of Elihu. The phrase *testimonium dei* had already been used with reference to Job by Hilary, *in psalm.* 119,19 (*Job ... testimonio dei dignus*) and by Zeno of Verona 1,15,2 (*dei ... testimonio conlaudatus*).

quid de diabolo suspicetur. The description of Behemoth (Job 40,11; LXX 40,16) which J. here ascribes to Job is in fact spoken by God (cf. Job 40,1; LXX 40,6). The words are again given to Job at *in Ezech.* 16,4 l. 894. In making this ascription J. is following Origen; cf. *in psalm.* 37 *hom.* 1,6 (Rufinus' translation). Origen had identified Behemoth with the Devil: *princ.* 1,5,5; *in psalm.* 37 *hom.* 1,6; *hom. in Ezech.* 6,4 p. 382,5 (*iste est ... draco, serpens antiquus, qui vocatur diabolus et Satanus*).

virtus eius in lumbis. J. cites Job 40,11 (LXX 40,16) frequently: it occurs in his works a dozen times. In giving the text a sexual reference J. was again following Origen; cf. *enarr. in Job* 40,11 *πόρνον ποιεῖν ἐντεῦθεν ὀρχεται*.⁸ The same interpretation is also found at Athanasius, *v. Anton.* 5; Ps.-Athanasius, *v. Syncl.* 26; Ambrose, *in psalm.* 37,33,2; Cassian, *concl.* 5,4,2; Eucherius, *form.* 6 p. 36,22; Philip, *in Job*

⁷ Fasting stops wet dreams according to *Historia monachorum* 20,3; cf. Evagrius Ponticus, *sent. mon.* 11.

⁸ The loin symbolizes procreation according to Origen, *serl. in Ezech.* 1,26 and *schol. in Cant.* 7,1; cf. also Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ps.* 37,8* (on pagan Latin usage cf. Adams, p. 48).

rec. long. 40 p. 782^D. On the other hand Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 7) had taken the text to signify unreason's dominance over the soul.

honeste viri mulierisque genitalia inmutatis sunt appellata nominibus. At *in Ezech.* 16,4 l. 891 J. again notes that Job 40,11 employs a euphemism in order to signify the male and female sexual organs. In the present passage he has taken both the idea and its formulation from his recent translation of Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 6,4 p. 382,12,⁹ where Job 40,11 receives exactly the same gloss: *vide quomodo honeste viri mulierisque genitalia obiectis nominibus scriptura nuncupaverit, ne per ea vocabula quae in promptu sunt turpitudinem significaret.* J. has made some improvements in remodelling this statement for the *Libellus*: by omitting the second half of the sentence with its ponderous tautology he has achieved an arresting concision, while he has also introduced an elegant hyperbaton which in turn generates a very choice clausula.¹⁰ Several other passages of Origen likewise state that the verse refers euphemistically to the male and female genitals: *enarr. in Job* 40,11 (πάυυ ... εὐταπειστότατα); *in psalm.* 37 *hom.* 1,6; *pasch.* 35. The same identification is also made later at Ambrose, *in psalm.* 37,33,3 and Eucherius, *form.* 6 p. 37,1; cf. Philip, *in Job rec. brev.* 40 p. 1464^D.

11,3

de lumbis David. J. proceeds to demonstrate that in scripture 'loins' denote the male genitals. He again uses Ps. 131,11 for a similar purpose along with Job 40,11 at *in Nah.* 2,1 l. 47, where he also mentions Levi still in his father Abraham's loins, John's leathern girdle and the command to the apostles at Lk. 12,35; this verse of the Psalms is also cited to show that loins mean generation at *in Eph.* 6,14 p. 550^C. Origen had already used the text in this way at *hom. in Ezech.* 1,3 p. 323,22 (*ib.* p. 323,20 *renis quippe coitus significatio est*); J.'s recent translation of this homily is evidently his source here.¹¹

promittitur esse sessurus. For the substantival use of the adjective cf. (e.g.) Apoc. 4,2 *ecce ... super sedem sedens*. Cf. further Goelzer, p. 117.

septuaginta et quinque animae introierunt Aegyptum, quae exierunt

⁹ The translation is usually assigned to 381; the circumstance that no other work provides anything near as much evidence for self-imitation in the *Libellus* might be considered an argument against the attempt of Nautin (1988) to date this translation as far back as the 370's.

¹⁰ On the cretic tribrach cf. Herron, pp. 43ff. The hyperbaton is noted by Hritz, p. 79.

¹¹ His translation uses *lumbus*, like the *Libellus*; the LXX on the other hand has κοιλία (cf. Sabatier, II, p. 259 *venetr*).

de femore Iacob. J. has conflated Gen. 46,26 and 27. Basil (*hom. in Ps. 44,5*) had quoted this passage to prove that thighs denote ἡ κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν ἐνεργεία.¹²

concluctante deo. Reference is made to the story of Jacob's wrestling at *tract. in psalm.* II p. 358 l. 85, where Job 40,11 is also cited.¹³ At *epist.* 65,10,3 the episode is again evidence that the thigh stands for *opera nuptiarum*.¹⁴

The Bible calls the combatant both man (Gen. 32,24) and God (ib. 30); cf. Origen, *sel. in Gen.* 32,24 ὁ λεγόμενος ἄνθρωπος ὁμοῦ καὶ θεός. At *epist.* 65,10,3 J. makes him a man; so do Novatian, *trin.* 9,4 and Ambrose, *in psalm.* 43,17,3. As here, he is called God in the following passages: Ambrose, *epist.* 1,4,16; *Iac.* 2,7,30; *off.* 1,25,120; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 24,8. The question of his identity is discussed by Eusebius of Emesa, *fr. Gen.* 32,25 (he was not God but an angel) and by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Gen.* 32,27 (he was both God and man and angel). At Hilary, *syn.* 38 and 49 the assertion had been anathematized that it was the unborn God and not the Son as man who wrestled with Jacob.

qui pascha facturus est. At this point J. abandons the strict proof that loins signify the private parts, although here *mortificatis* attempts to conceal the fact. Instead he provides four straight examples of biblical cincture. In John's case loins are not even mentioned.

J. again uses Exod. 12,11 in conjunction with Job 40,11 at *tract.* p. 540 l. 105; the same passage also mentions John's loins and the command to the apostles (Lk. 12,35; cf. p. 159,1f. below). At *in Ezech.* 16,10^f l. 1186 he combines Exod. 12,11 with John, apostles and Job 38,3 (cf. l. 21 below). J. twice makes girding oneself for passover an act of mortification: *epist.* 78,3,3 (*accinctos pudicitia lumbos*); *in loel* 1,13 l. 410 (*balteo castitatis*). This interpretation had already been given by Origen, *pasch.* 36 (ib. Job 40,11 and John);¹⁵ Ambrose, *parad.* 3,16; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 40,40; 45,18; cf. also Ps.-Chrysostom, *pasch.* 6,3.

accingere sicut vir. Hilberg merely compares Job 38,3; however the same command is also repeated at 40,2 (= LXX 40,7). J. cites the text again at *in Ier.* 1,10,1 (on Jer. 1,17 'thou therefore gird up thy loins'), where it is combined with John, Elijah and the apostles (Lk. 12,35). It

¹² For secular usage of *femur* in this context cf. Adams, p. 51.

¹³ This passage may be by Origen.

¹⁴ According to Augustine, *serm.* 122,3 breadth of thigh denotes abundant posterity.

¹⁵ Like J. in the *Libellus*, Origen is here endeavouring to show that 'loins' are a synonym for the sexual organs; however his cautious and thoroughgoing treatment presents an instructive contrast to J.'s superficiality.

recurs at *in Ezech.* 16,10^f l. 1186 (ib. John, Elijah, Lk. 12,35, Exod. 12,11). Later J.'s disciple Philip connects the text with Exod. 12,11 (*in Job rec. long.* 38 p. 745^D, where it refers to chastity; however *rec. brev.* 38 p. 1460^A speaks of good works). Similarly Gaudentius associates it with Jer. 1,17 and Lk. 12,35 (*serm.* 2,22; ib. 23 John). J. would seem to have been the first to give this text a sexual reference.

Johannes zona pellicia cingitur. Vittori, I, p. 552^C, and more recently Schaublin, p. 57,¹⁶ add *circa lumbos suos* (cf. Mt. 3,4 *Johannes habebat ... zonam pelliciam circa lumbos suos*; Mk. 1,6 *erat I. vestitus ... zona pellicia circa lumbos eius*); Schaublin comments that the addition is 'im Zusammenhang von Hieronymus' Beweisführung unerlässlich'. This emendation is proved wrong by two passages in which J. repeats the same striking four-word expression (*Johannes zona pellicia cingitur*) in a discussion of *lumbi* as a designation for the private parts (*in Nah.* 2,1 l. 50; *tract.* p. 540 l. 112); in neither is the word *lumbi* mentioned in connection with John. J. clearly prefers a concise and impressive phrase to the clarity which would have resulted from a full citation of scripture.¹⁷

J. makes John's girding of his loins with a belt of dead skin an act of mortification at *epist.* 130,4,2; *in Jer.* 1,10,1; *in Ezech.* 16,10^f l. 1189.¹⁸ At *in Matth.* 3,4 l. 245 (ad loc.) J. remarks that *zona ... pellicia ... mortificationis symbolum est*. Origen had made the same point in connection with John at *pasch.* 36 δηλουμένου ὅτι νεκρώκεν ἐκεῖ πᾶσαν τὴν κίνησιν αὐτοῦ τὴν σπερματικὴν, τοῦ δέρματος νεκρότητα δηλοῦντος; cf. *fr. in Mt.* 39 and *hom. in Lev.* 9,2 p. 420,31. It is made later at Gaudentius, *serm.* 2,23¹⁹ and Ps.-Chrysostom, *praecurs.* 2 p. 491; cf. also the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 3 p. 648.²⁰

apostoli iubentur. Fremantle, p. 26, identified Lk. 12,35 as the source; Hilberg wrongly compares Eph. 6,14 and 1 Pet. 1,13. J. is very partial to this text, which recurs over a dozen times in his works. It is again linked to Job 40,11 at *in Nah.* 2,1 l. 51, while it has the same sexual reference at *in Ezech.* 16,10^f l. 1182 and *in Eph.* 5,24 p. 532^A. This interpretation goes back to Origen, who at *fr. in Lc.* 195 (ad loc.) had said that the loins of the chaste are girt; cf. also *comm. in Eph.* 34.²¹

¹⁶ Schaublin does not refer to Vittori.

¹⁷ It may be added that J. uses the collocation *zona pellicia cingi* again at *epist.* 38,3,1; 107,3,3; *in Matth.* 11,15 l. 128; *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 25 p. 150,7.

¹⁸ Since a belt is naturally worn around the waist, one of skin accordingly 'mortifies' that part of the body: hence J. may have been inclined to regard the addition of *circa lumbos suos* here as not merely cumbersome but also to some degree superfluous.

¹⁹ *Ib. pellicia ... non nisi mortui animantis est.*

²⁰ At Chromatius, *in Matth.* 9,2 John scolded his flesh *iniquam pellem mortuam*.

²¹ For the idea cf. Philo, *quaest. in Ex.* 1,19.

Later Augustine observes in connection with this Lucan verse that girding the loins means checking concupiscence (*contin.* 7,17); the text is given a similar reference at Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 15,297; Ambrose, *in psalm.* 37,33,2; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,167. Likewise Cassian uses it to show that wearing a dead skin betokens self-mortification (*inst.* 1,11,2). On the other hand according to Marius Victorinus (*in Eph.* 6,14) the girding had denoted strength.

11,4

in Ezechiel. The form of this name varies in the MSS. Where the present phrase ('in Ezekiel') occurs, Hilberg gives the indeclinable form at *epist.* 18A,1,3; 33,4,2; 49,21,2; 68,1,5; 69,6,2; on the other hand he reads *Ezechiele* at *epist.* 18A,6,5; 21,13,1; 25,4; 31,2,1; 37,1,2; 64,18,10; 65,18,1. The uninflected acc. occurs at *epist.* 33,4,6; 53,8,16; 54,6,4; 64,21,3; *Ezechielem* is found at *epist.* 69,7,2. J. has *Ezechielis* at *epist.* 66,2,2 and *Ezechieli* at 53,4,4.

non est praecisus umbilicus tuus. J. again connects Ezek. 16,4 with Job 40,11 at *in Ezech.* 16,4 l. 889. For this 'proof' that *umbilicus* signifies the female genitals he is dependent on his recent translation of Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 6,4 p. 381,24, who had also linked the text to Job 40,11 and said that a woman's navel is cut when she is chaste.¹² Later Aponius (10,11) also combines these passages of Ezekiel and Job; Fulgentius (*myth.* 2,2) cites the first and likewise puts lust in women at the navel.

In campo ... erroris in J.'s text comes from the variant reading πεδίου τῆς σκολιότητος at Ezek. 16,5. The whole phrase οὐκ ἐτμήθη ὁ ὀμφαλός σου is itself just a variant reading.

omnis igitur adversus viros dlaboll virtus in lumbis est, omnis in umbilico contra feminas fortitudo. J.'s resonant conclusion has been lifted straight from his translation of Origen's *hom. in Ezech.* 6,4 p. 382,11 *adversum masculos virtus eius in lumbo est, adversum feminas virtus eius in umbilico ventris est.* In Origen's text this sentence immediately precedes the one J. appropriated at the beginning of his scriptural excursus (cf. n. on *honeste viri mulierisque genitalia ...* at 11,2 above). Once again J. has enhanced the stylistic finesse of his translation: its artless monotony is replaced by an elegant chiasmus that is tempered by the anaphora of *omnis*, while he also introduces lexical *variatio* (*adversus / contra, virtus / fortitudo*) and alliteration (*viros ... virtus / feminas fortitudo*); the refinement is further increased by ellipse of the verb and dependent genitive in the second half. Such a

¹² J. however has typically dispensed with Origen's detailed and circumspect exposition: he simply quotes the text without argument.

combination of slavish derivativeness and stylistic finesse is characteristic: the sentence forms a fitting conclusion to a ch. which is indeed a 'tour de force'.

Chapter 12

Four picturesque episodes from the Old Testament illustrate the point made in the previous ch. that sexuality is the means whereby the Devil wreaks destruction.¹ All four examples are men.² The same four had already been used by Ps.-Clement, *ep. ad virg.* 2,9ff.³

12,1

accipe exempla. J. had used the same phrase (*accipe exemplum*) at *epist.* 18A,7,5 and *virg. Mar.* 14 as well as in his translation of Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 2,5 p. 347,5; 5,1 p. 371,23; 12,1 p. 433,14. It would seem to have been something of a cliché; cf. (e.g.) *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,5,1 p. 131 (*accipe exempla*); Ps.-Basil, *const.* 1,5 (δέχου τὰ ὑποδείγματα). On the employment of *exempla* in general cf. Lumpe (1966b); for their use in J. cf. Schneiderhan; Rebenich (1992b).

Sampson. Sampson is again a warning example at *in Mich.* 7,5 l. 143 (cf. also l. 256). He is used in the same way some five years after the appearance of the *Libellus* by Ambrose, who also adduces Solomon in this connection (*in psalm. 118 serm.* 15,18,3). Jovinian cites him as a model of conjugal virtue (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,23). J. makes him a type of Christ at *epist.* 73,3,1 and *in Eph.* 1,10 p. 454^B.

leone fortior. Hilberg fails to adduce Jgs. 14,6 (Samson rends a young lion; cf. *ib.* 18 *quid leone fortius?*). A number of passages point out that Samson was stronger than a lion but weaker than his passion: Ambrose, *apol. Dav.* I 4,16; [Ps.]-Ambrose, *apol. Dav.* II 3,16 (*ib.* David and Solomon); Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 23,11. It may be noted that none of these other texts makes the erotic element as explicit as J.: *in Dalilae mollescit amplexibus.*

saxo durior. The expression was proverbial; cf. Otto, p. 310 s.v. *saxum* 1; Häussler, pp. 79 and 209. J. would seem to have had in mind Jgs. 16,3, where Samson carries off the gates and gate-posts of Gaza on his back (cf. Basil, *hom.* 2,6, cited in next n.); Hilberg again misses the echo.

qui unus et nudus mille est persecutus armatos. Hilberg should have referred to Jgs. 15,15 (Samson slays a thousand men with the jawbone of an ass). Some twenty years later J. applies a similar phrase (*solus et nudus*) to Jacob on his way to Mesopotamia (*epist.* 118,7,2). It is

¹ Each of the first three opens with a complimentary relative clause.

² Male 'loins' likewise received more space in the preceding ch.

³ This foursome also recurs later at Orientius, *comm.* 1,359ff.

noteworthy that in the year after the *Libellus* Ambrose uses the words *inermis et nudus* in reference to Samson's feat (*epist.* 9,62,22);⁴ he significantly avoids J.'s bold *nudus*, which would typically seem to contain a subconscious sexual undertone. The paronomasia in *nudus et nudus* is registered by Harendza, p. 18; the effect of this impressive formulation is further enhanced by hyperbaton and anastrophe with cretic spondee clausula.

The same triad of Samson's exploits which J. mentions here had already been employed by Basil: ἕως ὅτε συμπαρῆν τῷ ἀνδρὶ (sc. νηστεία), κατὰ χιλίους ἐπιπτον οἱ πολέμιοι καὶ πόλλαι πόλεων ἀνεσπῶντο καὶ λέοντες τῶν χειρῶν τὴν ἰσχύν οὐχ ὑφίσταντο (*hom.* 2,6); this passage has perhaps been J.'s source.

in Dallae mollescit amplexibus. With *amplexibus* J. characteristically makes the sexual reference explicit; the LXX on the other hand has simply ἐκοίμισεν αὐτὸν ἀνά μέσον τῶν γονάτων αὐτῆς (Jgs. 16,19A; B ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα).

secundum cor domini. This phrase derives from 1 Reg. 13,14 (κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ): J. uses it again at *adv. Iovin.* 2,4 and *c. Ioh.* 8. As in the present passage, the same words had preceded mention of David's adultery and homicide at Tertullian, *praescr.* 3 l. 9,⁵ which has perhaps been J.'s source here.⁶ Both J. and Tertullian employ the phrase *secundum cor domini*; the LXX on the other hand has merely αὐτοῦ.⁷ The particular locution in question here would seem to be otherwise unattested.

postquam deambulans super tectum domus suae Bersabee captus est nuditate. While Tertullian's phrasing had been terse in the extreme (*stupri reus est; praescr.* 3 l. 9), J.'s own taste for the picturesque

⁴ On the likely date of this letter cf. Palanque, p. 511.

⁵ Cf. later Ps.-Basil, *cons.* p. 1696^D, which may be an imitation of the *Libellus* (cf. Frede [1995], p. 313 'keine Übersetzung ... wohl aus Gallien, 6. Jh').

⁶ The Tertullianic passage reads in full: *David vir bonus secundum cor domini, postea cordis et stupri reus est. Solomon omni gratia et sapientia donatus a domino, ad idololatriam a mulieribus inducitur.* This text exactly matches J.'s: *David secundum cor domini electus ... adulterio iunxit homicidium ... Solomon, per quem se cecinit ipsa sapientia ... recessit a domino, quia amator mulierum fuit.* In this connection it is instructive to compare a passage of Ambrose (*apost. Dav.* II 3,16, for Ambrosian authorship cf. Dekkers-Gaar, p. 41 [no. 136]), where David and Solomon are also combined, however the formulation is quite different: *Solomon templum deo condidit: sed vitam corporis tui templum ipse servasset! ... triumphavit David in decem milibus, sed erravit in viginti et amplius milibus et, quia erravit, hominem se esse cognovit, confessus est culpam, veniam deprecatus dicens ad dominum: domine, ne in ira tua arguas me neque in furore tuo corripuas me.*

⁷ 1 Reg. 13,14 is echoed in Acts 13,22: however the wording there too is simply κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου.

characteristically leads him to evoke the biblical story of David's first sight of Bathsheba at some length. It is also noteworthy that here he introduces a prurient detail which is absent from the scriptural account: whereas the Bible says simply that she was 'washing herself' (2 Reg. 11,2 εἶδεν γυναῖκα λουομένην), J. speaks explicitly of *nuditas*. Such salacious amplification is typical.

adulterio iunxit homicidium. If Tertullian had been content with a bald parataxis (*caedis et stupri reus est; praescr. 3 l. 9*), J. on the other hand employs a formulation that is elegantly hypotactic (*adulterio iunxit homicidium*); he reproduces the same arresting phrase a quarter of a century later at *epist. 122,3,2* (again of David) and in *Ezech. 16,3^b l. 836* (of the Elder who accused Susanna). It is however possible that here too J.'s formulation may not be his own, since the same wording is also used in connection with David at Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Ps. 50 2,7 φόνον συνέπλεξε τῇ μοιχείᾳ*.¹ Perhaps therefore J. is simply employing a cliché.

David is again linked with Solomon in this connection at *epist. 79,7,5*. The combination had already been made by Tertullian, *praescr. 3 l. 8*; cf. also Chrysostom, *Thdr. 2,2*.

12,2

ubi et illud breviter adtende, quod Exactly the same fussily didactic formula recurs at *epist. 29,3,6 illud breviter adtende, quod ...* (cf. also in *Ezech. 48,23 l. 1890*). J. would seem to be alone in using this particular phrase.

rex enim allium non timebat. Some twenty-four years later at *epist. 122,3,3* J. uses exactly the same words to explain the same text (Ps. 50,6 *tibi soli peccavi et malum coram te feci*). The same explanation of this verse is also given at Ambrose, *epist. 2,7,26*;² Didymus, *Ps. 50,6*; Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Ps. 50 3,6* (βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν, σὲ ἐφοβούμην μόνον); cf. also Julian of Eclanum, *epit. in psalm. 50,6^a*. Origen had glossed the verse by saying that David could be judged by God alone (*comm. in Rom. 2,14 p. 922^B*); cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, *qu. Steph. 8,3* (God alone knew his crime); Ambrose, *apol. Dav. I 10,51* (God alone was without sin). In the present passage of the *Libellus* the gloss is not quite *à propos*, since what matters in this context is not David's status, but his sin: again J. has been unable to resist making a clever and derivative point.

¹ Like the *Libellus*, this sermon belongs to the late 4th century; cf. Aldama, p. 109 (no. 294).

² The date is uncertain; cf. Ihm, p. 58.

The Psalm's superscription (v. 2) refers it to David's penitence after seeing Bathsheba (this interpretation had been rejected by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ps. 50 praef.*). Cassian reports (*inst.* 3,6) that this Psalm was sung in all the churches of Italy after the morning hymns.

per quem se cecinit ipsa sapientia. This charming phrase is repeated nine years later in J.'s *adv. Iovin.* 1,24 (again of Solomon) and over thirty years later in his *epist.* 133,2,5 (of Ecclesiastes). J. is evidently thinking of Prov. 8,1 ('doth not wisdom cry?') and 8,12 ('I wisdom ...'). However the wording which J. uses to describe Wisdom's self-eulogy has been lifted with only slight modification from Tertullian, *carn.* 20 l. 23 *per quem se cecinit ipse Christus*; there the reference had been instead to the Psalms of David.¹⁰ It is significant that Tertullian's striking formulation would not appear to be copied by anyone else.

disputavit a cedro Libani usque ad hysopum, quae exit per parietem. J. chooses to stress the botanical aspect of Solomon's wisdom;¹¹ the picturesqueness of the biblical language is no doubt the reason for J.'s particular emphasis. Comparison with the LXX shows that J. has subjected the text (3 Reg. 4,33; = LXX 5,13) to some minor streamlining on literary grounds: ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῶν ξύλων ἀπὸ τῆς κέδρου τῆς ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ καὶ ἕως τῆς ὑσσώπου τῆς ἐκπορευομένης διὰ τοῦ τοίχου. He quotes it in the same abbreviated form at *in Eph.* 3,5 p. 480^C. Elsewhere the text is seldom cited: no Latin Father before J. would seem to have used it. In his description of Solomon's wisdom in the present passage J. has again combined a text of scripture with a striking formulation borrowed from elsewhere (cf. previous n.).

amator mulierum fuit. There is a further allusion to Solomon's voluptuousness at 39,4 below. J. is fond of this subject: his works contain some ten references to Solomon's womanizing. At *epist.* 125,1,2 it is again said to have happened in spite of his wisdom: the same point had already been made by Tertullian, *praescr.* 3 l. 10. Jovinian put Solomon in his catalogue of husbands and made him a type of Christ (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,5).

in illicitum Thamar sororis Amnon frater exarsit incendium. J. mentions this episode half a dozen times. In 391 Chrysostom also used it as a warning example at *hom. in Jo.* 61,4: women destroyed

¹⁰ The Tertullianic context (*ille* [sc. David] *apud nos canit Christum, per quem se cecinit ipse Christus*) is accordingly the same as in J.'s antecedent II. 9–11 (*David ... Christum ... cantaverat*), which form a correlate to the present description of Solomon.

¹¹ So does Ambrose, *Aex.* 3,15,64 (*ne quod Solomoni specialiter sapientiae munere divinitus videtur esse conlatum, usurpatorie videamur exponere differentias arborum et virtutes radicum*); however J. characteristically employs a direct citation of scripture to make the point.

Absalom, Amnon and very nearly Job. The warning J. appends about complacency in regard to kin (*ne aliquis etiam de sanguinis sibi propinquitate confideret*) does not tally with what he says in the next ch. but one on the subject of *subintroductae*: *frater sororem virginem deserit, caelibem spernit virgo germanum* (14,2). J. ends the present ch. with a flourish by employing a striking hyperbaton that enfolds the whole clause.

Chapter 13

Having dealt with historical examples illustrating the destructive consequences of sexuality for men J. now returns to the present and deplores in a very vivid ch. the laxness of contemporary virgins.¹

13,1

piget dicere. These words are followed by four indirect questions of progressively increasing length. In the first J. states his point simply and with perfect clarity (*quot cotidie virgines ruant*). He then repeats it by using a striking cliché (*quantas de suo gremio mater perdat ecclesia*). Finally he repeats it again by means of several *recherché* allusions to scripture. This very impressive sentence accordingly provides yet another instance of the combination of biblical citation with striking second-hand material. For the anaphora (threefold *quot*) cf. Quacquarelli (1971), pp. 81ff. According to Petitmengin (1994), p. 496, J.'s employment of *ruere* in this passage has been prompted by Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 14,3; for an attempt at rebuttal and for documentation of a hitherto unidentified usage of this verb to denote the virgin's lapse cf. Adkin (1997b), pp. 155ff. The topic of fallen virgins recurs at 29,3 below; cf. also *virg. Mar.* 21 and *adv. Iovin.* 1,5.

de suo gremio mater perdat ecclesia. Here Mierow-Lawler, p. 237, n. 111, refer simply to Plumpe, p. 91, n. 27, who (like Deléani, p. 72) connects this passage with Cyprian, *unit. eccl.* 23 (*ut ... consentientis populi corpus unum gremio suo gaudens mater includat*). The objection may however be raised that this Cyprianic passage does not provide an exact parallel to J.'s 'lap of mother church', since the term 'church' is absent. A more serious flaw of Plumpe's study is its complete failure to establish the existence of this particular phrase 'the lap of mother church' as a fixed expression. It had occurred twice in Cyprian: *epist.* 16,4,2 (*in sinum matris ecclesiae*) and *laps.* 2; cf. *sent. episc.* 26. Around 400 this collocation is very common (*sinus* and *gremium* are used indifferently); while J. himself uses it again at *in Os.* 2,6 l. 143, it also occurs at Chromatius, *in Matth.* 55,2; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 32,5; Augustine, *bapt.* 6,33,63; *in euang. loh.* 39,2; *nat. et grat.* 21,23; *in psalm.* 38,3; 49,27; Evodius, *fid.* 45; *De miraculis S. Stephani Protomartyris* 2,4,1; Paulinus of Milan, *adv. Coel.* 3; Possidius, *vita Aug.* 18,5. The same collocation occurs in Greek at Chrysostom,

¹ The ch. is discussed by Vogué (1991), I, pp. 260ff.

catech. 1,1 (PG 49, p. 224 ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς κοινῆς ἀπάντων ἡμῶν μητρός); *pan. Phoc.* 2; *stat.* 6,1.

Besides the specific locution 'lap of mother church', the word 'lap' is applied to the church with some frequency. J. himself gives the church a *gremium* at *epist.* 7,3,1 and 78,18; she has a *sinus* at *epist.* 74,4,5. On her *gremium* cf. *TLL* VI,2, 2321,82ff. One might add *Concilium Carthaginense a. 343/348* p. 3 l. 11; Zeno 1,13,7; Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 1,22; *patr.* 5,27; Ps.-Chrysostom, *op. imperf. in Matth.* 49 p. 910. On the church's *sinus* cf. *TLL* VIII, 444,55ff. (add Irenaeus 5,20,2 [SC 153]; Hilary, *trin.* 7,4; Ambrose, *puenit.* 2,8,72). Augustine is unusually fond of these phrases: he speaks of the church's *sinus* at *epist.* 69,1 and 185,30; of her *gremium* (apart from *TLL*'s examples) at *c. Cresc.* 4,56,67; *de duab. anim.* 1; *doctr. christ.* 1,35; *c. epist. fund.* 23; *epist.* 151,11; 185,12; 185,23; *c. Faust.* 13,16; 15,3; *mor. eccl.* 30,64; *in psalm.* 10,8; 39,8; 103, *serm.* 3,5; 145,16; *util. cred.* 17,35. Chrysostom similarly refers to the church's κόλποι at *Eutrop.* 1,1 and *Is. interp.* 2,3.

The phrase 'mother church' on its own is also of course very common. It recurs fourteen times in J.'s works; Augustine on the other hand has it some seventy times, while it is found on fifteen occasions in Cyprian, but only eight times in Ambrose's much larger *oeuvre*. On its origin cf. Plumpe and *TLL* VIII, 444,29ff.; on the general concept cf. also Schmid (1954b), pp. 554f.; Rinetti. *Deus pater* is often added; cf. *TLL* loc. cit. 46ff. (add Hilary, *in Matth.* 19,5; Niceta of Remesiana, *virg. laps.* p. 132,3; Optatus of Milevis, 4,2 p. 104,1; 4,5 p. 107,5; Augustine, *discipl.* 3,3; *enchir.* 39,12; *epist.* 243,4; *c. Petil.* 3,9,10; *in psalm.* 88, *serm.* 2,14; *serm.* 22,9; 22,10; 56,14 *RBen* 68, 1958 p. 36,277; 57,2 p. 415,27 [Verbraken]; 216,8; 359,4; 359,6; Quodvultdeus, *ymb.* 3,13,1; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 100a,5). In Greek this addition is far rarer.² The bridegroom of mother church is Christ according to Didymus, *Pr.* 1,8; she is a virgin according to Epiphanius, *haer.* 80,6,5.

The church's motherhood can be described in strikingly physical terms.³ For her *ubera* cf. *TLL* loc. cit. 38ff. (add Peter Chrysologus, *serm.* 73,3). She has an *uterus* at Ambrose, *in Luc.* 7,171; Chromatius, *serm.* 9,6; Gregory of Elvira, *in cant.* 2,31; Augustine, *c. Faust.* 12,47; *serm.* 216,7; Philip, *in Job rec. long.* 40 p. 789^b (cf. 38 p. 755^b *viscera*); Quodvultdeus, *ymb.* 1,1,3; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 200,5. *Partus* is used at Amobius, *ad Greg.* 19 p. 424,1. The church is a spiritual mother in Amphilocheus, *exerc.* 5; Augustine, *epist.* 34,3;

² There is an example at Epiphanius, *haer.* 75,8,2

³ Cf. (e.g.) Basil, *hom.* 13,1.

Quodvultdeus, *ymb.* 3,13,2 (cf. *TLL* loc. cit. 37). The name 'mother' is given to one particular church at Basil, *ep.* 127 (τὴν μητέρα ὑμῶν τὴν ἐν Νικοπόλει ἐκκλησίαν); cf. *TLL* loc. cit. 64ff. Finally it may be noted that Augustine is very fond of applying the expression *catholica mater* to the church; cf. *TLL* loc. cit. 58ff. and in addition *conf.* 6,3,4; 9,13,37; *c. Cresc.* 3,63,69; *epist.* 69,1; 105,13; 170,10; 185,12; 185,32; 185,36; 185,44; 185,46; *c. Julian.* 6,21,67; *c. Julian. op. imperf.* 4,120; *c. Petil.* 3,5,6. It also occurs in Ps.-Augustine, *c. Fulg.* p. 220,22; Victor of Vita 1,21; 3,23.

super quot sidera superbus inimicus ponat thronum suum, quot petras excavet et habitet coluber in foraminibus earum. Though the exotic language was an obvious clue, Hilberg failed to detect any scriptural reference whatever in these words. Vaccari (1920), p. 389, then pointed to Is. 14,13 (ἐπάνω τῶν ἀστρῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου; cf. 4,3 above); Cant. 2,14 (ἐν σκέπη τῆς πέτρας; Vulg. *in foraminibus petrae*); Is. 11,8 (παιδίον νήπιον ἐπὶ τρίγωνον ἀσπίδων καὶ ἐπὶ κοίτην ἐγκόνων ἀσπίδων τὴν χεῖρα ἐπιβαλεῖ; Vulg. *super foramine aspidis et in caverna reguli*). It would appear however that here Obad. 3f. has been J.'s principal inspiration. J.'s translation of the LXX at *in Abd.* 2 l. 159 (ad loc.) reads as follows: *superbia cordis tui elevavit te habitantem in foraminibus petrarum, exultantem habitaculum (Vulg. solium) tuum ... si inter media sidera ponas nidum tuum ...* J. does in fact conflate this passage with Is. 14,13 at *in Am.* 2,6 l. 201 (*in caelum ascendam, super sidera caeli ponam nidum meum*); *in Hab.* 3,14 l. 1051; *in Os.* 8,1 l. 71. In the present passage he may also have had in mind Job 14,19 (Vulg. *lapides excavant aquae*); Nah. 1,6 (J.'s rendering of LXX [*in Nah.* 1,6 l. 178] *petrae contritae sunt ab eo*); Prov. 30,19 (Vulg. *viam colubri super petram*; this is immediately preceded by *viam aquilae in caelo*, which recalls Obad. 4 *si exaltatus fueris ut aquila*). At *in Abd.* 2 l. 232 (ad loc.) J. interprets Obadiah's 'holes in the rocks' as thoughts or feelings, while he has the nest placed *inter sidera ecclesiae* (l. 226). Such an exegesis is of course highly appropriate for the present context.⁴ J. uses Obad. 4 again at *in Eph. lib.* 3 *praef.* p. 515^D, where he applies it to the Devil and as here identifies the 'star' he treads on with a person: *volebat (sc. diabolus) quasi aquila ponere super illum (sc. Paulum) nidum suum*. Finally it may be noted that J.'s scriptural phantasmagoria would appear to have been

⁴ Holes are hearts # *in Soph.* 2,12 l. 633. The rocks of Nah. 1,6 are also hearts according to *in Nah.* 1,6 l. 182 and *epist.* 120,8,7. At *epist.* 130,8,5 J. describes how the snake climbs into people's thoughts; cf. Origen, *comm. ar. in Mt.* 28 p. 54,9 *βένων in eis (sc. corpore et anima) ... serpentes ... cubationes*. For the rock image applied to virginity cf. Ps.-Chrysostom, *annunt.* p. 760 ὀρθόλαμπρος ἡ καρδίαν, ὀλοτόμπρος ἡ πέτρα.

suggested by a simple line of Cyprian: *sic se expugnator inimicus per artes suas inserit* (*hab. virg.* 20; this short ch. begins with the words *sic ergo frequenter ecclesia virgines suas plangit*, which recall the opening of J.'s ch.; it also contains the phrases *viduae antequam nuptae* and *Christi adulterae*, which J. uses shortly afterwards at 13,1 and 13,2).

videas plerasque. Here Cavallera, l.l. p. 108, n. 2, speaks of 'exagération intolérable'. Goelzer, p. 264, had however pointed out that 'exagération can mean no more than *multi*, ou plutôt ... *comptures, aliquot*': cf. Vaccari (1924), pp. 83f. ('sinonimo di *quidam*'). This particular phrase (*videas plerasque*) recurs at 32,1 below; J. also uses it at *epist.* 54,5,3 and twice at *in Gal.* 5,26 (pp. 424^C and 424^D).⁵ J. of course is always partial to exaggeration for the sake of dramatic effect. On hyperbole in the Fathers cf. Quacquarelli (1971), pp. 161ff.

viduas ante quam nuptas. Keenan, p. 37, and Duval (1970), p. 33, n. 36, point out that J. has borrowed this phrase from Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 20 *viduae antequam nuptae*. Weyman (1893), p. 341, compared Apuleius, *apol.* 76,2 (*vidua antequam nupta*); this is evidently Cyprian's own source.⁶ J. uses *mater ante quam nupta* of Mary at *epist.* 49,21,2 and *virg. Mar.* 2; he has taken this expression from Tertullian, *carn.* 23 l. 29. Similarly at *epist.* 1,15,2 J. had said *sepultum paene ante quam mortuum*. J.'s taste for extravagant phraseology makes him use this kind of expression with particular frequency. In the present passage J. also produces a notable *adnominatio* (*videas plerasque viduas*); neither Cyprian nor Apuleius had achieved the same effect.

infelicem conscientiam mentita tantum veste protegere. Here *conscientia* covers objective pregnancy as well as subjective guilt.⁷ For the idea cf. Ambrose, *epist.* 8,56,11 *tumescit alvus ... ut praetermittamus alia, quibus se vel tacita prodit conscientia*. In the present passage however J. would seem to have taken a hint from Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 14,2 *ventres tegere coguntur infirmitatis ruina*; in this section of ch. 13 J. has appropriated further material from the same passage of Tertullian (cf. next n.). Once again J. has made his own formulation more arresting than its source. On *mentita* cf. *TLL VIII*, 782,1ff. '*faltax*' (though the present instance is wrongly adduced at 779,46).

quas nisi tumor uteri et infantum prodiderit vagitus. The last three words have been lifted from Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 14,6 *non enim confitebuntur nisi ipsorum infantium suorum vagitibus proditae*. Again

⁵ Cf. already Quintilian, *inst.* 6,4,9, 8, *prooem.* 27, Ps-Quintilian, *decl.* 19,7.

⁶ Lurbeck and Hagendahl (1958, 1974) provide no evidence for any knowledge of Apuleius on J.'s part; cf. also Koch (1926), pp. 332f.

⁷ Pacian, *paroen.* 8,2 has *vulneratam argere conscientiam*.

J. has enhanced the rhetorical impact of the material he has borrowed. He would also appear to have combined it with another passage of Tertullian, who in *monog.* 16,5 has the phrase *uterus nauseantes et infantes ripientes*. J. has again improved his source by substituting the more graphic *tumor*;⁸ he has also achieved a very elegant chiasmus.

erecta cervice et ludentibus pedibus incedunt. Deléani, p. 73, identified the source as Is. 3,16⁹ αἱ θυγατέρες Σιών ... ἐπορεύθησαν ὑψηλῶ τραχήλῳ καὶ ἐν νεύμασιν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ τῇ πορείᾳ τῶν ποδῶν ἅμα σύρουσαι τοὺς χιτῶνας καὶ τοῖς ποσὶν ἅμα παίξουσαι. J. has again compressed his source for literary effect. At *in Is.* 2,3,16 l. 25 (ad loc.) J. uses this text in order to criticize 'women of the church', while in the present passage it expresses his annoyance at the levity of virgins as well as their lapse. The verse had already been widely quoted; cf. Clement of Alexandria, *paed.* 3,11,72,2; Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 13;¹⁰ Commodian, *instr.* 2,15,3; Hilary, *in psalm.* 128,8; Ambrose, *Noë* 15,54; Orsiesius, *doctr.* 43. At *hom. in 1 Tim.* 8,3 Chrysostom uses it against half-hearted virgins. Here J. has again combined scripture with striking phraseology that has been borrowed from elsewhere (cf. previous n.): a sentence which at first sight would appear to record J.'s own careful observation of life accordingly turns out once again to be wholly derivative.

13,2

sterilitatem praebibunt. On contraception cf. Waszink (1959), p. 1254. Add Augustine, *nupt. et conc.* 1,15,17 (*sterilitatis venena*); Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 44,2 (*illas diabolicas potiones ... per quas iam non possint concipere*); 51,4; cf. Ulpian, *dig.* 40,7,3,16.

necdum satl hominis homicidium. Papinian, *dig.* 35,2,9,1 does not recognize a *homo* before birth. In the church it was debated whether abortion was homicide; cf. Augustine, *quaest. hept.* 2,80. J. himself adopts the view that this is not the case until the embryo takes shape (*epist.* 121,4,5); the same opinion had been expressed by Tertullian, *anim.* 37,2.¹¹ For homicide before actual conception (as here) cf. Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 1,12 *quantoscumque concipere ... potuerat*,

⁸ J. also combines 'swollen wombs' and 'wailing infants' at 2,1 above.

⁹ The allusion is also recorded in Gryson (1987), p. 127.

¹⁰ Because the verb *ludere* is absent from the Vulgate, Deléani, p. 73, argues that the wording of the *Libellus* is due to this Cyprianic quotation of Is. 3,16; however *ludere* is simply part of the Old Latin. In fact J.'s use of *cervice* and *manibus* proves that he is not following the text in the *De haereticis*, whereas Cyprian's *collo* and *nutu* belong to the African version of the Old Latin, the terms which J. employs are peculiar to the European (cf. Gryson [1987], p. 126).

¹¹ According to Philo, *apoc. leg.* 3,109 it is an ἀνθρώπος if the limbs are formed

taniorum homicidiorum reatu tenebitur. J.'s own formulation of the idea is marked by very striking *adnominatio* (*hominis homicidium*). Cf. further Dölger (1934); Waszink (1950); id. (1954).

aborti venena. To the examples of contraceptives in Waszink (1950), pp. 59f. (cf. Mayor, p. 201) add Sulpicius Severus, *chron.* 2,48,3 (*graminibus*); Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 1,12 (*potiones*); 44,2; 52,4; 200,4. J. condemns the practice at *epist.* 123,4,1 and *adv. Iovin.* 1,49. The penalty was ten years' penance according to *Concilium Ancyranum* a. 314, 21 and Basil, *ep.* 188,2. *TLL* cites no example of the word *abortium* outside J.

ipsae commortuae. The same point is made in Basil, *ep.* 188,2; cf. *Homiliae Clementinae* 4,21,2 and Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 51,4 (quoting the present passage). According to Pliny (*nat.* 7,40) abortion in the fourth and eighth months is fatal.

ad inferos. For the tone of this phrase cf. *epist.* 118,5,5 *quod tecum pergat ad inferos, immo ad regna caelorum*.

Christi adulterae. Keenan, p. 37, and Duval (1970), p. 33, n. 36, identified the phrase as a borrowing from Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 20 *non mariti sed Christi adulterae*. It had also been used by Cyprian at *epist.* 4,4,1. J. himself repeats the locution at *epist.* 147,11,3; it also recurs in Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,19 and Augustine, *in psalm.* 83,4. At *bon. viduit.* 10,13 Augustine dissents from the view of those who thought that women who married after a vow of chastity were adulteresses in actual fact (cf. Saint-Martin, pp. 463f. [n. 33]).¹² One might compare further Origen, *comm. in 1 Cor.* 26 *πόρνοι ἐπὶ Χριστόν*. For the idea itself cf. also Chrysostom, *hom. in 1 Tim.* 8,3 (*Χριστόν ἔχεις νυμφίον· τί ἐραστάς ἀνθρώπους ἐπισπᾶσαι; μοιχείας σε τότε κρινεῖ*) and Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom.* 10 p. 40 (*οὐχὶ συνδούλου κοίτην ἐνύβρισας, ἀλλὰ τοῦ δεσπότου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*).

J. characteristically incorporates the phrase he has borrowed into an impressive tricolon crescens: *homicidae sui, Christi adulterae, necdum nati filii parricidae*. It is reproduced by Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 51,4. For the combination 'killer of oneself' and 'killer of one's offspring' cf. Basil, *ep.* 188,2 and *Homiliae Clementinae* 4,21,2. Whereas this pair naturally goes together, J.'s importation into it of the Cyprianic 'adulteress of Christ' might be felt to entail a certain inconcinnity. On *homicidae sui* cf. Laurence (1996), pp. 51f.

filii parricidae. It is perhaps possible that here J. was thinking of Tertullian, *uxor.* 1,5 l. 10, where the very striking phrase *parricidiis*

¹² With typical extravagance J. himself says at *adv. Iovin.* 1,13 that virgins who marry after consecration are not so much adulterous as incestuous.

expugnantur is used of the unborn victims of abortion.¹³

13.3

istae sunt, quae solent dicere: *Sermocinatio*¹⁴ is an effective way of enlivening the discourse (Quintilian, *inst.* 9,2,29). The figure is also especially suitable for depicting the attitude of one's opponents (ib. 9,2,30). Here J. uses it to describe the viewpoint of loose-living virgins. For the wording which J. employs to introduce this *sermocinatio* cf. 29,5 below (*istiusmodi ... solent ... dicere*;) and *epist.* 54,15,1 (*solent adolescentulae viduae ... dicere*;).

It would seem that here J. has borrowed his *sermocinatio* from elsewhere. J. says: "*omnia munda mundis*", *sufficit mihi conscientia mea. cor mundum desiderat deus. cur me abstinence a cibis, quos deus creavit ad utendum*"? At the end of *cult. fem.* Tertullian deals with the same topic as J.'s ch. 13: the department of Christian women who resemble prostitutes is scandalous.¹⁵ The reasons which such folk use to justify their behaviour are set out by Tertullian in the following *sermocinatio*: *aliqua fors dicit: 'non est mihi necessarium hominibus probari; nec enim testimonium hominum requiro; deus conspexor est cordis'* (2,13 l. 1). It would appear that here we have the source of J.'s own *sermocinatio*: the argument in both is identical. In particular it might be thought that there is a faint verbal echo of *deus conspexor est cordis* in J.'s *cor mundum desiderat deus*: *cor* and *deus* enclose both statements.

In Tertullian this line of reasoning is entirely appropriate. The point at issue is external adornment. Tertullian rebuts his *sermocinatio* by insisting that it is not enough for a Christian woman to be chaste; she must show by her outward appearance that she is (2,13 l. 15). In J.'s own *sermocinatio* on the other hand the argument of its Tertullianic model is not *à propos*. The *istae* in whose mouths he puts it have just been described as guilty of illegitimate pregnancies, contraception and abortion (13,1f.). Clearly such people cannot claim a 'pure heart' and a 'clear conscience'. In fact J. himself has just said that they try *infelicem conscientiam mentita tantum veste protegere* (ll. 7f.). The

¹³ *TLL* X,1, 446.49ff. records two further instances of *parricidium* applied to abortion: Minucius Felix 30,2 (*parricidium faciens antequam pariam*) and Cyprian, *epist.* 52,2,5 (in *parricidium partus*). In both cases the word has clearly been chosen for the sake of the *adnominatio*. *TLL* provides no parallel for the use of *parricida* in this abortional sense.

¹⁴ On the question of terminology for this rhetorical figure cf. Calboli, pp. 420ff. (nn. 277; 290).

¹⁵ On J.'s early and close knowledge of *cult. fem.* cf. Petimengin (1988), p. 55.

inappropriateness of the argument is convenient verification that it has been borrowed from elsewhere. Such inconcinnity is typical.

If J. has appropriated his argument from *cult. fem.*, it is significant that he differs from Tertullian in making lavish use of scripture: J. begins and ends his *sermocinatio* with a quotation from the Bible (cf. also n. on *cor mundum*). The result is to enhance the rhetorical effect. Here we accordingly have yet another instance of the tendency to combine scriptural citation with striking phraseology that has been taken from elsewhere (in this case Tertullian; cf. also n. on *sufficit mihi conscientia* ...).

omnia munda mundis. J. repeats Tit. 1,15 at 29,7 below. It ends with *mens et conscientia*; this would seem to have been the cue for what J. says next (*sufficit ... conscientia*).

sufficit mihi conscientia mea. Schade (1936), p. 75, n. 2, and Bauer (1983), p. 44, n. 2, compare Cicero, *Att.* 12,28,2 *mea mihi conscientia pluris est quam omnium sermo*. However Cicero's formulation is rather different. Otto, p. 90, s.v. *conscientia* 2, lists J.'s phrase, though he admits that it is not 'im strengen Sinne sprichwörtlich'.¹⁶ Häussler, p. 99, adds two further examples from J.: *epist.* 117,4,4 and the present passage. Their evidence certainly establishes that this expression is one of J.'s favourites (cf. in addition *tract. in psalm.* I p. 148 l. 207). *TLL* IV, 368,22f. also adduces Quintilian, *inst.* 11,1,17 (*in veris quoque sufficit conscientia*) and Sidonius Apollinaris, *epist.* 1,7,7. Perhaps J.'s immediate source was however Tertullian, *carn.* 3 l. 12 '*satis erat illi, inquis, conscientia sua*'. J. borrows from this treatise on a number of occasions in the present work; moreover in Tertullian the expression forms part of a *sermocinatio*, as it does in J. This formula is also found in a number of other texts from the late fourth century onwards; they too should be added to Otto and Häussler: Rufinus, *Clement.* 3,13,1; 10,46,2; Augustine, *bon. viduit.* 22,27; *epist.* 140,79; *in psalm.* 147,11; *serm.* 163B,5 coll. *Morin* p. 217,17; 356,7; Valerian of Cemele, *hom.* 1,8; Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,3,21. Chrysostom (*pecc.* 4) has ἀρκεί τὸ σκευδαίσιον.

cor mundum desiderat deus. *Cor mundum* is a scriptural locution; cf. Ps. 23,4 (LXX and Hebr.); 50,12 (LXX and Hebr.); 72,1 (Hebr.); Prov. 20,9; Mt. 5,8. The suggestion was made above (cf. n. on *istae sunt quae solent* ...) that J.'s words here may be a reminiscence of Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,13 l. 2 *deus conspexor est cordis*; each sentence

¹⁶ Otto cites J.'s *epist.* 14,7,1 and 123,14,1, where the wording is the same as in the *Libellus*, he also compares Cicero, *Att.* 12,28,2 and Ovid, *fast.* 4,311 (*conscia mens recti famae mendacia rufes*).

is framed by the terms *cor* and *deus*. On Tertullian's formulation Turcan, p. 162, compares I Reg. 16,7 ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἐμβλέπεται ἄνθρωπος, ὄψεται ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ὄψεται εἰς πρόσωπον, ὁ δὲ θεός ὄψεται εἰς καρδίαν. J. himself quotes these words in his attack on worldly women at 38,2 below; it may therefore have seemed inappropriate to echo the same text in the present passage. An attitude similar to the one described here is again censured by J. at *adv. Iovin.* 2,9: *frustra quidam simulant salva fide et pudicitia et integritate mentis se abuti voluptatibus*.

cur me abstineam a cibis, quos deus creavit ad utendum? Hilberg fails to record the echo of I Tim. 4,3 *abstinere a cibis, quos deus creavit ad percipiendum*; it had however been identified by Fremantle, p. 27. The next verse of the same Epistle is quoted at 29,7 below (ib. Tit. 1,15 *omnia munda mundis*, quoted in l. 15 above). With these words J. now passes from lasciviousness to food and drink; they therefore prepare the way for the *bon mot* about 'Christ's blood' in ll. 3f. For the frame of mind depicted here cf. [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 57,102ff. *si volucrum edulium refutaveris ... sacrilegii crimen adfigetur statimque aient: hi sunt qui creatorem mundi contemnunt; in usus nostros facta sunt omnia*. Similarly at *epist.* 117,6,3 J. notes: *ut vinum bibas, dei laudabitur creatura*. In the present passage the anaphoric *adnominatio* of *cor / cur* suits the expostulatory tone.¹⁷

festivae. J. again disapproves of *festivitas* at 29,6 (on song); cf. also his critical remarks at 24,1 *facetam ... vocant*.

ingurgitaverint. J. achieves an effective bathos by appending a coarse word to ones that express grace (*lepidae et festivae*). *TLL* s.v. gives about a dozen examples from patristic authors where this verb again refers to gluttony and drunkenness (add J.'s *epist.* 72,2,3 *mero*). J. also uses it at *epist.* 108,17,3 and *c. Lucif.* 8.

ebrietati sacrilegium copulantes. J.'s very impressive formulation is copied shortly afterwards by Ambrose, *Hel.* 12,41, where it concerns the Golden Calf episode.

'*absit, ut ego me a Christi sanguine abstineam*'. J. adds a second

¹⁷ Deléani, p. 72, argues that the section of the *Libellus* which extends from these words to the end of the paragraph (p. 161,6) has been suggested by Cyprian, *hah. virg.* 11 *locupletem se dictis et divitem et utendum putas his quae possidere te deus voluit: vere sed ad res salutare et bonas artes: vere ad illa quae deus praecepit, quae dominus ostendit*. There is however no reason whatever to see Cyprianic influence in this passage of the *Libellus*: whereas J. refers exclusively to God's creatures of food and wine, Cyprian deals instead with wealth. Here the *De habitu virginum* is indebted to Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,9 ll. 25–8, which J. himself does imitate at 29,5 below (cf. n. on *rebus tuis utere*).

and shorter *sermocinatio*. Labourt, I, p. 123, n. 1, explains: 'C'est-à-dire: je ne me priverai pas pour cela de communier; l'usage romain de cette époque était que les fidèles pussent communier chez eux tous les jours, s'ils le désiraient'.¹⁸ However this interpretation fails to take account of *sacrilegium* in l. 3. The correct explanation would seem to have been supplied by Schade (1936), p. 75, n. 3: 'So nennen sie den Wein, unter dessen Gestalt das Blut Christi dargestellt wird'.¹⁹ The sacrilege of such people consists in justifying their inebriation by referring to the wine they have drunk as 'Christ's blood'. It would seem that this observation has not been inspired by any literary source. That such a line of argument was in fact current at this period is suggested by two contemporary texts. The first is J.'s own (*in Gal.* 5,19 p. 417^D),²⁰ where he is dealing with criticism of the passage of the *Libellus* which had prescribed that young women should avoid wine 'like poison' (8,1). He excuses himself thus: *alioquin sciebamur et in Christi sanguinem vinum consecrari*. The second text is Ambrose, *hex.* 3,17,72.²¹ Here Ambrose argues that God created wine in the knowledge that its moderate use was beneficial and that only excess would lead to vice. He continues: *sed dominus et in eo creaturae suae gratiam reservavit, ut eius fructum nobis converteret ad salutem ac per eum nobis peccatorum remissio proveniret*.²² Here the reference is to the Eucharist. These passages of Ambrose and J. himself accordingly indicate that in the 380's it was indeed customary to justify the consumption of wine on the grounds that Christ's blood took such a form. Whereas therefore J.'s immediately antecedent instance of *sermocinatio* was found to be a case of literary imitation, this particular one would seem on the other hand to be an authentic observation from life.

quam viderint tristem. J. notes at *epist.* 38,5,2 that the ascetically-minded are called sad because they eschew roars of laughter; cf. *adv. Iovin.* 2,36 *de nostro grege tristes*. J. employs *subtristis* as a term of approbation at *epist.* 107,9,3; *lugubris* is used in the same way at *epist.* 66,13,2. At 28,2 below monks are said to feign sadness. At 27,3 on the other hand J. would like to see a happy face during fasts (cf. Mt. 6,16ff.).

On sadness of countenance cf. further Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 15,4 *quis ... audebit oculis suis premere faciem clausam, faciem non sentientem*,

¹⁸ The same explanation is given by Cola, I, p. 198, n. 15, and by Camisani, p. 340, n. 69.
¹⁹ Cf. also Vogt (1991), I, pp. 261f.

²⁰ It belongs to 386 according to Nautin (1979).

²¹ The work is dated to 387 by Bannert, p. 13.

²² There is nothing comparable in Basil's *hex.*

faciem, ut dixerim, tristem? Similarly Ambrose recommends *tristitia* at *in psalm. 118 serm.* 12,9,1: it is the companion of *gravitas*.

miseram. For this criticism of the serious ascetic cf. *epist.* 45,5,2 *tu tales miseros arbitraris*.

monacham. TLL VIII, 1399,47 gives this passage as the earliest instance of *monacha*. J. has the feminine form again at *epist.* 39,5,2 and 39,6,2. Siricius also uses it at *epist.* 1,6,7. 'Monk' is again an insult at *epist.* 38,5,2 *quia serica veste non utimur, monachi iudicamur*. *Virgo* rather than *monacha* was the more usual designation; cf. *epist.* 107,10,3 *virginum ac monachorum* (so also *epist.* 46,13,1; 108,28,3; 127,8,2; Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 6,1).²³

Manicheam vocant. For this accusation cf. [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 57,101 *quod si vilibus abstinueris carnibus et non crebro balneas frequentaveris, tunc fere per omnes columnas Manichaei tibi titulus adscribetur*. Jovinian accused J. himself of following the Manicheans (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,5). The charge is rebutted at *adv. Iovin.* 1,3; cf. *epist.* 49,3,2 and 71,6,2. At 38,7 below Manicheans are condemned.

The phrase *miseram et monacham et Manicheam* is particularly striking owing to the combination of alliteration, polysyndeton and adherence to Behaghel's law.²⁴

ieiunium heresis est. Cf. *c. Vigil.* 1 *dicat ... continentiam haeresim*.

13,4

per publicum notabiliter incedunt. Keenan, p. 36, and Deléani, p. 73, note that here J. has copied from Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 9 *si ... per publicum notabiliter incedas* (cf. also next two nn.). It may be observed that in the whole of this passage J. has again compressed his source: the various formulations he appropriates from the *De habitu virginum* are part of a very complex Cyprianic period that begins with six conditional clauses. On the wording of the present formulation cf. further Blaise s.v. *notabiliter*; and Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1109 *incessu notabili*. Deléani, p. 73, n. 40, also affirms that here the Hieronymian *incedunt* is 'surement' due to Is. 3,16 (cf. next n.). However the European version of the Old Latin text of this verse has *itinere*, not *incessu*; here J. is simply imitating Cyprian.

oculorum nutibus. Deléani, p. 73, identifies Is. 3,16 (ἐν νεύμασιν ὀφθαλμῶν) as the source; J. had quoted from the same verse at 13,1

²³ Cf. later Isidore, *eccf. off.* 2,16,17.

²⁴ The juxtaposition of *monacha* and *Manichea* had particular point according to Vogué (1991), I, pp. 409, who compares a recent law directed against Manichean 'solitaires' (*Codex Theodosianus* 16,5,9 *pr.*; March 382).

above (*erecta cervice ...*). In this section J. is imitating Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 9 *si ... per publicum notabiliter incedas, oculos in te iuventutis indicias, suspiria adulescentium post te trahas*; here however he chooses to replace Cyprian's *oculos in te iuventutis indicias* with the more graphic and compact citation of this biblical text. The same verse is glossed by Chrysostom as follows: νεύμασιν ὀφθαλμῶν, ὃ τῶν ἐπαιριζομένων ἐστὶ γυναικῶν, διαστρέφειν τὰς κόρας (*Is. interp.* 3,8). Chrysostom also takes exception in a lax virgin to τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν τὰς μυρίας ἐκείνας περιστροφάς (*hom. in 1 Tim.* 8,2); cf. also Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra (= Evagrius Ponticus), *spir. mal.* 4 (noting how wanton virgins περιστρέφουσι βλέφαρα). In the same connection Basil of Ancyra had spoken of βλεφάρων περίεργος κίνησις (*virg.* 13). Twenty-five years later at *epist.* 123,4,2 J. draws a picture similar to the present one: *ne oculorum nutibus ... iuvenum post se greges trahat.*

adulescentium gregem post se trahunt. Keenan, p. 36, and Deléani, p. 73, note the imitation of Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 9 *si ... suspiria adulescentium post te trahas*.²⁵ Deléani does not mention that here Cyprian is himself echoing Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,3 l. 23 *non ut oculos et suspiria adulescentium post se trahat*. J. repeats the wording of the present passage at *epist.* 123,4,2 and in *Is.* 11,40,6 l. 34.

facies meretricis facta est tibi, impudorata es tu. J. was understandably partial to this prurient text (Jer. 3,3): it occurs eight times in his works. Elsewhere it is rather infrequent. Here again J. has combined scripture with striking phraseology that has been lifted from another author (cf. previous three nn.).

13,5

purpura tantum in veste sit tenuis. J. now employs the figure of συναθροισμός to give a vivid description of wanton virgins which this time does reveal his powers of observation as well as his keen interest in the fair sex. On *purpura tenuis* cf. also Ps.-Hilary, *epist. ad fil.* 5,2 *purpuram perangustam*: there it is a sign of simplicity. Contrast Tertullian, *pall.* 4,10 *latioris purpurae ambitio*.

laxius, ut crines decidant, ligatum caput. Similarly J. notes how the hair of an easy virgin falls over brow and ears at *epist.* 117,7,3. He also describes hairdos with pins and headbands *ne laxius fluant* (*in Is.* 2,3,22 l. 3). Loose hair had also been criticized by Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,7 l. 5 (*non bona simplicitate*) and by Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,29,7. Athanasius (*virg.* 11) had accordingly recommended cropped hair

²⁵ Fontaine (1988b), p. 182, n. 19, identifies J.'s source as Apuleius, *apal.* 76,5; however the only word the two texts have in common is *oculus*.

bound with a woollen hairnet. On the other hand fashionable coiffures of the period were like towers according to Paulinus of Nola (*carm.* 25,85f.) and Prudentius (*psych.* 183f.).

soccus villor. After her conversion Blesilla changed to this kind of footwear (*epist.* 38,4,3). At Chrysostom, *hom. in 1 Tim.* 8,3 a virgin says she wears a cheap shoe; however Chrysostom points out that it can actually make the wearer look more attractive.

per umeros maforte volitans. On this garment cf. *TLL*; Lampe (1961) s.v. In Chrysostom (*hom. in 1 Tim.* 8,2) the cape of a skittish virgin also flaps about her head.

strictae manicae brachiiis adhaerentes. At *epist.* 130,18,2 Demetrias is told to avoid wanton girls with tight sleeves. Chrysostom notes (*hom. in 1 Tim.* 8,2) that the sleeves of a lax virgin are so close-fitting that they seem part of her.

solutis genibus. The only instance of this locution in *TLL* s.v. *genu* is *Vulg. Hebr.* 12,12 *remissas manus et soluta genua erigite.*

fractus incessus. The virgin at 27,6 below adopts a gait which gives the impression that she is about to faint. A 'broken' gait was sexually attractive; cf. *virg. Mar.* 20 *ad adventum mariti ... gressum frangere* (cf. also *TLL* VI,1, 1252,57ff.; VI,2, 2326,70f.; and Ambrose, *Cain et Ab.* 1,4,14).²⁶

habeant istiusmodi laudatores suos. J. makes the same remark about the same sort of people at 38,2 below: *ad extremum habeat sibi gloriam suam. Istiusmodi* is again used substantivally at 29,5; cf. *TLL* VII,2, 513,54ff. (and for this type of expression cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, p. 70).

sub virginali nomine. At 38,7 below the Manichean virgin similarly hides behind the false honour of the name (*falso nominis honore*). J. warns the virgin in *epist.* 125,20,1 not to glory in her name alone. Basil of Ancyra had likewise complained (*virg.* 2) that most people are only interested in the 'name' of virginity (τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς παρθενίας μόνῳ) and pay no attention to the real thing.

lucrosius pereant. J. rounds off a similar description of the dress of rakish virgins with an almost identical remark thirty years later at *epist.* 130,18,2 *ut sub nomine virginali vendibilibus pereant. Lucrosius* recurs in [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 56,80. Ambrose speaks of *subsidia largitatum conferenda virginibus*.²⁷ J. accuses heretics too of acting for

²⁶ Chrysostom, *hom. in 1 Tim.* 8,2 censures the walk of a virgin that captivates the beholder.

²⁷ *Epur.* 10,73,12. He also remarks (*virg.* 1,9,56) that the prospective wife is anxious to seem a virgin in order to sell herself more dearly.

gain: in *Is.* 9,28,1 l. 53; in *Ezech.* 32,1 l. 564; in *Zach.* 14,10 l. 416; cf. *tract. in psalm.* l p. 320 l. 229. It was evidently something of an obsession with him. Cf. also 1 Tim. 6,5 ('supposing that gain is godliness') and Tit. 1,11 ('teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake').

libenter talibus non placemus. The feeling was mutual; cf. l. 5.

Chapter 14

J. now moves from loose-living virgins in general to the particular case of the *subintroductae*: the practice is here attacked with characteristic pungency. On *subintroductae* cf. Achelis; Koch (1907); Labriolle (1921); Clark; Elm, pp. 48ff. A stylistic analysis of the present ch. is given by Albrecht (1992), II, p. 1309.

14,1

pudet dicere. J. is again ashamed to speak at 28,2 below *pudet reliqua dicere*. The phrase *pudet dicere* also opens a ch. at *epist.* 52,6,1.¹ The preceding ch. of the *Libellus* began with *piger dicere*. On this combination of *pudet* and *piger* cf. Nonius Marcellus p. 423,27;² for patristic instances cf. Tertullian, *ielun.* 1 p. 274,16; Pacian, *paraen.* 12,2; Sulpicius Severus, *chron.* 2,28,3; Prudentius, *cath. praef.* 11; Augustine, *ord.* 1,8,23; *Quodvultdeus cont. nov.* 10,9. In the present passage J. enhances the effect further with the succeeding *exclamatio: pro nefas!* The point which he is making here is also found elsewhere; cf. Ps.-Basil, *contub.* 11 (*à propos* of *subintroductae*) ἃ καὶ τῷ λέγειν αἰσχρὰ τυγχάνει; Ps.-Chrysostom, *pseud.* 6 τὰ μὲν αἰσχρὸν ἐστὶ καὶ λέγειν ... συνεισάκτους ἐκτίσαντο.

agapetarum pestis. For the Latin form *agapeta* TLL gives only this passage. It is however used also in Asterius of Ansedunum, *ad Renat.* 1. 563; Ps.-Jerome, *epist.* 42 pp. 290^D and 291^B. The word is discussed by Guillaumont. For this use of *pestis* OLD cites Cicero, *fam.* 5,8,2 *pestes hominum*. On the expression cf. further (e.g.) Cyprian, *epist.* 73,4,2 (*haereticorum*); Ambrose, *hex.* 1,8,30 (*Manicheorum*); Paulinus of Périgueux, *Mart.* 5,445 (*Senonum*).

sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum. *Agapetae* are married in all but name at *epist.* 125,6,3. Basil of Ancyra had already used the same argument: εἰ γὰρ καὶ μὴ γάμος ἐστὶ τὸ ὄνομα, ἀλλ' ἡ φροντίς τῶν γεγαμηκότων αὐτοῖς ἐμφυεῖσα ... (*virg.* 43). Here J. invests the concept with a vituperative verve of his own; he also adds two further formulations of the same idea that are even more caustic (*novum concubinarum genus* and *meretrices univirae*). The striking language of the present passage is imitated by both Asterius of Ansedunum, *ad*

¹ All these passages are an echo of Plautus, *Cur.* 897 according to Antin (1960), p. 61.

² One might also compare *Schol. Stat. Theb.* 3,22 *unde et interdum — apud Sallustium praecipue — simul ponuntur*.

Renat. I. 564 and by Ps.-Jerome, *epist.* 42 p. 291^A.

plus inferam: unde meretrices univirae. Here the epidiorthisis is enhanced by inversion of Behaghel's law and more particularly by a stinging oxymoron, since *univira* had a very strong cachet of commendation; cf. *epist.* 77,3,4 *sub gloria univirae*. Tertullian had used it with a similar nuance at *castit.* 11 l. 12; 13 ll. 6, 8, 9 and 25; *monog.* 17,3; *uxor.* 1,8 l. 29; *virg. vel.* 9,6. He had given the name to Mary at *monog.* 8,2; it had been applied to Anna at *ieiun.* 8 p. 283,27 and *monog.* 8,3. Augustine says that being *univira* was not Anna's only distinction (*bon. viduit.* 13,16). For examples of the word in funerary inscriptions cf. *CIL* and Diehl, indices s.v., with the discussion in Körtling (1973); cf. also Lightman-Zeisel.

eadem domo, uno cubiculo, saepe uno tenentur et lectulo. Such people are again said to share lodgings at *epist.* 52,5,4; 125,6,3; 128,3,5. The same point had been made by Cyprian (*epist.* 4,4,1). They are again bed-fellows at *epist.* 117,9,1; cf. already Cyprian, *epist.* 4,1,1. The detail of the common bedroom is repeated by Asterius of Ansedunum (*ad Renat.* I. 583). J. uses the same tricolon at *epist.* 127,8,1 (though not about *agapetae*) *eadem domo, eodem cubiculo, uno usam cubili*. In the present passage this very striking *incrementum* (cf. Lausberg, pp. 221f.) with its homoeoteleutic tricolon *crescens* provides a characteristic combination of stylistic elegance and pruriently graphic description. The clausula is recorded by Harendza, p. 61. It is instructive to compare J.'s vivid depiction with Gregory Nazianzen's colourless *ὁμορφίους μελέεσαι* (*carm.* 1,2,2,100).

suspiciosos nos vocant. The same charge is again made twenty years later at *epist.* 117,10,1 *iterum me ... suspiciosum ... clamitas* (cf. *ib.* 2,1 *ne ceteri suspicentur*). The terms *suspiciosus* or *suspicio* had been similarly used in connection with *agapetae* at Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 7; *Concilium Carthaginense a. 343/348* p. 5 l. 67; Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,13; cf. also Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 2,2 (epigr.), 16,11f. (*ἀποφεύγειν δεῖ γλώσσων*) and Ps.-Chrysostom, *pseud.* 6 (*ἐκεῖθεν ... ψιθυρισμοί*).

14,2

frater sororem virginem deserit, caelibem spernit virgo germanum. J. makes the same complaint at *epist.* 117,4,2 and 125,6,2; cf. Asterius of Ansedunum, *ad Renat.* I. 516. Weyman (1910), p. 1005, refers to Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,9,2, who mentions the anger this passage caused. Weyman also questions whether the words *fratrem quaerit extraneum*, which some MSS add, are in fact an interpolation. Stylistic considerations would seem however to show that Hilberg was right to excise them: they spoil the elegant balance whereby the subject and

verb of the first clause enclose their object, but are in turn enclosed by it in the second.

quaerunt alienorum spiritale solacium, ut domi habeant carnale commercium. The gap between pretence and reality is mordantly emphasized by the parison with twofold alliteration and homoeoteleuton.³ *Carnale ... commercium* recurs at Siricius, *epist.* 1,7,9. In a similar context at *epist.* 117,11,1 J. asks why another's solace is sought.

alligabit quis ignem. J. again achieves a very powerful effect by using a quotation of scripture to conclude a ch. in which biblical citation has been absent (cf. ch. 7; a scriptural text has also rounded off chs. 1, 3, 4 and 6). In the present instance the device is particularly appropriate, since the verses in question (Prov. 6,27f.) themselves refer to adultery. They had already been applied to *subintroductae* by Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 2; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 45; Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon), p. 198,20; cf. Ps.-Chrysostom, *ascet. facet.* p. 1057. J. himself uses the text again at *adv. Iovin.* 1,7 (also with a sexual reference).

³ Both clauses also evince an elegant double cretic clause.

Chapter 15

Having dealt in the previous two chs. with virgins who are only concerned with the semblance of their calling, J. now turns to address Eustochium herself. He combines flattery with an injunction to exertion: as the first Roman noble to embrace virginity she must make a great effort. Encouragement is offered in the form of a comparison with the unenviable fate of her elder sister Blesilla, who was widowed after only seven months of married life: she thereby lost the reward of virginity as well as the pleasures of wedlock. This biographical information about the addressee stands between the autobiography of chs. 7 and 30.

15,1

explosis igitur et exterminatis his. Cf. 35,1 below *his igitur quasi quibusdam pestibus exterminatis* (again at the beginning of a ch.). In the present case there is also effective use of assonance (*ex-*).

nolunt esse virgines, sed videri. J. is rather partial to this striking antithesis of *esse* and *videri*, which occurs four times in his letters alone (besides the present passage cf. *epist.* 58,7,2; 82,6,1; 125,7,1). 'Seeming' and 'being' are also contrasted in Gregory of Nyssa, v. *Ephr.* p. 821¹ and Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,17; the antithesis had occurred earlier at *Sentences of Sextus* 64 and Philo, *migr. Abr.* 12.¹ Origen had spoken of *simulatores castitatis et virginitatis fictrices* (*comm. ser. in Mt.* 24 p. 40,16).

nunc ad te mihi omnis dirigitur oratio. At *epist.* 130,7,11 J. again says that in the remainder of the work he will address only the virgin (*ib. et virginem nobilem*). He would seem to have borrowed this formula from Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 3 *nunc nobis ad virgines sermo est, quarum quo sublimior gloria est maior et cura est.* It recurs at Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 5. J. has typically enhanced the style of his source: while the Cyprianic *nunc nobis ad virgines* is reproduced in his own *nunc ad te mihi*, the unassuming *sermo est* of the *De habitu* gives place to the impressive *omnis dirigitur oratio* with its alliterative hyperbaton. Cyprian's relative clause (*quarum quo sublimior ...*) would also appear to have inspired what J. says next: *quae quanto prima Romanae urbis virgo nobilis esse coepisti, tanto tibi amplius laborandum est.*²

¹ For classical usage of (e.g.) Sallust, *Conl.* 54,6 (with Vretska ad loc.).

² The same Cyprianic clause is also the source of J.'s similarly ensuing admonition in

quanto prima Romanae urbis virgo nobilis. J. has adapted the first half of Cyprian's antithesis (*quo sublimior gloria ...*; cf. previous n.) in order to fit his aristocratic recipient. He reports that when Eustochium's spiritual mentor Marcella had first taken an interest in the monastic life, it was deemed novel and vulgar (*epist.* 127,5,1). Accordingly Eustochium is now acclaimed as the first noble virgin in the capital. It seems however to have been something of a convention to hail well-born ascetics as the first of their kind; according to Rebenich (1992a), pp. 187f., such statements are a Christianization of the expectation that a Roman aristocrat should set an *exemplum* to his descendants. Thus Pammachius is the first noble monk at *epist.* 66,13,1; similarly in the following century the author of the *Vita Melaniae junioris* opens his biography with the statement that Melania was the first senatorial virgin in Rome (ch. 1). For aristocratic Roman virgins earlier than Eustochium cf. Gordini (1956), p. 224, n. 7; Cooper, p. 73. In the present passage Eustochium is also being contrasted with the many virgins who fall daily (13,1). On her nobility cf. *epist.* 108,3,1 and 108,4,1. J. refers to it again at 11,1 and 27,5 of the present work as well as at *epist.* 66,3,2; 108,2,2; *in Is. lib.* 13 *praef.* l. 14; *interpr. Job praef.* p. 75,6.

amplius laborandum. The need for effort is a recurrent theme of the *Libellus*: cf. 23,1; 38,6; 40,1; 41,1. The point is also made at *epist.* 14,10,3 and *in Eph.* 6,12 p. 547^B. In J.'s translations from Origen the topic is also quite common: *hom. in Cant.* 1,2 p. 31,2; *hom. in Jer.* 13 p. 684^C (PL 25 [1845]); *hom. in Lc.* 6 p. 37,5; 15 p. 93,14; 20 p. 124,10.

praesentibus bonis. Here marriage is something good. In the next sentence J. refers with some inconsequence to its vexations (*molestias nuptiarum et incerta coniugii*; cf. also 2,1; 22,1; 22,3). In the next but one sentence on the other hand it is again good (15,2 *nuptiarum ... voluptatem*; cf. 2,1). The inconsistency is characteristic.

molestias nuptiarum ... de domestico exemplo didicisti. Similarly it is from marriage itself that Furia is said to have found out its hardships (*epist.* 54,4,1).

aetate maior sed proposito minor. The reverse of this striking contrast had already occurred at Ambrose, *virg.* 1,4,19 (*aetate ... minor sed virtute maior*) and Zeno 1,1,15 (*aetate minor sed spiritu maior*). Likewise Melania is later said to have been young in age but old in

the afore-mentioned *epist.* 130,7,11 *cuius quanto sublimis ascensus est, tanto lapsus periculosior*. Here the borrowing from Cyprian is combined with citations from Vergil and scripture. The lavish means whereby J. heightens the eulogy in this letter are analysed at length by Hagendahl (1958), pp. 236ff., however he omits this imitation of Cyprian.

sense of piety (Palladius, *h. Laus.* 119 M. νέαν ... τῇ ἡλικίᾳ, πρεσβύτιν δὲ τῇ γνώμῃ τῆς εὐσεβείας); cf. also Basil of Seleucia, *or.* 14 p. 188^b Δαυὶδ ὀλίγος τὸν χρόνον, πολὺς τὴν διάνοιαν. Cf. also Curtius, pp. 273f.

post acceptum maritum septimo mense viduata est. Blesilla's husband was the brother of Furia (*epist.* 54,2,1). His name is not known.³

15,2

o infelix humana condicio et futuri nescia. J. uses the same exclamation at *in Mich.* 5,7 l. 394 *infelix humana condicio et insipientiae plena atque erroris*; cf. *epist.* 60,13,1 *o miserabilis humana condicio et sine Christo vanum omne, quod vivimus.* Caesarius of Arles has *o infelicitas generis humani* at *serm.* 46,4 and 70,1. In J.'s *futuri nescia* there may be an echo of Vergil, *Aen.* 10,501 *nescia mens hominum fati sortisque futurae.*

et virginitatis coronam et nuptiarum perdidit voluptatem. J. repeats the same idea at *epist.* 54,6,3 *et virginitatem frustra amiseris et fructus perdidideris nuptiarum.* It had occurred in a less concise form at Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 23 πάντων δὲ ὁμοῦ τῶν νομισθέντων ἡδέων ἀπὸ τοῦ γάμου πεσοῦσα, ἐζημιῶται μὲν διὰ βραχεῖαν ἡδονὴν τὸ κάλλος τῆς παρθενίας, τοσοῦτον δὲ γάμου πεπειράται, ὅσον τὸ πικρὸν τῆς χρεῖας γνωρίσαι; cf. also *Admonitio Augiensis* (= *Epist. Migne suppl.* 1,1703).

J. speaks of the 'crown of virginity' again at *adv. Iovin.* 1,3; cf. Methodius, *symp.* 8,11,198 (τὸν ... στέφανον ... τῆς παρθενίας); Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 7,11; 7,15; Chrysostom, *fem. reg.* 2; Ps.-Chrysostom, *op. imperf. in Matth.* 52 p. 929; Mark the Hermit, *opusc.* 5,7 (twice); Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,4; Peter Chrysologus, *serm.* 175,6; Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,8,16; 2,10,12; cf. Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 2 (τὸν ὑπὲρ παρθενίας στέφανον). At 29,3 below J. uses the phrase *castritatis ... coronam.*

secundum pudicitiae gradum. Widowhood is again the second rank of chastity at *epist.* 24,1,1; 66,3,3; 123,10,1. J. repeats the phrase *secundus pudicitiae gradus* at *epist.* 49,11,3 and 79,7,2. The 'second rank' had instead been marriage at Tertullian, *castit.* 9 l. 35. The present sentence is marked by an elegantly symmetrical fourfold hyperbaton: at the end of the first and third clauses only a single word separates the two elements which belong together (*secundum ...*

³ In *septimo mense* Petersen-Szemerdy, pp. 36 and 76, detects an echo of Lk. 2,36 (*Anna ... vixerat cum viro suo annis septem a virginitate sua*).

gradum; experta ... voluptate), while in the second and fourth these encompass the whole clause (*quas ... cruces; minorem ... mercedem*; with alliteration in each case).

quas illam per momenta sustinere aestimas cruces. J. uses the same phrase in his obituary of Blesilla at *epist.* 39,7,1 *quas Blesillam aestimas pati cruces*; cf. *TLL* IV, 1259,32ff. (s.v. *cruce*). Such anguish on Blesilla's part is however improbable before her illness and conversion later in the year; cf. *epist.* 38,2,2 and 38,4,1.

difficillius experta careat voluptate. J. likes to stress that experience of sexual pleasure makes widowhood hard: *epist.* 54,7,3; 66,2,1; 123,10,3; 128,8,3; *adv. Iovin.* 1,3. The same argument had often been used before: Tertullian, *uxor.* 1,8 l. 10; *virg. vel.* 10,4; Cyprian, *patient.* 20; Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 4,3; Ambrose, *vid.* 1,1. At *epist.* 128,2,3 J. rejects the rival view that it is easier to forego carnal gratification once it has been tried.

minorem continentiae habere mercedem. Schäublin, p. 57, insists that *se* must be inserted after *minorem*; Nisbet, ap. Schäublin, p. 57, n. 8, thinks that *reputantem se* should be added before *minorem*. Here the *se* is unnecessary; cf. Cüendet; Juret, pp. 174f.; Löfstedt (1942), II, pp. 262f.⁴ In the present passage the insertion of *se* would also destroy the elegant parallelism in the two directly adjacent sequences *difficillius experta careat voluptate* and *minorem continentiae habere mercedem*.⁵

sit tamen et illa secura, sit gaudens. Instead of *sit gaudens* strict grammar would require *gaudeat* (cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 388f.). J. however has permitted a slight breach of grammatical propriety in the interests of stylistic concinnity. A very impressive sentence is created

⁴ The scruples felt by Schäublin and Nisbet were evidently shared by a number of scribes, since one of Hilberg's MSS inserts *se credit* after *minorem*, while another adds *sciat* before *habere*; cf. also the reading of 'vetustiores editi' recorded by Vallarsi, I, p. 99, n. 'a' (= *PL* 22, p. 403, n. 'b') *continentiae se actat habere*. For decisive proof of the wrongness of such scribal expansion at 8,4 above (*praeus venter ...*) cf. n. ad loc., where J.'s wording is in fact shown to be a verbatim citation of Tertullian. J.'s taste for concision, which he shares with Tertullian, was no better understood by some scribes than it is by Schäublin and Nisbet.

⁵ In both of these clauses the object comes last, while the verb on which it depends occupies the penultimate position. A word qualifying the object is the second element, while each clause opens with a comparative which enunciates the conceptual antithesis underlying the two clauses: this opposition makes the formal correspondence all the more effective. An artist as accomplished as J. would not have allowed such an impeccable parallelism to be spoiled by the insertion of an expendable *se*. Finally it may also be noted that J. employs a similar parallel construction near the end of the next ch.: *maritorum expertae dominatum viduitatis praeferrunt libertatem* (16,3). The present parallelism in his description of Blesilla also occurs near the end of its ch.: in each case therefore the smooth parallel structure forms an apt prelude to the strikingly staccato conclusion of both chs.

by the resulting combination of anaphora (*sic*) and a particularly elegant cretic spondee clausula (cf. Herron, pp. 12ff.; the present example is noted by Harendza, p. 61).

centesimus et sexagesimus fructus de uno sunt semine castitatis. J. alludes to the final verse of Matthew's parable of the sower (Mt. 13,8); he does so again at 19,2 below. J. applies this text's 'hundredfold', 'sixtyfold' and 'thirtyfold' crop to virgins, widows and married women respectively in *epist.* 66,2,1 and 123,8,3; at *adv. Iovin.* 1,3 this allocation is said to be supported by the configuration of the fingers. The hundredfold harvest similarly belongs to virgins in J.'s own addition to Victorinus of Pettau, *in apoc.* 20,1; cf. also *epist.* 107,13,3. On the other hand J. notes at *epist.* 49,3,1 that most give the hundredfold to martyrs; cf. *in Matth.* 13,20 l. 811. Initially the hundredfold, sixtyfold and thirtyfold yields had in general been referred to martyrdom, virginity and widowhood respectively, while later on they were usually applied to virgins, widows and those who married: this is the case in the present passage and at 19,2 below.

The patristic exegesis of this text has been the object of very detailed study; cf. Quacquarelli (1953); Beatrice (1979). To their evidence some dozen further passages may be added (besides those in J. cited above). Of these new passages the following assign the hundredfold crop to martyrs: Origen, *hom. in Gen.* 12,5 p. 111,13; Ps.-Athanasius, *doct. mon.* p. 1425^D; Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 4 p. 485^A; Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 42 p. 97,17. It is given to virgins in the following additional passages: Ambrose, *virg.* 1,10,60; Augustine, *civ.* 15,26 p. 116,10; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 39,1; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 6,7. Both interpretations are mentioned by Eucherius, *form.* 10 p. 62,4 (cf. p. 61,4 and 20). Finally Ps.-Athanasius, *v. Syncl.* 23 makes the hundredfold 'ours', the sixtyfold the class of the continent and the thirtyfold that of chaste livers. Two further unnoticed Athanasian passages occur in his *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]): it is argued below that they are J.'s source here.

Quacquarelli (1953), p. 44, quotes the present passage of the *Libellus* in full. He notes further that Athanasius is the first to give the hundredfold reward to virgins and that J. does the same. However he asserts that 'Girolamo non sembra abbia conosciuto quanto scrisse Atanasio' (p. 47). Neither Quacquarelli nor Beatrice mentions Athanasius' *Letter to virgins*. Here the parable of the sower is dealt with twice. In the first passage Athanasius is rebutting Hieracas' view that marriage is bad because virginity is superior (p. 66, l. 18): 'Car ce n'est pas parce que le chiffre cent est plus gros, que soixante devient mauvais; mais celui-ci est bon, et celui-là est de beaucoup préférable. Tous deux, en effet, proviennent de cette même semence'. The second

passage is another attack on Hieracas' opinions (p. 69, l. 8): 'S'il accuse le mariage, force est d'accuser plutôt les cent fruits, c'est-à-dire votre genre de vie et d'être ensuite dans le péché d'athéisme. En effet, le fruit de ce qui a rendu cent, de ce qui a rendu soixante et de ce qui a rendu trente provient de la même semence'. Here we clearly have the source of J.'s *centesimus et sexagesimus fructus de uno sunt semine castitatis*. Such a statement occurs nowhere else in the numerous applications of this parable listed by Quacquarelli, Beatrice and the present n. The striking words of consolation which J. here addresses to Blesilla accordingly turn out to be nothing more than an almost verbatim borrowing from Athanasius. J. repeats the same wording later at *adv. Iovin.* 1,3 *centesimus et sexagesimus et tricesimus fructus quanquam de una terra et de una semine nascatur ...*⁶

⁶ Just before these words J. says: *nunquid argentum non erit argentum, si aurum argento pretiosius est? aut arboris et vegetis contumelia est, si radici et foliis, culmo et arboris poma praefervantur et fructus?* (ib.). It would appear that these comparisons have been inspired by the following passage of Athanasius' *Leter* (p. 66, l. 13): 'Cette méthode revient à dire que le soleil est mauvais parce que l'ange est préférable, et que l'homme est mauvais puisque le soleil est préférable. Considérez et sachez que c'est une absurdité de dire cela; c'est-à-dire insulter ce qui est petit, parce qu'il n'est pas comme ce qui est plus grand que lui'. In particular 'insulter' matches *contumelia*. In both Athanasius and J. these two passages immediately precede the statement that the various yields all come from the same sowing. It may be noted how once again J. has greatly enhanced the rhetorical impact of the material he has borrowed: in particular *transductio* of *argentum* (cf. Lausberg, p. 328) in the first half is combined with elaborate 'double zeugma' (cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, p. 834) in the second. This passage of *adv. Iovin.* is quoted by Quacquarelli (1953), p. 43; again the Athanasian source is overlooked.

Chapter 16

J. specifies the sort of company which Eustochium should avoid. She must beware of snobbish matrons and worldly widows. The latter are described at length in a satiric passage of characteristic vigour and vividness.

16,1

nolo habeas consortia matronarum. Visits to matrons are again censured at 29,4 below (cf. 28,4); their speech is criticized at 29,6. J. also warns against such company at *epist.* 58,6,3 and 130,18,1; cf. also *epist.* 43,3,3 and 117,6,3. He records approvingly how Marcella made a special point of avoiding the houses of noble matrons (*epist.* 127,4,2). Such behaviour was not well received: Ambrose reports (*epist.* 8,56,16) that people were put out *quod ista virgo non circumeat domos nec eorum matronas salutet atque ambiat*.

J. has opened this ch. with a very impressive tricolon that is marked by threefold anaphora (*nolo ... nolo ... nolo*) and by successively shorter clauses. Twofold anaphora of *nolo* recurs in 25,2 below.

nolo ad nobilitum accedas domos. Condemnation of the social round is a favourite theme in J.: he repeats it at *epist.* 43,2,1; 46,12,2; 58,6,1; 117,6,1; cf. also 58,6,3 (*saecularium et maxime potentium consortia devira*). The virgin had also been advised to keep clear of visits and parties in Cyprian (*hab. virg.* 18; 21) and Ambrose (*virg.* 3,3,9); cf. also Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1109.

quod contemnens virgo esse voluisti. J. repeats this argument at *epist.* 58,6,3 and 125,7,1; cf. 127,4,2.

sibi solent adplaudere mulierculae de iudiciis viris. At *epist.* 52,11,1 a priest is also told to keep away from dinners given by the worldly *qui honoribus tument*. The contemptuous diminutive *mulierculae* recurs at 28,2 below.¹

On *iudices* cf. *Codex Iustinianus* 1,3,32 *pr.* (a. 472) *iudices ordinarios, hoc est provinciarum rectores* (also Hilary, *coll. antiar.* p. 181,14 *iudices quibus provinciarum amministrationes creditae sunt*). J. himself speaks of *iudex provinciae* at *epist.* 52,11,1 and 125,15,1; cf.

¹ According to Hickey (1987), p. 23, in the one-upmanship described in the present passage of the *Libellus Paula*, who 'had ties to the elite of the Roman aristocracy but remained somewhat on its periphery', would 'not have fared as well as many': *ead.* (1983), p. 54, had said simply 'would not have fared well'.

TLI VII,2, 600,34ff. (s.v. *iudex*). Their conduct is discussed by Jones, pp. 46; 399; 479. J. mentions *iudices* along with the emperor at *epist.* 125,15,1; in *Mich.* 7,1 l. 91; in *Eph.* 5,3 p. 519^D. Sulpicius Severus includes them among *summae istius saeculi ... potestates* (*dial.* 1,20,3). J. attacks their rapacity in a number of passages: in *Ezech.* 18,5 l. 383; in *Dan.* 13,5^b l. 717; in *eccles.* 3,16 l. 258; in *Tit.* 2,9 p. 585^D. At in *Tit.* 1,1 p. 557^C he condemns their pride of station.

concurrat ambitio salutantum. On abstract for concrete cf. *coniugia* at 21,5 below and Goelzer, pp. 394ff.; Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 745ff.; Löfstedt (1911), pp. 111ff. *Ambitio* is also used in this way by Paulinus of Périgueux, *Mart.* 2,42 *portis ruit obvia totis ambitio*.

viro tuo. Christ is also called *vir* at 18,3 below; cf. 29,2 (2 Cor. 11,2 *despondi enim vos unī viro virginem castam exhibere Christo*). J. gives this name to Christ again at *epist.* 123,3,3 and in *Gal.* 4,27 p. 391^C (he is *vir* of the church); cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 328 l. 166 (*vir* of the soul). Examples of the usage may be cited from Origen, where it is not rare: *comm. in 1 Cor.* 7,4 (Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τῆς νύμφης); *hom. in Gen.* 6,3 p. 69,1 (on Rom. 7,2 *quae sub viro est mulier ...*); 10,4 p. 98,4 (*Christus animae vir dicitur*); *hom. in Ezech.* 8,3 pp. 404,21 and 405,8. Christ had in addition been called *maritus* at Tertullian, *orat.* 22 p. 196,6 (cf. *resurr.* 61,6 *virgines Christi maritae*). J. also makes God himself a *vir* at in *Is.* 4,10,1 l. 38 and 15,54,1 ll. 32 and 47; cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 144 l. 69. He tended to be somewhat reckless in using terms of kinship; cf. 20,1 and 38,3.

ad hominis coniugem dei sponsa. J. may have borrowed the argument from Basil, *hom. in Ps.* 61,4 εἰ ... ὁ δεῖνα μέγα φρονεῖ ὅτι δοῦλος ἐστὶ βασιλέως ... πόσον σοι προσῆκεν ἐπὶ σαυτῷ μεγαλύνεσθαι ὅτι δοῦλος εἶ τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως. Ps.-Sulpicius Severus maintains later (*epist.* 2,16) that if virgins really believed themselves daughters of God, they would never admire human nobility.

In the present passage it is God himself who is said to have the virgin as spouse: J.'s choice of language is of course determined by the contrast with *homo*. This identification was not however unusual in Latin authors. *Deo nubere* is already used twice by Tertullian (*castit.* 13 l. 36 and *uxor.* 1,4 l. 20). It occurs later in Ambrose, *virg.* 1,8,52 and at *Inscr. christ. Rossi* II, 6,7,8. According to Paulinus of Nola (*carm.* 25,173f.) the virgin's husband is not a man but God.

Such usage was presumably facilitated by the habit of addressing Christ himself as *deus*. Examples of the practice are common. The form *deus noster Iesus* was evidently a popular one, since it is used repeatedly by *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* (10,2; 17,1; 18,1; 19,2; 19,19; 23,8; 23,9); cf. *Acta Petri* 5 *deus Iesu Christe*. Similarly in Greek θεὸς Ἰησοῦ occurs in (e.g.) *Acta Joannis* 112; cf. *Acta Thomae* A 60 θεὸς

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. J. himself speaks of *Christus deus noster* in *Aug. epist. Divj.* 27,3,6. For biblical precedent cf. (e.g.) Jn. 20,28 (Thomas' words to Christ: *Deus meus*) and Rom. 9,5 (*Christus ... qui est ... Deus benedictus*; cited by [e.g.] Marius Victorinus, *adv. Arium* 1,18; ib. 'quod deus Christus').

superbiam sanctam. J. encourages a self-conscious spiritual elitism to bolster Eustochium's resolve. Elsewhere in the *Libellus* however pride is either deprecated (3,1), assumed to be absent (27,5), or condemned (16,3). J. again speaks of 'holy pride' at *in Soph.* 1,11 l. 509. It is defined by Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 12,7 *est ... et sancta superbia ... nam et iustificatur superbia, quae huic mundo superbit et contemnit hoc saeculum.* J. distinguishes between vicious and virtuous pride at *in Is.* 17,61,6 l. 33. On 'holy pride' as a Christian substitute for the Roman aristocracy's secular sense of its own superiority cf. Rebenich (1992a), p. 192. J.'s point in the present passage is reinforced by asyndetic *disiunctio* (*disce ... scito*).

16,2

quas eunuchorum greges saepiunt. Eunuchs are again mentioned as an appanage of the rich at 32,2 below. Paula and Eustochium themselves used to be carried by them (*epist.* 66,13,2 and 108,7,3). J. notes (*epist.* 130,4,1) that they belong to an ambience unfavourable to the ascetic life: he therefore prohibits their use (*epist.* 54,13,1). Eunuchs are an even more popular theme in Chrysostom (*hom. in Ps.* 48,17 1,8; *hom. in Mt.* 20,2; *hom. in Jo.* 28,3; *hom. in Rom.* 20,2; *hom. in Eph.* 20,7; *laud. Max.* 6; *stat.* 13,2); like J. here, he also links them with golden raiment (*hom. in Rom.* 31,1). In this sentence of the *Libellus* the polyptoton of the relative pronoun is striking (*quae ... quas ... quarum*).

in quarum vestibibus adtenuata in filum metalla texuntur. Gold-embroidered clothes recur at 27,6 below. They are again described at *epist.* 66,5,1; 107,10,1; *vita Pauli* 17. This kind of garment is also mentioned at Ps.-Cyprian, *laud. mart.* 17; Ambrose, *virg.* 1,6,29; *virginit.* 12,68; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,2,85; Paulinus of Périgueux, *Mart.* 1,108; 3,94; 4,389. A number of passages state that the gold has no place there: Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 12,5; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 33,10; Gregory of Nyssa, *mart.* p. 528^D. Chrysostom expresses his disapproval frequently: *hom. in Ps.* 48,17 2,2; *hom. in Rom.* 31,1; *hom. in Rom.* 12,20 4; *hom. in Eph.* 20,7; *hom. in Phil.* 10,5. He notes with satisfaction how a young lady clothes herself in virginity instead of such garments (*pan. Pelag. Ant.* 3). Finally they are said by Orientius (*comm.* 1,555) to weigh the wearer down.

non quo mortem optare debuerint maritorum. J. comes close to suggesting as much when in *epist.* 108,5,1 he says that Paula began to serve the Lord with such zeal that she seemed to have wanted her husband's death. He also asserts that Blesilla grieved more for her lost virginity than for her deceased spouse (*epist.* 39,1,2). J.'s argument in the present passage would appear to have been suggested by Tertullian, *castit.* 10 l. 47 *etsi non exoptatissimam* (sc. *occasionem*; cf. next n.).

datam occasionem pudicitiae libenter arripere. J. has taken the argument from Tertullian, who had used it three times: *castit.* 10 l. 47 (*rapt occasionem, etsi non exoptatissimam, attamen opportunam*); *pudic.* 16 p. 255,14; *uxor.* 1,7 l. 18. J.'s wording indicates that he is thinking particularly of the first of these passages. J. again urges widows to 'seize the opportunity' (*occasionem arripere*) at *epist.* 54,6,4 and 123,10,2. He tells how Melania did so at *epist.* 39,5,5.

veste mutata pristina non mutatur ambitio. The same point is made nearly thirty years later at *epist.* 125,16,1. On the other hand a change of dress does reflect a change of mind in *epist.* 58,2,1 *tunicam mutas cum animo*. Chrysostom expresses the view at *hom. in 2 Tim.* 7,4 that a widow who maintains the same pomp as before would do better to remarry.

A widow's weeds are said by Augustine (*epist.* 262,9) to be lowly, black and comparable to monkish dress. In addition cf. Herzog-Hauser, esp. p. 2230,23ff. '*vestem mutare*'.

caveas basternarum. Tertullian, *uxor.* 2,8 l. 20 had also objected to sedans.

rubentibus buccis. J. disapproves of ruddy cheeks with remarkable frequency: *epist.* 54,13,2; 117,7,1; 128,3,5; *adv. Iovin.* 2,21; 2,36; *c. Vigil.* 11; *in Mich.* 2,9 l. 315. They are also condemned in Basil, *hom.* 1,9 (σμερόν τὸ χρῶμα, οὐκ εἰς ἐρύθημα ἀναιδές ἐξανθοῦν) and Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 17,1 (*facie ... ruberet, parum spiritualibus buccis*).

ut eas putes maritos non amisisse, sed quaerere. This idea would seem to have been suggested by the description of the worldly virgin in Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 5 *quasi maritum aut habeat aut quaerat*. Again J. has improved his source: the opening is enlivened by replacing Cyprian's rather bland *quasi* with the graphic *ut eas putes*, while the antithesis itself is adapted to fit the widow (*amisisse*) and thereby acquires additional vigour.

16,3

plena adulatoribus domus. J. refers to flatterers again at 24,2 below (cf. 2,2). Crowds of κόλακες are also mentioned at Basil, *ep.* 45,1;

hom. 20,1; Chrysostom, *Thdr.* 1,18; Ps.-Chrysostom, *villic.* p. 788. On the ensuing description of *salutationes* in the present passage cf. Rebenich (1992a), p. 178.

clerici ipsi, quos ... esse oportuerat ... timori. J. distinguishes two senses of *timor* and defines the second as *reverentia* (in *Eph.* 5,33 p. 537^a; cf. Origen, *sel. in Ps.* 2,11). Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 17 had also expected to see in the priest a severity that made women tremble. One should likewise view the priest's face with fear according to the later view of (Ps.)-Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 1,5 p. 133,28.

osculantur capita patronarum. The head is also kissed at *adv. Iovin.* 2,37. Ambrose had noted how this is done to a money-lender (*Tab.* 7,26). At Augustine, in *epist. Ioh.* 10,8 it is a token of honour, while in Chrysostom (*sac.* 6,13) it accompanies embrace.

pretium accipiunt salutandi. J. likes to inveigh against venal and avaricious priests; cf. *epist.* 40,2,2; 52,5,3; 52,6,2; 60,11,3 (*matronarum opes venentur obsequiis*); 69,9,3; *adv. Pelag.* 2,24; in *Am.* 8,4 l. 102; in *eccles.* 10,19 ll. 320, 329 and 334; in *Matth.* 21,13 l. 1341. A priest also receives gifts at 28,5 below. J. denies taking money himself at *epist.* 45,2,2. Ambrose on the other hand encourages generous giving to priests (in *Luc.* 8,79). For imperial legislation against such munificence cf. *Codex Theodosianus* 16,2,20.

sacerdotes suo vident indigere praesidio. For the influence of matrons on ecclesiastical appointments cf. in *Is.* 2,3,12^a l. 17 and 16,58,9^b l. 54. On the other hand they are afraid to offend a priest who is *veredarius urbis* at 28,5 below.

viduitatis praeferunt libertatem. On the *libertas* of widowhood cf. *epist.* 45,4,1; 54,13,1; 77,4,1; 127,3,3. In all these passages J. is censorious. Ambrose by contrast takes a positive view at *vid.* 1,2 in *hac ipsa ... virtute praemia sunt reposita libertatis* (ib. 1 Cor. 7,39 *si dormierit vir eius liberata est*).

castae vocantur et nonnae. Cf. *epist.* 117,6,2 in *adulationem tui sanctum et nonnum coram te vocant*. The word *nonnus* recurs in combination with *sanctus* at Ambrosius Junior, in *psalm.* 105 l. 107 and 140 l. 18; cf. also Asterius of Ansedunum, *ad Renat.* l. 570 'carulus' et 'nonnulus' vocant. The *nonna* is defined as *mulier deo sacrata* at *Gloss.* l. 300 (*cod. Leid.* 191), while a *nonna* is called an *ancilla dei* in *Inscr. christ. Diehl* 1137a (a. 521). At *Inscr. Dessau* 8542 an *alumnus* makes a dedication to his *nonna*; cf. *CIL IX* 4693 (*nonno suo*); *Inscr. christ. Diehl* 2584; 4602. *Nonni* are explained as *patres* in *Gloss.* V 414,7 (from Benedict, *reg.* 63,12 *iuniores ... priores suos nonnos vocent, quod intellegitur paterna reverentia*). Franes, pp. 722f., would also like to read *nonna* at Faustus of Riez, *epist.* 7 p. 202,12; he defines

the word's meaning as 'eerbied voor ouderen ... gemengd met kinderlijke vertrouwelijkheid'.

cenam dubiam. A borrowed phrase; cf. *TLL* V,1, 2108,83ff.

apostolos somniant. Mention of such pious dreams is infrequent;² however they do figure in Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 3,3 p. 350,20 (*per somnium ... spirituales vident delicias*), which J. had recently translated. Moreover in both *Libellus* and translation the reference to dreams is directly preceded by mention of food (*post cenam dubiam / qui in victu corporis occupati sunt* [p. 350,19]). It would seem therefore that here too J. has taken a hint from his translation, whose phrasing in regard to both dreams and food has again been sharpened. Apostles are an object of emulation at 38,6 below.

² For a rare parallel cf. Theodoret, *A. rel.* 2 p. 1308^B μόνον δὲ τὸν ἐπόμενον (sc. θεόν) καὶ νόκτω ὀνειροπολεῖν.

Chapter 17

Having specified in the previous ch. the kind of company which Eustochium should avoid, J. now defines what makes a suitable companion. He then proceeds to issue a number of miscellaneous precepts concerning obedience to parents, seclusion, moderate diet, study of scripture and finally the dangers of excessive fasting when followed by over-eating. The last topic leads to a long discussion of the way to combat sexual temptation; it consists almost exclusively of lavish scriptural citation.

17.1

sint tibi sociæ. At *epist.* 107,9,3 J. stipulates that the ideal companion is grave, pale, grubby and inclined to mope.

quas ... ieiunia tenuant, quibus pallor in facie est. At *epist.* 45,5,2 J. confesses that he finds thinness and pallor deeply gratifying (cf. Tertullian, *ieiun.* 17 p. 297,14 *macies non displicet nobis*; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,3,55 μέγας κόσμος ὠχρότης). Thinness and pallor had also occurred together at Basil, *reg. fus.* 17,2; Chrysostom, *oppugn.* 2,2 (γενέσθω ... λεπτός καὶ ὠχρός); *virg.* 6,1; cf. also Rufinus, *Basil. hom.* 7 p. 1786^D and Paschasius of Dume, *verba patr.* 11,3. Here the striking polyptoton of the relative pronoun (*quas ... quibus ... quas ... quae ... quae*) is noted by Hritzu, p. 39.

quas et aetas probavit et vita. J. repeats this impressive formulation some fifteen years later at *epist.* 79,7,3. 'Age' and 'life' are again combined at 29,2 below. J. also connects the two at *epist.* 92,6,1 and 107,4,5; cf. *reg. Pachom.* 143 p. 51,10. The combination had already occurred in Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 22 (κοσμιῶν καὶ βιω καὶ ἡλικία γυναικῶν). It recurs later at Caesarius of Arles, *reg. virg.* 36,2.

ubi pascis? Cant. 1,6 (1,7 LXX) is cited again more fully at 25,5 below. J. is very fond of this picturesque text, which he quotes another nine times. It had already been used in Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon), p. 203,7; Ambrose quotes it later at *exhort. virg.* 9,57.

ex affectu. Sincerity is again stressed at 18,2 and 27,5 below, while hypocrisy is repeatedly castigated in this work: 13,5; 14,2; 15,1; 28,2; 29,4; 38,7.

cupio dissolvi. Phil. 1,23 appealed strongly to J.; he quotes it eleven times elsewhere. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,48 Christians are said to repeat it daily.

esto subiecta parentibus: imitare sponsum tuum. St. Paul had required subjection to parents at Col. 3,20 (*filiis oboedite parentibus*) and Eph. 6,1 (*filiis oboedite parentibus vestris in domino*; this text is cited by Cyprian, *testim.* 3,70 *parentibus obsequendum*). Since Eustochium's mother Paula was a widow, in the present passage the injunction is not entirely appropriate. Moreover J. tells Eustochium not to be put off by her mother at 24,3 below: *nemo sit, qui prohibeat, non mater* At in Eph. 6,1 p. 537^B (ad loc.) he speaks of obedience to spiritual parents (cf. 41,3 below *carnis et spiritus matres tuas*). A virgin is also told to obey her mother at *epist.* 128,4,1 and 130,12,1 (ib. as here *imitare sponsum tuum*). On the other hand J. reports with approval that Marcella's obedience to her mother was qualified (*epist.* 127,4,3). He also affirms in *epist.* 14,3,4 that love of Christ is more important than obeying one's parents. The young Jesus' submissiveness is again mentioned at *epist.* 117,2,2.

rarus sit egressus in publicum. Eustochium is again admonished to stay indoors at 25,1; 25,2; 26,2 below. J. repeats the precept in *epist.* 44,2; 54,13,1; 128,4,2 (in the last passage with specific reference to church-going). Similarly he notes that Marcella seldom went out (*epist.* 127,4,2); he also records with admiration how Asella stayed indoors all the time (*epist.* 24,4,1). At 37,6 below a virgin is advised to pray on leaving the house.

The ban on going out was traditional. Virgins are told to avoid it altogether by Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,13 l. 42 (*pedes domi figite*); Basil, *renunt.* 5 (*πᾶσαν προέλευσιν παραιτοῦ*); Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,9; Ps.-Athanasius, v. *Syncl.* 25. Their outings should be infrequent according to Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 19 and (Ps.)-Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 3,5,4, while only ones that are essential can be justified in the view of Athanasius, *virg.* 22 and Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,3,14. Pelagius (*epist. ad Demetr.* 22) even considers it superfluous to mention the subject at all.

Weyman (1910), p. 1006, notes that J.'s wording here resembles Tacitus, *ann.* 13,45,3 *rarus in publicum egressus*; he posits a Sallustian source.

martyres tibi quaerantur in cubiculo tuo. J. notes how Asella sped to the martyrs' shrines unseen (*epist.* 24,4,2); Marcella's visits are also said to have avoided the crowds (*epist.* 127,4,2). He stipulates that the virgin should go only if accompanied by her mother (*epist.* 107,9,2). J.'s grave concern in this matter would not appear to have been shared by other writers of the period. He thought that in Rome the crowds at the martyrs' tombs were particularly dense (*in Gal. lib.* 2 *praef.* p. 355^B; cf. also *epist.* 107,1,4); but they seem to have been large everywhere (cf. Chrysostom, *exp. in Ps.* 115,5). Ps.-Gregory

Thaumaturgus (*sanct.* p. 1199^A) describes the scene.

si semper, quando necesse est, processura sis. The emendations of Hilberg (*quando <necesse, quando non> necesse est*) and Engelbrecht (ap. Hilberg ad loc. *quando <nec> [= ne-quidem] necesse est*; supported by Souter [1912], p. 151) are unnecessary. J.'s point is simply that Eustochium should not go out 'every time she needs to'. A similar argument is also found elsewhere: Athanasius had said the virgin should not go out *χωρίς ἀνάγκης μεγάλης* (*virg.* 22), while later Caesarius of Arles likewise makes the stipulation *non nisi pro grandi et inevitabili necessitate* (*epist. ad virg.* 2,3,14).¹ Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 19) had also complained of continuous goings out.

17,2

moderatus cibus. At 37,3 below J. again applauds the moderate eater. The phrase *moderatus cibus* is repeated at *epist.* 79,4,3. J. states that food ought to be sparing at *epist.* 54,10,5 and 125,7,1 (good for body and soul). Similarly he requires that fasting should be moderate in *epist.* 52,12,1; 125,7,1; 127,4,2 (long fasts on the other hand are said to be bad at *epist.* 107,10,2 and 130,11,1). He also reports with approval that in Jerusalem no one condemns a moderate fullness (*epist.* 46,10,4). The emphasis which J. gives to this topic is noteworthy. However abbots are also said to prefer just a little nourishment every day at Theodoret, *h. rel.* 3 p. 1325^C and *Vitae patrum* 5,10,44.

numquam venter repletus. J. favours frugal meals and a permanently esurient stomach (*epist.* 54,10,5). Similarly he stipulates (*epist.* 107,10,1) that even after a meal the virgin should still feel hungry.

cum vino sint sobriae, ciborum largitate sunt ebriae. J. has lifted this very striking formulation straight from Tertullian, *ieiun.* 9 p. 285,29 *verisimile non est, ut quis dimidiam gulam deo immolet, aquis sobrius et cibus ebrius*. Again J. has enhanced the rhetorical effect. Tertullian's rather bald parallelism is replaced by two cola of increasing length. J. also improves on Tertullian's *paronomasia*: *sint sobriae ... sunt ebriae* (Harendza, p. 18, refers only to the *paronomasia* in *sobriae* and *ebriae*, which of course comes from Tertullian). Here however this arresting idea is not quite *à propos*. In its original context it formed an apt climax to a discussion of the interrelation between food and drink: *qualis enim esus, talis et potus ...* (p. 285,28). J. on the

¹ It is not impossible that the Athanasian pronouncement has in fact inspired J.'s own statement, while the words of Caesarius may in turn have been suggested by the dictum of the *Libellus*. The ascription of this *De virginitate* to Athanasius has been questioned (cf. Aubineau [1953], pp. 144ff.); however Ps.-Athanasian treatises were also utilized with alacrity by Latin Fathers (cf. Adkin [1992b]).

other hand is dealing exclusively with eating. He has not mentioned wine for the last four chs.; the subject does not occur again for the next twelve. Finally it may be noted that this idea would not seem to be found anywhere else. Only Cassian makes a somewhat similar point at *inst.* 5,6 *non sola crapula vini mentem inebriare consuevit: cunctarum escarum nimietas vacillantem eam ac nutabundam reddit*. Cassian significantly avoids the clever conceit found in Tertullian and J. Once again J. stands alone in his theft.

ad orationem tibi nocte surgenti. The advice to get up during the night and pray is repeated at 18,1 and 37,2 below; cf. also 35,5. J. again tells the virgin she should get up to pray at *epist.* 107,9,3. Lea and Paula were both accustomed to spend the night in prayer (*epist.* 23,2,2 and 108,15,3); cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 134 l. 44 and p. 235 l. 16 (the devout prefer night-time). Examples of nocturnal prayer are given by Scudamore (1875b), p. 798. In addition there is a reference to the habit at Tertullian, *uxor.* 2,5 l. 16. There are also additional exhortations to practise it in *Canones Hippolyti* 79,9; Clement of Alexandria, *str.* 7,7,49,4; Athanasius, *virg.* 20 (ib. Ps. 118,62 'at midnight I will rise to give thanks unto thee'); Orsiesius, *doctr.* 48; Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 7,32,2; 19,18,1; Basil, *hom.* 5,4; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 1,31; 3,127 (ib. Lk. 6,12 'he ... continued all night in prayer to God'; Acts 16,25 'at midnight Paul and Silas prayed'; Ps. 118,62).

non indigestio ructum faciat sed inanitas. Thierry (1967), p. 123, maintains that *rugitum* should be added to *inanitas*, since *ructus* 'can indeed be caused by too full a stomach, but not by an empty one'. In support of his own argument Thierry might have referred to the statement of J. himself at *epist.* 65,5,1 *ructus ... proprie dicitur digestio cibi et concoctarum escarum in ventum efflatio*. Thierry points out on the other hand that *rugitus* is the term which J. normally employs to signify the rattling of the stomach.²

It would however appear possible to adduce evidence which indicates that *ructus* could on occasion be used with a sense approaching that of *rugitus*. Thierry's conjecture is accordingly superfluous; nor is it necessary to posit an excessively bold zeugma. At *in Os.* 11,10 l. 331 J. translates the LXX's ὡς λέων ἐπεύξεται as *sicut leo rugiet*. However later in the same year³ J. twice renders the words λέων ἐπεύξεται as *leo ructabit*; here he is dealing with the LXX text of

¹ Thierry's view receives support from the dictionaries: *OLD* and *Lewis-Short*, ss.vv. *ructo* and *ructus*, give no indication that these words can denote a stomach-rumble (the relevant fascicle of *TLL* has not yet appeared).

² Viz. 406; cf. Cavallera, I,2, p. 163.

Amos 3,4 and 3,8.⁴ Here *ructare* is virtually a synonym of *rugire*. It may accordingly be concluded that in the *Libellus* the reading of the MSS should be retained.

The gross realism of this reference to the rattling of the virgin's belly is entirely in character. It is significant that this time J. does not appear to be dependent on any predecessor; nor would anyone else seem to borrow from him. At *epist.* 58,6,2 J. again urges sleep on an empty stomach.

crebrius lege et disce quam plurima. J. is referring to scripture, as is clear from *pagina sancta* at the end of the next sentence. Harendza, p. 53, notes the chiasmus; it is further enhanced by observance of Behaghel's law. Here the precept is inserted rather incongruously in the middle of a treatment of diet.

Eustochium is also pictured as reading at 25,1 below (like the monks at 35,2; 35,7; 35,8 *cotidie de scripturis aliquid discitur*), while memorized passages of scripture are recited during the night at 37,2. J. reports that Blesilla, Paula and Nepotian were all avid readers (*epist.* 39,1,3; 39,5,1; 60,10,9). He often insists that sacred literature should never be put down: *epist.* 52,7,1; 58,6,2; 79,9,2; 125,11,1. In particular a virgin must learn to love it (*epist.* 130,7,12 and 130,20; cf. 108,20,2). The study of scripture is also enjoined at *in Eph.* 4,31 p. 517^B and *in Tir.* 3,9 p. 594^{C,3}.

The frequency with which J. urges his addressee to read the Bible is without parallel: it is of course to be expected from a writer who has packed his work with scriptural citation and allusion as densely as J. has done in the *Libellus*. Elsewhere injunctions to read scripture occur only intermittently: Cyprian, *ad Donat.* 15; *zel.* 16; Ps.-Ignatius, *Her.* 1; Ambrose, *Abr.* 2,5,22; *in psalm. 118 serm.* 12,33; Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,14; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,37; 2,198. It behoves the virgin at Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1108.

tenenti codicem somnus obrepat et cadentem faciem pagina sancta suscipiat. Just as in ll. 5-7 J. attempted to make his precept on moderate diet more impressive by introducing a striking conceit from Tertullian, so he now embellishes the traditional injunction to read scripture with material appropriated from Ambrose, *virg.* 3,4,15 *somnus in codice*. This arresting but laconic statement has been converted by J. into a picturesque vignette, whose charm contrasts

⁴ In Am. 3,3 ll. 56 and 63. The translation from the Hebrew gives *rugier*. The verb *epirrephat* means of course both 'roar' and 'belch'; cf. *LSJ*, s.v. However lions do not 'belch'; they 'roar'.

⁵ On the other hand *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 289 l. 180 (perhaps inspired by Origen) notes critically that *virgi, monachi* and *maifercolae* do it in a spirit of one-upmanship.

notably with the grossness of the immediately antecedent *ructus* (l. 8). He repeats the same idea twelve years later at *epist.* 60,11,2 *super pectus soporati dulcis pagina decidebat*. It may be noted that such excessive reading is explicitly prohibited by Pelagius: *sit ... ipsa lectio temperata, cui finem consilium, non lassitudo imponat* (*epist. ad Demetr.* 23); cf. also Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 3,238.

cotidiana ieiunia. These words would seem to have been something of a cliché; they are found at Maximus of Turin 50,3; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 15,4; Augustine, *epist.* 36,9; Cassian, *conf.* 5,12,3; 20,8,10; *inst.* 5,24; 5,26; *Regula Magistri* 90,4. Daily fasting is recommended by Cassian, *conf.* 2,23,2; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 198,5; Paschasius of Dume, *verba patr.* 1,4. According to Augustine (*mor. eccl.* 33,70) eating once a day at dusk was common practice.

refectio. Forcellini cites Livy 37,24,6 for *reficere* in this sense: *cibo reficerent vires*. The verb is used both transitively and intransitively at Augustine, *serm.* 14,6; cf. 362,11 (*subicimus quod recessit et reficere dicimur*); 385,7 (= Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 21,7 *manducas, reficeris*). For the noun *refectio* Forcellini gives Celsus 4,13,6 and Pliny, *paneg.* 15,4. As in the present passage, J. again uses the word to denote a meal after fasting at *epist.* 24,3,1; 125,7,1; *adv. Iovin.* 2,12; *Vulg. Iudith* 6,20. It is also used with the same sense in Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 29,13; Augustine, *epist.* 36,27; 36,31; 54,9; *in psalm.* 122,12; *Regula Magistri* *rit.* 28.

biduo triduoque transmissa. J. reports that Asella went for two and three days without food (*epist.* 24,4,2). The same practice is mentioned by Ps.-Athanasius, *v. Syncl.* 53; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 18; Augustine, *mor. eccl.* 33,70; *Vita Eupraxiae* 6; 14. The Younger Melania's biographer describes how she progressed from two and three to five day fasts (*Vita Melaniae iunioris* 22); when Ambrose's sister fasted, he actually lost count of the days (*virg.* 3,4,15). Monks are said to fast for two and three days together at Theodore, *A. rel.* 3 p. 1333^B and Cassian, *inst.* 2,5,2; 5,5,2; cf. also Athanasius, *v. Anton.* 7 (two or four) and *Apophthegmata patrum* 146 (Nau [1908], p. 50; two, four or five).

As in the present passage, J. is critical at *epist.* 54,10,5: there he prefers a little food regularly to three day fasts. Cassian goes so far as to regard such fasts as worse than over-eating (*conf.* 2,17,1f.). They induce vainglory according to Paschasius of Dume, *verba patr.* 1,4. At 37,3 below J. cautions anyone who has fasted for two days against thinking himself better than a non-faster.

vacuum portare ventrem. J. repeats this phrase at *in Is.* 16,58,2^c l. 94. *si compensatur saturitate ieiunium*. This is what happens to the

remnooth in 34,3 below. At *adv. Iovin.* 2,12 J. again describes how fasting often alternates with over-indulgence. Cassian condemns the same fault at *conf.* 2,22,1f. and *inst.* 5,9. The virgin herself is told to avoid it in Ps.-Athanasius, v. *Syncl.* 100. On the kind of gastronomic excess involved cf. Janini Cuesta, p. 12.

ilico mens repleta torpescit. In the Fathers this idea had occurred at Clement of Alexandria, *paed.* 2,1,11,1; Origen, *hom. in Lc.* 25 p. 149,17; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 10; cf. Rufinus, *Clement.* 6,1,4. It is found later at Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 44,5; *hom. in Jo.* 45,1; Nilus of Ancyra (= Evagrius Ponticus), *spir. mal.* 1; Prudentius, *carh.* 7,16ff.; Theodoret, *h. ref.* 3 p. 1325^c; Cassian, *inst.* 5,5,2. It goes back to Plato, *resp.* 519b.

inrigata humus. J. repeats this metaphor at *epist.* 55,2,3: when the body is watered, lewdness ensues (cf. also *tract. in psalm.* I p. 200 l. 142). The metaphor had also been given the same application by Basil, *renunt.* 6. It is used again in this way at Nilus of Ancyra, *Magn.* 65 and Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 46,2.

spinas libidinum germinat. Hilberg fails to note that this is an echo of Gen. 3,18 *spinas et tribulos germinabit.* The verse is also made to signify the enticements of the flesh at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 200 l. 145; the same passage also uses the irrigation metaphor (cf. previous n.). If these *Tractatus* are by Origen, he is evidently the source of J.'s argument here. Gen. 3,18 again refers to fleshly lust at Maximus of Turin 66,3 *germinat enim mihi terra mea spinas, si me corporalis libidinis titillatione compungit.* Similarly Ferrandus, *epist.* 7,1 speaks of *spinas cupiditatis.* J.'s striking phraseology in the present passage is imitated by Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 198,4 (*ilico mens repleta torpescit et inrigata corporis nostri terra spinas libidinum germinabit*); cf. also *serm.* 201,1. Here J. has again linked food to lust, as he did in chs. 8-11.

17,3

florem adolescentiae. For the phrase cf. *TLL* VI,1, 935,36ff. J. gives *flos* a sexual reference again at *epist.* 50,3,2; cf. also Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 10,1; *Concilium Eliberitanum* 15; Ambrose, *hex.* 5,19,63; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 1; Augustine, *bon. viduit.* 20,25; Cassian, *conf.* 21,9,1.

accepto cibo cum te in lectulo conpositam dulcis libidinum pompa concusserit. Prurience is brought on by a meal according to Hilary, *in psalm. 118* zain 6 p. 422,2. In two passages food is similarly said to generate lust when we are in bed: Basil, *ep.* 22,3 and Ambrose, *in psalm. 118* *serm.* 7,31,3. It was customary to go to bed after the big evening meal (cf. Janini Cuesta, p. 16), while the best time for

intercourse was thought to be after a meal and before sleep (cf. Oribasius, *exp.* 1,13,4).

J. uses *libidinum pompa* again at *in psalm.* 6. In the present passage there is a fine contrast between this grandiloquent phrase and the pathetic diminutive *lectulus*.

arripe scutum fidei, in quo ignitae diaboli extinguuntur sagittae. The fiery darts of Eph. 6,16 are thoughts at *epist.* 79,9,2; for this interpretation cf. Origen, *exp. in Pr.* 6,19. J. has altogether some thirty references to these arrows, which he designates as *iacula* more often than *sagittae*. J. again combines Eph. 6,16 with Hos. 7,4 (l. 18 'all adulterers, as an oven') at *in Is.* 8,27,4 l. 41; 16,58,13 l. 29; 17,64,8 l. 62; *in Joel* 1,19 l. 550; *in Mich.* 5,7 l. 325; *in Eph.* 6,16 p. 551^D. The connection had been made by Origen (*or.* 30,3).

omnes adulterantes, quasi clibanus corda eorum. The text (Hos. 7,4) is one of J.'s favourites: he quotes it nearly twenty times, while Augustine has it once and Ambrose avoids it altogether. With the exception of *in Jer.* 5,67,7 and *in Mich.* 5,7 l. 325 it is always cited in this form, which is a conflation of Hos. 7,4 (πάντες μοιχεύοντες, ὡς κλίβανος κατόμενος εἰς πέπιν κατακαύματος) and Hos. 7,6 (ἀνεκαύθησαν ὡς κλίβανος αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν); the two verses had been juxtaposed in Origen, *hom. in Lev.* 5,5 p. 343,19. The same conflated form recurs later at Gaudentius, *serm.* 13,29; Eucherius, *form.* 7 p. 43,4 (fire means pleasure); Philip, *in Job rec. long.* 28 p. 699^A. In the present passage scripture has again become a picturesque and ingenious substitute for argument: here texts are clustered around the *Stichwort* 'fire', as Eustochium is urged to recite verses in which the fire of divine inspiration is an antidote to the oven and burning arrows of Hosea and Ephesians. Apart from the practical usefulness of these 'fire' texts in encouraging perseverance or inducing an appropriate frame of mind, they also embellish the *Libellus* and impress the reader with J.'s biblical expertise.

nonne cor nostrum. As here, J. cites Lk. 24,32 in five further passages for the sake of the *Stichwort* 'fire'. The fire had been love of God according to Origen, *fr. in Lc.* 256.

ignitum eloquium. This is the only occurrence of Ps. 118,140 in J. The verse is similarly linked to Lk. 24,32 (cf. previous n.) by Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 6,186 and Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 18,19,2. Ambrose also has it at *Ioseph* 4,19.

17,4

difficile est humanam animam non amare. Origen had said that it is impossible for human nature not to love something (*Cont. praef.* p. 72,11; cf. also *ib.* 3 p. 186,16). Simon, II, p. 234 (n. 1477), assumes a

direct borrowing on J.'s part. His *amare* picks up *dilexit* in the foregoing citation of Ps. 118.

carnis amor spiritus amore superatur; desiderium desiderio restringitur. The same point had already been made by Tertullian, *uor.* 1,4 l. 27 (*spirituali affectione carnalem illam concupiscentiam humabis*) and by the anonymous homily *περὶ παρθενίας* (Amand-Moons) 60 (τὸν ... τῆς σαρκὸς πόθον τῷ ἐπουρανίῳ πόθῳ καταπαλαίσαντας).⁶ Love's conquest by love is common knowledge according to Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 45,1 (*omnibus ... notum est, quia amor amore vincitur; incipiamus bonas cogitationes diligere et statim nos deus ab illis quae malae sunt dignabitur liberare*). J. again makes it our duty to quench the heat of sensuality with the greater love of Christ at *epist.* 79,9,5. Cf. also 1,2 above (*carne contempta sponsi iungaris amplexibus*). Here the homoeoteleuton (-atur ... -itur) alone is noted by Hritzu, p. 90; in addition the figures of *interpretatio* (cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4,28,38), anaphoric and epiphoric *disiunctio*, asyndetic parison and twofold polyptoton invest J.'s own formulation of this commonplace with customary panache.⁷

The antithesis of carnal and spiritual love is a concept that had occurred with some frequency in Origen. At *hom. in Cant.* 1,2 p. 31,7 the analogy of physical and spiritual food suggests to him the idea of a love of the flesh that comes from Satan and one of the spirit that has its source in God (*ib.* l. 6 *ut aliquid audentius dicam ... siquidem est et spiritualis amor*). He restates the antithesis of carnal and spiritual love at *Cant. praef.* p. 66,29: the poets called the former *Cupido*. The desire of the flesh is defined as desire for what is wrong and that of the spirit as desire for God's salvation at *comm. in Rom.* 6,1 p. 1056^D. Finally Origen represents love of God and love of the flesh as being in combat at *hom. in Gen.* 8,3 p. 79,27 and 8,7 p. 82,26.

The opposition between love of the flesh and love of the spirit is also a concept that is frequent in Augustine. At *civ.* 15,5 p. 65,18 he speaks of carnal and spiritual desire with reference to Gal. 5,17 ('the flesh lusteth against the spirit'). They are again said to be in conflict at *conin.* 2,5 and *c. Pelag.* 1,10,17; however through chastity spiritual delights succeed fleshly ones (*bon. viduit.* 21,26). The antithesis of carnal and spiritual love recurs at *doctr. christ.* 3,72 and *epist.* 211,14. It had also been employed by Ambrosiaster at *in 2 Cor.* 13,12.

⁶ The conflict is between love of God and love of woman according to Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 5 (*amor dei mulieris amore non vincitur*) and Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 7 l. 197 (*reflexe ... amorem tuum ab amore mulieris, ne te ab amore dei eius amor excludat*).

⁷ According to Tristoglio, p. 276, 'la frase persuade perché nella voce è confluita una lunga esperienza'.

super lectum meum. Cant. 3,1 recurs at *epist.* 66,10,1 and 130,7,12. Ambrose uses it at *virginit.* 8,45; cf. *exhort. virg.* 9,58. In the present passage the text is highly appropriate, since a bed is mentioned just before at 17,3 and just after at 18,1. Here J.'s treatment of love is brief: he at once moves on to the subject of asceticism.

mortificate membra vestra. J. returns to the theme of self-mortification which had occupied him in 17,2f. He now rounds off the ch. with a crescendo of appurtenant scriptural citation, in which the careful differentiation of 17,2 is ignored.

In his quotation of Col. 3,5 ('mortify ...') J. omits the apostle's definition of the 'members' ('fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry'); instead he simply equates them with the flesh. He likewise glosses the text with *mortificationem membrorum corporalium* at *in Am.* 4,10 l. 386. As in the *Libellus*, Col. 3,5 is also linked to Gal. 2,20 ('nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me') in this passage of *in Am.* (l. 373); the combination had already occurred in Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 52. J. is very partial to Gal. 2,20: he cites it a dozen times. In the present passage of the *Libellus* 'Christ liveth in me' is perhaps intended as corroboration of J.'s statement in ll. 4f. that love of Christ should supplant carnal love; J. however gives no hint of such a link.

17,5

in imagine perambulabat. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, identified the source as Ps. 38,7 μέντοιγε ἐν εἰκόνι διαπορεύεται ἄνθρωπος; Thierry (1967), pp. 124f., repeats the identification. J. quotes this text again at *adv. Pelag.* 2,3; *in eccles.* 8,13 l. 208; *in Ezech.* 8,10 l. 205; 16,17 l. 1503; *in psalm.* 115.

Mierow-Lawler, p. 149, refer J.'s words here to the preceding *Christus* and translate 'in His image'.⁸ This is also Epiphanius' interpretation of Ps. 38,7 at [Jerome], *epist.* 51,6,8 (cf. the Old Latin version at Ambrose, *in psalm.* 38,23,1 *in imagine dei*; it is rejected by Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ps.* 38,7^a). *TLL* VII,1, 410,69 on the other hand makes Christ himself the subject of J.'s sentence.⁹ For Christ's 'example' cf. (e.g.) Ps.-Basil, *const.* 1,1 (ὡς ἐν εἰκόνι διαγράφων ἡμῖν εὐσέβειαν). Such an interpretation would moreover be compatible with the preceding clause (*qui mortificavit membra sua*), since Christ is said to have mortified the flesh at (e.g.) *epist.* 65,10,4.

⁸ They do not discuss the interpretation of the text.

⁹ Cf. Labourt's translation (p. 127) 'dont la conduite était symbolique'. Again he fails to justify his interpretation.

It would seem however that Thierry was right to suppose that J. is instead thinking of the effect of mortification: the ascetic is 'like a shadow' through physical emaciation. Thierry might have added that this explanation finds corroboration in Palladius, *h. Laus.* 43 δι' ὑπερβολὴν ... ἐγκρατείας ... ὑπενοήθη καὶ φάσμα εἶναι; it also fits the scriptural texts that follow (cf. esp. 1. 15 *adhæsit os meum carni meæ*). J. has accordingly converted the psalmist's reflections on the transience and futility of human life into a description of ascetic deportment. Thierry rightly prefers *perambular*; Hilberg's *perambulabat* will have arisen from contamination with *aiebat* (l. 9).

tamquam uter in pruina. Ps. 118,83 is cited at *tract. in psalm.* l p. 200 l. 137 (ib. *quando caro nostra non libidinem quaerit*); the passage may be by Origen. At Ps. 118,83 (ad loc.) Origen had appended Col. 3,5 ('mortify ... your members'). The psalmic text had also referred to self-mortification at Hilary, *in psalm. 118* caph 4 p. 452,20; it does so again later at Ambrose, *in psalm. 118* serm. 11,13,1 (it is spoken by the just man who has mortified his body); Cassian, *inst.* 1,11,3; Ps.-Jerome (= Eutropius presbyter), *epist.* 19 p. 205^B; cf. Eucherius, *form.* 2 p. 11,5 *pruina abstinentia*. The Latin version of Hesychius of Jerusalem's commentary on Leviticus (7,8 p. 859^D) offers a different interpretation: as a leather bottle is strengthened in frost, so endurance grows through tribulations. The reference was likewise to troubles in Julian of Eclanum, *epit. in psalm. 118,83*.

quidquid enim in me fuit umoris, excoctum est. If J.'s *tract. in psalm.* 106 is in fact by Origen, it has been the source for the present passage. There Ps. 118,83 (cf. previous n.) is glossed in exactly the same way: *quando omnisumor exsiccatus est et excoctus* (*tract. in psalm.* l p. 200 l. 138).

J. refers frequently to drying up the wetness of lust: *epist.* 65,14,2; 75,1,3; 98,19,2; 100,2,2; *adv. Iovin.* 1,11; 1,21; *c. Ioh.* 36; *adv. Rufin.* 1,25; *in Is.* 3,7,10 l. 47; *in Ier.* 2,73; *in Ezech.* 16,10^e l. 1178; 22,17 l. 638; *in Zach.* 14,16 l. 686; *in Mat.* 4,4 l. 71. Similarly lechery is said to be moist at *epist.* 122,1,13 and *adv. Iovin.* 2,4 (Behemoth rules the waters of lasciviousness; the idea comes from Origen, *exp. in Pr.* 21,19). On the other hand at *in Is.* 14,52,4 l. 77 continence is dry.

The idea was common. Chastity and mortification had been said to desiccate in Tertullian (*apol.* 40,15 *ieiuniis aridi et omni continentia expressi*; cf. *ieiun.* 12 p. 290,24), Origen (*hom. in Lev.* 2,4 p. 297,23; 4,10 p. 330,28) and Asterius the Sophist (*hom.* [Richard] 21,10 ἵνα τῇ ἀρτεία ἐξηράνησιν τὴν ὑγρότητα τῶν παθῶν); the same idea is also found at Chrysostom, *poenit.* 6,2 and Cassian, *conl.* 22,6,7. Such language was not merely metaphorical; it also fitted contemporary views on physiology. Basil had noted that draining the body's fat dries out the

pipes around the private parts (*ep.* 45,1; cf. also *Vitae patrum* 5,8,23). It is food that engenders this moisture according to Origen, *Jo.* 13,2,8. The ascetic accordingly takes dry aliment: Ps.-Basil, *const.* 6,4 and Palladius, *h. Laus.* 2. The monk Arsenius is described as being 'dry' at *Apophthegmata Patrum* p. 108^A. It is therefore natural for xerophagy and virginity to be linked repeatedly in Ps.-Chrysostom, *poenit.* (1,1; 1,4; 2,3). Finally it may be noted that medical opinion too found the dry diet least conducive to sex (cf. Oribasius, *syn.* 1,6,4).

Ascetic teaching took due account of these principles. Basil of Ancyra had required that the proportions of wet and dry in the body should be carefully observed (*virg.* 9). Similarly Cassian wants the body's wantonness to be minimized by keeping the consumption of water down (*conf.* 12,11,5). He states that moistness produced by food and drink leads to wet dreams (*ib.* 2,23,1): a judicious diet can limit such mishaps to three times a year. Similar advice is repeated at 22,6,5 of the same work (cf. also *Historia monachorum* 20,3).

infirmata sunt in ieiunio genua mea. J. quotes Ps. 108,24 again only at *adv. Iovin.* 2,15. It had been applied to Christ by Origen, *Ps.* 108,23.

oblitus sum manducare panem meum; a voce gemitus mei adhaesit os meum carni meae. This is the only place where J. cites Ps. 101,5f. Verses from the same psalm are quoted at 18,1 and 18,2 below. The condition depicted in the second half of this text is ascribed to dehydration at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 178 l. 29 (ad loc.). At Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 15,4 it is again an ascetic who speaks the verse.

Chapter 18

As Eustochium lies awake in bed, she is urged to weep as an antidote to temptation. The virgin can thereby escape the curse which was pronounced upon women at the Fall: the second half of this ch. accordingly leads up to the theoretical justification of virginity which occupies the ones that follow (19–22). There is a discussion of chs. 18ff. in Moreschini (1988), pp. 134ff.

18,1

esto cicada noctium. The cicada was especially loud at noon according to Ambrose, *hex.* 5,22,76: J.'s *cicada noctium* accordingly entails a piquant oxymoron. On the metaphorical application of this insect cf. Antin (1961b); Egan; Trisoglio, p. 275; Nazzaro, pp. 205f. The delightfully picturesque zoological imagery continues in the next line with *passer*: it is very much in J.'s manner. At [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 58,157 the reader is urged to be a bee.

lava per singulas noctes lectum tuum. J. uses this charming text (Ps. 6,7) another half dozen times. It refers to the struggle with the flesh at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 350 l. 63; it particularly suits the virgin according to Origen, *sel. in Ps.* 6,7 and Ambrose, *virg.* 3,5,21.

fiere. On this rather colloquial substitute for *fi* cf. *TLL* VI,1, 85,6ff. (add J.'s translations of Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 9,2 p. 409,19 and *hom. in Is.* 5,2 p. 264,26). J. says on a number of occasions that he uses colloquialisms to help understanding: *epist.* 64,11,2; *in Ezech.* 40,5 l. 397; 47,1 l. 1047; *in Eph. lib. 2 praef.* p. 477^A.¹ The addressee of the present work is of course a young girl. In this particular passage the colloquialism is also appropriate to the intimate context. Throughout the *Libellus* colloquialisms are notably common; their frequency does not however prevent J. from complaining at 28,6 about a priest's uncouth speech.

sicut passer in solitudine. J. cites this picturesque verse (Ps. 101,8) again at *in Hab.* 2,9 l. 450 and *in eccles.* 12,4 l. 182. It expresses the fallen virgin's disconsolateness at Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 46. Evagrius Ponticus (*sent. mon.* 46) compares the wakeful monk to a sparrow.

psalle spiritu, psalle et mente. Ambrose had also recommended

¹ Origen had said the same at *Con.* 3 p. 130,6.

psalmody in the bedroom at *virg.* 3,4,19 *sed etiam in ipso cubili volo psalmos ... contexas*; cf. also *exhort. virg.* 9,58. J. characteristically expresses the injunction in the form of a scriptural citation (1 Cor. 14,15 *psallam spiritu, psallam et mente*).

benedic, anima mea. J. quotes Ps. 102,2ff. again at *epist.* 120,12,7; in *Is.* 8,26,14 l. 33; in *Ion.* 2,7 l. 280 D.

18,2

cinerem quasi panem manducavi. Ps. 101,10 appealed strongly to J., who repeats it on eight occasions. Ambrose had cited it in a ch. on the blessedness of weeping (*vid.* 6,35). Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom.* 1 p. 14 assumes that here the psalmist is describing ascetic practice.

non flendum est, non gemendum. The tears in 7,1, 7,3, 7,4 and 30,2 are penitential, while in 35,3 they indicate the speaker's quality: here they are a response to temptation. J. notes that weeping beseems the godly (*in Eph.* 5,3 p. 520^A); he also records how Paula had wanted to make up for years of laughter with continuous tears (*epist.* 108,15,4). Ambrose later suggests topics for virgins to bewail (*exhort. virg.* 11,75); he had already stipulated that their prayers should be accompanied by tears at *virg.* 3,4,15. According to J.'s translation of Pachomius (*epist.* 5 p. 90,13) tears should continue day and night.

J. again combines *flere* and *gemere* at *epist.* 23,4 and *vita Pauli* 12; cf. in *Is.* 11,38,14 l. 11. Cf. *TLL* VI,1, 899,53ff.; 904,50ff.; VI,2, 1749,81ff.; 1760,38ff. This combination was greatly favoured by Augustine: in addition to *TLL*'s examples cf. *beat. vit.* 2; *conf.* 3,11,20; 4,5,10; *de duab. anim.* 3; *epist.* 111,1; 153,7; in *psalm.* 21, *enarr.* 2,1; 26, *enarr.* 2,14; 37,2; 38,20; 50,11; 127,9; *serm.* 254,4 *RBen* 79, 1969 p. 65,55; p. 66,57; p. 66,63; *util. cred.* 1,2; 2,4. In the present passage J. imparts urgency to his question with the anaphora of *non*; the excited tone is maintained by the similar anaphora of *cum* in the line below and of *quid* in ll. 10f.²

de paradiso virginitatis. J. uses the same phrase again nearly thirty years later at *epist.* 128,3,1. He states at 19,4 below that Eve was a virgin in paradise. In the present passage temptation is dramatically described in language that evokes the Fall: this phraseology prepares the way for J.'s rejection in ll. 12ff. of the curse on womankind.

tunicis vult vestire pellicis. Here the coats come from the serpent; in Gen. 3,21 on the other hand it is God who makes them. They recur in connection with marriage at 19,4 below (cf. 19,3). J. mentions them again at *epist.* 64,19,3; 128,3,1 (*pellicias tunicas nuptiarum*); in *Am.*

² For the latter cf. (e.g.) Seneca, *epist.* 51,6 *quid mihi cum ...? quid cum ...?*

2,13 l. 485 (*peccatorum*); in *Agg.* 1,1 l. 21: in the first three of these passages they are discarded. Origen had argued that because they are made of the skins of dead animals they are coats of mortality (*hom. in Lev.* 6,2 p. 362,15; cf. also Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 1,241); Ambrose calls them coats of corruption and passion (*Isaac* 6,52). For examples of Christians putting them on (as in the present passage) cf. Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,199 and Lawrence of Novae, *paen.* p. 91^c (through lapse after baptism the coat of the Gospel is exchanged for one of skin). Cf. further Beatrice (1985).

quas Helias ad paradysum rediens proiecit in terram. As a symbol of carnality the coats of skins in Gen. 3,21 are now equated with the mantle that Elijah cast off when he was carried up to heaven. This combination would not seem to occur elsewhere: its whimsicality is typical. At 4 Reg. 2,13 the Bible speaks of *pallium* (μῆλωτιν) in the singular; here however Elijah discards 'shirts' in the plural. Elsewhere J. says that his mantle signifies wealth (*epist.* 71,3,1 and 118,4,4). According to Chromatius (*in Matth.* 54A,5) Elijah is in paradise; cf. *ad paradysum* here.

dulci et mortifero carmine Sirenarum. J. repeats the striking phrase *dulci et mortifero carmine* a quarter of a century later at *in Is.* 6,13,19 l. 95; cf. *ib.* 12,43,16 l. 50 *dulci carmine atque mortifero*. He has evidently borrowed it from Ambrose, *fid.* 3,1,4 *dulcem ... sed mortiferam cantilenam* (sc. *Sirenarum*; this work had appeared four years earlier in 380). At *in Nah.* 3,18 l. 785 on the other hand the epithets that J. uses are *suavi et pernicioso*. His very numerous references to the songs of the Sirens are assembled by Antin (1961c). Though other Christian writers allude to their songs on occasion, J.'s love of striking phraseology makes him refer to them far more frequently than anyone else. Siren songs are also mentioned in Ambrose, *Iac.* 2,12,56; *in Luc.* 4,2; *Tob.* 5,16; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 16,7; Basil, *leg. lib. gent.* 4 B.; Epiphanius, *haer.* 64,20,2. 'Siren' occurs in scripture itself at *Is.* 13,21f. (quoted at 6,4 above); evidently it was not an uncommon word, cf. Probus, *app. gramm.* IV 199,10. In the *Libellus* there are further pagan allusions at 28,6 and 35,8.

18,3

nolo illi subiacere sententiae, quae in hominem est lata damnatum.

J. refuses to obey a decree that ordains childbirth. For the sympathetic and very vivid identification with the addressee cf. 25,4 below *nobis ... quae ... adolescentulae sumus*.

in doloribus et anxietatibus partes, mulier. Gen. 3,16 recurs at *epist.* 130,8,2; *in Mich.* 4,8 l. 314; *in Gal.* 4,19 p. 385^a; cf. *virg. Mar.* 20. It had already been quoted by Tertullian (*cult. fem.* 1,1 l. 13), Cyprian

(*hab. virg.* 22; *testim.* 3,32 'de bono virginitatis') and Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 23). J.'s use of the text in the present passage would appear to have been inspired by Cyprian's *De habitu* (cf. next 3 nn.);³ however the particular wording employed in the *Libellus* has not come from Cyprian, but from Tertullian, whose formulation at the start of the *De cultu* (*in doloribus et anxietatibus paries, mulier*) is far more striking than Cyprian's simple *in tristitia paries filios*; hence J.'s preference for the former. Such use of multiple sources is typical.

Avoidance of birth-pangs had been counted among virginity's blessings in the following passages: Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 7,3; Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,16; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 19; Ambrosiaster, *in I Cor.* 7,26,1; cf. Amphilochius, *hom.* 2,1. According to Eusebius of Emesa (*serm.* 6,5) it would alone be sufficient reward.

— *lex ista non mea est* —. The most recent translation of the *Libellus* renders these words as 'questa legge non l'ho fatta io';⁴ Hilberg's MSS k and B do in fact add *sed dei*. This kind of statement had scriptural precedent at I Cor. 7,10 (*praecipio non ego sed dominus*); it also occurs frequently elsewhere (cf. Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 5,2 p. 316,17; Ambrose, *vid.* 4,23; Chrysostom, *hom. in Rom.* 20,3; *hom. in Heb.* 3,6; Severian of Gabala, *cruc.* p. 906; Hesychius of Jerusalem, *serm.* [Aubineau 1978] 12,10), while J. himself makes it at *epist.* 125,19,2 and *in Gal.* 5,26 p. 424^A. However it would appear preferable to understand these words of the *Libellus* as having rather the meaning: 'that law does not apply to me'.⁵ Such an interpretation receives support from the words which precede J.'s reference to Gen. 3,16 (l. 12 *nolo illi subiaccere sententiae, quae in hominem est lata damnatum*); for the particular phrase at issue cf. Tertullian, *idol.* 24,3 *haec erit lex nostra*. Instead therefore of an exclamatory parenthesis J. is making use of a gloss which exactly matches the other two employed in this passage (ll. 15–17): all three affirm the inapplicability of the foregoing biblical text to the virgin. Hilberg's punctuation should be emended accordingly; in particular the hyphens around *lex ista non mea est* need to be eliminated. The passage then reads as follows: '*in doloribus et anxietatibus paries, mulier*': *lex ista non mea est*; '*et ad virum conversio tua*': *sit conversio illius ad maritum, quae virum non*

³ It may also be remarked that the portion of the *De habitu* at issue is the only one in which Cyprian deals with the drawbacks of wedlock; since this is the topic for which J. refers his reader to the treatise in the *Libellus* (22,3), this Cyprianic passage had evidently impressed itself on his mind.

⁴ Cola, I, p. 204; cf. Bauer (1983), p. 50 'nicht von mir ruht dieses Gesetz her'.

⁵ This is in fact the translation which Mierow-Lawler give in their actual text (p. 150). However on p. 238, n. 142, they instead propose the rendering 'that law is not mine [scil., but rather God's]'.
 1

habet Christum; et ad extremum 'morte morieris' finis iste conjugii; meum propositum sine sexu est. The striking tricolon of glosses that results exactly replicates Cyprian's own on the same text of Gen. at *hab. virg.* 22 *vos ab hac sententia liberae estis, vos mulierum tristitias et gemitus non timetis, nullus vobis de partu circa filios metus est; nec maritus dominus, dominus vester et caput Christus est ad instar et vicem masculi, sors vobis et condicio communis est.*⁶ In particular J.'s first gloss (*Iex ista non mea est*) now matches Cyprian's initial *vos ab hac sententia liberae estis*. J. typically improves on the Cyprianic sequence of glosses by making his own alternate with scripture: the resultant counterpoint is highly effective.

et ad virum conversio tua. J. now proceeds to cite the next clause of Gen. 3,16. Cyprian had glossed this text as follows:⁷ *nec maritus dominus, dominus vester et caput Christus est ad instar et vicem masculi.* This rather discursive statement is now recast by J. to produce the following incisive gloss: *sit conversio illius ad maritum, quae virum non habet Christum.* J. retains the Cyprianic antithesis between the husband and Christ.⁸ However in place of Cyprian's allusion to 1 Cor. 11,3 (cf. footn. 6) J. substitutes a characteristically vivid form of expression that represents Christ himself as the husband; in doing so he may have had 2 Cor. 11,2 in mind (*despondi enim vos uni viro*

⁶ Keenan, p. 67, translates the second half of this Cyprianic passage thus: 'nor is your husband your master, but your Master and Head is Christ, in the likeness of and in place of the man: your lot and condition are in common' (the same rendering is found in Deferrari, p. 50). Keenan (like Hartel, p. 203) fails to identify the reference that Cyprian makes here to 1 Cor. 11,3 *omnis viri caput Christus est: caput autem mulieris vir*. This biblical text not only accounts for Cyprian's *caput (sc. vestrum) Christus est*, it also clarifies the meaning of *ad instar et vicem masculi*. Cyprian is asserting that by virtue of virginity the head of the woman is no longer the man, but Christ himself, who in St. Paul had been the head of the man: in consequence the woman has now been raised to the same level as the man. Accordingly *ad instar et vicem masculi* should not be rendered 'in the likeness of and in place of the man': rather *ad instar* here has the sense 'according to the standard or pattern of' (so *OLD* s.v. *instar* 4), while *ad vicem* is similarly to be taken as signifying 'after the manner of' (so *OLD* s.v. *vicus* 9b). Likewise Cyprian's ensuing statement (*sors vobis et condicio communis est*) is a further affirmation of the woman's assimilation to the man. Cyprian is accordingly making the same point as Gal. 3,28 *non est masculus neque femina: omnes enim vos unum estis in Christo Iesu*. It may be observed that Cyprian himself had employed the term *masculus* at the end of the preceding clause; however 1 Cor. 11,3, which he is paraphrasing there, has instead *vir*. According to Sabatier, III, pp. 773f., the Old Latin text of Gal. 3,28 is invariably *masculus*. It is perhaps possible therefore that Cyprian has this text specifically in mind here.

⁷ The gloss is preceded by the words *vos mulierum tristitias et gemitus non timetis, nullus vobis de partu circa filios metus est*. Since this statement merely expands on Cyprian's initial *vos ab hac sententia liberae estis* by paraphrasing the start of Gen. 3,16, it may be discounted.

⁸ He also keeps Cyprian's term *maritus*.

virginem castam exhibere Christo).⁹

Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 23) and Eusebius of Emesa (*serm.* 7,18) had also pointed out that this text of Gen. could not be applied to the virgin. Similarly Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian) had observed that virgins do not have a husband for master (*puhic.* 7,4);¹⁰ this circumstance alone would be sufficient reward according to Eusebius of Emesa (*serm.* 6,5). J. cites this text of Gen. again at *virg. Mar.* 20 (it does not apply to Sarah); *adv. Iovin.* 1,27; *in Ier.* 1,62,2; *in Eph.* 5,22 p. 531^A; *in Tit.* 2,3 p. 581^C.

morte morieris. J. introduces his third and final citation of scripture in this passage; unlike the first two, it does not come from Gen. 3,16, but 2,17. Here J. may have taken another hint from the opening of Tertullian's *De cultu feminarum*, which had combined an allusion to Gen. 2,17 with quotation of 3,16 (1,1 ll. 13 and 19); this Tertullianic passage is indisputably the source for J.'s citation of the latter text (cf. n. on *in doloribus* ... above). J. now glosses Gen. 2,17 with the words *meum propositum sine sexu est* (l. 17). The statement 'ma la mia regola di vita non è legata al sesso' (so the most recent translation: Cola, I, p. 204) entails a *non sequitur* when used as a gloss on *morte morieris*; significantly one of Hilberg's MSS replaces *sexu* with *exitu*.¹¹ On the other hand J.'s comment does correspond exactly to the final element of Cyprian's gloss: *sors vobis et condicio communis est*. The inconsequence attendant on J.'s own gloss would seem to supply convenient verification that he has appropriated it from Cyprian.

The same argument had also been employed by Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 7,3 *virginitas neutri est sexus*;¹² cf. also Ps.-Cyprian,

⁹ An allusion to this verse is detected by Klostermann (1911), p. 194. Cf. also n. on 16,1 *viro tuo*.

¹⁰ This treatise is likewise indebted to Cyprian's *De habitu virginum*; cf. Bardenhewer (1913), II, p. 494. J. would not appear to have made any use of the *De bono pudicitiae* in the *Libellus*; nor does he mention it at *vir. ill.* 70, where the titles of nine works by Novatian are given.

¹¹ For this idea cf. (e.g.) Augustine, *epist.* 150 *adhaerens* (sc. *virgo*) *coniugio, quod non habet finem*.

¹² It may in fact be observed that the same three ideas as occur in this passage of the *Libellus* (ll. 14–17) and the *De habitu virginum* are also found in this treatise: *virginitas neutri est sexus, virginitas est perseverans infantia, virginitas est voluptatum triumphus, virginitas filios non habet, sed quod plus est filiorum contemptum habet, non habet fecunditatem, sed non habet orbuitatem, felix quod est extra partus dolorem felicitior est autem extra funerum filiorum calamitatem, virginitas quid aliud est quam sola libertas? maritum non habet dominum* (*puhic.* 7,3f.). However there is no reason to suppose that J. is in any way indebted to this passage, which makes no reference to scripture and omits the antithesis between husband and Christ; it also presents the ideas in a different order and intersperses them with extraneous material. For this treatise's lack of influence on the *Libellus* and for its own debt to Cyprian's *De habitu virginum* cf. footn. 10 above.

singul. cler. 40 (*illos [sc. tam masculinum quam feminam] operatione utriusque sexus abscedit [sc. virginitas]*). The idea recurs in Ambrose, in *Luc.* 2,28. J. himself shows a unique fondness for making this point: he repeats that there is no difference of sex for the virgin at *epist.* 65,1,3; 75,2,2; 122,4,5; *virg. Mar.* 20; *adv. Iovin.* 1,16; *adv. Rufin.* 1,29; in *Eph.* 5,29 p. 534^B. With characteristic extravagance he asserts that she becomes a man at *epist.* 71,3,1 and in *Eph.* 5,28 p. 533^C. Cf. also Gal. 3,28 'there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus'.

mibi virginitas in Maria dedicatur et Christo. Origen had stated that Mary and Christ inaugurated virginity for men and women respectively at *comm. in Mt.* 10,17 p. 22,1 οἶμαι λόγον ἔχειν, ἀνδρῶν μὲν καθαρότητος τῆς ἐν ἀγνείᾳ ἀπαρχὴν γεγονέναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, γυναικῶν δὲ τὴν Μαρίαν. J. uses the idea here to create an effective climax to the ch. He repeats it at *epist.* 49,21,3, where it is given a particularly impressive formulation: *Christus virgo, virgo Maria utriusque sexui virginitatis dedicaverit principia.* The same idea recurs in *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,6,2 p. 133; cf. also Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,3. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,24 and 1,39 J. says simply that Christ inaugurated virginity. Christ and Mary again appear together in this connection at 19,5 and 21,7 below.

Chapter 19

At the central point of the work J. now embarks on a theoretical justification of virginity. Predictably it is largely historical and draws heavily on scripture. The present ch. in fact provides a good example of J.'s method of composition: it consists of a hotchpotch of biblical texts, which are interspersed with lapidary commonplaces and J.'s own bizarre imagery. It also contains four notable instances of the 'Strichwort' technique (p. 168,12ff.; 16ff.; 21f.; p. 169,6ff.). A clear line of argument is hardly discernible.

19,1

dicat aliquis. The ch. opens with an arresting figure, which Hritzu, p. 70, calls *procatalepsis*; cf. further Scourfield, p. 206. Use of *sermocinatio* makes it especially vivid. For this particular form ('someone will say') cf. (e.g.) Origen, *comm. in Mt.* 16,29 p. 572,1 (εἶποι γὰρ ἄν τις); *comm. ser. in Mt.* 46 p. 93,29; 48 p. 99,9; *hom. in Num.* 6,3 p. 33,18; 26,3 p. 248,17; Ambrose, *incarn.* 7,62; *inst. virg.* 2,14; *off.* 1,30,159; *virg.* 1,3,12; 1,7,34; 1,10,57; 2,3,21; *virginit.* 2,8. Norden, pp. 556f., cites New Testament examples.

audes nuptiis detrahere. J. now begins his case with a denial that he is attacking marriage: he merely regards virginity as superior. At *virg. Mar.* 19 and 20 J. had already notified the reader that he was not decriing marriage. He does so again in *adv. Iovin.* 1,3; cf. also *tract.* p. 541 l. 130. J. nonetheless provoked this charge with the *Adversus Iovinianum* (cf. *epist.* 50,5,4); it is vigorously rebutted in *epist.* 49,4,2; 49,5,1; 49,6,1; 49,8,2; 50,5,5.

The same caveat as J. issues here had occurred in Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 7,1. It recurs in *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,4,2 p. 127. Chrysostom's wording at *hom. in 1 Cor.* 12,6 is similar to J.'s in the present passage: τί οὖν, φησί, διαβάλλεις τὸν γάμον, εἰπέ μοι;

quae a domino benedictae sunt. Cf. Tertullian, *uor.* 1,2 l. 1 *non quidem abnuimus coniunctionem viri et feminae benedictam a deo.* Ambrose too (*epist. extra coll.* 15,3) will not deny the divine blessing on marriage.

non est detrahere nuptiis, cum illis virginitas antefertur. The argument was traditional; cf. Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 1,29 p. 330,27 (*non ... proicimus sed deponimus nuptias*); 5,15 p. 628,6; Origen, *comm. in 1 Cor.* 29 (ταῦτα δὲ λέγω οὐ περιγράφων τὸν γάμον ... ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ συγκεχώρηται τὸ πρᾶγμα, οὐ προηγουμένου ... τὸ γὰρ προηγουμένον

ἀγνεύειν); Ambrose, *virginit.* 6,31; Augustine, *virg.* 18,18.

nemo malum bono comparat. The comparison of good and bad with reference to marriage and virginity goes back to 1 Cor. 7,38 'So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better'. The argument which J. employs here had occurred in numerous earlier passages: Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 1,29 p. 330,27 (*non ut malo bonum*); *castit.* 3 l. 54; *monog.* 3,2; *uxor.* 1,3 ll. 9 and 17; Origen, *comm. in 1 Cor.* 35; Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,6; Chrysostom, *virg.* 10,1; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 37,10; Anonymous homily περὶ παρθενίας (Amand-Moons) 4; cf. also *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,5 p. 106,1 and Ps.-Julian of Eclanum, *lib. fid.* 11 p. 1734 (PL 45). J. himself uses the argument again at *epist.* 49,17,6; 123,5,1; 123,6,3; *adv. Iovin.* 1,7; 1,9. Ambrose had said that he compared good with good at *virg.* 1,7,35 *bona cum bonis comparo*. Later Augustine was accused of 'comparing bad with good'; cf. Julian of Eclanum's remark ap. Augustine, *c. Julian. op. imperf.* 4,122 and Augustine's reply *ib. non tanquam malo bonum, sed tanquam bono melius virginitatem nuptiis antepoñimus*.

crescite, aut, et multiplicamini et replete terram. Here scripture is cited dramatically and without introductory comment in order to make a new point: the divine command to replenish the earth is inapplicable to the virgin and was only put into practice after the Fall. J.'s attitude to this text (Gen. 1,28) is again disapprobatory at *in Eph.* 1,3 p. 445^B and *in Zach.* 14,10 l. 358. His usual approach is to argue that the command has been superceded: *epist.* 66,3,3; 123,12,2; *virg. Mar.* 20; *adv. Iovin.* 1,3; 1,16; 1,24; *in Agg.* 1,1 l. 16; *in eccles.* 3,5 l. 87; *in Gal.* 6,8 p. 431^C (cf. Cassian, *conf.* 17,19,1f.). Only once does J. quote the verse with approval (*epist.* 69,4,3).

At *epist.* 52,10,3 J. indicates that a spiritual sense is implied. Such an interpretation is occasionally found: Origen had understood the text to signify spiritual growth at *hom. in Le.* 11 p. 66,24, while Eusebius had made it refer to increasing discipleship and salvation (*Ps.* 66,2); according to Augustine some expositors thought the soul filled the flesh (*civ.* 14,21 p. 45,20). Hilary reports an exclusively literal interpretation to have been usual, though in his opinion it was less valuable (*in psalm.* 66,2).

crescat et multiplicetur ille, qui impleturus est terram: tuum agmen in caelis est. The antithesis of earth and heaven as the domains of marriage and virginity respectively had already been set out by both Gregory Nazianzen (*carm.* 1,2,1,188 κόσμος ὁ μὲν [sc. γάμος] γαίης, ἢ δ' [sc. ἀζυγίη] οὐρανόιο χορείας) and Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 54 οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρότοι ... ταῖς ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις γάμοις τὴν γῆν ἀνθρωπότητος ὄλην κατέσπειραν, ἡ δὲ [sc. παρθενία] τὰ κατὰ πάσαν γῆν ...

ἐσπαρμένα εἰς τὰς τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀποθήκας συνάγει). It would seem however to have been J. who first applied this antithesis to the exegesis of Gen. 1,28. He does so again triumphantly at *adv. Iovin.* 1,16 *consideranda vis verbi 'replete terram': nuptiae terram replent, virginitas paradisum*. The same interpretation is taken over shortly afterwards by the author of *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,5 p. 106,7 *praecipiti veteris est, ut terra procreationibus impleatur; novi autem, ut continentia atque virginitas impleat caelum*. J. remarks at 21,2 below that the empty earth had to be filled.

Hilberg fails to note that *tuum agmen in caelis est* is an echo of Phil. 3,20 *nostra ... conversatio in caelis est*.

19,2

hoc expletur edictum post paradisum. J. places the fulfilment of the blessing pronounced in Gen. 1,28 after the story of the Fall which is described in Gen. 3. Here he would seem to be following a hint from Tertullian, who at *monog.* 17,5 had declared: *semel de paradiso sanctitatis exulavit, semel exinde nupsit* (sc. Adam). J.'s more concise formulation of the idea at *adv. Iovin.* 1,16 is somewhat closer to Tertullian's wording: *extra paradisum protinus nuptiae*. At *castit.* 13 l. 41 Tertullian also states that paradise is exempt from matrimony. Later Augustine argues (*civ.* 14,21 p. 45,6) that lust sprang up after the transgression, but that the benediction came before it to show childbirth pertains *ad gloriam conubii, non ad poenam ... peccati*.

post ... nuditatem. The addition of *ficus folia* would seem to indicate that here *nuditas* has a negative connotation. For this sense cf. (e.g.) Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 19,14 ἐντεῦθεν γυμνὸς ἐγὼ καὶ ἀσχημῶν. The reader is accordingly meant to think of Gen. 3,7: 'and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together'.

Elsewhere in J. however Adam's *nuditas* has a positive sense. It is connected with chastity at *epist.* 128,3,2 (*virginitatis et aeternae pudicitiae nuditatem*) and in *Agg.* 1,1 l. 21 (*post unionem virginitatis et paradisi nuditatem*). Likewise Chrysostom says that putting on the clothes of sin was indecent, for the glory of God bedecked Eve's nudity (*hom. in Col.* 10,5); he states elsewhere that she and Adam had no need of clothes (*hom. div.* 3,1). According to Augustine (*civ.* 14,17 p. 39,16), though they realized their nakedness, it had not become indecorous, since lust had not yet caused involuntary stirrings in the body.

ficus folia auspiciantia pruriginem nuptiarum. Here J. has remodelled a phrase of Tertullian: *pudic.* 6 p. 229,28 *de ficulneis foliis pruriginem retinens*.

nubat et nubatur ille, qui ... J. continues to depict marriage as a consequence of the Fall. The polypoton of the relative pronoun in this

impressive sentence is noteworthy (*qui ... cui ... cuius*): these clauses form a tricolon of progressively decreasing length. Hritzu, p. 41, registers the triple alliteration: *terra tribulos ... sentibus suffocatur ... fruge fecundum*.

On *nubat et nubatur* cf. Mt. 22,30 *neque nubent neque nubentur*. Meershoek, p. 60, translates 'que lui ou elle se marie'. For the *ille* cf. *crescat ... ille* in ll. 7f. above. At *in Matth.* 22,30 l. 1828 (ad loc.) J. remarks that Latin usage does not fit the Greek idiom;¹ he accordingly suggests understanding *nubere* of husbands and *nubi* of wives (cf. Rufinus, *sent. Sexr.* 230b *uxorem nube*).

cuius herba sentibus suffocatur. Here J. has connected Gen. 3,18 ('thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth') with Mt. 13,7f. ('some fell among thorns ...') to create an extremely effective climax: *meum semen centena fruge fecundum est*. This decorative *Stichwort* technique appeals strongly to J., who would seem to have been the first to combine the two texts in question. There is a further echo of the parable of the sower at 31,2 below.

non omnes capiunt verbum dei. Again an abrupt citation of scripture introduces a fresh point: virginity is optional. Mt. 19,11 recurs in *adv. Iovin.* 1,12; J. does not refer to it elsewhere. The text had also been quoted at Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 4 (cf. *testim.* 3,32); Ambrose, *vid.* 13,75; *virginit.* 6,29; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 57; cf. later Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 3,18; Augustine, *virg.* 23,23.

alium eunuchum necessitas faciat, me voluntas. J. alludes to Mt. 19,12 ('there are some eunuchs ...'), which follows the verse he has just quoted (cf. previous n.). Here *me* matches *meum* in l. 13. The eunuchs of this Matthean text had been explained by Origen as τροπικῶς ... οἱ ἀρροὶ πρὸς ἀποδοῖα (*comm. in Mt.* 15,4 p. 357,19). Tertullian had spoken repeatedly in this connection of *spado voluntarius*: *patient.* 13,5; *resurr.* 61,6; *uxor.* 1,6 l. 9; *virg. vel.* 10,1 (the phrase is copied by Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 9). Mt. 19,12 had been adduced by Cyprian at *testim.* 3,32 ('*de bono virginitatis*'); he had also referred to it in *hab. virg.* 4 and 23. Deléani, p. 71, thinks that J. has borrowed the antithesis *necessitas / voluntas* from the latter passage of the *De habitu*. It was however traditional in the exegesis of Mt. 19,12; cf. Hilary, *in Matth.* 19,2; Ambrose, *vid.* 13,75; *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,5 p. 106,13. J. himself uses it again in this connection at *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 and *in Matth.* 19,12 l. 808.²

¹ Cf. Donatus (J.'s teacher), *gramm. mai.* 2,14 p. 645,16f. *nubor ... non dicitur*.

² The opposition between *necessitas* and *voluntas* also occurs frequently in contexts that are unrelated to Mt. 19,12; cf. (e.g.) Ambrose, *hab.* 5,21; 5,23; *in psalm.* 1,30,2; *in psalm.* 118 *serm.* 14,24,2; 14,24,3; 14,26,4.

19,3

tempus amplexandi et tempus abstinendi manus a complexu; tempus mittendi lapides et tempus colligendi. Once again a biblical text (Eccles. 3,5) which is cited without warning serves to introduce a new topic; this time the point at issue is virginity's part in the new dispensation. For such a theme the first half of this text would alone have sufficed (*tempus amplexandi ...*). However J. has also included the second half (*tempus mittendi lapides ...*) for the sake of the elaborate array of scriptural texts which he now proceeds to assemble around the *Stichwort* 'stone'. He has in fact reversed the biblical order for this purpose: in Eccles. 'stones' precede 'embrace'. Augustine speaks of 'gathering stones' in connection with chastity at *doctr. christ.* 3,62; cf. Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 1,29 p. 331,21. J. quotes the text another four times.

postquam de duritia nationum generati sunt filii Abraham. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, identifies the source as Mt. 3,9 *potest deus de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abrahae*. Here J. has shown considerable subtlety in his handling of the *Stichwort*: the biblical *lapides* are replaced by the periphrasis *duritia nationum*. J. thereby alludes to the standard exegesis of Mt. 3,9. At *in Matth.* 3,9 l. 252 (ad loc.) he notes: *lapides ethnicos vocat propter cordis duritiam* (so *epist.* 65,21,4 and *in Gal.* 3,7 p. 352^C). The interpretation would seem to go back to Origen; cf. *schol. in Lc.* 3,8 λιθους ὀνομάζει τοὺς ἔθνικοὺς, τοὺς λιθίνην ἔχοντας καρδίαν.³ It may be noted that the phrase *duritia gentilis* was evidently something of a cliché: it occurs at Hilary, *in Matth.* 6,2; 33,8; Ambrose, *in Luc.* 10,141; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 12,2.

coeperunt sancti lapides volvi super terram. The *lapides sancti* of Zech. 9,16 now pick up the *Stichwort* 'stone'. In the present passage they are the heroes of ascetic tradition since Christ's coming. Cyril of Alexandria later identifies the stones of this biblical text as saints: λιθοῖς ἔσθ' ὅτε τὸ σείπτον τῶν ἁγίων παρεϊκόζεται στίφος (*ador.* 14 p. 916^B).⁴ J. is exceedingly fond of this picturesque text, which he cites no fewer than seventeen times; on the other hand it never occurs in either Ambrose or Augustine. At *in eccles.* 10,9 l. 133 he glosses the text as follows: *praetereunt et semper ad altiora nitentes hinc abire festinant*. It may be noted that Gregory of Nyssa had already linked Zech. 9,16 with Eccles. 3,5 (cf. penultimate n.) in 381 at *hom. in Eccl.*

³ J. identifies the stones as 'us' at *tract.* p. 551 l. 79. This interpretation also comes from Origen; cf. *hom. in Jer.* 14 p. 690^C (PL 25 [1845]).

⁴ Stones were already saints in Hermas, *sim.* 9 (esp. 12,4 and 15,4).

7 p. 716^D; the same combination is repeated later in *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,5 p. 106,6 and 9.

pertranseunt quippe mundi istius turbines. The clause explains *super terram* in the previous line (= Zech. 9,16). *Turbines* comes from Zech. 9,14 (Vulg. *vadet in turbine austri* [sc. *dominus deus*]; LXX πορεύσεται ἐν σάλῳ ἀπειλήs αὐτοῦ). J. repeats the phrase *mundi turbines* at *in Eph. prol.* p. 439^A and *in Is. lib.* 14 *praef.* l. 14. It is a cliché that would appear to go back to Cyprian, who had used it repeatedly (*Demetr.* 19; *ad Donat.* 6; *mortal.* 2; 3; *patient.* 21); it is also found in Ps.-Cyprian, *laud. mart.* 14; *tract.* 5; Hilary, *in psalm. 118* zain 3 p. 420,8; Lucifer of Cagliari, *moriend.* 3 l. 77; Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira), *tract.* 11,27; Chromatius, *in Matth.* 42,6; Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,38; Philip, *in lob rec. long.* 14 p. 650^D; *Epist. ed. Caspari* 7 p. 171; Maximus of Turin 110,1; Eucherius, *epist. ad Val.* p. 726^C; (Ps.)-Leo the Great, *serm. app.* 3,3; 11,3.

in curru dei rotarum celeritate volvuntur. Godel, p. 65, compares Ezek. 1,15ff. (the wheels in Ezekiel's vision). J. again combines this passage with Zech. 9,16 at *in Is.* 18,66,10 l. 14 and *in Ezech.* 1,15 l. 492. The two passages are also linked at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 61 l. 193 and p. 164 l. 67. If this work is by Origen, he would seem to have been J.'s source.⁵ J. also compares the stones of Zech. 9,16 to wheels at *epist.* 78,39,1 (because of their roundness) and *in Ezech.* 28,11 l. 281 (*ib. volubilitate sua ad caelestia festinantes*); cf. *in Ezech.* 16,12 l. 1272 (*ib. terrena pertranseunt*). They are *κοῦφοι καὶ εὐκίνητοι* (cf. J.'s *celeritate*) in Didymus, *Zach.* 3,217.⁶ For *currus dei* cf. J.'s comment at *in Ezech.* 1,6 l. 234 *hanc ... quadrigam in aurigae modum deus regit*. In the present passage his picture of stones being conveyed in a speeding chariot and passing through whirlwinds shows a characteristically bizarre whimsicality.

consuant tunicas, qui inconsutam desursum tunicam perdiderunt. J.'s use of the *Stichwort* 'stone' is immediately followed by references to two further texts of scripture which are again connected by a *Stichwort*: this time it is 'coat'. With them J. has passed without warning from the virgin back to married couples. In the first part of this sentence (*consuant tunicas*) he is alluding both to the coats of skins (*tunicae*) made by God for Adam and Eve at Gen. 3,21 and to the episode in which they sewed together (*consuerunt*) fig leaves for themselves at Gen. 3,7. The fig leaves were mentioned in l. 10 above;

⁵ At Ezek. 10,9 these wheels are compared to a stone (*ἡ ὄψις τῶν τροχῶν ὡς ὄψις λίθου ἄφρακτος*). This occurrence of the *Stichwort* 'stone' may also have had some influence on the inclusion of Ezekiel's wheels in the present passage.

⁶ The phrase *celeritate rotae* occurs in Gaudentius, *serm.* 8,25.

the coats of skins are found again shortly afterwards at p. 169,3 below.

The second part of the sentence is of course a reference to Jn. 19,23: Jesus' 'coat was without seam, woven from the top throughout'. Here people are said to have lost it. J. makes someone who is *absque armatura apostoli* lose Christ's garment at *in Am.* 2,13 l. 487; the same passage refers to *tunicae pelliceae* (l. 485). The Jews also lose Christ's coat at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 220 l. 340. It is similarly abandoned in Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 3,137 (where Christ's seamless coat is knowledge), while Chrysostom tells his audience to procure such a coat instead of secular finery (*hom. in 1 Tim.* 2,3). J. elsewhere equates Christ's seamless garment with orthodoxy: *epist.* 15,1,1; 133,12,3; *in Eph.* 4,28 p. 513^A. At Ps.-Chrysostom, *prec.* p. 923 it is baptism; in Epiphanius Latinus it is immortality (*in euang.* 37 p. 84,19). Cf. also Aubineau (1971).

The twofold occurrence of *tunica* in this passage is cited as a figure of repetition by Ottolini, p. 72. According to *TLL* s.v. *inconsutus* the word occurs only here in this sense (Vulg. has *inconsutilis*). The partition of Christ's garments is mentioned in 19,6 below.

in ipso lucis exordio. J. had used the same striking phrase ten years earlier at *epist.* 10,1,1; he repeats it a quarter of a century later at *in Is.* 11,38,10 l. 56.

fletu lugente, quod nati sunt. Souter (1912), p. 150, compares Lucretius 5,226f. *vagituque locum lugubri complet (sc. puer), ut aequumst / cui tantum in vita restet transire malorum.* A number of examples from the Fathers are listed by Waszink (1947), p. 279. To his collection of evidence can be added J.'s own *in Ezech.* 16,4 l. 935 and Ps.-Basil (= Proclus of Constantinople), *aegr.* p. 1716^B; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,98.⁷ In the present context the *topos* is really out of place. Here J. is arguing for the primacy of virginity. The fact that new-born babies cry because of the troubles in store for them is not *ad rem*; cf. Goulon,⁸ p. 17 'Rien n'appelle logiquement la suite de la phrase: "à peine ont-ils vu le jour qu'ils pleurent comme pour déplorer d'être nés", sinon l'emprise quasi obsédante d'un thème déjà obligé'. It would seem however that J.'s inconsequence is due less to the force of tradition than to his own partiality for repeating a clever idea that he has found elsewhere. This whole sentence (from *consuant* ...) is in fact a good example of J.'s propensity to juxtapose scripture and second-hand gaudery. The reading *lugente* (as against *lugentes* in several MSS) receives some support from Cicero, *Tusc.* 1,30 *fletus ... maerens*.

⁷ At Isidore, *synon.* 1,26 the idea is given in four different forms.

⁸ For the patristic period Goulon does not add to the texts already adduced by Waszink.

Eva in paradiso virgo fuit. Paradise was mentioned earlier in the ch. at p. 168,10. For J.'s statement here cf. Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 5,2 *adhuc digna paradiso, adhuc virgo* (sc. *Eva*). Chrysostom also notes that Eve was a virgin in paradise: παρθένος ἦν ἡ Εὐα. οὐδέπω γάρ ἄνδρα ἐγίνωσκεν, ὅτε τὴν ἀπάτην ὑπέμεινε (*pasch.* 2). At *virg.* 15,2 he had asked διὰ τί μὴ ἐν παραδείσῳ ἡ μιξίς; cf. also Ps.-Chrysostom, *elem.* 1 p. 1062 ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἦν ἡ παρθενία. Gen. 4,1 ('and Adam knew Eve his wife') had been widely taken to mean that married life began only after the Fall: Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 5,9 p. 1047^A; *comm. in 1 Cor.* 29; Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 12,5; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 54; Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 12,4; cf. later Ambrose, *inst. virg.* 5,36. J. himself repeats that Adam and Eve were virgins in paradise at *adv. Iovin.* 1,16 and 1,29 (cf. also 2,15); the same opinion is expressed by Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,8. Augustine on the other hand takes the rather different view that if there was any urge for intercourse in paradise, it lacked lasciviousness (*epist. Divj.* 6,8,1ff.);⁹ cf. also (Ps.-)Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. 1* (Berthold) 7,2 πρὸ τῆς παραβάσεως ἀπαθῶς ἐκοινωνεὶ ὁ Ἀδὰμ τῇ Εὐα.

post pellicias tunicas initium nuptiarum. J. reverts briefly to the theme of the Fall, which had been treated near the beginning of the ch. in ll. 10–12 and recurred recently in two words of l. 21.

tua regio paradisus. Cyprian had declared that paradise was the Christian's home: *patriam nos nostram paradisum computamus* (*mortal.* 26). Origen had made the same point at *hom. in Ex.* 2,1 p. 155,25 (*nemo patriam paradisum recordetur*) and *hom. in Num.* 27,4 p. 261,8 (*cum regresso fuerit ... ad patriam suam paradisum* [sc. *anima*]); this passage would seem to have been J.'s source here; cf. next n. but one). The idea recurs later in Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 7,2 (*patria ... nostra paradisus est*) and 151,2. The expression *paradisi patria* had also occurred in Origen (*hom. in Num.* 23,11 p. 221,24); it is repeated by Caesarius of Arles with great frequency (*serm.* 42,1; 58,5; 78,3 etc.). J. concludes the present work with a call to enter paradise (41,5). Here the sequence of three short and pithy sentences (from *Eva in paradiso* ...) is noteworthy: each makes a striking point.

serva, quod nata es. Here *nasci* is customarily rendered 'to be born' (so [e.g.] Labourt, p. 129, 'garde-toi telle que tu es née'). In the present context however it must have the sense of 'to be by nature'. It is glossed by *natura* (l. 6), which must itself signify 'nature' rather than 'birth', because otherwise the proof supplied in the following sentence

⁹ See further Solignac, XIV, p. 540.

(L 6) would be circular: *nascitur* there clearly does refer to birth. This sense of 'to be by nature' has not hitherto been documented.¹⁰ It was however quite common at this period.

J. himself had used it already at *virg. Mar.* 20 *conatur pulchrior esse quam nata est* (ib. *natura*). It recurs in the present work at 27,8 below. J. employs it again at *epist.* 54,9,3 (*grandis ... virtutis est ... superare, quod natus sis, in carne non carnaliter vivere*;¹¹ ib. 2 *natura*); 130,10,6 (*quia contra naturam, immo ultra naturam est non exercere, quod nata sis*; only if *nasci* here means 'to be by nature' does J.'s statement acquire the paradoxicality which makes it really effective); *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 (of eunuchs: *nohuerunt esse, quod nati sunt*). In Ambrose this usage is quite frequent: *epist.* 4,15,2 (*cur ... non vis videri esse, quod natus es?*; ib. *natura*); *epist. extra coll.* 15,3 (*prius est quod nati sumus, quam quod effecti; multoque praestantius divini operis mysterium, quam humanae fragilitatis remedium*; the parallel formulation of the second clause would seem to indicate that here *prius* has the sense of 'better'); *exhort. virg.* 6,35 (*illud enim verum quod nascimur, non in quod mutamur*); *hex.* 5,3,9 (on the eunuch: *tollis homini quod natus est et virum de viro exsuis*; ib. *natura*); 6,6,36 (*et haec [sc. elephants] serviunt homini et naturam suam humana institutione deponunt, obliviscuntur quod nata sunt, induunt quod iubentur*; the passage is of course self-consciously chiasmic in structure); *inst. virg.* 4,30 (*non est vitium mulieris esse quod nascitur*); *virg.* 1,6,28 (*cupit mutare quod nata est*;¹² ib. *natura*). Augustine uses this sense of *nasci* to produce a characteristic word-play: *servans in corde, quod renata es, servans in carne, quod nata es* (*virg.* 38,39). It is also found in Asterius of Ambedunum, *ad Renat.* 1. 548 (of the ascetic) *quos et libertas et sexus cogit desiderare quod nati sunt*.¹³

¹⁰ It is not recorded by Forcellini or *OLD* s.v. The article on *nasci* in *TLL* has not yet appeared.

¹¹ Hilberg wrongly punctuates *superare, quod natus sis in carne, non carnaliter vivere*. The antithesis *in carne non carnaliter* is a conceit of which J. is extremely fond; cf. n. on *in carne, non carnis* at 36.2 below.

¹² The most recent critical edition of the text (Cazzaniga) reads *natum est*. *Nasci* can indeed be used with a non-personal subject and have the meaning 'to be natural' (cf. n. on *omne quod nascitur* at 29,6 below). However in all the examples enumerated there the verb is used in the present tense. It is clear moreover from the foregoing evidence that Ambrose is very partial to using this verb with a personal subject. It would seem therefore that *nata est* should be adopted: the reading is also to be preferred on literary grounds, since it gives each of the three verbs in Ambrose's sentence the same subject.

¹³ According to Gennaro, p. XIV, these words are borrowed from J.'s *Libellus* 19,3 *flēt Iugentis quod nati sum*. In fact however the two passages have nothing whatever in common. At 19,3 J. uses *nasci* in its standard sense of 'to be born', while in Asterius it means 'to be by nature'. Accordingly whereas Asterius' *quod* is the complement of *nasci*, the same word in J. simply introduces an indirect statement (so *TLL* VII,2,2.

In the present passage 'what you are by nature' refers to virginity. Elsewhere J. uses these words to signify the opposite: they denote human sexuality at *epist.* 54,9,3; 130,10,6; *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 (all cited above). Basil of Ancyra had noted that virginity is ours 'by nature': κατὰ φύσιν σοι συγγενάται ἡ παρθενία (*virg.* 59). Like J. he had urged the virgin to keep it: μένε ὁ ἐγεννήθης (*ib.*). The virgin is also told to keep 'quod nata es' in Augustine, *virg.* 38,39 (cited in full above).

revertere, anima mea, in requiem tuam. It is not at first clear to what J. intends the *requies* of Ps. 114,7 to refer. Clarification would however seem to be supplied by Origen, *hom. in Num.* 27,4 p. 261,9. There Ps. 114,7 is cited and glossed as follows: *ad requiem suam, id est ad patriam suam paradisum.* J. has just announced at the start of the line *tua regio paradisus*; he would therefore appear to have copied this passage of Origen. J. has however spatchcocked *serva, quod nata es* in between with a characteristic disregard for coherence.

Elsewhere J. cites Ps. 114,7 as corroboration of the Origenist doctrine concerning the soul: *epist.* 51,4,7; *c. Ioh.* 7; *in Is.* 11,38,4 l. 36; cf. Epiphanius, *haer.* 64,4,8. At Chrysostom, *pan. Bern.* 3 the repose is death.

virginitatem esse naturae. J. returns to *serva, quod nata es* in the previous line. One might contrast his comment on virginity as a matter of choice at 20,3 below: *durissimum erat contra naturam cogere.*

nuptias post delictum. J. reverts to the point made in l. 3: *post pellicias tunicas initium nuptiarum.* A statement similar to the one which J. makes in the present passage is found in Amphilochius, *hom.* 4,4 μετὰ δὲ τὴν παράβασιν ... ὁ γάμος ἀντεισῆχθη (cf. also Theodoret of Cyprius, *Ps.* 50,7 προὔλαβε γὰρ τῆς Εὐας τὴν σύλληψιν τῆς ἐντολῆς ἢ παράβασιν). J. repeats this idea at *adv. Iovin.* 1,16 *post peccatum ... protinus nuptiae.* For additional instances of the view that marriage did not begin until after the Fall cf. n. on *Eva in paradiso virgo fuit* above.

virgo nascitur caro. J.'s 'proof' would not seem to be found anywhere else. His wording would however appear to be echoed by Gaudentius, *serm.* 8,12 (*ib.* 1 Cor. 7,38 [*qui matrimonio iungit virginem suam*]) *virginem suam, hoc est carnem suam, virginem natam.*

in fructu reddens, quod in radice perdiderat. The antithesis 'fruit' / 'root' was a commonplace. Here it enables J. to apply his favourite

1801,78E [s.v. *hūgeo* (*hūgenz*)]: while therefore J.'s infants are merely indulging in the conventional lament 'that they have been born' (cf. n. ad loc.), the reference in Asterius is on the other hand to a person's sexual nature.

technique of the *Stichwort* and so to introduce a text of scripture (Is. 11,1 *virga de radice Iesse*) which in turn leads to the topic of Christ and Mary as virgins. This passage well illustrates the superficiality of J.'s mode of argumentation.

The opposition of 'fruit' and 'root' forms the substance of a *chria* in the fourth century grammarian Diomedes (*gramm.* I 310,16). Otto, p. 195, s.v. *litterae* I, lists the use of these contrasting terms with reference to education as proverbial: *litterarum radices amaras, fructus dulces*. J. himself uses the antithesis in this way at *epist.* 78,27,1 and 125,12,2. He applies it to a pagan father's Christian children in *epist.* 107,1,2. As in the present passage, the root and the fruit refer to marriage and virginity respectively at *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 (cf. *epist.* 49,7,2), while in *adv. Iovin.* 1,27 J. uses the antithesis to repeat the striking argument employed here that virgin children are a compensation for motherhood: *si quod ipsa perdidit, acquirat in liberis et damnum radicis ... flore compenset et pomis*.

J. was not the first to apply the antithesis of 'fruit' and 'root' to marriage. Gregory Nazianzen had already said that marriage is the root of lovely fruits at *carm.* 1,2,1,235.¹⁴ Eusebius of Emesa had equated root and fruit with the mother and the child at *serm.* 6,16; the same identification is made later by Chrysostom (*hom. in Rom.* 31,3).

exiet virga de radice Iesse et flos de radice ascendet. J. cites Is. 11,1 on no fewer than eighteen further occasions. Here it is prompted by the *Stichwort* 'root'. Its juxtaposition with the preceding antithesis of 'fruit' and 'root' (cf. previous n.) is another example of J.'s partiality for combining scripture with second-hand cleverness.

19,5

virga mater est domini. J. now picks up the theme of Mary's virginity, which was mentioned briefly at the end of the previous ch. The exegesis he offers of the 'rod' in Is. 11,1 was traditional: already Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 5,8 p. 598,7 had identified the rod as Mary. The same interpretation is given by J. himself at *in Is.* 4,11,1 l. 12 (ad loc.). Ambrose is in the habit of making Mary the rod, Christ the flower, and the Jews the root: *apol. Dav.* II 8,43; *in Luc.* 2,24; *patr.* 4,19; *spir.* 2,5,38 (the root is David at [Ps.]-Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* 10 p. 368^c). On the other hand the rod is the cross in *Quodvultdeus, catacl.* 5,2 (at *symb.* 2,4,4 he makes the rod Mary and the flower Christ). A number of passages pun on *virgo* and *virga*: Ambrose, *inst. virg.* 9,59

¹⁴ He makes parents the root in the following passages: *or.* 19,16; *carm.* 2,1,45,222 (of a *γονίον*); 2,2 (epit.),61,3 (of a *θάλασ*); 2,2 (epit.),74,2 (of a *πρόσθον*); 2,2 (epit.),91,1. Gregory of Nyssa does the same at *mort.* 2 p. 769^a.

(*virgo es, o virgo*); Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira), *tract.* 6,36; 9,8; Evagrius Gallicus, *alterc.* p. 18,3; Quodvultdeus, *symb.* 2,4,4. Here J. himself uncharacteristically eschews the *calembour*. Cf. also n. on *virgae flos Christus est* below.

simplex. It is perhaps possible that J.'s wording here (*simplex, pura, sinceris, nullo extrinsecus germine cohaerente*) has been influenced by the very striking description of God by Gregory of Elvira at *fid.* 4 l. 34 *simplex, singulare, purum, nulla concretionem permixtum*.¹⁵ A similar string of epithets had described the Virgin at Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,198 ἀγνῆς ... παρθενικῆς, ἀδέτοιο, θεουδέος, ἀχράντοιο. J. refers to Mary's purity again at 38,3 below.

sinceris. On the form *sinceris* cf. Neue-Wagener, II, pp. 166f. The material in the *TLL's Zettelarchiv* adds Scribonius Largus 224; Fronto p. 150,13; Hilary, *in psalm.* 67,16; Ambrose, *hex.* 5,18,60 and five passages of the Old Latin Bible. In addition this form occurs in the Latin version of Clement of Rome, *ad Cor.* 2,5; Hilary, *in psalm.* 140,2; Priscillian, *tract.* 6,110; Maximus of Turin 88,6 (twice); 108; Cassian, *inst.* 12,19 (*ib. sincera*). The occurrence of the form *sinceris* in such a range of authors might seem to suggest that there was nothing especially distinctive about it; on the other hand Charisius, *gramm.* p. 102,1 stipulates *sincerus dicitur, non sinceris*.

nullo extrinsecus germine cohaerente. J. describes the Virgin in whimsically botanical terms suggested by the simple *flos de radice* of Is. 11,1 (l. 8). Such bizarrerie is characteristic of J., whose particular language here would not appear to be indebted to any predecessor. He himself applies the same metaphor to Mary again at *in Is.* 4,11,1 l. 13 (*nullum habuit sibi fruticem cohaerentem*) and *in eccles.* 10,16 l. 285 (*nullum habens fruticem, nullum germen ex latere*); it refers to her womb at *in Os.* 13,14 l. 378 (*absque semine humano nullo frutice pullulaverit*). Later Quodvultdeus states simply that Christ is born of the virgin like a flower from a shoot *sine ullo composito semine* (*symb.* 2,4,6; *ib. Is.* 11,1).

et ad similitudinem dei unione fecunda. This typically extravagant formulation perplexed Erasmus, who emends unnecessarily to *sed ad conchae similitudinem, dei unione fecunda* (I, fo. 61^B), where *unio* is taken to mean 'pearl'. Mary is again *unione fecunda* twenty-two years later at *in Os.* 13,14 l. 379 (*ib. simplex atque purissima*), while God

¹⁵ Gregory's asyndetic συναρροισμός continues: *limpidum, bonum, perfectum, beatum, integrum, sanctum, totum*. At *vir. ill.* 105 J. refers specifically to the *De fide*, which he qualifies as an *eliquis liber*; here he is evidently thinking of language like that just cited.

himself is described as *unione fecundus* in *epist.* 65,1,3. On the 'oneness'¹⁶ of God cf. in *Ezech.* 40,44 l. 1159; in *Am.* 5,3 l. 98; in *Agg.* 1,1 l. 39; 2,16 l. 552. On the 'oneness' of virginity cf. in *Am.* 5,3 l. 113; in *Agg.* 1,1 l. 21. The idea which J. employs in the present passage would not appear to have occurred to any of his predecessors,¹⁷ while — perhaps significantly — none of his immediate successors would seem to copy it either; on the other hand for J. himself this bizarre novelty clearly had a certain appeal. At l. 18 below he briefly picks up the theme again by referring to the 'cleanness' of unequal numbers.

virgae flos Christus est. Christ had been identified as the flower of Is. 11,1 in Tertullian, *carn.* 21 l. 32; cf. further Mahé, II, p. 425 (*ad loc.*). Christ was both rod and flower at Origen, *Jo.* 1,23,147; *ser.* in *Ezech.* 7,10; Novatian, *trin.* 9,6. Cf. also n. on *virga mater est domini* above.

ego flos campi et liliu[m] convallium. J. now proceeds to round off the ch. with a very impressive array of miscellaneous biblical exegesis. The present text (Cant. 2,1) and that cited in ll. 15f. are meant to show that the interpretation given to another biblical text is correct; all the others relate to virginity.

Cant. 2,1 is again combined with Is. 11,1 at *epist.* 75,1,2; in *Is.* 4,11,1 l. 15; in *Os.* 13,14 l. 380; cf. *tract.* in *psalm.* 11 p. 394 l. 14 (perhaps by Origen). The verse is spoken by Christ himself at *epist.* 65,2,2; 130,8,3; in *Os.* 14,5 l. 149. At *hom.* in *Cant.* 4 p. 840^c Gregory of Nyssa uses it of the bride.

qui et ... lapis praedicatur absctus de monte sine manibus. Here J. gives the standard exegesis of Dan. 2,34; cf. in *Dan.* 2,31 l. 408 *lapis — dominus ... — sine manibus — id est absque coitu.* The stone is already identified as Christ in Irenaeus 3,21,7 (*SC* 211; cf. perhaps also Justin, *dial.* 70,1). Irenaeus adds the explanation *sine manibus ... id est non operante in eum Ioseph.* A similar gloss is also appended in Ambrosiaster, in *Rom.* 9,33,3; Gregory of Nyssa, *bapt. Chr.* p. 589^a; Epiphanius, *anc.* 40,5; Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 5 p. 492^d; Augustine, in *epist. Ioh.* 1,13; in *ewang. Ioh.* 9,15; in *psalm.* 98,14; *serm.* 45,6; Quodvultdeus, *c. Iud. pag. Ar.* 12,4; *prom.* 2,34,74; Ambobius Junior, in *psalm.* 117 l. 62. J. reports at *epist.* 61,4,2 that Vigilantius identified the mountain with the Devil.

significante prophetia virginem nasciturum esse de virgine. The prophecy does nothing of the sort. It is always interpreted with

¹⁶ In all the following examples *unio* is used: it is glossed as *singularitas* in J.'s translation of Origen, *hom.* in *Ezech.* 9,1 p. 406,3.

¹⁷ Gregory of Nyssa had merely noted the paradox of virginity in the Father after begetting a son (*vrg.* 2,1).

exclusive reference to the virgin birth (cf. previous n.): it cannot be made to bear any relation whatever to Christ's own virginity. The reason for J.'s inconsistency in the present passage is that he has again been unable to resist inserting a striking cliché: *virgo de virgine*. Although the cliché is out of place here, it does effectively round off this section on Mary and Christ as exemplars of virginity (though Christ's virginity recurs at the very end of the ch. [p. 170,5f.]).

J. himself is exceedingly fond of the formulation *virgo de virgine*: he uses it again at *epist.* 65,8,2 (*virgo de virgine*; here the phrase stands alone); *tract. in psalm.* I p. 38 l. 110 (*virgo de virgine*; again the phrase stands on its own); II p. 440 l. 7 (*ubi virgo de virgine procreatur*); *tract.* p. 521 l. 143 (*quomodo de virgine virgo natus sit*); cf. further *epist.* 49,21,1 (*Christus virgo, mater virginis nostri virgo perpetua, mater et virgo*); 127,5,4 (*ut hereditatem virginis domini virginem matrem filius virgo susciperet* [sc. *Iohannes*]); *adv. Iovin.* 1,16 (*Christum ... virginem qui et natus ex virgine*).

The first occurrence of this idea would seem to be at Tertullian, *carn.* 20 l. 55 *per Christum, virginem et ipsum, etiam carnaliter, ut ex virginis carne*. The conceit is found on a number of occasions in the Ps.-Chrysostomic corpus, where it receives the same incisive formulation as in J.: *meretr.* 1,1 (ὁ ... Ἰησοῦς, ὁ παρθένος καὶ ἐκ παρθένου); *prodig.* 1,3 (τὸν παρθένον καὶ ἐκ παρθένου); cf. *nat. Chr.* 2 p. 765 (ὁ παρθένου βρέφους παρθένε μῆτερ; ib. *Dan.* 2,34). Several examples occur in Latin authors around the year 400: Gaudentius, *serm.* 19,35 (*virginem permansurum virgo edidit mater*); Augustine, *serm.* 188,4 (*peperit ... virgo virginum principem*); *virg.* 2,2 (*virginis filius et virginum sponsus, virginali utero corporaliter natus, virginali conubio spiritualiter coniugatus*); *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,6,2 p. 133 (*tam permanere virgo voluit quam de virgine procreari*); Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,3 (*virginem habuit matrem virgo ipse permansurus*). These instances generally lack the sententiousness characteristic of J. and Ps.-Chrysostom.

manus quippe accipiuntur pro opere nuptiarum. With a scholarly air J. appends a brief philological proof (there is a long one on *lumbi* in ch. 11). He again says that hands stand for *opus nuptiale* when he quotes *Dan.* 2,34 at *in Hab.* 3,10 l. 698. For the equation cf. Eucherius, *form.* 6 p. 36,8 *manus opus*. Caesarius of Arles later glosses *Dan.* 2,34 as follows: *in manibus ... opera intelleguntur* (*serm.* 169,6).

sinistra eius sub capite meo et dextera eius amplexabitur me. The proof that 'hands' mean 'sexual activity' is *Cant.* 2,6. Elsewhere J. warns against a physical understanding of Canticles (*epist.* 107,12,2). He makes *Cant.* 2,6 refer to secular wisdom in *epist.* 66,8,5, while the verse describes Christ's embrace at *epist.* 78,29,2. Origen had

interpreted it as a spiritual caress (*hom. in Cant.* 1,2 p. 31,19). On the other hand Origen had also taken the literal view at *Cant.* 3 p. 195,22 *descriptio est ... amatorii dramatis sponsae festinantis ad conubium sponsi.*

19,6

in huius sensus congruit voluntatem. J. uses the phrase *in hunc sensum congruit* at *Didym. spir.* 11 and *in Is.* 2,5,20 l. 41, while at *Didym. spir.* 57 he says *in hanc congruit voluntatem*: in the present passage he has combined both locutions. The impressive formulation that results fails however to make quite clear to what J. is actually referring; he apparently means the superiority of virginity.

animalia, quae a Noe bina in arcam inducuntur, immunda sunt. Noah was ordered to take 'of every clean beast ... by sevens ... and of beasts that are not clean by two' (*Gen.* 7,2). The unequal number of clean animals is again a symbol of virginity at *epist.* 123,11,4 and *tract. in psalm.* II p. 433 l. 118 (the latter perhaps by Origen). Ambrose had noted that the number seven was called 'virgin' (*Abr.* 2,11,80 and *Noe* 12,39; cf. Philo, *quaest. in Gen.* 2,12). According to Origen the command to Noah shows the number two was impure (*sel. in Ezech.* 4,9 and *sel. in Ps.* p. 1076^A; cf. Philo, loc. cit.).

inpar numerus est mundus. At *epist.* 49,19,4 J. lists the church writers who had already dealt with the issue of odd numbers. Ones that are even are said to be bad at *in Ezech.* 11,2^b l. 937; *in Agg.* 1,1 l. 20; *in eccles.* 4,6 l. 87. They denote marriage according to *adv. Iovin.* 1,16 and *in Ezech.* 43,13 l. 806. Mary was *unione fecunda* at ll. 10f. above.

Moses et Iesus Naue nudis in sanctam terram pedibus iubentur incedere. In this final section of the ch. J. fails to provide any explicit interpretation of the passages he adduces; the same lack of elucidatory argument marked his treatment of 'loins' as a designation for the private parts in ch. 11. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,20 Moses is said to unlace his shoes and throw off the trammels of marriage: this is clearly how J. intends the episode to be understood here. Moses' barefootedness had already been connected by a number of writers with *Deut.* 25,9 (if a man refuses to marry his dead brother's wife, she shall 'loose his shoe from off his foot'): Origen, *hom. in Ex.* 12,3 p. 265,5; Cyprian, *testim.* 2,19 (*ut quisque nuptias recusaret calciamentum deponeret*); Ambrose, *fid.* 3,10,71; cf. later Ambrose, *in Luc.* 3,34; *patr.* 4,22; Chromatius, *in Matth.* 11,4 (not Moses, but Christ is the church's spouse); Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 96,4. On the other hand Moses' shoes were removed because they were dead skins according to Origen, *hom. in Gen.* 8,7 p. 82,5 (*mortalitatis vincula*); *hom. in 1 Reg.* 6; *fr. in Lam.* 23; *pasch.* 37; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 45,19; Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Cant.* 11 p.

1005^c.¹⁸ When in the following century Theodoret of Cyrrhus addresses the question why Moses was bidden to take off his shoes, he reports two explanations: either the skins of which they were made symbolize worldly cares or alternatively shoeless feet sanctify the earth (*qu. in Ex.* 7). J. associates the shoes Moses took off with the skin of literalism at *epist.* 121,4,4. His shoes signified a variety of vices at Epiphanius, *anc.* 102,3. As in the present passage, Moses' bare feet had already been linked with Joshua's in Origen, *fr. in Lam.* 23; Cyprian, *testim.* 2,19; Ambrose, *fid.* 3,10,71. J. combines them again at *adv. Iovin.* 1,21; *in Ezech.* 16,10^b l. 1166; *in Am.* 2,6 l. 188. He had referred to nakedness earlier in this ch. at p. 168,10 and 21.

discipuli sine calciamentorum onere. Elsewhere J. explains that in Mt. 10,10 the disciples are told to go unshod because shoes of skin betoken death: *in Matth.* 10,10 l. 1597 (ad loc.: *mortiferis vinculis*) and *in Am.* 3,12 l. 325. This exegesis went back to Origen; cf. *hom. in I Reg.* 6 *omni carerent mortalitatis indicio*. It recurs in Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 6,2 and Ambrose, *in Luc.* 7,57. In the present passage however J. evidently means the *calciamentorum onus* to signify marriage (cf. next n.). There is perhaps a hint of this interpretation in J.'s gloss on Mt. 10,10 at *in Am.* 2,6 l. 190 *ne quid mortis habeant et pellium, quae referuntur ad carnes*. This same passage of *in Am.* also combines the command to the disciples with Moses and Joshua (cf. preceding n.). Again the combination went back to Origen; cf. *Jo.* 32,7. It is also found in Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 12,251.

vinculis pellium. Skin denotes marriage at *epist.* 128,3,2 (*à propos* of the foreskin) *matrimonio pelle circumdatus*. This is evidently the sense that J. intends here; he had referred to skin in connection with marriage at p. 169,3 above. Normally however skin was associated with death: it is the mark of a dead animal (so [e.g.] Origen, *hom. in Ex.* 13,5 p. 277,4). Hence J. equates the skin of shoes with dead works at *epist.* 23,4; cf. Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 6,3 p. 325,13 *vinculi mortalis*. The *Didascalia apostolorum* had observed that shoes are made from dead animals which have been sacrificed to idols (60,15). Dölger (1936), p. 106, provides pagan examples of the connection between skin and death.

militis vestimentis Iesu sorte divisis caligas non habuere, quas tollerent. J. concludes with a third example of shoelessness. The point he makes here would not seem to have occurred in any

¹⁸ Dölger (1930), p. 65, assumes that this is what J. has in mind in the present passage of the *Libellus*. He fails to mention the connection of Moses' disalcation with Deut. 25,9.

predecessor; nor would it appear to find an immediate imitator. Gaudentius asserts on the contrary that Christ had to wear boots because the earth could not bear his naked footsteps (*serm.* 5,9); similarly Augustine states that Lk. 3,16 ('the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to unloose') is proof that Christ did wear shoes (*serm.* 101,7 *RBen* 42, 1930 p. 311,175). Here the supporting argument for J.'s assertion (*nec enim poterat habere dominus, quod prohibuerat in servis*) is presented with a triumphal flourish as the climax of this very long ch.; it certainly provides a neat conclusion, since it looks back to the previous example (ll. 2ff.).¹⁹

¹⁹ In the *apparatus fontium* for *quod prohibuerat in servis* Souter (1912), p. 150, would insert references to Mt. 10,10 ('neither shoes') and Lk. 10,4.

Chapter 20

So far from attacking marriage (cf. 19,1 '*audes nuptiis detrudere?*'), J. commends it as the source of virgins. A daughter's virginity also brings honour to her mother. J. then proceeds to refute the argument that St. Paul himself was married and to enquire why he says that 'concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord' (1 Cor. 7,25): the answer is that what is voluntary has greater value and that obligatory virginity would run counter to nature.

20,1

laudo nuptias, laudo coniugium, sed quia mihi virgines generant. J. emphatically denies the charge of *detractio nuptiarum* in an impressive *interpretatio* (cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4,28,38) marked by asyndetic parison together with anaphora of *laudo* and an epiphoric *disiunctio* that also follows Behaghel's law. He thereby returns to the topic which was broached at the start of the previous ch. and subsequently abandoned (*dicat aliquis: 'et audes nuptiis detrudere?'*). The reason J. gives for his commendation of marriage is that it begets him virgins. Grütz-macher, I, p. 254, takes this response to be the result of original speculation on J.'s part. In fact however the idea that marriage is the source of virginity can be shown to have been a commonplace.

J. had used it himself the year before at *virg. Mar.* 19, where it served the same apologetic purpose. The idea would seem to have originated with Eusebius of Emesa: at *serm.* 6,6 he had said that marriage is the root of virginity and therefore good.¹ Marriage is again the root of virgins in Gregory Nazianzen (*carm.* 1,2,1,385f.;² 1,2,3,25) and Amphilochius (*hom.* 2,1). Eusebius himself had returned to this idea later in the same homily (6,17): there he went further and made the begetting of virgins the criterion of honourable marriage. J. takes over this argument in *epist.* 66,3,3. It had also been used by Gregory Nazianzen: he argues that wedlock would not be sacred if it did not produce virgins (*or.* 37,10). Eusebius had also pointed out that without marriage there could be no virginity (*serm.* 6,17). Ambrose had used the same argument when at *virg.* 1,7,35 he had declared that it was not his purpose to discourage marriage. Similarly Amphilochius admits

¹ This text of Eusebius is linked to the present passage of the *Libellus* by Serrato Garrido, p. 58.

² Cf. also *ib.* 222, 338ff.; 689f.

(loc. cit.) that the flower of virginity cannot be plucked from anywhere else.

The idea might in fact be used not merely to excuse marriage but also to defend and uphold it. Already in the middle of the fourth century Cyril of Jerusalem had reminded the virgin that she is the offspring of matrimony (*catech.* 4,25). Later Chrysostom observes at *Eutrop.* 2,15 that this was a reason for her not to despise it. The *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* go somewhat further and assert that whatever virginity has that deserves praise is merely the outcome of marriage (3,5 p. 105,31). Finally Augustine finds it necessary at *virg.* 10,10 to argue against the view that giving birth to virgins actually puts marriage on a par with celibacy; his reasoning is that this is a blessing not of marriage but of nature.

Iego de spinis rosas. J. characteristically proceeds to embellish the cliché he has just used (cf. previous n.) with no fewer than three contiguous proverbs plus a rare citation of scripture. The impressive isocolon is noted by Hritzu, p. 86.³ The triad of roses, gold and pearls also occurs in Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 47,4 (on the poor man's soul).

Here the negative connotation of *spinis* is at odds with the twofold *laudo* in the preceding line; it clashes even more seriously with *honorantur* in l. 10 (cf. also next n.).⁴ For the proverb 'roses from thorns' cf. Otto, p. 302, s.v. *rosa*, and Häussler, p. 319 (no. 1552). To their evidence can be added Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 1,7; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 2,1,38,35; *ep.* 183 (ῥόδα ἐξ ἀκανθῶν, ἐς ἡ παροιμία, συλλέγομεν). J. states that roses symbolize virginity (*epist.* 130,8,2); cf. also Ambrose, *virg.* 1,8,45 and 3,4,17.

de terra aurum. On this proverb cf. Otto, p. 202, s.v. *lutum* 6 (with Häussler, p. 312 [no. 997]). To their examples from J. can be added (besides the present passage) *adv. Iovin.* 1,12⁵ and *in eccles.* 12,9 l. 298. J. calls virginity gold and marriage silver in *adv. Iovin.* 1,3 (cf. *epist.* 49,3,1; Cyril of Jerusalem had also done so at *catech.* 4,25). Methodius had noted that gold was a fitting symbol of chastity (*symp.* 5,8,131). In the present passage however *terra* might be thought a little pejorative as a designation for marriage, which J. insists he is 'praising' (cf. previous n.).⁶

³ He might also have pointed to the *adulterio* (cf. Lausberg, pp. 371ff.), which creates an elegant counterpoint to the immediately preceding anaphora.

⁴ This passage accordingly provides yet another example of incoercibility resulting from the incorporation of second-hand material.

⁵ Here J. has been referring to real mining; however the whole passage is simply an extended metaphor describing the difficulty of virginity.

⁶ Gregory Nazianzen speaks of 'gold from sand' in connection with virginity at *carm.* 1,2,1,697. There however the proverb is entirely *à propos*: Gregory is stressing

de conca margaritum. In conformity with Behaghel's law J.'s final proverb is longer than the preceding two. This third proverb is absent from Otto and Häussler. It is however attested elsewhere; cf. Asterius of Amasea, *hom.* 6,2,2 ὡσπερ τινὰ μαργαρίτην ἐν θαλαττίῳ ἀσπράκις ἐνδεκόμενον ἢ χρυσὸν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις ἐνόητα τῆς γῆς. Similarly Clement of Alexandria says it is the business of the nurseryman to pluck the rose from among the thorns and that of the τεχνίτης to find the pearl hidden in the oyster (*str.* 2,1,3,3). One might compare further Augustine, *c. Faust.* 16,1 *quisquam nollet in omni profundo margaritam nasci, in omnibus terris gemmas, in silvis omnibus poma?* While J. uses the neuter *margaritum* here, he had employed the feminine *margarita* at 8,4 above; on these forms cf. *TLL* VIII, 391,18ff.

numquid, qui arat, tota die arabit? J. reinforces his point with a straight quotation of scripture. Here it is so well integrated that it escaped Hilberg's notice. Fremantle, p. 30, had however identified the words as Is. 28,24. This text would not seem to be cited by anyone else. The *laetabitur* of J.'s succeeding sentence (*nonne et laboris sui fruge laetabitur?*) would moreover appear to have been suggested by Is. 28,26 (εὐφρανθήσῃ; J.'s rendering of the LXX at *in Is.* 9,28,23 l. 20 [ad loc.] is *laetaberis*). From the ensuing lines of the *Libellus* (10ff.) it becomes clear that these two sentences are addressed to Eustochium's mother. The point which J. characteristically expresses here by means of scriptural citation is found elsewhere: cf. Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 15 *partus sui gemitum per tuam virginitatem consolabatur (sc. mater)*. Similarly Augustine notes that the daughter's virginity compensates the mother for the loss of her own: *bon. viduis.* 8,11 (*virginitas prolis tuae compensavit dispendium virginitatis tuae*); 14,18; *epist.* 150.

quid invides, mater, filiae? It would seem that J.'s question is simply a device to accommodate the striking tricolon in ll. 11–13, the cliché in ll. 13f. and above all the climactic conceit in ll. 14f.⁷ There is no evidence that Paula was opposed to her daughter's ascetic resolve. On the other hand Eustochium is told that she should not let her mother stop her at 24,3 below (cf. however n. ad loc.); similarly her spiritual mother is distinguished from her physical mother at 41,3. However in this connection it is perhaps relevant to cite J.'s assurance to Geruchia at *epist.* 123,17,2 *non tam tibi quam sub tuo nomine alibi sum locutus*. On parental *invidia* cf. *epist.* 39,7,1 and Ambrose, *virg.* 1,11,65.

⁷ virginity's superiority to marriage.

⁸ J. has possibly also been influenced by Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,687 μητρὸς κούφου με ἀπεινὸν βίον ἄδ' ἀνιόντα;

tu lacte nutrita est. Blesilla makes the same appeal to her mother at *epist.* 39,7,1 *si tua suxi ubera.*

tu illam sedula pietate servasti. J. describes a mother's *pietas* at *epist.* 117,4,1 *difficiliores infantiae mores blanda pietate sustinuit*; cf. also Ambrose, in *Luc.* 8,75 *alimenta quae tribuit (sc. mater) tenero pietatis affectu inmulgens labris tuis ubera.*

The asyndeton in this impressive tricolon is noted by Hritzu, p. 46. The anaphoric polyptoton (*tu* ..., *tuis* ... *tu* ..., *tu* ...) is even more striking.

voluit militis uxor esse, sed regis. The antithesis 'soldier' / 'king' was a very common cliché; for full documentation cf. Adkin (1984c). Its use here in connection with Eustochium is highly appropriate, since it was customary to say that the virgin married 'the king'; cf. Basil, *ep.* 46,2; Ambrose, *virg.* 1,7,37; Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 19 (ib. Ps. 44,12 'so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty'); Bachiarus, *repar. laps.* 21.

grande tibi beneficium praestitit: socrus del esse coepisti. J. caps the cliché about soldier and king (cf. previous n.) with a characteristically tasteless novelty of his own. Rufinus found the statement that Paula had become 'God's mother-in-law' inexcusable: *quid tam impurum vel profanum a quoquam gentilium poetarum saltem dici potuit?* (*apol. adv. Hier.* 2,13; cf. ib. 2,46). It shows J.'s striving for something clever to say at its worst. Nobody would seem to imitate it.

20,2

de virginibus, inquit apostolus, praeceptum domini non habeo. Again a quotation of scripture (1 Cor. 7,25) introduces a fresh topic. Having attempted to demonstrate the superiority of virginity, J. now addresses the question why Christ did not therefore make it obligatory. Chrysostom had also cited 1 Cor. 7,25 at *virg.* 41,5f. and like J. had glossed the text with a vivacious 'why?' (τί οὖν; cf. J.'s *cur?*; 1, 16). Chrysostom's answer also resembles J.'s: Christ did not want to coerce. J. offers a similar explanation for the absence of a specific precept at *epist.* 130,10,6 (*quia ... ultra naturam est*) and *virg. Mar.* 21 (*quia ultra homines est*). 1 Cor. 7,25 had been widely cited in works dealing with the ascetic life: Methodius, *symp.* 3,13,85; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 55; 56; Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 62,17; Ambrose, *vid.* 12,72; *virg.* 1,5,23; Chrysostom, *virg.* 2,2 (*et passim*). The text recurs later at Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,35; *exhort. virg.* 3,17; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,4; *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,10,7 p. 142; 6,10,9 p. 145; 6,15,4 p. 159; Augustine, *virg.* 13,13; 14,14. However only J. and Chrysostom link this verse with the issue of Paul's own virginity. Chrysostom explains Paul's reticence by asserting that he was

not a virgin himself. J. is evidently trying to rebut this argument with the answer to his self-posed question: *cur? quia, et ipse ut esset virgo, non fuit imperii, sed propriae voluntatis* (ll. 16f.).

cur? This lively question was perhaps suggested by Chrysostom, *virg.* 41,6 (cf. previous n.). There is no such interrogative in any of the numerous passages which like J. and Chrysostom also quote 1 Cor. 7,25 (cf. previous n.); moreover in both J. and Chrysostom the question is also accompanied by a balancing 'because' (*quia*; ὅτι).

quia, et ipse ut esset virgo, non fuit imperii, sed propriae voluntatis. The reason J. gives is not a satisfactory answer to his question. It is on the contrary a rather awkward attempt to accommodate the ensuing rebuttal of the view that Paul himself had not been a virgin (cf. next n.). J. supplies the real reason for Paul's lack of a precept on the subject of virginity at p. 171,7ff. below.

neque enim audiendi sunt, qui eum uxorem habuisse confingunt. In his note on this passage Vallarsi, I, p. 104, n. 'c', observed that it is exceedingly rare to find statements in the Fathers to the effect that Paul had had a wife ('rari admodum'). He suggested that here J. was referring specifically to a comment by Clement of Alexandria (*str.* 3,6,53,1). It may however be doubted whether an *obiter dictum* enunciated some two centuries earlier would have provoked J.'s intrusive repartee in the *Libellus*. The same view that Paul was married also finds an echo in Origen (*comm. in Rom.* 1,1 p. 839^B) and in Methodius (*symp.* 3,12,83). In the fourth century on the other hand there would seem to be only two passages in which it is encountered prior to the *Libellus*.⁸ The first occurs in the 'Long Recension' of Ignatius' *Epistula ad Philadelphios* (ch. 4). This forgery would appear to have been produced by an Arian between 364 and 373 (cf. Smith); it therefore predates J.'s *Libellus* by a period of between ten and twenty years. Here Paul is merely mentioned *en passant* in a list of married men which also includes Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Isaiah and Peter together with the other prophets and apostles. Again such an insignificant reference cannot account for J.'s peremptory tone in the *Libellus*. The second passage however belongs to Chrysostom's *De virginitate* (41,6). This was a work on a subject of vital importance to J. by an influential churchman whom he heartily disliked.⁹ In the

⁸ Later on at the very end of the century Jovinian was to assert that Peter and the other apostles were husbands (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,5; 1,16).

⁹ Though both were keen advocates of the ascetic life, they had taken opposite sides in the Antiochene schism; whereas J. favoured Paulinus, Chrysostom was closely associated with Melitius. Both had been in Antioch during the 370's. It would therefore be no surprise if J. were to attack his adversary on a point of scholarship.

Chrysostomic treatise, which is largely an exegesis of the Pauline teaching on virginity in 1 Cor. 7, Paul alone is at issue; if a date of 382 is accepted for it (cf. Musurillo-Grillet, pp. 21ff.), it had just been published.¹⁰ While therefore the demonstration of Paul's virginity in this passage of the *Libellus* provides J. with a further opportunity to show off his scriptural expertise, the principal reason for introducing it would seem to have been the rebuttal of Chrysostom's assertion to the contrary (cf. also the three previous and the two succeeding nn.).¹¹ The final point may be made that whereas Chrysostom had argued his case with some subtlety, J. merely strings together biblical texts.

volō autem omnes esse sicut me ipsum. At *epist.* 48,3,2 J. reports the interpretation given to this text (1 Cor. 7,7) by Pierius: ἀντικρυς ἀγαμίαν κηρύσσει. The text is quoted at Tertullian, *monog.* 3,3; 11,7; *uxor.* 2,1 l. 24; Cyprian, *testim.* 3,32 (*de bono virginitatis*); Athanasius, *Sermon on virginity* (Casey), p. 1045; Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 4,22; *vid.* 14,82. Chrysostom had also cited the verse on a number of occasions in his *De virginitate*; in particular at 41,6 he had adduced it to demonstrate Paul's ἐγκράτεια, while simultaneously denying his παρθενία. It would seem that here J. is using the same text in an attempt to rebut Chrysostom's argument (cf. previous n.).

The phrase which introduces this text in the *Libellus* (*de continentia disserens et suadens perpetuam castitatem*) evinces an elegant chiasmus that follows Behaghel's law and is also marked by double cretic and dichoree clausulae.

bonum est illis, si sic permaneant, sicut et ego. 1 Cor. 7,8 had also been cited in Ambrose, *vid.* 14,82 (cf. *exhort. virg.* 4,22) and several times in Chrysostom's *De virginitate*. In particular Chrysostom had quoted it at 41,6 in connection with Paul's ἐγκράτεια; J. would seem to have that passage in mind here (cf. preceding n.).

numquid non habemus potestatem uxores circumducendi sicut et ceteri apostoli? 1 Cor. 9,5 would not seem to have been cited elsewhere as proof of Paul's celibacy. The ambiguity of the Greek text (ἀδελφῆν γυναῖκα) is discussed at *adv. Iovin.* 1,26 ('sorores mulieres vel uxores').

¹⁰ J. will have had swift access to a work of Antiochene provenance owing to his intimate association with Evagrius of Antioch, cf. Spanneut, pp. 103f.; *Pasth.* pp. 344f. He may accordingly be supposed to have received a copy immediately before writing the *Libellus*. Rebenich (1992a), p. 107, n. 530, is rightly sceptical of J.'s claim in the maliciously brief notice allotted to Chrysostom at *vir. ill.* 129 to have read only the *De sacerdotio*; here he is merely being offensive. Rebenich adduces evidence to show that J. was in fact familiar with a wide range of Chrysostom's works.

¹¹ Since this passage of the *Libellus* provides the first tangible evidence of animosity between the two men, it should be added to the dossier assembled by Baur.

quia maioris est merces. After the disruptive excursus on Paul's own virginity J. now gives a proper answer to the question he had asked at p. 170,16 above. Two reasons are given for Paul's lack of a precept from the Lord concerning virginity: compulsion would reduce its value and also go against nature. The first of these arguments had already been used at *virg. Mar.* 21 *virgo maioris est mercedis dum id contemnit quod si fecerit, non delinquit.* It has perhaps been suggested by Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 62,31 'C'est pourquoi il laisse la virginité au libre choix de ceux qui le désirent, afin que son mérite revienne à ceux qui l'ont choisie' (cf. next n.). According to *TLL* VIII, 852,25f. (Bulhart) *merx* is here synonymous with *merces* (sc. 'pretium' in the particular sense of 'praemium'); however Bulhart also wonders whether the meaning may not be rather 'meritum' (on this sense of *merces* cf. *TLL* VIII, 797,48ff.).

non cogitur. J. again stresses that virginity is optional at *virg. Mar.* 21; *adv. Iovin.* 1,13; *in Ezech.* 46,12 l. 643. The point is frequently made: Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 23; Origen, *comm. in 1 Cor.* 39; 42; *comm. in Rom.* 10,14 p. 1275^B (ib. 1 Cor. 7,25 'concerning virgins I have no commandment of the Lord'); *sel. in Ps.* 118,108; Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon), p. 199,18; Ambrose, *virg.* 1,5,23 (ib. 1 Cor. 7,25); *Consulationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,5 p. 106,23 (ib. 1 Cor. 7,25); Chrysostom, *ep.* 2,7 (ib. Mt. 19,12 'he that is able to receive it, let him receive it'); *hom. in Mt.* 78,1 (ib. 1 Cor. 7,25); Ps.-Chrysostom, *elem.* 1 p. 1061; Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 59 p. 162,13 (ib. Mt. 19,12). It is also found at Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 62,25 (cf. p. 63,16). This final passage would seem to be the only one outside the *Libellus* which combines the idea with the arguments that virginity runs counter to nature and that it makes its practitioners resemble angels (for both cf. l. 9 below).¹² J. certainly imitates the sections of this *Letter to virgins* which occur on either side of the passage in question here (cf. nn. on *Gabriel in viri specie* at 38,3 below and on *alius castitatis chorus* at 41,3 below). Perhaps therefore J. is thinking particularly of Athanasius' *Letter to virgins* in the present passage also.¹³

¹² An exception is Ps.-Chrysostom, *elem.* 1 p. 1061. Here however the juxtaposition of the three elements is much less striking. The work would seem moreover to have been written considerably later than J.'s *Libellus*; cf. Aldama, pp. 80f. (no. 217).

¹³ If this is so, it is noteworthy that, while J. and Athanasius both make exactly the same points, they are in fact arguing two quite different cases. Athanasius is asserting the value of marriage: for J. on the other hand the only argument in its favour is that it provides a supply of virgins (20,1). This complete difference of purpose has evidently not deterred J. from appropriating Athanasius' ideas: he has condensed them into a

offertur. Virginity is also said to be 'offered' at *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 and in *Ezech.* 46,12 l. 644; cf. also Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 10,14 p. 1275^b; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 9; Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 7 l. 207.

nuptiae videbantur ablatae. J. now proceeds to set out the second of his reasons why Paul should have had no commandment regarding virgins. In doing so he merely produces a concatenation of clever points: none of them is developed with expository argument. The first of these points (*nuptiae videbantur ablatae*) is perhaps inspired by Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 63,25 'voilà pourquoi le mariage n'est pas proscrit'¹⁴ (cf. n. on *non cogitur* above). J. repeats the idea at *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 *si virginitatem dominus imperasset, videbatur nuptias condemnare.* J. had of course insisted at 19,1 that he did not 'detract from marriage'.

durissimum erat contra naturam cogere. J. had used the phrase *adversum naturam cogere* at *virg. Mar.* 21. In *epist.* 130,10,6 virginity is said to be *contra naturam, immo ultra naturam* (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,34; 1,41; on the other hand this is denied at *adv. Iovin.* 1,36). Statements that virginity is against nature occur with some frequency: Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 7,2; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 56 (τὴν φύσιν βιάσασθαι); Ps.-Basil, *const. praef.* 2 (φύσει προσπαλαίοντα); Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 7,1 (ἀντιβαίνει δὲ πῶς ἡ παρθενία τῇ φύσει); Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 78,2; Ps.-Chrysostom, *elem.* 1 p. 1061 (πρὸς τὴν φύσιν παλαίει); Theodore of Mopsuestia, *1 Cor.* 7,8. At *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 63,7 Athanasius had said 'La virginité, elle, est au-dessus de la nature humaine (Lefort [1929], p. 247, translates 'contre nature'), car elle est l'image de la pureté angélique'; this statement would appear to be J.'s source in the present passage (cf. n. on *non cogitur* above). The opening chs. of the *Libellus* demonstrated the difficulty of virginity; it requires violence at 40,5 below.

angelorumque vitam ab hominibus extorquere. J. had pointed out at *virg. Mar.* 21 that to demand virginity would have been tantamount to wanting somebody to be the same as the angels; cf. also *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 *angelorum vitam non exigimur, sed docemur.* For the probable source of the present passage cf. the words of Athanasius quoted in the previous n. At 2,2 J. had promised that he would not 'set Eustochium among the angels'.

id quodam modo damnare, quod conditum est. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,8 J.

single sentence of very impressive format. J. would seem to have utilized the same portion of Athanasius' *Letter* several months earlier at *virg. Mar.* 21, where the treatment is again less taut than in the present passage of the *Libellus*.

¹⁴ Lefort (1929), p. 248, translates 'mis aux rebuts'.

again concedes marriage so as not to 'condemn nature' (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,40; *in Is.* 14,52,2 l. 34). The argument would seem to have been borrowed from anti-heretical polemic: in a number of passages heretics had been said to ban marriage because they reject the creator's work as bad (Tertullian, *icir.* 15 p. 293,14; *adv. Marc.* 1,29 p. 331,3; Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 7,1 [*ib.* 1 Tim. 4,1ff. 'forbidding to marry ...']; Epiphanius, *haer.* 48,8,8 [the reason is not virtue or reward, but abomination of what the Lord has created]). Chrysostom had noted (*virg.* 9,3) that Catholic doctrine is superior because it does not scorn God's creation.

Chapter 21

Under the old dispensation a different set of values obtained: there marriage was the norm. Even then however some isolated cases of virginity were found. Now that 'the time is short' (1 Cor. 7,29), marriage is no longer a desirable state. Mary's virgin conception broke the curse on womankind, while the coming of her son inaugurated the new era in which renunciation in general and virginity in particular are the ideal.

21,1

alia fuit in veteri lege felicitas. In *virg. Mar.* 20 J. had already noted that people in the Old Testament served a different law appropriate to their own times; he repeats the point at *adv. Iovin.* 1,24; 2,4; *adv. Pelag.* 2,1 (cf. *epist.* 123,12,4). Later the same idea is expressed in regard to marriage at *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,6,1 p. 132 and in Eucherius, *instr.* 1 p. 75,9. Augustine remarks that under the old dispensation people were temperate in their polygamy and only interested in rearing the progeny which the circumstances required (*doctr. christ.* 3,63). The old law is also said to have favoured marriage and voluptuousness at Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,3,27f. and Chrysostom, *subintr.* 13, while in addition Chrysostom asserts that under it no one managed to practise virginity (*hom. in Mt.* 78,1 and *poenit.* 3,3). The striking hyperbaton with which J. opens the present ch. is noted by Hritzu, p. 79.

beatus, qui habet semen in Sion et domesticos in Hierusalem. J. produces a characteristic string of biblical texts to prove his point that the Old Testament's idea of blessedness was different. Only the first three are actually concerned with the begetting of children; J. then moves on to the topics of wealth and strength (ll. 15ff.), which have no connection with his theme of marriage and virginity. This slight inconsistency recurs in the parallel description of the new dispensation (ll.17ff.), which reproduces exactly the same sequence of children, wealth and strength.

The first text (Is. 31,9) is quoted by J. with some frequency: he adduces it five more times. On each occasion it is cited in the LXX version: at *epist.* 57,11,1 J. notes that this makes the Jews laugh (Vulghas instead *cuius ignis est in Sion et caminus eius in Hierusalem*). As in the present passage, J. again combines the verse with Ps. 127,3 and with *maledicta sterilis ...* (cf. next n.) at *adv. Iovin.* 1,22.

maledicta sterilis, quae non pariebat. This agraphon has baffled commentators. On it cf. Adkin (1983); Gryson (1987), pp. 783ff.¹ In the present passage there is a neat antithesis between *maledicta* and the *beatus* of Is. 31,9 (l. 12).

filii tui sicut novella olivarum in circuitu mensae tuae. J. notes at *epist.* 123,12,3 that this statement (Ps. 127,3) was only valid in the old dispensation. On the other hand at *in Is.* 18,65,22^a l. 80 and *in Heb.* 3,17 l. 1222 he gives the verse a spiritual interpretation; cf. Eucherius, *form.* 4 p. 22,15 (*bonarum cogitationum fetus*).

repromissio divitiarum. J. passes from children to wealth. The 'promise of riches' is suggested by Ps. 104,37 (ἐν ἀπυρρίῳ καὶ χυροίῳ); the second half of this verse is given in direct quotation in ll. 16f. (*non erit infirmus in tribubus tuis*).

21,2

nunc dicitur: 'ne te lignum arbitraris aridum'. J. continues to employ texts of the Bible as he now turns to a description of the new dispensation; as so often, scriptural citation becomes a substitute for argument. Here he employs an impressive threefold anaphora of *nunc*; each of the three statements that follow this adverb is progressively shorter in length.

J. starts by choosing a passage from the Old Testament (Is. 56,3–5) to describe the new order after Christ's coming. The eunuch's admission to the cult community is thereby turned into an assurance of heavenly reward for the virgin: J. alters ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ μου καὶ ἐν τῷ τείχῳ μου to *in caelestibus*. J. quotes the passage again at *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 and *in Zach.* 14,15 l. 583. It was often applied to virgins. This usage had already occurred at Clement of Alexandria, *str.* 3,15,98,1; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 58ff.; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,3,96; Anon. *περὶ παρθενίας* (Amand–Moons) 58. It is found later at Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 3,17; *inst. virg.* 6,45; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,2; *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,17 p. 161; Augustine, *virg.* 24,24 (*et passim*); Ps.-Chrysostom, *virg. corrupt.* p. 743.

benedicuntur pauperes. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compares Mt. 5,3 (*beati pauperes spiritu*). However Lk. 6,20 provides a more exact parallel: *beati pauperes*. This text is also echoed at 31,4 below.

Lazarus. According to Souter (1912), p. 151, the reading *Eleazarus*

¹ Possibly also relevant is a gloss of Philo on Exod. 23,26 at *quarst. in Ex.* 2,19 ἀγαπῶν καὶ στείρωσιν ἐν κατάρσι τῶντων Μωϋσῆς. ... Cf. in addition *Protuevangeliem Jacobi* 1,2 (οὐκ ἐξέσθιν σοι κρῆνον προσεγγεῖν τὰ δάρα σου, καθότι στείρωσιν οὐκ ἐποίησας ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ). 3,1 (ὅτι κατὰ ἐγενήθη ἐγὼ ἐνάκιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ).

should be preferred.

qui infirmus est, fortior est. This is an adaptation of 2 Cor. 12,10 *cum enim infirmor, tunc potens sum*; at *epist.* 3,5,1 J. again uses *fortior*. J. shows a strong partiality for this text, which occurs another ten times in his *oeuvre*.

vacuus erat orbis. J. now reverts to the theme of virginity. The argument he uses here was traditional. The earth had been said to have needed filling at Tertullian, *castit.* 6 l. 14; *uxor.* 1,2 l. 3 (on these two passages cf. also next n. and n. on *paulatim vero incremente segete* at 21,3 below); Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 23; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,117ff.; Chrysostom, *virg.* 14,4 (a strikingly similar formulation: *ἡ γῆ τότε ἢ γῆ ἔρημος ἦν ἀνθρώπων*); cf. also Eusebius of Caesarea, *d. e.* 1,9. The same point is made later in *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,14,4 p. 155; Jovinian also represents his opponents as making it (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,5). At *virg. Mar.* 21 J. had argued that the earth is now full (*iam plenus est orbis*); here the wording is close to Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 23 (*iam refertus est orbis*). Chrysostom had also used this argument in *virg.* 19,1 (hence the only excuse left for marriage is to avoid fornication).

ut de typis taceam. The patriarchs' polygamy has typological significance according to Tertullian, *castit.* 6 l. 4 and *uxor.* 1,2 l. 8. There is some evidence to suggest that here J. has these two passages particularly in mind (cf. previous n.): he characteristically adds specific examples.

sola erat benedictio liberorum. The begetting of children is said to have been a consolation for the advent of mortality by Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 54 and Chrysostom, *hom. in Gen.* 18,4; cf. also Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,127.

21,3

Abraham iam senex Cetturae copulatur. J. provides further exemplification of the pre-eminence of marriage under the old dispensation. It consists of a succinct series of biblical episodes that are typically concrete and picturesque. The striking homoeoteleuton (*copulatur ... redimitur ... conqueritur*) is noted by Hritzu, p. 90.

Here J. gives a literal interpretation to the story of Keturah. Elsewhere it is allegorized. Origen had found it incredible that passion should revive in an old man like Abraham: Keturah accordingly stood for wisdom (*hom. in Gen.* 11,1). Augustine also dismisses incontinence as a motive in view of Abraham's age and godliness (*civ.* 16,34 p. 179,11). He conjectures that Keturah and her sons represent the *carnales* of the new dispensation as Hagar and Ishmael those of the old (p. 179,16); they may also be a warning to the opponents of second

marriages (p. 180,13). At *in Gal.* 40,7 Augustine makes her sons betoken heresies and schisms. J. reports that the name 'Keturah' means *copulata* (*quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 39,1 and *nom. hebr.* p. 4,28); here he has accordingly produced a learned pun in juxtaposing *Ceturae* with *copulatur*. Keturah is mentioned again at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 265 l. 124.

Jacob mandragoris redimitur. Again J. understands in a literal sense an episode that is elsewhere interpreted allegorically. According to Ambrose the bargain for Jacob's bed symbolizes the way in which the synagogue surrenders to the church the fruits it had received from the son of God (*in psalm. 118 serm.* 19,24,2f.); cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *glaph. Gen.* 4 p. 220^Aff. (the mystery of Christ). Augustine (*c. Faust.* 22,56) denies that Rachel wanted the mandrakes to help her conceive: common sense suggests they mean popular repute, which passes to the studious life when Jacob is diverted from it to church administration. J. does not mention the story again.

conclusam vulvam in ecclesiae figuram Rachel pulchra conqueritur. J. again identifies Rachel as a type of the church at *epist.* 123,12,4; *adv. Iovin.* 1,19; *in Os.* 11,1 l. 84; 12,12 l. 322; cf. *epist.* 36,16,6 (citing Hippolytus). This was an extremely common interpretation; cf. Justin, *dial.* 134,3 (Λεία μὲν ... ἡ συναγωγή, Ῥαχὴλ δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία); Irenaeus 4,21,3 (SC 100**); Origen, *fr. in Mt.* 35; Cyprian, *testim.* 1,20; Hilary, *in Matth.* 1,7; Gregory of Elvira, *in cant.* 4,20; Ambrose, *epist.* 5,18,12; *fug. saec.* 5,27; *in psalm.* 37,10,3; *virginit.* 14,91; Ps.-Chrysostom, *Rach.* p. 700; Epiphanius Latinus, *in evang.* 7 p. 6,10; Cyril of Alexandria, *glaph. Gen.* 4 p. 212^A; p. 220^A; 5 p. 232^D; 6 p. 329^B. The identification is supported by etymology according to Ambrose, *loc.* 2,5,25; cf. Cyril of Alexandria, *glaph. Gen.* 4 p. 201^A; 6 p. 296^A ('God's sheep' or 'God's flock'). On the other hand Rachel is perfect virtue in Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 3,254; she is heavenly grace at (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 61,2,1.² Bodin, pp. 35f. and 73ff., mentions only the passages from Irenaeus and Hilary.

In ll. 1f. J. had said that he would avoid typological interpretations: he is instead demonstrating the importance of marriage under the old dispensation. Here however J. has been unable to resist showing off his expertise by incorporating this commonplace exegesis. The addition of *in ecclesiae figuram* does also lend a greater fullness to the last member of an impressive tricolon.

paulatim vero crescente segete messor inmissus est. Though previous commentators have detected no biblical source here, J.

² Rachel had been bodily beauty according to Philo, *sobr.* 12.

probably has in mind Lk. 10,2 ('the harvest truly is great ... pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest'; in particular J.'s *messor immixtus* matches the biblical *mittat ... in messem*). Basil of Ancyra had used Jn. 4,35 ('[the fields] are white already to harvest') in the same way at *virg.* 54. J. is probably also thinking of Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 1,29 p. 331,18 *si nubendi iam modus ponitur, ... is caedet silvam, qui plantavit; is metet segetem, qui seminavit*. J. uses the image of reaping again in the same connection at *epist.* 123,12,4. Tertullian had also applied the metaphor of wood-cutting to the advent of virginity at *castit.* 6 l. 19 *propterea silvam quis instituit et crescere sinit, ut tempore suo caedat silvam* (the Tertullianic *crescere* is possibly the source of J.'s *increscente*; cf. n. on *vacuus erat orbis* at 21,2 above); cf. also *uxor.* 1,2 l. 15. J. had already used this particular imagery of silviculture himself at *virg. Mar.* 21; he repeats it at *adv. Iovin.* 1,16 and *epist.* 123,12,2. In the present passage the formulation is succinctly chiasmic. The multiplicity of sources, both biblical and patristic, is characteristic.

virgo Helias, Helisaeus virgo. It was common to assert that both Elijah and Elisha had been virgins. The evidence may be assembled.³ In his extant works Origen had refrained from comment on the matter. However in the third century Ps.-Clement assures his reader at *ep. ad virg.* 1,6 that investigation will show both Elijah and Elisha to have led lives that were chaste. In the following century the same information is repeated by Athanasius in his *Sermon on virginity* (Casey), p. 1044, while Ps.-Ignatius (*Philad.* 4) sets the pair in a catalogue of virgins which also contains Joshua, Melchizedek and Jeremiah as well as New Testament and apostolic personages. Both were true lovers of virginity according to Chrysostom (*virg.* 79,1). The fifth-century author of *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,14,2 p. 155 even recalls seeing a text which said that Elijah and his disciple never married.

J. himself is so confident that when Jovinian put Elijah and Elisha in his list of biblical husbands, he thought his opponent's fatuity self-evident and rebuttal superfluous (*adv. Iovin.* 1,25; cf. 1,5; 2,15). Jovinian was not however the only one at this period to show scepticism.⁴ Augustine too felt doubt: being altogether more circumspect and reflective than J., he observed in *gen. ad lit.* 9,6 p.

³ Bardy (1956), p. 156, relies on a single text to show that Elijah was regarded as a virgin, viz. Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 1,181. Hervé de l'Incarnation, pp. 189f., quotes only the following as evidence of Elijah's virginity: Tertullian, *monog.* 8,7; Filaster 110,9; Cassian, *conf.* 21,4,2; *inst.* 6,4,1. Elisha's virginity would only seem to be mentioned in connection with Elijah's.

⁴ In this connection it is noteworthy that Methodius had said no prophet ever praised or chose virginity (*symp.* 1,4,22).

274,17 that scripture nowhere states Elijah was celibate.⁵ On the other hand Augustine also reports in the same passage the belief that Elijah had neither wife nor children, since scripture does not say that he had. It was this lack of evidence to the contrary which had persuaded Athanasius at *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 58,11 (ib. Elisha and Jeremiah).⁶ Ambrose too had found that there was no indication Elijah had ever felt the need for intercourse (*virg.* 1,3,12). The second-rate writers of the Ps.-Chrysostomic corpus have no doubt whatsoever: according to Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Ps. 76,4* 2 Elijah's virginity set him apart among the prophets, while Ps.-Chrysostom, *Jud.* p. 1076 says it did him no harm, and in Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom.* 2 p. 15 Elisha follows his master in the practice of chastity. That Elijah was a virgin can be so far taken for granted by these writers that he even serves as a paradigm: Ps.-Chrysostom, *virt. spei* p. 774 makes him a model of virginity just as Joseph is one of modesty and David one of meekness. The polymath Epiphanius is also sure that Elijah was a virgin; cf. *anc.* 98,8 (his translation to heaven was in some degree a reward); *haer.* 58,4,8; 63,4,5; 79,5,2. While dealing with Gnostics, he reports at *haer.* 26,13,4f. that the 'Levites' say Elijah proclaimed his virginity on ascending to heaven, but was informed by a female demon that she had borne him children from his involuntary ejaculations at night. In addition there are allusions to Elijah's virginity at Ps.-Basil, *jei.* 2; Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 6,1; Chrysostom, *hom. in Phil.* 12,3.

Here J.'s unqualified formulation of the idea is particularly impressive: *virgo Helias, Helisaeus virgo, virgines multi filii prophetarum*. He has achieved a tricolon crescens with chiasmus, ellipse, paronomasia, *reditio* and polypototic anadiplosis; only the asyndeton is noted by Hritzu, p. 46. However J.'s statement that Elijah and Elisha were virgins is directly contradicted by his affirmation only seventeen lines later at 21,7 that virginity 'began with a woman': the woman in question is the chronologically sequent Virgin Mary.

virgines multi filii prophetarum. At *epist.* 125,7,3 J. again says that the sons of the prophets were monks. He also tells his fellow-monk Paulinus that their pioneers are Elijah, Elisha and the sons of the

⁵ Augustine also wonders whether it is proper to speak of 'virginity' when referring to men (*in euang. Ioh.* 13,12). J. feels no such scruple: *virgo Helias, Helisaeus virgo, virgines multi filii prophetarum*.

⁶ There is some evidence to suggest that in the present passage J. may be thinking particularly of this section of Athanasius' *Letter* (cf. n. on *Hieremias dicitur* ...). Accordingly the contrast between J.'s emphatic assertion of Elijah's virginity and Athanasius' careful circumspection is all the more significant: 'du moins nous ne lisons nulle part à son sujet, et personne n'a écrit, qu'il procréa des enfants, et fut du tout marié'.

prophets (*epist.* 58,5,3). The claim that the sons of the prophets were virgins would seem to have been a characteristically extravagant idea of J.'s own: it would not appear to be attested earlier. At 4 Reg. 4,1 they have wives: *γυνῆ μία ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν τῶν προφητῶν*. Methodius had stated earlier (*symp.* 1,4,22) that no prophet had been a virgin.

Hieremiae dicitur: et tu ne accipias uxorem. As in the present passage, Jeremiah had been associated with Elijah and Elisha as an example of celibacy at Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 58,11; like J., Athanasius is here discussing the infrequency of virginity under the old dispensation. This particular threesome would not seem to be attested elsewhere.⁷ It looks therefore as though J. has this passage of Athanasius in mind; the assumption would appear to receive some support from what Athanasius says next (cf. n. on *statim ut filius dei* ... at 21,7 below). Unlike Athanasius however J. characteristically employs a direct quotation of scripture. Jer. 16,2 (= 16,1 LXX) had already been used by Origen to demonstrate *ὅτι καὶ ἐν ἀγνεῖα ἐζήσεν* (sc. Ἱερεμίας; *hom. in Jer.* 20,7 [GCS 6]). Like J., Origen had omitted 'in this place'. J. adds the gloss *captivitate propinquante*; he does so again a quarter of a century later at *epist.* 123,12,2 (*Hieremias captivitate propinqua uxorem prohibetur accipere*). The theme of the captivity is resumed in ll. 14ff. below.

sanctificatus in utero. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,33 J. states that Jeremiah enjoyed this privilege because he was destined to be a virgin. The connection between his sanctification and his virginity is repeated at *adv. Pelag.* 2,28; *in Ier.* 4,48,4; *praef. Vulg. Ier.* p. 5,6. Athanasius had also mentioned Jeremiah's sanctification at *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 58,15 (cf. previous n.).

21,4

allis verbis id ipsud apostolus loquitur. J. proceeds to spatchcock a sequence of biblical citations which in fact anticipate the points made at p. 173,11ff. about self-abnegation under the new dispensation. He resumes the thread of his present argument in l. 19 (*inveniebatur ergo, ut diximus* ...). A display of biblical erudition has accordingly been allowed to obstruct the proper development of the train of thought. It is significant that Athanasius had moved straight from the celibacy of

⁷ Ps.-Ignatius, *Philad.* 4 lists Elijah, Joshua, Melchizedek, Elisha, Jeremiah and various figures from New Testament and apostolic times. This work was written between 364 and 373 (Smith). Filaster 110,9 gives the following list of virgins: Elijah, Elisha, Daniel, Jeremiah, Ezra and the Three Children. According to Frede (1995), p. 475, the work was produced between 383 and 391. Neither of these passages groups Elijah, Elisha and Jeremiah together in the same way as Athanasius and J.

Elijah, Elisha and Jeremiah to Christ's advent and the general spread of virginity (*Letter to virgins* [Lefort 1955], p. 58,18). In J. on the other hand it is not just scriptural citation which interrupts this natural progression: before J. comes to Christ's earthly existence and its consequences (p. 173,7ff.), he also inserts a series of commonplaces (p. 173,4ff.). One of them flatly contradicts the material he appears to have borrowed from Athanasius concerning Elijah and his fellow-prophets (cf. n. on *coepit a femina* at 21,7). These attempts to improve on his source and impress his readership accordingly provide a good example of the ineptitude which characterizes J.'s scissors-and-paste technique.

The words which J. uses to introduce the first of his biblical quotations (*aliis verbis id ipsud ...*) find an echo at *epist.* 54,9,3 *hoc est quod apostolus verbis aliis loquebatur*. The form *ipsud* recurs at 27,6 below; on this unliterary variant for *ipsum* cf. *TLL* VII,2, 295,67ff. and 296,45ff. (J.'s teacher Donatus had inculcated *ipsum* at *gramm. min.* 3). There is MS authority for *ipsud* again at *epist.* 57,8,2; 69,2,6; 120,9,7; 120,10,14 (in the last two cases Hilberg reads *ipsum*); *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 175 l. 215; p. 243 l. 95.

existimo ergo hoc bonum esse propter instantem necessitatem. 1 *Cor.* 7,26 had also been cited by Ambrose (*vid.* 13,80; 14,82) and Chrysostom (*virg.* 42,3 *et passim*); it recurs later at *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,10,8 p. 143 (*et passim*) and Augustine, *virg.* 13,13 (*et passim*). J. had quoted the previous verse (7,25) at 20,2 above. *Virg. Mar.* 21 and *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 gloss the 'present distress' with Mt. 24,19 ('woe unto them that are with child ...'); the passage of *virg. Mar.* had resembled the *Libellus* (l. 12) in asking *quae est ista necessitas?* (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,12 *quae est illa necessitas?*). According to Origen the 'distress' was the sojourn in the body (*comm. in 1 Cor.* 39). Jovinian echoes the verse in an address to the virgin: *elegisti pudicitiam propter praesentem necessitatem* (cf. *adv. Iovin.* 1,5).

tempus brevium est. J. quotes 1 *Cor.* 7,29 with great frequency: it recurs no fewer than eighteen times in his works. The verse was widely used elsewhere: Tertullian had adduced it a dozen times, while it was cited by Cyprian at *testim.* 3,11 (*caelestia tantum ... cogitare debere*). The text had also occurred in Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 56 and Chrysostom, *virg.* 49,2 (*et passim*); cf. also *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,10,12 p. 147.

21,5

In proximo est Nabuchodonosor: promovit se leo de cubili suo. As is often the case, J. uses a text from the Old Testament to restate in figurative terms a point which he has just made; this time the point was a citation from St. Paul. At the same time J. also returns to the theme of

captivity which was introduced with mention of Jeremiah (l. 8).

Jer. 4,7 refers to Nebuchadnezzar. He is identified with the Devil at *in Jer.* 1,72,1 (ad loc.); the same identification had been made by Origen at *fr. in Jer.* 48 and *sel. in Ezech.* 17,12. The text recurs at *in Zach.* 11,3 l. 72. It would not seem to be cited elsewhere. Accordingly J. has again used a rare verse of scripture to achieve a very powerful effect. There is a similar reference to Nebuchadnezzar at *epist.* 45,6,1 *nec mihi dominetur Nabuchodonosor.*

quo mihi superbissimo regi servitura coniugia? For *coniugium* in the sense of 'wife' cf. *TLL* IV, 325,16ff. At *epist.* 147,4,2 J. has *violata matrimonia ... caesa* (cf. *TLL* VIII, 480,45ff.). For J.'s probable source in the present passage cf. next n.

quo parvulos, quos propheta conploret dicens. In this and the preceding sentence (cf. previous n.) J. may have in mind Tertullian, *monog.* 16,5. There mothers are bidden: *parent antichristo, in quae libidinosius saeviat.* Tertullian's injunction occupies a prominent position at the end of the treatise; at 2,1 above J. has evidently borrowed the immediately preceding words as well (cf. n. on *uterus intumescat*). Again however J. has improved stylistically the material he has copied; he has also enhanced it with biblical citation. The present passage would accordingly seem to supply a further example of J.'s penchant for combining scripture with formulations taken from elsewhere.

parvuli postulaverunt panem et, qui frangeret eis, non erat. Lam. 4,4 is cited again at *in Ezech.* 4,16 l. 1532 (on '*conteram baculum panis*'), where the *parvuli* are the *vulgus ecclesiae* (the combination of Ezek. 4,16 with Lam. 4,4 went back to Origen, *sel. in Ezech.* 4,16). Elsewhere Lam. 4,4 is seldom cited. Here J. quotes this rare text to very good effect.

21,6

inveniebatur ergo, ut diximus, in viris tantum hoc continentiae bonum et in doloribus lugiter Eva pariebat. After his scriptural excursus J. now picks up the thread of the argument he has borrowed from Athanasius (cf. n. on *Hieremiae dicitur ...* at 21,3); he also introduces his own distinction between men and women, which in turn allows him to accommodate a number of striking commonplaces (ll. 4ff.). It is perhaps possible that here J. also has in mind Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,189ff. Gregory notes that virginity was rare under the old dispensation (*πρόσθε μὲν ἐν παύροις φαίνεται καὶ σκίεσσα*; l. 194); unlike Athanasius and J. however he mentions no names. Christ's coming then made it popular; in this connection Gregory (like J.) also introduces Eve: *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ Χριστὸς ἀγγίξ*

διὰ μητρὸς ἀδούσας ... ἤγγισε θηλυτέρας, Εὖαν δ' ἀπεσείαστο
πικρὴν ... δὴ τότε παρθενίη στράψεν μερόπεσσι φαεινῇ (ll. 197, 200,
203).

21,7

postquam vero virgo concepit in utero. Somewhat later at Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 4,26 and Augustine, *pecc. orig.* 40,45 the immaculate conception is again said to free womankind. According to (Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* 3 p. 329^A women would have been doomed, had Christ not been born of a virgin. Ps.-Chrysostom states that Christ entered the virgin's womb to restore fallen nature by means of virginity (*virg. corrupt.* p. 743), while at Ps.-Chrysostom, *assumpt. Chr.* 2 p. 730 he is said to have released Eve from the pains of childbirth through Mary. In the present passage J. characteristically expresses himself by means of biblical texts (Is. 7,14 and 9,6 [= 9,5 LXX]; from the latter he has selected only the most significant and pertinent epithets).

soluta maledictio est. The same wording is found in Ps.-Chrysostom, *annunt. et Ar.* p. 766 (on Is. 7,14 'a virgin shall conceive') πέπαιται ... ἡ κατάρα.

mors per Evam, vita per Mariam. Here J. has introduced an enormously popular commonplace. He also invests it with a characteristically striking formulation: the parison is noted by Hritzu, p. 88. The idea goes right back to Irenaeus 3,22,4 (SC 211; cf. 5,19,1 [SC 153]). The antithesis is also adumbrated in Justin, *dial.* 100,5 and perhaps too in the *Letter to Diognetus* 12,8. The form it takes varies. The one which J. uses here is the most common and is also used by the following: Epiphanius, *haer.* 78,18,5; (?) Chrysostom, *nativ.* 2; Ps.-Chrysostom, *nat. Chr.* 1 p. 738; Peter Chrysologus, *serm.* 99,5; Quodvultdeus, *haer.* 5,15.

At Ps.-Chrysostom, *assumpt. Chr.* 2 p. 730 Eve is said to have been in travail with death and then through Mary to have given birth to life. Often Eve and Mary are not directly named. Thus it is a 'virgin' that on each occasion brought death and life according to Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 13,27; Chromatius, *in Matth.* 2,5; Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 12,15; Theodotus of Ancyra, *hom. BVM* 11 (the wording is varied slightly at Amphilochius, *hom.* 1,4; Chrysostom, *exp. in Ps.* 44,7; Ps.-Marius Victorinus, *phys.* 16). Death and life each came through a 'woman' according to Augustine, *agon.* 22,24 and Quodvultdeus, *ymb.* 2,4,25 (cf. Origen, *schol. in Lc.* 1,27; Augustine, *serm.* 51,3 RBen 91, 1981 p. 25,101; Ps.-Augustine [= Ambrosiaster], *quaest. test. app. vet.* 40; Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *annunt.* 3 p. 1177^A; Ps.-Hesychius of Jerusalem, *serm.* [Aubineau 1978] 16,29). Finally

Ambrose (*epist. extra coll.* 15,3) traces trouble to a woman and redemption to a virgin.

Elsewhere it is the idea of redress that predominates. The angel's greeting to Mary cancels the curse pronounced to Eve according to Origen, *fr. in Lc.* 21a (copied by Antipater of Bostra, *amant.* 3; cf. Proclus of Constantinople, *hom.* 4,14; [Ps.]-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. III* [Klostermann-Berthold] 28,1 [M]). In *fr. in Lc.* 21b Origen says that just as Eve's malediction brought a curse to all women, so Mary's tidings bring joy to every virgin soul. A common variant is for Mary to redeem Eve. This is to be found at Ambrose, *obit. Theod.* 47; Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 5 p. 501^A; Proclus of Constantinople, *hom.* 3,4; Ps.-Chrysostom, *Rach.* p. 700. Already Tertullian had made Mary's faith wipe out Eve's credulity in *car.* 17 l. 37. Occasionally the antithesis is between Eve and Mary's son. Thus Christ redeems Eve through Mary his mother at Ps.-Origen, *hom. in Matth.* 1,4 p. 243,13; Ps.-Chrysostom, *Samarit.* 1,2; *praecurs.* 1,1 (cf. Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,5 and Gregory Nazianzen, *car.* 1,2,1,200). According to Ps.-Chrysostom, *hebd. jej.* p. 703 just as Eve ate forbidden fruit and made all die, so Mary's son forwent legitimate food and saved all. At Augustine, *pecc. orig.* 40,45 Eve's deceiver binds and Mary's son sets free.⁸ A final variation is the addition of Elizabeth to Mary. This occurs in Origen, *hom. in Lc.* 8 p. 47,7 and is copied by Ambrose, *in Luc.* 2,28.

The whole idea was evidently influenced by both Sirach 25,33 (= 25,24 LXX; 'from a woman was the beginning of sin; and because of her we all die') and by 1 Cor. 15,22 ('as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive').

ditius virginitatis donum fluxit in feminas. Virgins are more numerous among women and continence is more abundant among them according to Chrysostom, *hom. in Eph.* 13,4; cf. Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ps.* 44,16^B. That women have struggled harder and achieved greater distinction is a view which had been expressed by Basil, *inst. ascet.* 3; cf. also Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 8,4 and Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *h. rel.* 29 p. 1489^B.

coepit a femina. In the previous decade Epiphanius had affirmed at *haer.* 78,10,11 that Mary was the ἀρχηγός of virginity. The same point is made later in *Passio Bartholomaei* 4 p. 136,14; its author states specifically that there was no man whose example she could follow. In fact the idea went back to Origen: at *comm. in Mt.* 10,17 p. 22,1 he had declared that Mary was the first to practise virginity among women and

⁸ Cf. also Eusebius of Emesa, *fr. Gal.* 4,4 ἐπειδὴ γὰρ γυνὴ προέβλεψεν ἁμαρτίαν, ἔτι γυναικὸς ὁ σῶζων.

that her son Christ was the first among men. In the present passage J. has repeated this commonplace without thinking, for he has failed to notice that it flatly contradicts the commonplace he has just used which made Elijah and Elisha virgins (cf. n. on *virgo Helias, Helisaeus virgo* at 21,3): if they were virgins, virginity cannot have begun with the Virgin Mary.

statim ut filius dei ingressus est super terram, novam sibi familiam instituit. J. makes Christ the author and pioneer of virginity at *epist.* 65,10,4 and 130,8,3 (so Chromatius, *in Matth.* 7,2; cf. Methodius, *symp.* 1,4,23 ἀρχιπρόθεος). Origen had declared that virginity started with Christ (*Confr.* 2 p. 155,10); cf. also Athanasius, *fr. Lc.* p. 1393^B. Christ is again identified as its πηγὴ by Gregory of Nyssa (*virg.* 2,2). Ambrose had difficulty finding it on earth before Christ's coming; it was then that virginity became widespread (*virg.* 1,3,11 and 13; cf. *in Luc.* 3,18 and also Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Ps.* 44,15^B). Duval (1974a), p. 33, notes that in these passages of *De virginibus* Ambrose is imitating Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 58,18.⁹ It would seem that the same passage of Athanasius has also been J.'s principal source here (cf. n. on *Hieremiae dicitur ...* at 21,3). J. may also have been thinking of Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,197ff. (cf. n. on *inveniebatur ergo ...* at 21,6); cf. also *carm.* 1,2,3,29ff. Two further passages may be adduced in which the same idea occurs. According to Ps.-Chrysostom, *elem.* 1 p. 1062 virginity reappears at Christ's advent after its disappearance from paradise. Finally (Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria remarks at *serm.* 3 p. 329^A that with Christ's birth virginity became so strong that even the Persians, who used to take their mothers to wife, now live as virgins.

Here virgins constitute the Lord's new *familia*. For the idea of virgins as servants of God corresponding to the angels cf. Chrysostom, *virg.* 11,1 λειτουργοῦσιν τῷ θεῷ (sc. ἄγγελοι), τοῦτο καὶ ἡ παρθένος. On the divine *familia* cf. the Old Latin version of Eph. 3,15 *ex quo* (sc. deo) *omnis familia* (Vulg. *paternitas*) *in caelo et in terra nominatur* (Rufinus, *Orig. in num.* 2,2 p. 12,26). In addition Lk. 12,42 (*quis ... est fidelis dispensator ... quem constituet dominus super familiam suam*) is referred to Christ at (e.g.) Origen, *comm. ser. in Mt.* 61 p. 139,28. Also pertinent is Mt. 10,25 *si patrem familias Beelzebub vocaverunt. J.* expresses the same idea again at *epist.* 3,1,1 (*coelestem in terris ... familiam*); 70,2,6 (*in familiam Christi*); 118,4,5; 130,19,7. Cf. further TLL VI,1, 242,15ff. (add Ambrose, *virg.* 1,1,4 *dominus ... sibi familiam*

⁹ The source had already been identified by Lefort (1935), pp. 64f.

etiam in hoc ... fragilitatis humanae corpore consecravit). Christ was *pater futuri saeculi* in l. 4 above,

qui ab angelis adorabatur in caelo haberet angelos et in terris. J. now enhances the statement he has just borrowed concerning Christ and the spread of virginity (cf. previous n.) by appending to it a very striking antithesis about angels in heaven and earth: this addition would also seem to have been taken from elsewhere. The alliteration in *ab angelis adorabatur* is noted by Hritzu, p. 42.

The idea of the virgin as an earthly 'angel' corresponding to those in heaven was already something of a commonplace: Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 51 (ἐκείνων [sc. ἀγγέλων] ἀνευ σαρκῶν κατὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν ... παρὰ τῷ παμβασιλεῖ τῶν ὅλων θεῷ φυλαττόντων, οὗτοι ἐπὶ γῆς ... τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν ἰσαγγελοῦ δι' ἀρετῆς τῷ ποιητῇ παραδοξότερον διεφύλαξαν); Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,10,923f. (on virgins: σύμφωνον, ἀντίφωνον ἀγγέλων στάσιν / δισσὴν, ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω τεταγμένην); cf. also Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 6,8 (likewise on virgins: *quando autem venit ista conversatio in vita, cum descendit deus ad terram, hoc est filius, tunc fecit ab hominibus angelos*).¹⁰ J. may have taken his cue from Ambrose, *virg.* 1,3,11 (*nemo ergo miretur, si angelis comparentur quae angelorum domino copulantur*) and 1,3,13 (*hoc illud est quod ministrantes in terris angeli declararunt futurum genus*); these passages come directly before and after those adduced in the previous n. J. may also have had in mind Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,209f. καὶ χορὸς ἀμφὶ ἀνακτα φαεσφόρον ἴστατ' ἀμεμφῆς, / οὐράνιος, γαίθθεν ἐπειγόμενος θεὸς εἶναι (for possible imitation of the immediately preceding section of this poem cf. n. on *inveniebatur ergo ...* at 21,6). Such utilization of more than one source would be entirely in character.

21,8

tunc Olofernae caput Judith continens amputavit. J. proceeds to develop his description of the results of Christ's advent with a characteristically impressive sequence of scriptural allusion and citation. The effect is enhanced by a fourfold anaphora of *tunc*.¹¹ J. starts by allegorizing two events from the Old Testament (ll. 9 and 10) and by boldly transferring them to the time of Christ's coming, so that they coincide with his calling of the fishermen (ll. 11ff.) and with his injunction to self-denial (ll. 13ff.). The first of this series of biblical

¹⁰ Chrysostom had called virgins 'angels on earth' (*virg.* 79,2). He also notes (*Hom. in Is.* 6, / 1,1) that just as angels glorify above, so do human beings in churches below.

¹¹ J. uses a similar anaphora of *tunc* in ch. 41. It therefore marks both the middle and end of the work.

episodes concerns Judith: since this *exemplum* is the only one that has anything to do with virginity, it alone is strictly relevant.

Judith had already been cited as an example of chastity in Tertullian, *monog.* 17,1. J. notes that the church read the book of Judith, but did not place it among canonical scripture (*praef. Vulg. Salom.* p. 53; cf. also *epist.* 54,16,3). Judith was a widow in the biblical account (Judith 8,1), where her chastity is praised (ib. 15,11 and 16,26). J. himself urges the widow to imitate her at *epist.* 79,11,3, while he makes her a model of chastity in *praef. Vulg. Judith* p. 214,1. On the other hand Judith symbolizes the church at *epist.* 79,11,3 and in *Soph. prol.* l. 6. J.'s treatment of Judith's feat at *epist.* 54,16,3 makes explicit the exegesis which he offers implicitly in the present passage: *castitas truncat libidinem*. For Holofernes cf. *epist.* 76,3,1 *ut ... Olofernes in te occidatur*.

Aman, quod interpretatur 'iniquitas'. The story of Haman had been treated in Origen, *princ.* 3,2,4; it recurs later at Ambrose, *Ioseph* 6,35 (he attacks the Lord's churches); *Hel.* 9,30 (ib. Holofernes); *off.* 3,21,123. The combination of Haman's adversary Esther with Judith (cf. previous n.) was traditional: *I Clement* 55,4; 55,6; Clement of Alexandria, *str.* 4,19,118,4f.; Origen, *or.* 13,2 (cf. 16,3); *Apostolic Constitutions* 5,20,16; cf. also Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,29 and Paulinus of Nola, *carm.* 28,26f. The theme of unchastity occurs in the story only at 7,8. J. repeats the false etymology *iniquitas* (Hbr. 'awen) at *epist.* 53,8,18. He has evidently borrowed it from Origen (ap. *Gloss. Ansil. exc. II* [Pitra (1852), III, p. 395]). Since J. is dealing with virginity, this piece of erudition is not entirely *à propos*.

suo igne combustus est. Haman was in fact hanged on the gibbet he had prepared for Mordecai. For the proverb which J. has chosen to use here instead cf. Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 42,2 ὁ ... ἐπιβουλεύων ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖ πρῶτον· καὶ γὰρ ὁ πῦρ ἀνάπτων ἑαυτὸν κατακαίει καὶ ὁ ἀδάμαντα παίων ἑαυτῷ ἐπηρεάζει· καὶ ὁ πρὸς κέντρα λακτιζων ἑαυτὸν αἰμάττει. Otto, Häussler and *TLL* s.v. *ignis* 'in proverbis' all fail to register this proverb. It may be noted further that in connection with the deaths of Nadab and Abihu Origen quotes Is. 50,11 *ambulate in igni vestro et in flamma, quam accendistis vobis* (*hom. in Lev.* 9,8 p. 432,26). Similarly Gregory of Nyssa observes at *castig.* p. 316^B (*à propos* of Dathan and Abiram): τὸ πῦρ ἀνήπτων ..., ὁ ... τοὺς θυμιῶντας κατέφλεξε. Basil also describes how the Devil lights a fire against the church, but the saviour turns it upon the arsonist (*hom.* 21,9). Finally J. himself says at *epist.* 40,2,2: *cupio suis ignibus ardere Vulcanum*. In the present passage therefore J. has combined inexact and derivative erudition (cf. previous n.) with a trite proverb.

tunc Iacobus et Iohannes relicto patre, rete, navicula secuti sunt

salvatorem affectum sanguinis et vincula saeculi et curam domus pariter relinquentes. J. continues to move away from the subject of virginity, which is replaced by the theme of renunciation (for the probable reason cf. below). Though abandonment of home by James and John is really inapposite in the present passage, it does pick up a topic that runs through the work: while the *Libellus* had opened with a figurative exhortation to leave a father's house (cf. *relicto patre* here), Eustochium is told at 24,3 that she should not be deterred by relatives, and at 30,1 J. himself tells how he had abandoned his own family.

The calling of James and John is a topic of which J. is particularly fond: he refers to this picturesque episode on no fewer than fifteen further occasions. The tricolon *pater, rete, navicula* (*navis*) is reproduced at *epist.* 38,5,1; 79,4,2; 125,8,1; *c. Vigil.* 14; *tract. in Marc.* p. 361,27; *tract.* p. 505 l. 78; cf. *tract. in psalm.* II p. 370 l. 182. The word-play *rete ... vincula saeculi* recurs at *tract. in Marc.* p. 332,30 (*in vinculis retium omnia vitia relinquuntur*). It is repeated by Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 5,6 (*cum retibus rerum suarum et implicatione patrimonii*). J. has borrowed it from Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon) p. 192,3. Here J. has accordingly followed a proverb (cf. previous n.) with a second-hand pun.

It would appear that in this passage J. has also been influenced by Tertullian, *idol.* 12,3, where the example of James' and John's abandonment of home is used in a quite different context to rebut the argument advanced by makers of idols that concern for their dependents prevents them from giving up their livelihood; the immediately preceding section (*idol.* 12,2) is imitated at 31,3f. below.¹² *De idololatria* 12,3 states: *iam tunc demonstratum est nobis et pignera et artificia et negotia propter dominum derelinquenda, cum iacobus et iohannes vocati a domino et patrem navemque derelinquunt.* Tertullian's striking tricolon (*pignera et artificia et negotia*) has inspired J.'s own: *affectum sanguinis et vincula saeculi et curam domus*. The *De idololatria*'s first item (*pignera*)¹³ has determined the first one in J. (*affectum sanguinis*), while the final element of the original (*negotia*) would seem to lie behind the one that also comes last in the *Libellus* (*curam domus*). Tertullian's second noun (*artificia*) naturally puts J. in mind of the tools of the fisherman's trade.¹⁴ He accordingly adds *rete* to the *patrem navemque* he found at the end of

¹² J. had already utilized both *idol.* 12,2 and 12,4 at *epist.* 14,10,3; cf. Duval (1974c) p. 213, n. 85. The imitation of *idol.* 12,4 had been particularly close (Tertullian: *fides famem non timet*; J.: *fides famem non sensit*); on J.'s debt to this Tertullianic phrase cf. further Adkin (1996a); id. (2002a).

¹³ Here *pignera* denotes 'beloved ones, relations'; cf. Waszink-Winden, p. 218.

¹⁴ For *artificium* of the fisherman cf. *TLZ* II, 705,27f.

Tertullian's sentence.¹⁵ The result is a second impressive tricolon: *patre, rete, navicula*. This insertion of *rete* leads in turn to a modification of the second element in the other tricolon: in place of Tertullian's *artificia* J. introduces the phrase *vincula saeculi* in order to generate the second-hand conceit (*rete / vincula*) documented above.¹⁶ Waszink-Winden, p. 218, point out that the same section of Tertullian's *De idololatria* is also imitated later by J. at *epist.* 38,5,1; however they fail to register the imitation in this portion of the *Libellus*.¹⁷

In the same passage Tertullian quotes Mt. 16,24 (*idol.* 12,2) and Mt. 8,21f. (*ib.* 12,3), which are duly reproduced in the *Libellus* (ll. 14–17) immediately after the episode of James and John. All three biblical passages are concerned with renunciation of the world. Since this had been the theme of the *De idololatria*, Tertullian's use of this scriptural material had been entirely appropriate: he was urging the idol-maker to give up his job and disregard his dependents. J. on the other hand is dealing in this ch. with virginity. Here the topic of renouncing livelihood and family is not really *à propos*.

tunc primum auditum est: qui vult venire post me, neget se ipsum sibi et tollat crucem suam et sequatur me. J. now introduces the last of his four sentences that are marked by anaphora of *tunc*. Typically it is scripture which provides J.'s climax: here he quotes Mt. 16,24. The

¹⁵ *Rete* comes from Mt. 4,22 *illi autem statim relictis retibus et patre saeculi sui eum*.

¹⁶ The end-product of J.'s 'improvement' of his Tertullianic source is a very impressive pair of matching tricola. Each item in the one has its correlate in the other: *patre / affectum sanguinis, rete / vincula saeculi, navicula / curam domus*. The second tricolon is marked by a strictly symmetrical arrangement, which underlines the correspondence: in every case a dependent genitive immediately follows its noun, while the connecting particle is always *et*. At the same time deliberate *variatio* achieves a very careful counterpoint between the two tricola. The first consists of single words denoting concrete objects, whereas the second is made up of two-word units which all signify abstract conceptions. *Asyndeton* characterizes the first tricolon, while the second makes use of connectives. Whereas the final element of the first (*navicula*) is longer than the preceding, the corresponding element of the second (*curam domus*) is notably shorter than the two that come before it (on this inversion of Behaghel's law cf. Albrecht [1989], index s.v. 'end cola, shorter'). Finally it may be observed that while these tricola occupy the beginning and end of the sentence respectively, they are enclosed by the verb *relinquere*, which in the initial position is a passive participle in the ablative, whereas the form it takes at the end is that of an active, nominative participle (*relicto - relinquentes*): the result is a polyptotic *reddite*. In this sentence J.'s artistry has accordingly created a formulation which for all its derivativeness is stylistically far superior to its source.

¹⁷ They also miss an earlier echo at *epist.* 14,6,1 (*respice cum patre relictum rete, respice surgentem de teloneo publicanum*; cf. the Tertullianic *cum iacob et iohannes ... et patrem novemque derelinquent, cum Martharus de teloneo suscitatur*). The two episodes are nowhere juxtaposed in the Bible; moreover the formulation *de teloneo* is not in the scriptural account (cf. Mt. 9,9; Mk. 2,14; Lk. 5,27f.).

rather uncouth language of the Old Latin version naturally makes the rhetorical finesse of the antecedent sentence (cf. previous n.) appear all the more impressive by comparison: in place of the Old Latin's unrefined *neget se ipsum sibi* the Vulgate reads *abneget semet ipsum*. At the same time this text had also been employed by Tertullian (*idol.* 12,2) immediately before the passage dealing with the calling of James and John (cf. previous n.): *si vis domini discipulus esse, crucem tuam tollas et dominum sequaris necesse est, id est, angustias et cruciatus tuos vel corpus solum, quod in modum crucis est*. Accordingly Tertullian would appear to have been J.'s source here once again: it is characteristic that J. should have omitted Tertullian's explanatory gloss in the interests of an arresting concision.

nemo enim miles cum uxore pergit ad proelium. The comment which J. does append to Mt. 16,24 (cf. previous n.) has been lifted from Tertullian, *mart.* 3,1 *nemo miles ad bellum cum deliciis venit*. Again J. has improved on his source: he achieves an elegant alliteration in *pergit ad proelium*. He also replaces Tertullian's *deliciae* with the more concrete term *uxor*.¹⁸ This substitution of *uxor* is an attempt to give the foregoing citation of scripture (Mt. 16,24 'if any man will come after me ...') the sexual reference necessitated by J.'s context but entirely absent from the biblical text: this mention of an *uxor* in fact provides the sole hint of J.'s purported theme of virginity in the whole of this section. Once again J. has combined scripture with a striking formulation that has been appropriated from another author; it in turn is copied by Ps.-Jerome, *epist.* 42 p. 290^A (*nemo miles cum uxore pergit ad bellum*).

21,9

discipulo ad sepulturam patris ire cupienti non permittitur. After a very brief return to his actual theme of virginity (l. 16 *uxore*) J. reverts to the topic of renunciation and again speaks of a father (cf. l. 11). The text to which he alludes here (Mt. 8,21f. [= Lk. 9,59f.]) had a considerable appeal for him; he cites it eight times.¹⁹ The use of this

¹⁸ An erotic sense could easily be attached to *deliciae* in view of Tertullian's next clause: *nec de cubiculo ad aciem procedit*. J. had already imitated these words in *epist.* 14,2,1, as was noted by Hilberg, who like other commentators failed however to identify the reminiscence in the present passage of the *Liberulus*. Devail (1974c), p. 213, n. 85, remarks that *epist.* 14,10,3 had combined another echo of this section of *Ad martyras* (for '3,9' read '2,9': *quotiens eam [sc. viam] spiritu deambulaveris ...*) with two further borrowings from the ch. of *De idololatria* currently at issue (12,2 *egohe ...* 12,4 *fides famem ...*).

¹⁹ In *epist.* 54,2,2 on the other hand J. dissociates himself from the rigorist attitude it inculcates. At 27,3 of the *Liberulus* Eustochium herself is warned against excessive attendance at funerals.

text in the present passage is however due to Tertullian, *idol.* 12,3, where the sentence that deals with the calling of the fishermen (cf. n. on *tunc Iacobus et Iohannes ...* at 21,8 above) ends with a reference to the same episode: *cum etiam sepelire patrem tardum fuit fidei*. J. has merely tempered the extreme brevity of the *De idololatria* by returning to the language of scripture. Typically he also appends the preceding verse of the Gospel (Mt. 8,20 [= Lk. 9,58] *vulpes foveas habent ...*). This is another favourite text, which J. quotes on eleven further occasions; it had occurred in Cyprian's collection of *testimonia* (3,11: *caelestia tantum ... cogitare debere*).

si anguste manseris. On the adverb cf. *TLL* II, 64,50ff.

qui sine uxore est. In characteristic fashion J. rounds off with a substantial citation of scripture which also reverts to the subject of virginity. The text (1 Cor. 7,32ff.) offers comfort to the virgin and also supplies a defence of her calling: in this final vindication J. typically appeals to authority. The text's reference to 'worldly cares' (II. 3f. and 7) might also be thought to provide a link with J.'s treatment of this topic in the foregoing lines (p. 173,11ff.); in contrast however to this derivative Hieronymian disquisition the *quae sunt mundi* of the biblical citation are defined as pertaining strictly to wedlock: *quomodo placeat uxori / quomodo placeat viro*.

This text of scripture had already been quoted in full at *virg. Mar.* 20. There are further allusions to it in *epist.* 79,7,7 and 123,5,1; the punctuation is discussed at *adv. Iovin.* 1,13. Verse 34 (part of which J. repeats at 38,2 below) was written on the wall in a part of the church set aside for virgins according to Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 24. The text had already been widely cited: Tertullian, *castit.* 9 l. 3; *monog.* 3,3; *puhic.* 16 p. 255,11; *uxor.* 1,3 l. 40; Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 5; *testim.* 3,32 (*de bono virginittatis*); Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 6; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 23; 56; Athanasius, *virg.* 2; Ambrose, *virg.* 1,5,23; Chrysostom, *virg.* 74,1 (*et passim*); cf. also Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,38; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,8; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 12; *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,10,13 p. 147; Augustine, *virg.* 22,22 (*et passim*).

Chapter 22

For a discussion of the drawbacks of marriage the reader is referred to J.'s own *Adversus Helvidium* and to works by Tertullian, Cyprian, Damasus and Ambrose. J. permits himself to make just one point in this connection: a person who is bound by the obligations of wedlock cannot fulfil the apostle's injunction to 'pray without ceasing'.

22,1

quantas molestias habeant nuptiae et quot sollicitudinibus vinciantur. J. now picks up the theme of the 'cares of wedlock' which was introduced in the long biblical citation at the end of the preceding ch. (ll. 3f. and 7).

On the shackles (*vinciantur*) of marriage cf. (e.g.) Basil, *ep.* 2,2; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 19; Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 18,4; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,1,234 (γάμος καὶ δεσμός); Chrysostom, *virg.* 41,1; 47,5 ('δέδεσαι', φησί, 'γυναικί; [1 Cor. 7,27] ... δεσμὸν τὴν συζυγίαν ἐκόλλησε); Ps.-Basil, *const. praef.* 2 (τὸν γάμον ὡς περ τιναὶς πέδας ἀπέφυγε). Examples in Latin authors are found at (e.g.) *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,4,3 p. 127; Augustine, *ctv.* 15,16 p. 93,16; *virg.* 16,16. Cf. 22,3 *adstricta*.

adversus Helvidium de beatae Mariae perpetua virginitate. The same title is given with slight variations at *epist.* 49,18,2 and *vir. ill.* 135; cf. *virg. Mar. tit.* The work had been written some months earlier; cf. Cavallera, 1,2, p. 24. J. suggests further reading at the end of this ch.

nunc eadem replicare perlongum est et, si cui placet, de illo potest hautre fonticulo. J. makes a similar statement with reference to his *Adversus Iovinianum* at *epist.* 54,18,3 *non necesse est eadem ex integro scribere, cum possis inde, quae scripta sunt, mutuari.* For the invitation to consult a fuller treatment elsewhere cf. Origen, *Com.* 2 p. 118,16 *de his plenius in libro Numerorum prosecuti sumus, quae si quis dignum iudicat noscere, illa perquirat.* In the present passage there would seem to be a certain inconsistency between *breviter* (l. 11) and *perlongum* (l. 12).

Here J. refers to his *Adversus Helvidium* as a *fonticulus*. He is in fact extremely fond of the image of the spring to denote literary provenance: it occurs in his letters alone at 20,2,1; 27,1,3; 28,5; 34,4,1; 36,1,4; 49,13,1; 49,13,3; 51,4,7; 60,5,2; 75,3,1; 85,3,2; 99,2,1; 100,10,5; 106,2,3; 121 *praef.* 4; 133,1,2; 133,1,3; 134,1,2. On J.'s use of the diminutive for his own works cf. Bartelink (1980), p. 29. In the

present passage the striking hyperbaton *illo ... foniculo* is noted by Hritzu, p. 79.

22,2

verum, ne penitus videar omisisse, nunc dicam. For this kind of statement cf. Origen, *or.* 23,4 πλὴν καὶ νῦν ἵνα μὴ τέλειον παρασκευάσωμεν τὸ τηλικούτον πρόβλημα, αὐτάρκως ἀναμνησθησόμεθα ...

cum apostolus sine intermissione orare nos iubeat. Hilberg merely compares Eph. 6,18 *orantes omni tempore*. Fremantle, p. 31, had however identified the source correctly as 1 Thess. 5,17 *sine intermissione orate*. J. refers to the precept again at 37,1 below. It recurs at *epist.* 125,11,1; in *Eph.* 5,20 p. 529^A; in *Tit.* 1,8 p. 568^C; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 5 l. 83; p. 190 l. 34.

On 'rendering what is due in marriage' (l. 15) Fremantle (ib.) compared 1 Cor. 7,3 *uxori vir debitum reddat* (ib. 7,5 refers to prayer: *ut vacetis orationi*). Both of Fremantle's identifications are repeated by Souter (1912), p. 150.

aut oramus semper et virgines sumus. This rather superficial kind of reasoning appeals strongly to J., who sets out exactly the same argument again in *adv. Iovin.* 1,7 and 1,34; cf. *virg. Mar.* 20 and *tract.* p. 540 l. 121. J. was not however the first to use it: he has again borrowed it from elsewhere. The argument is found in both Origen (*comm. in 1 Cor.* 34; *hom. in Num.* 23,3 p. 215,11) and Tertullian (*castit.* 10 l. 16). Somewhat later the author of *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,10,8 p. 144 wonders how the incontinent can fulfil the commandments of 1 Thess. 5,17 and Lk. 21,36 (*omni tempore orantes*). On the other hand Chrysostom (*hom. in 1 Cor.* 19,2) thinks prayer can be combined with intercourse, though even he concedes that the chaste pay more attention.

et si nupserit, inquit, virgo, non peccat. Again J. uses a text of scripture to introduce a fresh stage in the argument: marriage is legitimate, but has drawbacks. J. cites 1 Cor. 7,28 only twice elsewhere: *adv. Iovin.* 1,13 and in *Ier.* 3,60,2. The text had been frequently adduced: Tertullian, *castit.* 4 l. 14; *monog.* 11,10; *puhic.* 16 p. 255,4; *uxor.* 1,7 l. 14; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 56; Ambrose, *virginit.* 6,32; Chrysostom, *virg.* 39,1 (*et passim*); cf. later *Tractatus Pelagianus* 6,10,10 p. 146; Augustine, *virg.* 15,15 (*et passim*).

22,3

si tibi placet scire, quot molestis virgo libera, quot uxor adstricta sit. J.'s phraseology here would appear to have been influenced by the

words which introduce Cyprian's discussion of Gen. 3,16 at *hab. virg.* 22.¹ *vultis scire quo malo careat et quid boni teneat continentiae virtus?* Duval (1974a), pp. 25 and 29, n. 107, has identified the influence of this statement on Ambrose, *virg.* 1,6,24 (Duval's '1,6,25' is erroneous; *conferamus, si placet, bona mulierum cum ultimis virginum*) and 1,9,54 (*audi ergo, soror, quantis careas*). J.'s own imitation is much nearer the original than Ambrose's; in particular his *si tibi placet scire, quot molestiis virgo libera* closely reproduces the Cyprianic *vultis scire quo malo careat ... continentiae virtus?*² Cyprian's antithetic form of expression has also been retained; however the wording in J.'s second half (*adstricta*) reflects the metaphor which had opened this ch. of the *Libellus* (*vinciantur*; 22,1).³ Cyprian is named later in the present sentence of the *Libellus*, where J. recommends his reader to consult the Cyprianic treatment of *molestiae nuptiarum* that is introduced by the words currently at issue.⁴

Tertulliani. Tertullian is praised at *epist.* 21,3,2; 49,18,3; 58,10,1; 64,22,3; 133,2,1. He is pronounced to be eloquent (*epist.* 36,1,3), learned (*epist.* 70,5,1; c. *Vigil.* 8; in *Gal.* 1,8 p. 320^A) and sharp-witted (*vir. ill.* 53). On the other hand J. condemns him as a heretic in *virg. Mar.* 17; *adv. Rufin.* 3,27; in *Tit.* 1,6 p. 564^D. The reader is accordingly told to be selective at *epist.* 62,2,1; cf. *epist.* 84,2,2. Tertullian is mentioned by name on some further twenty occasions. J.'s references to him are assembled by Hamack (add *Aug. epist. Divj.* 27,3,1).

ad amicum philosophum. J. calls this work of Tertullian frivolous and juvenile at *adv. Iovin.* 1,13. On it cf. Tibiletti. The other publications of Tertullian on the subject of virginity to which J. here refers are *De exhortatione castitatis*, *De pudicitia* and *De virginibus velandis*.

beati Cypriani volumen egregium. This is the *De habitu virginum*. Deléani, p. 80, notes that this work in fact contains little on the subject of 'tracas du mariage'. J. does however have a habit of producing lists in which a number of the items are not very relevant to the point he has

¹ For J.'s extensive debt to this discussion at 18,3 above cf. *nn. ad loc.*

² It is perhaps possible that J.'s *libera* has been suggested by the occurrence of *liberae* at the start of Cyprian's immediately succeeding gloss on Gen. 3,16. Numerous synonyms were available, cf. (e.g.) Cicero, *Verr.* II 4,23 *vocari, expertes, soluti ac liberi fuerunt ab omni nuptiis*.

³ The use of *molestiae* in the same opening sentence no doubt accounts for its occurrence in the first half of J.'s antithesis.

⁴ Kunst, pp. 183, n. 5, and 184, n. 6, has pointed to J.'s habit of echoing an author's phraseology when he mentions his name. Such imitation is all the more likely in the present case, since this time the Cyprianic wording in question happens to occur in the very same passage to which J. is here making explicit reference.

set out to make (cf. [e.g.] 11,3 above). He is evidently doing this here as well. At the same time J. is anxious to establish the originality of his own work: he himself will not discuss the 'drawbacks of marriage'.

J. makes a similar judgment on Cyprian's *hab. virg.* at *epist.* 130,19,5 *beatus Cyprianus egregium de virginitate volumen edidit*. J.'s admiration for the African bishop is unqualified. Various other works of Cyprian are praised at *epist.* 66,5,4; 70,5,2; *in Gal.* 5,19 p. 417^b; cf. *vir. ill.* 67. J. speaks highly of Cyprian's style in a number of passages: *epist.* 58,10,1; 70,3,1; *in Is.* 17,60,13 l. 33. He is quoted at *epist.* 30,14,2 and 52,4,3. His works are recommended for study in *epist.* 107,12,3. At *in Ion.* 3,6 l. 211 D. the man himself is said to be an example.

J.'s high regard for Cyprian is shared by Augustine. At *doctr. christ.* 4,128 he quotes *hab. virg.* 3 and 23f. as an illustration of the temperate manner. Augustine expresses his admiration for Cyprian's eloquence at *doctr. christ.* 4,84 and *serm.* 335K,5 *RBen* 59, 1949 p. 73,3; cf. Prudentius, *perist.* 4,18 and 13,7ff. Lactantius had also said (*inst.* 5,1,24) that Cyprian wrote many works which are *in suo genere miranda*.

papae Damasci. On *papa* cf. Bartelink (1980), p. 28 (for 'DACL 3' read '13,1' and add Sainio, pp. 100f.). Contrast *epist.* 123,9,1 *Damasum Romanae urbis episcopum*.

versu prosaque composita. Ferrua, p. 8, rejected the general view that these verse compositions of Damasus on virginity are the epigrams devoted to Agnes and Irene and similar works. He is followed by Fontaine (1988a), p. 331, n. 16, and (1988b), p. 183, n. 23 ('il pourrait s'agir d'un *opus geminatum*, tourné de vers en prose'). The present passage is cited by Nautin (1986), p. 305, in support of his view that J. did not have 'a particularly high opinion' of Damasus; however J.'s words would seem on the contrary to be purely encomiastic. At *epist.* 120 *praef.* 2 J. employs the collocation *prosa versusque*.

Ambrosii nostri quae nuper ad sororem scripsit opuscula. Ambrose had produced his three books *De virginibus* in 377; they were addressed to his sister Marcellina. For the particular nuance of J.'s use here of *nostri* and *opuscula* cf. n. on *exquisierit* ... below.

tanto se fudit eloquio. Augustine agreed with J.'s verdict. At *doctr. christ.* 4,129 he cites a passage of Ambrose's *De virginibus* (2,2,7f.) as a model of the temperate mode. He quotes another passage of the same work (1,6,28) in order to exemplify the grand style (*ib.* 4,132).

quidquid ad laudem virginum pertinet. Ambrose himself refers to the *De virginibus* in similar terms at *vid.* 1,1 *tribus libris superioribus de virginum laudibus disseruimus*. J. states that it is his intention to

avoid praise (2,2; 23,1).

exquisierit, ordinarit, expresserit. J.'s phraseology evidently reflects the traditional division of oratory into *inventio*, *dispositio (ordo)* and *elocutio* (cf. books two and three of Cicero's *De oratore*). J.'s teacher Donatus uses identical wording at *Ter. Eun.* 167,2 *exquisitum ... expressum*. The asyndetic tricolon of *exquisierit, ordinarit, expresserit* with its parison and homoeoteleuton provides a very effective conclusion to this ch. The asyndeton is noted by Ottolini, p. 84, while Hritzu, p. 90, registers the homoeoteleuton. Further examples of J.'s taste for the 'tricolon asyndétique' are assembled by Lardet (1993), p. 108.

Dossi, p. 243, wondered whether J.'s statement here was a charitable assessment of Ambrose's use of his sources or an expression of sincere admiration; he opted for the second explanation. Similarly Neumann, pp. 58f., refers to a 'glowing' compliment. More recently Fontaine (1988a), p. 332, has spoken of 'admiration chaleureuse'.³ On the other hand Nautin (1983), p. 258, has argued that J.'s remarks are to be seen as an allusion to the derivative nature of Ambrose's work. Since however Nautin accepts Paredi's theory of a breach between the two men in the following year, he believes that J.'s observations here are made 'sous une forme aimable'.

It may be questioned whether what J. says here about Ambrose is in fact 'aimable'. In the first place there was no reason whatever for J. to speak of the *De virginibus* in terms which suggested that it was wholly derivative. Here J. is listing works which deal with the drawbacks of marriage: he mentions Tertullian, Cyprian and Damasus besides Ambrose. However it is significantly Ambrose's treatise alone that is described in language which is suggestive of plagiarism. Cyprian's *De habitu virginum* by contrast is qualified as a *volumen egregium* (l. 2). When seen in conjunction with the adjacent description of the *De virginibus*, the epithet *egregium* would seem to be an implicit criticism of Ambrose's work. It is also noteworthy that the term *opuscula* (l. 4) is applied to the *De virginibus*. This diminutive is admittedly used often as a designation for literary productions; cf. *TLL IX*, 862,70ff.; *Arms*, pp. 106f. Moreover in this survey of works on the inconveniences of wedlock J. has been anxious to achieve lexical *variatio*: he speaks of

³ He continues: 'ne peut-on voir en ces trois verbes la définition d'un maniérisme comparable à celui de Jérôme épistolier, par ces trois composantes d'une expression intensive: le lyrisme, le raffinement, l'expressivité?' Cf. also Penna, p. 102, n. 15 ('ammirazione'), and p. 135 ('se ne lodano incondizionatamente i libri su la verginità'); Paredi, p. 198 ('le massime lodi'); Nauroy, p. 178 ('loués avec une chaleur qu'on ne retrouve nulle part ailleurs'); Testard (1988), p. 232 ('le plus grand éloge'); Gori, p. 65 ('in termini elogiativi').

libellos, *volumen* and *composita* as well as of *opuscula* (ll. 1-4). However it is again noticeable that the last term has been reserved for Ambrose. The word *opusculum* is often contrasted unfavourably with *opus* (cf. *TLL* IX, 862,18ff.). It would seem therefore that here the diminutive may well have a somewhat derogatory connotation, which is all the more likely in view of J.'s reference at *epist.* 49,14,13 to the amplitude of the *De virginibus* (*latissime*).

In such a list of authors it was inevitable that the reference to Ambrose should be by name. It may therefore be noted that all of J.'s overtly hostile allusions to Ambrose are anonymous (cf. Nauray, pp. 202f.). In the *Libellus* the necessity of mentioning Ambrose's name will accordingly have imposed a certain restraint; this factor alone would seem to be more significant than any putative breach in 385. In the present passage of the *Libellus* J. is alleging that the *De virginibus* combines plagiarism of content with elegance of form: the three verbs *exquisierit*, *ordinarit*, *expresserit* are preceded by the phrase *tanto se fudit eloquio*. Exactly the same combination of charges is made against Ambrose's *De spiritu sancto* in 387 at *Didym. spir. praef.*,⁶ where the reference to the *informis cornicula* decking itself *alienis ... coloribus* is followed by the sequence *totum flaccidum, molle, nitidum atque formosum et exquisitis hinc inde coloribus pigmentatum*.⁷ The only difference is that at the later date Ambrose is not named: hence the tone is correspondingly sharper.⁸

Nautin's reference to Ambrose's sources is unspecific: he speaks only in vague terms of 'emprunts à des auteurs antérieurs'. Ambrose's principal source in the *De virginibus* was however the Athanasian *Letter to virgins* preserved in Coptic (Lefort [1955]). Scholarly opinion holds that J. was unfamiliar with this work when he wrote the *Libellus* in 384; cf. Duval (1974a), p. 65 and n. 271; Dossi, p. 243. However the *Libellus* itself can be shown to have made use of Athanasius' *Letter* (cf. [e.g.] nn. on *centesimus et sexagesimus fructus ...* at 15,2 above and on *neque enim undecim apostoli ...* at 38,1 below). J. will accordingly have been well aware how heavily the *De virginibus* had plagiarized from the Athanasian text: on the very considerable extent of Ambrose's debt cf. Duval (1974a), pp. 29-53. J.'s comment in the *Libellus* on

⁶ For the date cf. Nautin (1986), p. 306.

⁷ A similar combination is also found in the attack on Ambrose at *in Eph. prol.* p. 440^B, which belongs to 386 (so Nautin [1986], p. 306): *paene in communibus locis pontificum iactare sermonem*. For Ambrose as the target cf. Dunphy.

⁸ The point may be made that precisely the same combination of charges which J. makes in the *Libellus* could be directed with perfect aptness against the *Libellus* itself: it is of course human nature to attack in another the faults of which one knows oneself to be guilty.

Ambrose's method of composition must be seen in the light of this awareness: so far from being 'aimable', J.'s words are definitely malicious.

At the same time J. speaks in this passage (l. 3) of *Ambrosii nostri*. Lardet (1980), II, p. 283, observes that 'il est vrai qu'il y a aussi, quoique rare, un *noster* ironique chez Jérôme'. However he is certainly right to classify the present passage as an example of the other use of *noster* which he identifies; in such cases the word 'évoque une nuance positive de la relation, où l'on peut voir la familiarité amicale s'allier au respect admiratif pour celui qui est ainsi dénommé' (ib. 282; the corresponding discussion in Lardet [1993], p. 104, is less full). J. has accordingly combined a malicious sneer with an unctuous claim to intimacy. The incongruity is in fact less strange than might at first appear: an exact parallel is supplied by J.'s reference to Gregory Nazianzen at *epist.* 52,8,2. There Gregory is introduced with oleaginous self-complacency as *praeceptor quondam meus*; at the same time he is denigrated as a glib and ignorant charlatan.

Chapter 23

The ch. opens with a species of second exordium after the justification of virginity in the central section of the *Libellus* and the enumeration of works dealing with the woes of wedlock and the blessings of virginity at the end of the previous ch. J. now stakes out a claim for originality of approach: unlike these works by other authors his own treatise is not concerned with praise of virginity but instead with its preservation. J. then introduces the theme of seclusion, which extends to the end of ch. 26. It is the first of a series of topics that concern the virgin's general deportment. Just as the first half of the work is devoted principally to the subject of temptation and the ways to combat it, so the second half deals mainly with questions of everyday conduct. In the present ch. the virgin is told to stay indoors for her own safety. Once again J.'s treatment relies heavily on biblical allusion.

23,1

nobis diverso tramite inceditur: virginitatem non efferrimus, sed servamus. J. distinguishes his own work on virginity from the kind of treatment to be found in Tertullian, Cyprian, Damasus and Ambrose (cf. 22,3): his theme is not mere eulogy but the serious business of preserving the virgin's state intact. J. is accordingly repeating the programme he set out at the beginning in ch. 2. Here however he is also making an explicit claim to be original.

What J. says here is imitated by Pelagius at *epist. ad Demetr.* 1 *nobis alio magis itinere pergendum est, quibus propositum est institutionem virginis non laudem scribere.* Similarly *Tractatus Pelagianus* 1,5 p. 12 expresses concern that a virgin should know how to safeguard her condition (*quomodo virginitatis bonum servet*); the author of this treatise notes further that ignorance is widespread and can easily endanger it. J. himself again emphasizes the need for persistence at *epist.* 24,2 and 130,19,6. The virgin had already been passionately urged to persevere by Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 22 *servate, virgines, servate quod esse coepistis.*¹ The same advice is repeated later by Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,19 (*ib. non inchoasse tantum sed perfecisse virtutis est*; like J., he also quotes Mt. 10,22 'he that endureth to the end ...').

¹ Cyprian had also remarked (*epist.* 13,2,1) that greater importance attaches to the preservation of what has already been achieved: *plus est quod adeptus es posse servare.*

For the phrase *virginitatem servare* cf. Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 17; Rufinus, *ymb.* 8; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 9; Augustine, *virg.* 5,5; 7,7; 49,49; 53,54.

nec sufficit scire, quod bonum est, nisi custodiatur adtentius, quod electum est. J. proceeds to amplify his point with a series of impressive formulations (ll. 8–10) and with two quotations from scripture (ll. 11–12). The present argument finds a parallel in Seneca, *epist.* 16,1 *plus operis est in eo ut proposita custodias quam ut honesta proponas.*

illud iudicii est, hoc laboris. The same antithesis had occurred at Hilary, *in psalm.* 14,9 *ut ... iudicium etiam operatio consequatur.* J. observes at *in Matth.* 19,12 l. 817 that chastity has a universal appeal, but account must be taken of the aspirant's stamina.

illud commune cum pluribus, hoc cum paucis. J. repeats this maxim at *epist.* 71,2,1 (*coepisse multorum est, ad calcem pervenisse paucorum*) and *adv. Iovin.* 1,36 (*incipere plurimorum est, perseverare paucorum*). The contrast between the large number of people who find virginity attractive and the few who persevere in its practice is found elsewhere. Origen had remarked that many are drawn by the rewards of chastity and then tire (*comm. in Rom.* 10,5 p. 1255^b). Similarly Ambrose had said that continence was preached to all but embraced by few (*virginit.* 6,29); he notes further that women in labour often declare they are giving up marriage (*ib.* 6,32). Basil had made the same point with reference to the Christian life in general: in *ep.* 173 he states that anyone can choose to live according to the Gospel, but he has heard of few who have been meticulous in actually achieving it. He expresses the same view at *renunt.* 9.

qui perseveraverit usque ad finem. Mt. 10,22 was a popular verse. Cyprian had included it in his collections of texts: *Fort.* 8 (*perseverandum in fide ...*) and *testim.* 3,16 (*de bono martyrii*). J. himself cites it another five times.

multi vocati, pauci autem electi. J. was extremely fond of Mt. 20,16 (= 22,14), which recurs in his *oeuvre* on no fewer than sixteen occasions. The text is glossed at *adv. Iovin.* 1,36: *difficilis res est virginitas et ideo rara.* In the *Libellus* the *pauci* of this text picks up *paucis* in l. 10.

23,2

obtestor te coram deo et Christo Iesu et electis angelis eius. J. opens the series of precepts which constitute the second half of the work with a suitably impressive fullness of expression. Souter (1912), p. 150, compares 1 Tim. 5,21 *testor coram deo et Christo Iesu et electis angelis.* The Hieronymian addition of *eius* to the final element pro-

duces a striking tricolon crescens. J. does not repeat this majestic formulation anywhere else: at *vita Pauli* 6 and *epist.* 108,2,1 he calls only 'Jesus and his holy angels' to witness. *Electi* has just occurred in the line above.

ne vasa templi, quae solis sacerdotibus videre concessum est, facile in publicum proferas. Again biblical allusion is employed to introduce a topic. It is followed by further references to scripture (ll. 15-18) and by an exegetical commonplace (p. 176,1); only then does J. address Eustochium in direct, personal terms (ll. 1-3). This allocution leads in turn to another commonplace (ll. 3-4) and J. then concludes with further scriptural allusion (ll. 4-8). Such an arrangement is characteristic.

J.'s phrase *in publicum proferre* (or one similar) is often used metaphorically in conjunction with 'what is hallowed'. *TLL* VIII, 1757,9ff. (s.v. *mysterium*) furnishes two examples: Lucilius 652 (*ne mysteria efferres foras*) and Porphyrius, *Hor. carm.* 1,18,12f. (*non proferam in publicum mysteria tua*). To these instances can be added the following: Rufinus, *Orig. in num.* 4,3 p. 23,4 (*nec facile proferre ad publicum [sc. vasa sacra, id est mysteriorum sapientiae secreta]*); Ambrose, *Abr.* 1,5,38 (*qui parcus loquendi sit nec sacra in medium feras*); Jerome, *epist.* 84,4,1 (*ut sacra eorum atque mysteria in publicum proferam*). Such a form of expression would seem to have been proverbial; however it is omitted by both Otto and Häussler. In the present passage J. has typically introduced a biblical element with *vasa templi*; here he has possibly been influenced by the text of Origen cited above.² It is also characteristic that J. should have enclosed this proverbial formulation with scriptural citation and allusion (cf. previous and succeeding nn.). Moreover a text of scripture would appear to mark the proverbial expression itself: *solis sacerdotibus* evidently comes from Mt. 12,4 (David entered the house of God and ate the shew-bread *quos non licebat ei edere ... nisi solis sacerdotibus*). Hilberg overlooks all three scriptural allusions.

ne sacrarium dei quisquam profanus inspiciat. No commentator has detected a biblical allusion in these words. J. would seem however to be thinking of 2 Paralip. 26,16 and 18, which record king Uzziah's intrusion into the sanctuary: this monarch's namesake is mentioned by J. in the line below (on *profanus* cf. οὐ σοί ... ἀλλ' ἢ ... τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις in v. 18). There is a slight inconcinnity in the juxtaposition of this allusion with the preceding one (ll. 14f.): the reader has just been warned against taking the vessels outside; now the warning is not to let anyone in.

² Basil (*ep.* 199,18) had called the virgin a sacred vessel that is dedicated to the Lord.

Ozias arcam, quam non licebat, adtingens subita morte prostratus est. The story of Uzzah and his unintentional violation of the Ark's sanctity had been told by Pacian to demonstrate how God watches sinners (*paraen.* 6,3).³ It had also occurred in Gregory Nazianzen: *carm.* 2,1,34,101f.; *or.* 2,93 (ib. 94 sacred vessels); 20,3. J. himself uses it again at *epist.* 147,10,2 (where it warns the seducer Sabinian) and *adv. Pelag.* 1,39.

neque enim aureum vas et argenteum tam carum deo fuit. J. returns after an interruption (ll. 15–17) to the vessels of l. 14; such vessels of precious metal are now said to be worth less to God than the temple of a virgin's body. This kind of argument was something of a commonplace. Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 41) had already lamented the loss of something far more serious than lifeless vessels of gold and silver: instead the spoils are living sacrifices and the very temple itself, which is the virgin's body. Similarly Athanasius had pronounced that the virgin herself is a sacred vessel which none can touch without being defiled like Belshazzar (*Letter to virgins* [Lebon] p. 198,2). Chrysostom tells his addressees that they are far holier than consecrated vessels (*hom. in Eph.* 14,4); the same assurance is given later by Caesarius of Arles at *epist. ad virg.* 2,5,8f. Chrysostom also makes God himself describe how it is not gold and silver vessels but chastity itself that is stolen from his house (*theatr.* 4). The same *a fortiori* argument that J. uses in the present passage is also found in the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 11 p. 691: if Belshazzar's desecration of the sacred vessels was so fatal, then the vessels of our own body, which are God's dwelling-place, require particular safe-keeping.

templum corporis virginalis. The virgin's body had been identified as God's temple by Athanasius, *virg.* 11 (τὸ σῶμά σου ... ἐστὶ ... ναὸς θεοῦ) and Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,18 (cf. Damasus, *car.* 37,8). A virgin herself had been the temple at Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 7,21 (*virgo templum est dei*) and Basil, *ep.* 46,3; cf. Gregory Nazianzen, *car.* 1,2,2,73. The same identification occurs later at Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 6 and Ps.-Chrysostom, *virg. corrupt.* p. 741; cf. Theodoret of Mopsuestia, *Ps.* 44,16^b. The temple is the virgin's soul according to (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *ep.* p. 417^a; it is virginity itself in Athanasius, *virg.* 24. The whole idea would seem to go back to *Acta Pauli et Theclae* 5 μακάριοι οἱ ἀγνήν τὴν σάρκα τηρήσαντες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ναὸς θεοῦ γενήσονται; cf. also 1 Cor. 3,16 ('ye are the temple of God') and 6,19 ('your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost').

³ For the little that can be deduced about the chronology of Pacian's works cf. Rubio Fernández, pp. 14ff.

23.3

praecessit umbra, nunc veritas est. Here J. inserts with much abruptness and some obscurity what turns out to be a very common exegetical *topos*; for a full documentation cf. Adkin (1985). While the evidence adduced there reveals considerable diversity in the way the antithesis is applied, in the present passage the shadow refers to the law, and the truth denotes the Gospel: the old law which prescribed that sacred vessels should be inviolable has been superceded by the Gospel message of virginity. The extremely concise formulation which J. gives to the antithesis here is as usual particularly impressive. It too would seem however to have been borrowed from elsewhere. Similar wording had occurred in Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 22,5 p. 437,15, which is extant in Rufinus' translation (*umbra praecessit et veritas insecurata est*), while it had also been employed by Gregory Nazianzen at *or.* 38,2 (αἱ σκῆαι παρατρέχουσιν, ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐπεισέρχεται); there is a later example in Chrysostom, *Laz.* 6,8 (ἦλθεν ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ παρέδραμεν ἡ σκιά). J. has characteristically added a striking chiasmus.

tu quidem simpliciter loqueris et ignotos quoque blanda non despicias, sed aliter impudici vident oculi. J. suspends his use of biblical allusion and speaks to Eustochium directly: she is kind to strangers, but they may be motivated by lust. Here the 'simplicity' to which he refers is a negative quality. On the other hand simplicity is a virtue in the *Libellus* at 11,2; 19,5; 24,1; 24,4. Regarding J.'s use of the term in the present passage cf. Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 35 (*oculi ... masculinum non simpliciter adspexerunt*); Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,3,34 (*tunc oculus alium simpliciter videt*); *reg. virg.* 23,3 (*quae in virum non simpliciter convertit aspectum*). J.'s own references to 'simplicity' are discussed by Antin (1961d); for the concept in general cf. Bacht.

The same admonition that J. employs here had occurred in a similarly antithetical form at Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 19 *impudice tu neminem conspicias, sed ipsa conspiceris impudice.* Since J. has just mentioned Cyprian's name (p. 175,2), an echo of the *De habitu* would not be surprising: with specific regard to Cicero Kunst, p. 183, n. 5, has drawn attention to J.'s tendency to imitate Ciceronian phraseology in the vicinity of a reference to him by name. While J. is concerned with going out in general, Cyprian is speaking exclusively of baths: however it is not unusual for J. to give a different application to the material he borrows (cf. [e.g.] in the previous ch. but one the n. on *tunc iacobus et iohannes ...* [21,8]). J. has in addition replaced Cyprian's colourless adverb *impudice* with the strikingly concrete phrase *impudici oculi*. This locution would also appear to have been appropriated from elsewhere: J.'s source this time would seem to be Ambrose, who had employed the same arresting formulation, whose prurience was bound to attract J.,

shortly beforehand in a particularly memorable antithesis at *virg.* 2,3,19 *fecit* (sc. Thecla) *ut qui impudicos detulerant oculos pudicos referrent*. J. himself had already made use of the Ambrosian phrase *impudici oculi* several months prior to the publication of the *Libellus* at *virg. Mar.* 20. Its occurrence in the present passage is accordingly another example of a Hieronymian *Selbstzitat* in which the wording at issue has been taken initially from someone else; at the same time J. has just mentioned Ambrose by name (p. 175,3) in a reference to the *De virginibus* that stands next to his mention of Cyprian. No further instance of the collocation *impudici oculi* besides this passage of the *Libellus* is supplied by *TLL* ss.vv. *impudicus* and *oculus*. It is however repeated later at Augustine, *epist.* 211,10 (ib. *impudicus oculus impudici cordis est nuntius*; this entire clause is reproduced by Caesarius of Arles, *reg. virg.* 23,2 and by *Regula Tarnatensis* 18,5). It may also be noted that *impudicus* had been used with *lumina* by Lactantius (*inst.* 1,20,10), while Chrysostom is extremely fond of the collocation ἀκόλαστοι ὀφθαλμοί: *compunct.* 1,3; *comm. in Gal.* 5,6; *exp. in Ps.* 110,6; *hom. in Gen.* 56,1; *hom. in Mt.* 10,6; 17,4; 18,5; 36,3; 41,4; 86,4; *hom. in Jo.* 60,5; *hom. in Ac.* 5,4 (twice); *hom. in 1 Cor.* 7,2 4; *hom. in 2 Cor.* 5,3; 7,6; 15,4; *hom. in Eph.* 13,4; *hom. in Tit.* 2,2; *hom. div.* 6,2; *pan. Bern.* 4; *poenit.* 6,2. J. himself speaks later of *oculi casti* at *epist.* 52,15,1; cf. Evagrius Ponticus, *sent. virg.* 55 παρθένοι ὀφθαλμοί.

non ... animae pulchritudinem ... sed corporum. The striking antithesis between the beauty of the soul and that of the body was a patristic commonplace. It had occurred in Clement of Alexandria (*paed.* 3,2,12,3; cf. ib. 3,1,3,3) and Origen (*or.* 17,2).⁴ In the fourth century it had already been employed by Basil of Ancyra (*virg.* 16) and by Gregory Nazianzen (*or.* 26,11; a particularly impressive example: ἀντιστίλπει τὸ κάλλος τῷ κάλλει, τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς τῷ τοῦ σώματος)⁵. Shortly after the appearance of the *Libellus* the antithesis is found in other western Fathers: Ambrose, *hon. mart.* 7,27; *exhort. virg.* 10,68; *iac.* 2,9,38;⁶ Chromatius of Aquileia, *serm.* 35,1. Chrysostom is extremely fond of it: *anom.* 12,5; *catech.* (Wenger) 5,25; *Eustrap.* 2,17 (where both elements of the antithesis are defined); *exp. in Ps.* 44,11; *hom. in Rom.* 12,20 4; *hom. in 2 Cor.* 11,1 1; *hom. in Eph.* 20,2; *laud. Mar.* 6; it also occurs in the doubtfully genuine *temp.* p. 578.

Ezechias thesaurum dei monstrat. In characteristic fashion J. proceeds to combine a reference to scripture with the arresting

⁴ Philo had used it at *sober.* 12.

⁵ This oration was delivered at Constantinople in 380; cf. Gallay, p. 252. J. was presumably present in the congregation.

⁶ There had been a hint of the antithesis at *virg.* 1,6,30.

commonplace he has just used (cf. previous n.). Here he makes Hezekiah show *thesaurus dei*. In the biblical account however (4 Reg. 20,13) Hezekiah reveals only the contents of his own treasury (ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς αὐτοῦ). Over thirty years later at *adv. Pelag.* 2,22 J. insists that the contents of the temple were also shown: here he quotes the last part of 4 Reg. 20,13 (*in domo et in omni potestate sua*) and draws the following conclusion: *ex quo intellegimus etiam vasa templi Babylonis monstrata legatis*. A similar assertion had been made at *in Is.* 11,39,1 l. 70 *non solum thesauros suos atque palatii, sed templi ostenderit*. Ambrose takes the same view at *in psalm. 118 serm.* 2,27,2 *si divulgaverit Babylonis thesaurum dei*. In the present passage *thesaurum dei* fits the preceding reference to *vasa templi* (p. 175,14; cf. *vasa domini* l. 6) as well as the general moral lesson which J. wishes to inculcate; it may also be noted that in 4 Reg. 18,15 Hezekiah had given to the king of Assyria as tribute πᾶν τὸ ἀργύριον τὸ εὐρεθὲν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου καὶ ἐν θησαυροῖς οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως. The story of Hezekiah's display of his treasures had already been used by Tertullian at *adv. Marc.* 4,15 p. 466,3 and 4,28 p. 519,17; there however it had served as a warning against wealth.

Assyriis. The people to whom Hezekiah shows the treasure at 4 Reg. 20,13 are not Assyrians, but Babylonians (at 4 Reg. 18,14 on the other hand it is the king of Assyria who exacts tribute from him). Here J. is accordingly guilty of a slight error. A collection of his other mistakes in dealing with scripture is provided by Morin (1903), p. viii (add *epist.* 57,1,1 as well as the present passage). J. correctly states at *adv. Pelag.* 2,22 that it was the Babylonians who were shown Hezekiah's treasures. He explicitly distinguishes between Assyrians and Babylonians in reference to the same story at *in Is.* 11,39,1 l. 25 *perspicuum est aliud fuisse tunc regnum Assyriorum et aliud Babyloniorum*. Confusion between Babylonians and Assyrians was widespread: Ps.-Basil, *cons.* p. 1695^A; p. 1696^C; *Is.* 13,272; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 24,10 (on the children in the fiery furnace; cf. *carm.* 1,2,2,179; 2,1,1,8); 25,12; *carm.* 1,1,17,48; Gregory of Nyssa, *mart.* 3 p. 777^B; 3 p. 785^D; *Placill.* p. 881^A; Asterius of Amasea, *hom.* 6,2,1; Augustine, *civ.* 19,24 p. 400,28 (*Babylone Assyriorum*); Paulinus of Nola, *carm.* 9,1 (contrast 9,7); 26,255 (*Assyria ... Babylone*); *epist.* 20,4; Ps.-Chrysostom, *op. imperf. in Matth.* l p. 627; 49 p. 913. Tertullian had referred to the people who saw Hezekiah's treasure as Persians at *adv. Marc.* 4,28 p. 519,18. J. alludes to the confusion again at *in Mich.* 7,8 l. 418 *siquidem Babylon Chaldaeorum fuit civitas, non Assyriorum*. Cf. further the n. on *quorum carnes rex in olla succendit Assyrius* at 4,2 above.

capta atque translata sunt. Harendza, p. 59, notes that here *atque* has been chosen for the sake of the very elegant double cretic clausula, on

which cf. Herron, pp. 27ff.

palma vitiorum. The same striking phrase recurs in *epist.* 127,3,1 and 147,10,3.

Balthasar potat in fialis. J. refers again to Belshazzar's impious feast at *in Hab.* 1,4 l. 72; *in Joel* 3,4 l. 106; *in Is.* 5,21,5 l. 12. In the first two passages he again uses the phrase *potat (-et) in phialis* (LXX has $\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\eta$). The feast had already been adduced as an *a fortiori* warning to the seducer of a virgin at Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 7,27, where the virgin had been described as *templum dei*. Since J. himself has just referred to *templum corporis virginalis* (p. 175,18), Eusebius may have been his immediate source in the present passage. Somewhat later Belshazzar's feast is used once again as a warning example to the violator of a virgin at Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 39; here too the virgin is *a vas rationabile consecratum Christo*.

Chapter 24

The virgin should not be amused by ribald jokes and must set her face against the flattery that geniality encourages. The need for her to renounce the world is expressed in a long series of very charming and picturesque images drawn from both the Old and the New Testaments.

24,1

ne declines aurem tuam in verba mala. Eustochium must avoid obscene conversation. Again J. has used a verse of scripture to introduce a fresh topic: no preparatory remark of any sort precedes. Since the text in question (Ps. 140,4) is itself an injunction, this technique is especially effective here. For the reading *mala* (instead of *malitiae*) cf. (e.g.) the Latin version of Origen, *in 1 reg.* 15; Hilary, *in psalm.* 140,6; Augustine, *virg.* 41,42. In the present passage the word means of course 'obscene'; the sense it is here intended to bear is immediately made clear by *indecens* in the same line. The biblical text has *cor meum* instead of *aurem tuam*; J. has made the modification in order to fit the present context. The phrase *declina aurem tuam* is itself found at Sirach 4,8; the variant form *inclina aurem tuam* is a very common biblical locution (it occurs in the opening words of the *Libellus*, where J. quotes Ps. 44,11). J. is fond of quoting Ps. 140,4, which recurs another half dozen times in his works.

indecens aliquid loquentes. J. deals with the subject of obscenity rather more frequently than others; it is however a reasonably common theme in the Fathers. J. stipulates that the virgin should be unfamiliar with obscene language at *epist.* 107,4,1 and 128,4,1 (*nullum impudicum verbum noverit et, si forte in tumultu familiae discurrentis aliquid turpe audierit, non intellegat*); cf. also *epist.* 108,20,5 and 130,13,1. Ribald conversation is mentioned at Tertullian, *uxor.* 1,8 l. 25 and Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 18. It is wrong to indulge in it according to Clement of Alexandria, *paed.* 2,6,49,1; Ambrose, *virginit.* 13,81; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,8; Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1108; Chrysostom, *educ. lib.* 28. The virgin is told not to listen to it by Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,2,77; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,10; Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1108. We should neither listen nor use it ourselves according to Ambrose, *off.* 1,18,76 and Ps.-Athanasius, v. *Syncl.* 24. Avoidance of it is an effect of conversion in the view of Epiphanius, *anc.* 102,4. It had already been condemned by St. Paul; cf. Eph. 5,4 and Col. 3,8.

temptant mentis arbitrium. J. refers again to this kind of test in *epist.*

130,13,1 *perditae mentes hominum uno frequenter levique sermone temptant claustra pudicitiae*. J. remarks at *epist.* 108,20,5 that indecent language is the mark of a wanton mind.

virgo. This address recurs at 38,7 below: *mi virgo*; cf. *epist.* 117,6,1; 127,1,1 (*Christi*); 130,6,5. *Virgo* is also used in address at Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 6; 22; 24 (*bonae*); Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 9,57; 9,58; 10,70; 10,71; 13,86; *inst. virg.* 9,58; 9,59; 9,60; 9,61; 9,62; 10,66; 13,82 (*sacrae*); 15,93 etc.; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,10; 2,12; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 5; 9; 16. For the Greek equivalent cf. Athanasius, *virg.* 9 ὁ παρθένε. Addressing the recipient was recommended as a way of enlivening the style of a letter; cf. Sykutris, p. 194.

si ad ridicula quaeque solvaris. J. is deeply opposed to laughter. This distaste was shared by the Fathers in general; however none of them condemns the practice with quite the same persistency. For a full documentation of the Hieronymian and patristic evidence cf. Adkin (1984b).¹ The present passage connects laughter with ribald talk (cf. n. on *indecentis aliquid loquentes* above). The two are linked in a number of other passages: Chrysostom says at *stat.* 15,4 that laughter often leads to such obscenity (πολλάκις γοῦν ἀπὸ γέλωτος αἰσχρὰ ῥήματα τίκτεται), while he speaks of dirty jokes at *hom. in Eph.* 14,3 and *hom. in I Cor.* 7,2 1 (αἰσχρὸν ... ῥῆμα καὶ γέλωτος γέμον). J. himself refers to the latter at *in Matth.* 12,36 l. 541 and *in Eph.* 5,3 p. 519^c (*aliqua narrant turpia ut risum moveant*). For J.'s use of *solvi* in the present passage cf. *OLD* s.v. 9; for contemporary examples cf. Augustine, *epist.* 95,2 (*risu ... solvi*) and Prudentius, *perist.* 10,226. Finally for a possible motive for J.'s decision to mention laughter in this particular passage cf. next n.

quidquid dixeris, laudant; quidquid negaveris, negant. These words might seem to be a direct observation from life. In fact however they are an echo of Terence, *Eun.* 251f. which has escaped the notice of previous commentators: *quidquid dicunt laudo; id rursum si negant, laudo id quoque; / negat quis: nego; ait: aio*. It may be observed further that in both Terence and J. these words are immediately preceded by a reference to laughter; J.'s *si ad ridicula quaeque solvaris* (l. 11) corresponds exactly to the Terentian *hisce ego non paro me ut rideant, / sed eis ultro adrideo* (249f.).² J. has however compressed and streamlined Terence's phraseology in order to heighten the rhetorical effect: while the largely pleonastic clauses *id rursum si negant, laudo*

¹ Steidle's treatment is chiefly devotional and based only on a handful of texts.

² At *c. Lucif.* 11 J. refers to a children's game: *parvulorum inter se certantium ritu quidquid dixeris, dicam; affirmabis, affirmabo; negabis, negabo*. This clearly has no connection with what J. says in the present passage.

id quoque and *ait*: *ait* are now omitted, repetition of Terence's *quidquid* introduces a striking anaphora, which is all the more impressive since it matches that of *si* in the first half of the sentence. The result of these modifications is a pair of very succinct and powerful clauses (*quidquid dixeris, laudant; quidquid negaveris, negam*), which evince an exactly parallel structure: while the isocolon is noted by both Hritzu, p. 86. and Harendza, p. 51, they might also have pointed to the polyptoton, the twofold homoeoteleuton and the adhesion to Behaghel's law besides the afore-mentioned asyndetic anaphora.

The initial impression created by J.'s condensed version of this Terentian passage is dazzling. Closer scrutiny however reveals an important defect: the words in question do not fit their new context. In Terence they are spoken by one Gnatho, who is describing how to be an effective sycophant. Whereas the old method had been to entertain with buffoonery, Gnatho now achieves far greater success by simply agreeing to everything his patrons say: *omnia dominis consentiendo* (so the paraphrase given by Eügraphius' commentary on l. 232). Accordingly the Terentian passage is no more than a characterization of the successful parasite. J. on the other hand is talking about indecent language and the appropriate reaction to it. He acknowledges that it is hard for the virgin to turn a deaf ear: if she unbends and is amused by others' jokes, people will like her and say she is 'nice' (*si ad ridicula quaeque solvaris ... facetam vocant et sanctam ...*; ll. 11-13). This argument is perfectly clear and reasonable, if somewhat unremarkable. However J. has intruded into it Terence's arresting description of successful toadyism. While this insertion unquestionably heightens the rhetorical level of the passage, it has no place in it. When J. argues that, if Eustochium laughs at indecent jokes, people will agree with whatever she says, he is really perpetrating a *non sequitur*. The point of such obsequiousness is to make people like the person who practises it. As Eügraphius conveniently paraphrases: *est hominum genus ... quos sectando et consensu his commodando facile in amorem tuum possis inducere* (on l. 244). J. however is describing exactly the opposite situation. He is telling Eustochium how by being relaxed and genial she could make people like *her*; the way in which they could make her like them is irrelevant here. Accordingly Gnatho's brand of mindless toadyism is not *à propos* in the present passage; J.'s argument only becomes properly coherent when it is left out.

It is true that J. speaks later of flattery: *adulatoribus nostris libenter favemus* (ll. 16f.). Here however he is clearly referring to the handsome compliment which immediately precedes this statement: '*ecce vera Christi ancilla ...*' (ll. 13ff.). Only this kind of praise would justify the embarrassed reaction which accompanies the reference to *adultores*

nostris: quamquam nos respondeamus indignos et calidus rubor ora perfundat (ll. 17ff.). J. argues quite properly that flattery of this sort is people's instinctive response to geniality in the virgin: hence it is so hard to resist. However such spontaneous praise of someone who is popular differs radically from the indiscriminate and calculated hypocrisy which J. has imported from Terence. In this connection it is noteworthy that Donatus' commentary on *Eun.* 251 points out how Terence's choice of *quidquid* underlines the absurd and moronic character of Gnatho's sycophancy: *non 'quod dicunt', sed 'quicquid dicunt', id est bene maleve, ut, vel si interclusa fuisset assentatio, non se impediverit, quod contrarium laudaverit.* Terence had used *quidquid* only once. It was noted above that on rhetorical grounds J. deliberately duplicates this expression: he employs it twice within the space of four words. Accordingly J. has not merely taken over a passage which does not fit the context: he has in fact gone out of his way to accentuate its absurdity.

The inconcinnity which J.'s depiction of unconditional toadyism entails is convenient verification that it has been borrowed from elsewhere. At the same time this imperfection is a serious indictment of J.'s compositional method. Here we do not have a case of the author's thought finding natural and spontaneous expression in the language of the classics. Instead J.'s craving for something clever and striking to say has been allowed to get the better of his thought and in consequence has produced an incongruity. There is moreover no need to be surprised (as is Hagendahl [1958], p. 111) that J. should introduce such quotations from classical authors in the same work which describes the oath he swore in his famous dream to stop reading these authors (30,5). The modifications which J. makes to Terence's wording not only enhance its rhetorical effectiveness, but also help to conceal the fact that it is a quotation: in consequence it appears to be a clever and original formulation of J. himself. On the other hand J. might well be thought guilty of inconsistency in going to such lengths to incorporate a rhetorically striking phrase in the very treatise that warns against 'wishing to seem particularly eloquent' (29,6).

vocant ... sanctam. For this flattering title cf. *epist.* 45,3,1 (*dicebar sanctus*) and 45,4,1 (*dominae vocarentur et sanctae*); also *epist.* 39,5,4; 45,4,2; 123,13,3; 125,6,2. Cf. further Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,21,1 (*quis ... nostrum est, quem si ... fatuis adque adulantibus verbis femina una laudaverit, non continuo elatus sit superbia ... ut etiamsi non habeat conscientiam sanctitatis, tamen, quia vel stultorum adulatione aut fortasse errore sanctus esse dicatur, sanctissimum se putabit*); Benedict, *reg.* 4,62 (*non velle dici sanctum, antequam sit*); Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 20,2 (*multi ex comparatione peiorum dicuntur sancti*). A

definition of the word is offered in Rufinus' translation of Origen, *hom. in Lev.* 11,1 p. 447,12 *si qui ... se ipsum devoverit deo, si qui nullis se negotiis saecularibus implicaverit, ... iste merito sanctus appellatur*. The term *sanctus* is used in address at Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,11 (*matres*); in *Luc.* 2,20 (*mulieres*; cf. *vid.* 6,34 [*feminae*; so *virg.* 3,6,31]); *obit. Valent.* 38 (*animae*; so 64); 40 (*filiae*; so also Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 1,3); 52 (*pater*); *vid.* 2,13 (*viduae*); 14,87 (*virgines*; so *virg.* 1,8,51; 2,4,27; 2,6,39; Augustine, *serm.* 161,12; 184,2; Ps.-Jerome, *epist.* 42 p. 291^c); *virg.* 1,3,10 (*soror*; so 3,1,1; 3,7,32); *Collectio Avellana* 25,3 (*domine*; so 27,2). For the Greek equivalent cf. (e.g.) Origen, *Cels.* 4,1 ἱερὲ Ἀμβρόσιε (so 5,1; 6,1; 7,1; 8,76; *et passim*).

in qua nullus sit dolus. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, identified these words as a quotation of Jn. 1,47, where Christ says of Nathaniel: *ecce vere Israhelita, in quo dolus non est* (cf. J.'s *ecce vera Christi ancilla* in the same line). As was the case with the preceding citation of Terence (cf. n. on *quidquid dixeris, laudant ...* above), what at first sight appears to be observation from life turns out to come straight from a literary source: this time it is scripture. The fact that J. puts a biblical reference into the mouths of ordinary people who are simply describing someone they like would seem to shed more light on his own compositional technique than on the everyday speech of the period: again J.'s object would seem to have been simply to heighten the rhetorical level of the passage. Here at least the formulation is not at odds with the point which J. wishes to convey. He reports on a number of occasions that the charge of deceit and imposture was commonly made against ascetics (*epist.* 38,5,2 *si tunica non canduerit, statim illud e trivio: 'impostor et Graecus est'*; 45,2,1; 54,2,2; 54,5,2); hence *dolus* is the *mot juste*.

It turns out therefore that lines 11–13 contain a quotation from the classics and a quotation from the Bible in two directly adjacent sentences. Combination of scriptural and classical citations is a recurrent feature of J.'s style. The trait was noted by Hagendahl (1958), p. 302: 'The Bible and the Classics are J.'s two sources of inspiration, and it is not unusual to find both of them quoted in the same passage'. He then proceeds to define the purpose of these combinations as being 'so to speak to give double evidence'; cf. p. 155 'to give full evidence, to evoke the impression of a kind of *consensus omnium* on this or that point'. Hagendahl also commends J. for his 'unprejudiced attitude' in quoting impartially from both scripture and secular literature: this lack of prejudice sets him apart from other Christian writers (p. 303). Antin (1960) too has discussed J.'s habit of combining the classics and the Bible. Here he sees 'un double loyalisme': J. is striving to build a

bridge between classical culture and the new message of Christianity (p. 58).

It may be questioned whether the explanations given by Hagendahl and Antin are applicable in the present instance. The theory that J. intends to present 'double evidence' or perform a bridge-building function demands that each reference should be clearly recognizable as a quotation. Such is not however the case in this passage, where neither Terence nor the Bible is cited verbatim. Here the language of the *Eunuch* has been deliberately modified in order to enhance the rhetorical impact: J.'s aim would appear to have been simply to impress the reader with the brilliance of a formulation which is intended to look like the writer's own. Whereas direct quotation would merely have allowed J. to appear well-educated, such covert appropriation enables him to give the impression of being supremely creative. Combination with a biblical echo doubles the impact. It would seem therefore that this juxtaposition of Terence, *Eun.* 251f. with Jn. 1,47 is to be seen as merely one more example of J.'s ubiquitous habit of combining scripture with any sort of arresting formulation that has been borrowed from elsewhere: the source in question may be pagan, but is more usually patristic. There can accordingly be no question of ideological 'bridge-building' here.³

ecce vera Christi ancilla. These words continue the reminiscence of Jn. 1,47 (cf. previous n.); here J.'s *ecce vera ...* is inspired by the biblical *ecce vere Israelita* (ἴδε, ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης). Since Hilberg failed to recognize the source, it might be thought that his reading *vera* should be changed to *vere*, which is in fact found in the majority of the MSS he uses. However the reading *verus* was also current in versions of Jn. 1,47: J. himself employs it at (e.g.) in *Ezech.* 40,1 l. 193. On the other hand when J. wrote the *Libellus*, he had just finished his revision of the Gospels, where we find *vere*: perhaps it should therefore be preferred here after all.

The title *Christi ancilla* is given by J. to a number of his female associates: Lea (*epist.* 23,2,2; on this passage cf. Laurence [1997b]); Eustochium (*epist.* 31,3,3); Fabiola (*epist.* 77,2,3); the younger Paula

³ Since J.'s citation of Jn. 1,47 resembles his reference to *Eun.* 251f. in not being verbatim, Klostermann, who detected the scriptural echo, follows his identification with a question mark. The reminiscence has also been generally ignored in annotated editions which have appeared subsequently (it is however recorded by Bauer [1983], p. 173). Such doubt would seem to be dispelled by the recognition that here we have yet another case of J.'s juxtaposition of scripture with a striking second-hand phrase. This biblical citation continues into the immediately succeeding *sermocinatio*: a similar combination of scripture and plagiarism likewise marked the opening of J.'s earlier instance of the same rhetorical figure (13,3).

(*epist.* 107,13,6); the elder Paula (*epist.* 108,6,3); Hedybia (*epist.* 122,1,1); Paula and Eustochium (*Dichym. spir. praef.*). It had already occurred in Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 3,3 and Zeno 1,14,6; cf. also Augustine, *epist.* 211,14; Philip, *in lob rec. long.* 40 p. 789^A; Amobius Junior, *ad Greg.* 18 p. 422,10 (an adaptation of Gal. 1,10 *Christi servus non essem*); Patrick, *epist.* 7; Victor of Vita 1,30. J. uses *ancilla dei* (instead of *Christi*) at *epist.* 11,2 and 108,18,3. This collocation had been widely used by Tertullian: *cult. fem.* 1,4 l. 12; 2,1 l. 2; 2,3 l. 4; 2,11 l. 14; *uxor.* 2,6 l. 1. It is specifically qualified as a complimentary title for the virgin at Ps.-Augustine, *sabr.* 2 p. 1109. Both forms were evidently in popular use: cf. Diehl, III, p. 320 s.v. *ancilla*. They were presumably inspired by Lk. 1,38 *ancilla domini*.

tota simplicitas. J. notes that 'simplicity' is a compliment paid to the compliant at *epist.* 117,6,3 *omnes te, cum aliquid eorum, quae suadent, retractans feceris, puram, simplicem, dominam et vere ingenuam conclamabunt*. It was certainly a term of approbation; cf. *Inscriptiones christianae Diehl* 3977^c *Iulia ... virgo, annima simp(lex)*. Cf. further Antin (1961d) and Bacht. For the particular form of expression which J. employs here (*tota simplicitas*) cf. Ambrose, *sacr.* 1,3,10 *ubi tota innocentia, ubi tota pietas, tota gratia, tota sanctificatio*.

illa horrida, turpis, rusticana, terribilis. For the asyndetic συναθροισμός of epithets cf. (e.g.) Terence, *Ad.* 866 *ego ille agrestis, saevos, tristis, parvus, truculentus, tenax*; J.'s concluding *terribilis* also achieves an effective αὔξησις. On the reproach of *rusticitas* cf. *epist.* 14,11,2 *tunc tu rusticanus ... exultabis*. As in the present passage, 'rusticity' and 'simplicity' are contrasted by J. himself at *epist.* 57,12,4 (cf. 27,1,2). On the other hand J. combines the two at *epist.* 27,1,3; 49,13,5; 52,9,3; 61,3,4; 133,11,2; *in Os.* 2,13 l. 285; *in Ion.* 3,6 l. 209 D.; *vir. ill. praef.*; *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 74 l. 29; cf. also Augustine, *cur. mort.* 12,15 (*simpliciter rusticanus*) and Cassian, *conf.* 10,34 (*simplicitate rusticitatis*). Basil of Ancyra had observed at *virg.* 53 that it is better if a virgin is unsociable and can put up with being called rude.

While the present *sermocinatio* opened with an echo of scripture (l. 13), the rest of it would not seem to have been inspired by any identifiable source. It therefore apparently presents the same amalgam of literary imitation and observation from life as the earlier one (13,3) which also described the opponents of J.'s brand of rigorous asceticism.

24,2

adulatoribus nostris libenter favemus. J. later warns Rusticus not to believe flatterers (*epist.* 125,18,1). The same precept occurs in Ambrose, *off.* 1,42,218 *prospiciendum etiam ne adulantibus aperiamus*

aurum. Sulpicius Severus agrees with J.'s statement in the present passage that it is very hard to resist (*dial.* 1,21,1). The subject would appear to have received relatively little attention from the Fathers.

intrinsecus anima laetatur. Cf. Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 21 *saepe adulantium resistimus verbis ad faciem et in secreto mentis favemus*. J. warns against vainglory at 27,4 below.

sponsa Christi arca est testamenti. After dealing briefly with the subjects of indecency and flattery J. proceeds to urge the virgin to shut herself off from the world. This exhortation consists entirely of scriptural allusion: five separate biblical passages are evoked. The application given to each one can be paralleled; however the density of allusion makes J.'s treatment unique.

The ark of the covenant was mentioned in the previous ch. (23,2); there too it had stood for the virgin. At *adv. Iovin.* 1,20 the ark symbolizes the superiority of virginity, since it is made of pure gold. On the other hand it is the church at *in Math. prol.* 1. 25. As guardian of the law, the ark is deposited in ourselves according to *in Eph.* 2,19 p. 476^B.

The figurative interpretation which J. applies to the ark in the present passage had not been without parallel. Gregory of Nyssa had already identified the man of God as the ark with its divine mysteries inside (*Melet.* p. 856^C);⁴ similarly at *laud. Bas.* p. 812^A Gregory had said that the tables of the covenant are lodged in the soul and that each man's heart thereby becomes an ark. In the saints the ark had been *mundi intellegibilis imitatrix imago* according to Ambrose, *Noe* 7,16. It had been equated with the memory by Origen (*hom. in Ex.* 9,4 p. 242,17).

Shortly after the publication of the *Libellus* the ark is again identified with the virgin at Bachiarus, *epist.* 2 p. 298,20 *arca corporis tui*; likewise Proclus of Constantinople states that the ark overlaid with gold without and within is the virgin sanctified in body and spirit (*or.* 6,17). On the other hand Maximus of Turin makes the ark Mary, since she bore the heir of the covenant (42,5; so Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *annunt.* 1 p. 1152^D; 3 p. 1173^D). The ark is the heart with its library of books in Bachiarus, *epist.* 1 p. 293,7; similarly Cassian observes at *conf.* 14,10,2 that meditation on the scriptures turns the mind into an ark.

extrinsecus et intrinsecus deaurata. The detail is very much in point: the preceding sentence has *intrinsecus* (l. 1) and the succeeding one *ex-*

⁴ The sermon was delivered in May 381 at Constantinople; cf. Daniélou (1955), pp. 358f. J. was there at the time.

trinsecus (ll. 4f.).

nihil aliud ... nisi tabulae testamenti. Fremantle, p. 32, compares 3 Reg. 8,9 οὐκ ἦν ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ πλὴν δύο πλάκες λίθιναι, πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης.

nullus sit extrinsecus cogitatus. In contrast to 6,6 above the thoughts here are not sexual but social. Thinking of nothing but the Lord is a blessing of deafness at *epist.* 39,2,6.

super hoc propitiatorio quasi super cherubim sedere vult dominus. In typically striking and picturesque fashion J. uses scripture to express his thought: Eustochium is the mercy-seat on which the Lord sits (cf. Exod. 25,22 *loquar ad te supra propitiatorio scilicet ac medio duorum cherubin qui erunt super arcam testimonii*; the Lord is often said to 'sit on the cherubim', e.g. at Ps. 79,2 *qui sedes super cherubin*). Here the idea proceeds naturally from the foregoing description of the virgin as the ark of the covenant. It is in any case less bizarre than might at first appear: the notion of the Lord 'sitting on' a human being is in fact quite common.

J. himself employs this concept frequently. At *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 170 l. 100 the cherubim are abundance of knowledge and whoever possesses it is the seat on which God sits. Christ is said to mount us at *in Am.* 6,12 l. 476 (ib. Ps. 67,5 *iter facite ei qui ascendit super occurrum*). Christ mounts his apostles at *in Hab.* 3,14 l. 1075 (on Habakkuk 3,15 [LXX] *superduxisti in mari equos tuos*; cf. already Eusebius of Caesarea, Ps. 45,2). In addition the Lord 'sits on' people at *in Zach.* 14,15 l. 573 and *in Matth.* 21,4 l. 1205; the soul is sat on at *in Matth.* 21,6 l. 1217. It is God who mounts us at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 52 l. 82. Finally in *epist.* 79,9,5 the Holy Spirit does the sitting.

The idea had also occurred with considerable frequency in Origen (the two passages from *tract. in psalm.* cited above may also be by him). In his exegesis of Mt. 21,2ff. (Christ's entry into Jerusalem) he makes ass and colt the Jews and gentiles: Christ sits on them (*comm. in Mt.* 16,16 p. 526,30; 16,17 p. 534,13; cf. *hom. in Lc.* 37 p. 210,15). At *hom. in Lc.* 37 p. 212,6 Origen asks which of us is so fortunate that Jesus should sit upon him. In addition he notes that those souls are blessed which stoop their backs to let the Word of God sit on them (*Cont.* 2 p. 153,10). The Word of God is also said to sit on the flesh at *comm. in Rom.* 10,14 p. 1274^c.

A number of later examples can be adduced where the reference is again to Mt. 21,2ff.; in this connection it may be noted that in the present passage of the *Libellus* J. himself refers to Christ's entry into Jerusalem in the following sentence (*mittit discipulos suos, ut in pullo asinae ...*; cf. next n.). Thus Augustine tells his audience that the Lord sits on them as on the foal of an ass (*in psalm.* 33, *serm.* 2,5). The same

thing happens in *Collectio Ariana*, hom. 11,3 and Ps.-Titus of Bostra, palm. 12(7); cf. Nilus of Ancyra, ep. 2,81 (he sits on the mind).

There are also further instances where the idea is used independently of this Matthean text. In a reference to the beasts beside the manger Augustine makes the Lord sit on people at *serm.* 189,4 and 190,3. In (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt the heavenly driver mounts us at *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 9,3,8; cf. *hom. typ. II* (Dörries-Klostermann-Kroeger) 23,2 (the soul is mounted). Finally Chrysostom states at *hom. in Rom.* 20,1 that God does not refuse to 'sit on our bodies', while at *fem. reg.* 9 he describes how like the Cherubim a virgin becomes the king's chariot; here the king is of course Christ. Cf. further Smit (of the passages adduced above he mentions Origen, *Comm.* 2 p. 153,10; Jerome, *in Hab.* 3,14 l. 1075; *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 52 l. 82).

24,3

ut in pullo asinae curis te saecularibus solvant. Ch. 24,3-6 is cited by Schade (1910), p. 10, as an example of J.'s habit of emphasizing the points he makes by couching them in biblical language that is adapted to his addressee.

J. says the ass was fastened 'with many bonds of sin' at *in Matth.* 21,1 l. 1184. Similarly Origen had pronounced that ass and colt (viz. Jews and gentiles) were tethered by sin and ignorance (*fr. in Mt.* 407; cf. *comm. in Mt.* 16,15 p. 523,28); at *hom. in Lc.* 37 p. 211,10 he interprets the passage to mean that Christ wishes to free us from sin's bonds. On this use of *in* cf. *TLL* VII,1, 787,72ff.

paleas et lateres Aegypti derelinquens. In the opening ch. of the *Libellus* the virgin had been urged to leave her country; in the final one she escapes from Pharaoh and crosses the Red Sea in safety. In the centre of the work she is now exhorted to 'abandon the straw and bricks of Egypt'. Here Hilberg compared Exod. 1,14 (τῷ πλῶ καὶ τῇ κλινθείῳ). 'Straw' and 'bricks' however are specifically mentioned at Exod. 5,7 (ἄχυρον ... εἰς τὴν κλινθουργίαν) and 5,16 (ἄχυρον ... κλινθόν). The tropological interpretation which J. gives to this episode was very widely used. J. himself says that we are the ones who have been making the bricks at *epist.* 121,8,21 and *in Mich.* 6,3 l. 135; cf. *in Mich.* 7,18 l. 716. The same application is found in *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 78 l. 95. At *in Nah.* 3,13 l. 595 J. reports the identification of the clay as the body and the straw as the world: the soul is stuck in them. We are said to have left Egypt at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 78 l. 89; this is a spiritual Egypt according to *in Eph.* 6,1 p. 539^B.

As in the present passage of the *Libellus*, the Christian also abandons brick-making in Egypt on numerous other occasions outside J.; there is a slight variation in the particular tropological application

that is made: Origen, *hom. in Ex.* 1,5 p. 151,9 (the world's works); 3,3 p. 167,3; Ambrose, *Abr.* 2,9,65; Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 120; *or.* 1,3; 44,15 (sin and the frailness of the flesh; cf. Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,52); Chrysostom, *hom. in Heb.* 20,3 (the Devil's service and futile effort); Augustine, *serm.* 352,6 (earthly works); Theodotus of Ancyra, *hom.* (Aubineau [1969]) 7,4 (pleasure); cf. also the following (where the specific idea of 'abandonment' is absent): Origen, *hom. in Is.* 5,3 p. 267,5; Gaudentius, *serm.* 1,18 (bondage to unclean spirits); Augustine, *serm.* 8,17.

Already Philo had identified Egypt as the body (*agric.* 88). Origen had pronounced that enslavement to the Egyptians means subjection to fleshly vices and demons (*hom. in Gen.* 16,2 p. 137,15). Later Cassian describes how Egyptians of the mind oppress with hard and muddy work the true Israel, which is the monk (*conf.* 21,28,3). Two final passages may be noted: in Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira) the bricks are silly thoughts mixed with carnal weakness (*tract.* 7,5), while they are an earthly and wicked way of life according to (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 11,2,2.

Moyseu sequaris in heremo. On 'following Moses' cf. Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 1,7 p. 295,23 *secutus es Moyseu, praecepta scilicet et mandata legis observans.*

terram repromissionis introcas. J. is fond of saying that people 'enter the promised land': *epist.* 39,5,1; 54,11,2; 77,7,3; 78,2,3; 130,19,6. He is not alone; cf. Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 4,1 p. 309,10; *hom. in Num.* 27,12 p. 279,14; Gregory Nazianzen, *ep.* 120; Gaudentius, *serm.* 7,23; *Apophthegmata patrum* 142 (Nau [1908], p.49); Cassian, *conf.* 3,10,5; (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. II* (Dörries-Klostermann-Kroeger) 25,6; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,52 (in the mind); 3,156; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 100,12. Origen had described how the soul leaves the Egypt of this life to do so (*hom. in Num.* 27,4 p. 260,28); he had identified the promised land as the blessedness of perfection at *hom. in Jos.* 4,4 p. 312,15.

nemo sit, qui prohibeat. The kin mentioned (*mater, soror, cognata, germanus*) fit Eustochium, her father being dead. Her sisters and brother all married. In *epist.* 54,6,1 J. warns against *insidias adfinium ac pium parentis errorem.*

non mater. Sixteen years later Eustochium's mother Paula is told that she can make up in her grand-daughter what she omitted in her daughter (*epist.* 107,13,3). Earlier in the same letter (5,2) J. reports that Eustochium's aunt Praetextata tried to override Paula's will in the matter of her daughter's ascetic vocation. It might however be supposed that J.'s warning here is mainly intended as having a general

application. A short time earlier Ambrose had noted that a large number of virgins were hindered by their mothers, even when the latter were widows (*virg.* 1,10,58); cf. Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 60,24 'elle n'entraîne en contestation avec ses relations qu'en ce qui concernait le genre de vie seulement'. On the other hand J. says at *epist.* 54,2,2 that he will not divide a daughter from her mother. Finally it may be noted that in the present passage J.'s admonition leads up to a very striking conceit (*dominus te necessariam habet*); his earlier reproach to Paula at 20,1 (*quid invides, mater, filiae?*) was also a preliminary to a similar conceit (*socrus dei esse coepisti*). Perhaps therefore literary considerations have in both cases played a greater role than genuine concern about Paula's commitment to asceticism.

non soror. Eustochium had three sisters. Blesilla is described as *proposito minor* at 15,1 above: she had already married and been widowed. Rufina was planning to marry when her mother left for the East the following year (*epist.* 108,6,3). Finally Paulina married Pammachius. J. again warns Eustochium not to be like her sisters at 24,6 below: *sorores tuae cursitent*.

cognata. This was Eustochium's aunt Praetextata, sister-in-law of her father and presumably related to Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, the pagan consul designate of 384. She tried to interest Eustochium in fashionable hair-styles (*epist.* 107,5,2).

germanus. Eustochium's brother Toxotius married the daughter of a pagan, probably Publilius Caeionius Caecina Albinus.

dominus te necessariam habet. The enumeration of the members of Eustochium's family is capped in very striking fashion by citation of scripture: Mt. 21,3 and Lk. 19,34 (*dominus eum [sc. pullum asinae] necessarium habet*). J. thereby reverts to the subject of ll. 6f., where Eustochium had already been identified with the colt of the ass; its unfettering was deliverance from worldly cares. Mt. 21,3 and Lk. 19,34 are used again at *in Is.* 14,53,12 l. 21; there it is the gentiles that 'the Lord hath need of'. In the present passage the antecedent reference to family suggests that J. also intends a characteristic pun on the two meanings of *necessarius*: 'necessary' and 'relation, friend'; for the latter cf. (e.g.) Cicero, *Lael.* 74 *eos habere necessarios, quos ... dilexerunt*. Such a word-play makes the climax of this sentence even more effective. Perhaps the same play is imitated by Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 23,9 *frater necessarius*.

flagella Pharaonis. J. returns to the theme of the exodus from Egypt (ll. 7-9), which was interrupted by his reversion to the topic of the colt on which Jesus entered Jerusalem (l. 10); in this passage the two themes are interwoven (it may be noted that *dimittere* in the next line is

common to both; cf. Exod. 5,1 and Mt. 21,3). Pharaoh is mentioned again at 41,1 below. His scourges recur at *in Is.* 17,63,17 l. 45 and *in Jer.* 6,37,10.

illa, quae scripta sunt. This rather unliterary way of referring to the ten plagues utilizes a form of abbreviation to which J. is partial: it recurs at *epist.* 52,2,2; *in Is.* 5,14,28 l. 14; 9,30,1 l. 57. Origen uses it with great frequency: *hom. in Num.* 9,7 p. 64,18 (*prophetasse ... illa quae scripta sunt*); 11,4 p. 84,20; *hom. in Jud.* 5,4 p. 494,11; *comm. ser. in Mt.* 1 p. 1,19; 135 p. 281,2; *comm. in Mt.* 12,4 p. 75,15 (ἐλέγετε ὅσα γέγραπται); *Jo.* 10,23,133; *comm. in Rom.* 1,19 p. 869^C; 8,2 p. 1161^D. Elsewhere this form of expression is surprisingly rare: it evidently distinguishes the scholar from the mere belletrist.

24,4

Jesus ingressus templum. J. now evokes at some length Christ's cleansing of the temple; only in the third clause of the third sentence is the relevance to the virgin made explicit (*in pectore virginali*; l. 17). Origen had identified the temple as the soul, while the buyers and sellers were evil thoughts (*comm. in Mt.* 16,23 p. 555,18); at *Jo.* 10,34,221 he had said that this incident shows God will not have anything alien to his will in men's souls. Similarly Hilary had observed that it is our preoccupation with worldly business which turns the house of God into a house of merchandise (*in psalm. 118 zade* 3 p. 516,18; *ib.* 1 Cor. 6,19 'your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost'). J. himself refers to the story again at *epist.* 125,20,4; *in Is.* 9,28,5 l. 76; 15,56,8 l. 36.

deus enim zelotes est et non vult domum patris fieri speluncam latronum. J. makes an abrupt transition from the *Jesus* of the previous sentence to *deus*. As the passage stands, there is also a certain incongruity between the 'jealous God' and *domum patris*: the sentence inevitably reads as if the *pater* were God's own father. Here J. has combined Exod. 34,14 (θεὸς ζηλωτὴς ἐστίν) with Jn. 2,16 (*nolite facere domum patris mei domum negotiationis*). Hilberg refers only to Mt. 21,13, which like the other Gospels (Mk. 11,17 and Lk. 19,46) has *domus mea domus orationis vocabitur; vos autem fecistis eam speluncam latronum*. The *mea* of these versions, when appropriately altered to *sua*, might have avoided the inconsistency. J. however has taken over this combination of Exodus and John texts from Origen, *Jo.* 10,34,221 (ὁ Jn. 2,17 ὁ ζηλωτὸς τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφέρεται με) ζηλοῖ ... ὁ Χριστὸς τὸν ἐν ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἅτε θεοῦ ζηλωτοῦ υἱὸς ἄν. Unlike his source, J. has not troubled to harmonize the two. There is a similar inconcinnity in the combination of scriptural texts at 26,2 below (*esto cum sponsa, quia, si ... oraveris patrem tuum*,

veniet et pulsabit; Mt. 6,6 and Apoc. 3,20); cf. also 25,6 (*ab sponso ... de thalamo meo*; an explication of Cant. 1,8).

ubi sunt caveae columbarum et simplicitas enecatur. Origen had made doves a symbol of airy and frivolous thoughts (*Jo.* 10,24,142). For the connection with simplicity cf. Mt. 10,16 *estote ... simplices sicut columbae*.

ubi in pectore virginali saecularium negotiorum cura aestuat. J. refers the cleansing of the temple to our inner selves at *in Math.* 21,12 l. 1352 (ad loc.): in the house of our breast there can be no buying and selling nor desire for gifts. Similarly Origen had said that Jesus upsets the tables in the miser's soul (*Jo.* 10,23,137; cf. Ps.-Titus of Bostra, *palm.* 13[7]). Ambrose reproduces the collocation *saecularium negotiorum cura* at *in psalm. 118 serm.* 8,3. J.'s own clause produces an elegant tricolon *crescens*.

velum templi scinditur. In characteristic manner J. concludes his impressive evocation of the cleansing of the temple with two further Gospel texts. The first is the rending of the temple-veil (Mt. 27,51 etc.); the inclusion of this text has evidently been prompted by the *Stichwort* 'temple'. It had already been employed in a similarly picturesque metaphor at *epist.* 14,9,3: there J. had told Heliodorus that it is hard to match those who already reign with Christ, for an angel could come and 'rend the veil of his temple'. According to Origen the rending signified the revelation of scripture (*fr. in Lc.* 151). Dumortier (1949), p. 251, is wrong to assert that the present passage of the *Libellus* imitates Chrysostom, *fem. reg.* 1; here we simply have a self-imitation in the author's manner from *epist.* 14.

relinquetur vobis domus vestra deserta. Christ's judgment on Jerusalem (Mt. 23,38 etc.) is a text of which J. is exceedingly fond: he cites it almost thirty times. Origen had applied it to the sinner's soul at *comm. ser. in Mt.* 28 p. 54,8. In the present passage the text creates a very apt and effective climax to J.'s treatment of the cleansing of the temple.

24,5

lege evangelium et vide. J. introduces the last of the present series of scriptural episodes with an arresting twofold imperative. As is to be expected from a biblical scholar of such eminence, J. frequently tells his reader to look up a particular passage of scripture; this kind of injunction is also characteristic of the unusual vivacity of his style. As here, J. often adds 'and you will see' or a similar phrase. In the letters alone such a combination is found at 36,5,1 (*relege Lucam evangelistam et invenies ...*); 46,12,1 (*lege Apocalypsin Iohannis et ... contuere ...*); 48,3,2 (*lege ... apostoli verba ... et tunc videbis ...*);

48,4,2; 49,13,5; 52,9,3; 54,6,4; 61,2,5; 70,3,2; 72,4,2; 106,67,3; 129,5,2. It occurs intermittently elsewhere: Irenaeus 4,34,1 (SC 100⁺⁺, *legite ... prophetas et inuenietis ...*); Asterius the Sophist, *hom.* (Richard) 12,5 (ἀνάγνωθι τὸ τέλος τοῦ ψαλμοῦ καὶ εὐρήσεις ...); Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 5,39,2 (*lege Esaiam, vide ...*); Severian of Gabala, *serp.* 10; Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Jo.* 7,15 3 (ib. Jn. 5,39 'search the scriptures'); *hom. in Mt.* 26,39 p. 755; *hom. in Ps.* 83 2; Evagrius Gallicus, *altrerc.* p. 52,4; Quodvultdeus, *haer.* 6,19; Julian of Eclanum, *epit. in psalm.* 88. However J.'s fondness for this kind of exhortation is matched only by Augustine. Like J. in the present passage, Augustine has *lege evangelium et vide ...* at *in euang. loh.* 17,15; *c. Iulian.* 6,19,60; *serm.* 155,3; 301,4; 3351,5 *RBen* 62, 1952 p. 107,86. He says 'read and see' (or something similar) at *c. Cresc.* 2,13,16 (*primam ad Corinthios epistulam lege et inuenies ...*); *epist.* 55,17; 111,4 (*lege ... precem Danihelis et vide ...*); *in euang. loh.* 3,19; 10,2; 80,3; *c. Faust.* 32,12; *grat.* 21,42; *c. Iulian. op. imperf.* 2,77; 3,67; *c. Petil.* 2,104,239; *in psalm.* 32, *serm.* 2,29; *in psalm.* 51,14; *serm.* 14,4; 251,3. At 40,3 below Eustochium is also told to read (*lege*) 2 Cor. *Martha, sollicita es.* J. does not quote Lk. 10,41 anywhere else.

esto et tu Maria. For the very striking identification of the reader with a biblical figure cf. Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 20,6 *meminerimus te ... Petrum nobis esse factum*; Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom.* 10 p. 40 καὶ σὺ Μαρία ὑπήρχες ἕως οὗ τὴν παρθευεῖαν διεφύλαττες. J. uses the device again at 38,3 below: *potes et tu esse mater domini.*

cibus praeferto doctrinam. The biblical account does not mention food (Lk. 10,40 *Martha ... satagebat circa frequens ministerium*). The assumption that a feast was involved is however made in a number of later passages: Ambrose, *hex.* 5,24,91; Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 2,7,5; Augustine, *serm.* 352,7 (cf. J.'s *convivium* in l. 3). Augustine produces a similar conceit to J.'s at *serm.* 103,3 *Martha dominum pascere disponens ... occupabatur; Maria ... pasci a domino magis elegit.*

24,6

sorores tuae cursitent. Since Mary and Martha were sisters (cf. Lk. 10,39), the reference to Eustochium's own sisters can be made with perfect aptness. Blesilla was an example of *molestiae nuptiarum* at 15,1 above; Eustochium has just been told at 24,3 not to let her sisters impede her ascetic resolve.

Christum hospitem habeant. The picturesque idea that the Christian can 'have Christ as his guest' is one that understandably appeals to J., who repeats the phrase *Christum hospitem habere* at *in Is.* 17,60,5 l. 11 and *in Matth.* 12,44 l. 616. It is also found in *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 107 l. 141; if this work is by Origen, J. has evidently taken the idea from him.

At *in Hab.* 3,6 l. 398 J. uses somewhat different wording (*hospitium Christi*); cf. *tract. in psalm.* l p. 54 l. 153. He also makes God the 'guest' at *in Ezech.* 36,16 l. 957; *lib.* 13 *praef.* l. 40; 47,19 l. 1469; *in Mich.* 1,3 l. 113. The idea of Christ as our guest recurs later at Cassian, *inst.* 5,21,5; Paulinus of Périgueux, *Marr.* 5,84; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 187,3. Cf. also Mt. 25,35 *hospes eram et collexistis me.*

saeculi onere prolecto. Eustochium is again urged to reject worldly things at 27,6; 39,1; 41,5 (cf. 21,8). At *epist.* 145,4 J. uses the expression *proice sarcinam saeculi* (cf. his rendering of Orsiesius, *doctr.* 27 *saeculi sarcinam deposuerunt*). He uses *sarcina carnis* in *epist.* 14,10,2; at *epist.* 39,1,5 the phrase refers to death.

Inveni eum, quem quaerebat anima mea. J. now introduces two citations from Canticles: they form a charming dialogue between Eustochium and her divine spouse. In this way J. indicates the reward accompanying that renunciation of the world which the bulk of the present ch. has been concerned to inculcate. The two texts accordingly provide a marvellously effective climax.

The first text is Cant. 3,4, which had a strong appeal for J., who cites it another nine times. The same verse had already been used by Athanasius (*Letter to virgins* [Lebon] p. 203,8) and Ambrose (*virg.* 1,8,46; *virginit.* 13,77; 13,78; cf. later *inst. virg.* 17,111).

una est columba mea, perfecta mea; una est matri suae, electa generitrici suae, caelesti videlicet Hierusalem. Cant. 6,8 recurs at *epist.* 65,15,3; 65,20,3; 123,11,3 (of the church). Here J. identifies the bride's mother as the heavenly Jerusalem. Hilberg compares Heb. 12,22 *accessistis ad ... civitatem dei viventis Hierusalem caelestem*. Fremantle, p. 32, had also referred to Gal. 4,26 *illa autem quae sursum est Hierusalem libera est, quae est mater nostra*. J. has just told Eustochium not to be put off by her own mother (24,3).

Chapter 25

J. continues with his treatment of the subject of seclusion: Eustochium must stay indoors. The theme is developed by means of extensive citation from *Canticles*.¹ Jesus is depicted as the jealous lover who wants to keep his bride for himself. The tone of this ch. is highly erotic.

25,1

semper te cubiculi tui secreta custodiant. J. notes approvingly on a number of other occasions how female ascetics keep to one room: *epist.* 23,3,3 (Lea) *quam unius cubiculi secreta vallabant*; 24,3,1 (Asella) *unius cellulae clausa angustiis*; *ib.* 4,1 *ita se ... intra cubiculi sui secreta custodit, ut numquam pedem proferret in publicum* (cf. 108,29,2). According to Chrysostom (*laud. Max.* 7) it was the custom for virgins of the period to sit in their chamber continuously.

semper tecum sponsus ludat intrinsecus. J. characteristically introduces a prurient element. For the sexual connotations of *ludere* cf. Adams, pp. 162f.; J. had used the word in this sense at 8,4 above (*ib. libido*). Here the word sets the salacious tone of the passage. Adams remarks that the verb is applied particularly to the young; it is therefore especially 'appropriate' for Eustochium. There is furthermore a deliberate paradox in its juxtaposition with the immediately preceding *custodiant*; J. had employed the same device at the start of the work with the formulation *carne contempta sponsi iungaris amplexibus* (1,2).

oras: loqueris ad sponsum; legis: ille tibi loquitur. For Nautin (1986), p. 312, these words embody the quintessence of J.'s spirituality; similarly Antin (1961e), p. 154, cites them as encapsulating J.'s attitude to 'écriture sainte et vie spirituelle'. In fact J. has lifted the idea from Cyprian, *ad Donat.* 15 *sit tibi vel oratio adsidua vel lectio. nunc cum deo loquere, nunc deus tecum*. Accordingly when J. employs it here, he is simply following his standard practice of taking over arresting material from other people.

Cyprian's very impressive formulation naturally had an irresistible appeal for J., who had already used it in *epist.* 3,4,4 *nunc deum audit, cum divina relegit, nunc cum deo loquitur, cum dominum rogat*.² One

¹ Simon, I, p. 171, complains: 'Er läßt uns nicht deutlich erkennen, was er unter dem Finden, Festhalten, Verlieren oder Entgleitenlassen u. Wiederfinden des Geliebten, am Mittag insbesondere, meint'. Such 'Undeutlichkeit' is however unsurprising: J.'s purpose is largely ornamental.

² Schade (1910), p. 10, quotes the first half of this formulation as an embodiment of J.'s

half of the conceit is also found in *epist.* 24,4,2 (*sponso aut orans loquebatur aut psallens*); the other half occurs at [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 57,134 (*leges evangelium, confabulabitur tecum Iesus*).

It would seem that Cyprian himself has followed a cue from his 'mentor' Tertullian, who at *incor.* 1,4 l. 20 had spoken of Christian virgins as follows: *malum enim deo nubere, deo speciosae, deo sunt puellae, cum illo vivunt, cum illo sermocinantur, illum diebus et noctibus tractant, orationes suas velut dotes domino assignant, ab eodem dignationem velut munera maritalia, quotienscumque desiderant, consequuntur*. The words *cum illo sermocinantur* in conjunction with *orationes* and reciprocal intercourse with God would appear to be the source of Cyprian's brilliant formulation.

This aphorism stands conspicuously at the end of the *Ad Donatum*, which was perhaps the most highly esteemed of all Cyprian's works (cf. Molager, pp. 47f.). It is not therefore surprising that this Cyprianic phrase should have enjoyed a certain popularity. Ambrose would seem to be the next western Father after J. to exploit it: *off.* 1,20,88 *illum (sc. Christum) alloquimur cum oramus, illum audimus cum divina legimus oracula*.³ The idea also occurs in Augustine at *in psalm.* 85,7 *quando legis, deus tibi loquitur; quando oras, deo loqueris*.⁴ Vogüé (1991), I, p. 97, n. 64, registers a 7th c. echo in Isidore (*sent.* 3,8,2).

Previous commentators have failed to notice that the same dictum is also found in Greek writers.⁵ Its first occurrence would seem to be in Athanasius,⁶ *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 69,25 'il vous faut

concept of scriptural authority; he is clearly unaware that he is simply dealing with a second-hand conceit.

³ Duval (1970), p. 34 and n. 43, assumes that here Ambrose is directly dependent on Cyprian. The *De officiis* was published at some date after 386 (cf. Testard [1984], p. 49); it therefore belongs to the period immediately after the appearance of the two *Letters* in which J. himself had given Cyprian's idea a very effective restatement. In particular Ambrose's wording bears a marked resemblance to J.'s in *epist.* 3. It might therefore be felt that in this case J. has been the immediate source.

⁴ A date of 401 is proposed by Bonnardière, pp. 84ff. Tanulli, p. 1255, n. 4, asserts that Augustine's source is Ambrose's *De officiis*. Augustine's 85th *Enarratio* was however delivered on the anniversary of Cyprian's martyrdom; the particular phrasing which Augustine has chosen is also very close to Cyprian's own. It may be noted furthermore that this ch. of the *Enarratio* is concerned exclusively with prayer; in the present context therefore 'reading' is not *ad rem*. Augustine would accordingly appear to have made a particular point of echoing Cyprian's impressive formulation; here then we evidently do have a case of direct dependence on the *Ad Donatum*.

⁵ Dekkers (1953), p. 198, concludes that Cyprian's treatises as well as his correspondence were translated into Greek. J.'s *Libellus* was also available in Greek by 393: cf. *var. ill.* 134.

⁶ Athanasius had spent several years of exile in the West. According to Bardy (1948), pp. 131f., it is 'très probable' that Athanasius knew Latin well enough to be able to make his own translations into Greek.

quotidiennement, ou plutôt à chaque instant, converser avec votre fiancé, c'est-à-dire la parole de Dieu; il ne faut pas repousser loin de vous son langage. Votre langage avec lui, ce sont la prière, la ferveur et votre résolution; son langage, à lui, avec vous, ce sont les pensées justes qui vous montent au cœur, celles par lesquelles il excite votre ferveur et augmente en vous votre amour envers lui': here Athanasius has shown a characteristic independence in his treatment of the idea (on this passage cf. also next n.). The first Greek author to reproduce the conceit in the same form as in Cyprian would appear to be Chrysostom: *fem. reg.* 9 (of the virgin, as in J.'s *Libellus*) τούτω διαλεχθεῖσα ἐν εὐχαῖς, καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ μόνης ἀκούσασα φωνῆς διὰ τῶν Γραφῶν, *hom. in 1 Thess.* 6,4 ὅταν εὐχη, οὐχὶ τῷ θεῷ διαλέγη, εἰπέ μοι; ὅταν ἀναγινώσκῃ, ἀκούε αὐτοῦ σοι διαλεγομένου. The idea recurs later in Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *h. rel.* 3 p. 1325¹ τοῖς μὲν γὰρ θείοις ἐντυγχάνων λογίοις τῆς θείας φωνῆς ἀπολαύειν ἠγεῖτο, προσευχόμενος δὲ καὶ τὰς ἱκετείας προσφέρων, αὐτὸς τὴν πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην ἐποιεῖτο διάλεξιν.

Of all the afore-mentioned instances of this idea J.'s formulation in the *Libellus* is significantly the most economical and rhetorically striking: as so often, J. has here too enhanced the stylistic level of the material he borrows. Harendza, p. 52, notes the graceful parison which characterizes the entire phrase.¹ It may be observed further that *oras* and *legis* form two exactly parallel main clauses: no subordinative *cum* or *quando* is allowed to clutter the statement as in Ambrose and Augustine. Moreover the two principal clauses which serve as apodosis are likewise closely parallel, though at the same time marked by subtle *variatio*. They also evince an elegantly chiasmic structure: a polyptotic *loqui* encloses the whole by *redditio*, while the *sponsus* occupies the centre.

It is also significant that J. should similarly be alone in placing this idea in a purient context: only he goes beyond conversation to physical caress (cf. next n.). While therefore this commonplace that J. has borrowed from Cyprian turns out to be of no particular help in illuminating his personal spirituality, it does provide a perfect illustration of his plagiaristic and patchwork method, his consummate sense of style, and his dirty mind.

mittet manum suam per foramen et tanget ventrem tuum. To the conceit about 'colloquy with the Lord' (cf. previous n.) J. adds his own uniquely lubricious climax by making Christ fondle the virgin's belly (the eroticism started with *ludat* in l. 16). Here he is echoing Cant. 5,4

¹ He also traces the continuance of this figure in the words which follow: *oras / legis, venit / mittet / tanget, concurget / dices.*

ἀδελφιδός μου ἀπέστειλεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀπῆς, καὶ ἡ κοιλία μου ἐθροήθη ἐπ' αὐτόν. In the LXX however there is no physical contact.⁸ J.'s adscititious *tangere* is itself a sexual term; cf. Adams, pp. 185f. The combination with *venter* invests J.'s language with a tone that is downright pornographic.⁹ Kelly, pp. 102f., ends his analysis of the *Libellus* with a discussion of J.'s use of Cant. in this passage. He concludes that, while Ambrose and Augustine also exploit Cant. in their works on virginity, 'the sexual overtones seem transposed in their exhortations; J. makes no attempt to play them down'. Kelly has failed to notice how J. actually goes out of his way here to intensify the lasciviousness.

This evocation of Cant. 5,4 in conjunction with the preceding conceit about divine interlocution provides another example of J.'s habit of juxtaposing scripture with a striking formulation that has been appropriated from elsewhere. In the present case however the combination was perhaps suggested by Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 69,25ff. The lines of this passage that were quoted in the previous n. continue as follows (l. 32): 'De ce genre sont les discours qu'il adresse, dans le Cantique des Cantiques, aux âmes adhérentes à lui; de sorte que vous, qui avez vu ...'; the text breaks off before a specific verse is mentioned. If however the connection J. makes between Cant. and the conceit is due to Athanasius, J.'s specific formulation of the latter shows that here he has followed Cyprian instead of Athanasius, who had substituted 'thoughts' for Cyprian's more vivid 'reading' and had expressed himself with habitual lack of incisiveness. J. naturally prefers the more concise and arresting formulation: he improves even Cyprian's phrasing. Such multiple use of sources is entirely in J.'s manner. Finally it may be noted that, whereas Athanasius introduces his reference to Cant. with an explicit identification of the work, J. achieves a far more powerful effect by moving straight from his clever aphorism into direct citation of scripture.

vulnerata caritatis ego sum. This verse occurs at Cant. 2,5 and 5,8; Hilberg refers only to the latter. J. quotes this erotic text on four other occasions. The genitive comes from the LXX (*Vulg. amore languo*).

hortus conclusus soror mea sponsa. Cant. 4,12 had concerned

⁸ Nor is there in the Old Latin; cf. Ambrose, *virginit.* 11,60 *frater meus mihi manum suam per prospectum, et venter meus turbatus est ad illum*. In contrast to J. Ambrose had characteristically spiritualized the verse: at 11,60 he added the gloss *bonum est ad adventum domini interiora turbentur*, while at 13,79 he identified the 'window' as that through which we see Christ's works. J. himself uses the text again at *in Month. prol.* l. 22, where it is this time referred to the church.

⁹ Miller (1994), p. 220 with n. 81, inappropriately renders *venter* here as 'inner body'.

theological truth at *epist.* 15,1,1. On the other hand J. applies it to chastity in *epist.* 49,21,1 and *adv. Iovin.* 1,31. The latter interpretation was common: it had already occurred at Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon) p. 202,25; Orsiesius, *doctr.* 20; Ambrose, *virg.* 1,8,45; *virginit.* 12,69; 13,80; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 24,9. It recurs later in Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,36; *exhort. virg.* 5,29; *inst. virg.* 9,58; 9,60f.; 17,111. The combination of 'sister' and 'spouse' is explained at Paulinus of Nola, *carm.* 25,173f. (it was a mental union with God).

25,2

Dina egressa corrumpitur. At *epist.* 107,6,2 the younger Paula is also told that she must not go out like Dinah. J. mentions Dinah again at *in Is.* 11,40,1 l. 16 (a point of philology). Elsewhere the story seldom occurs: at Orientius, *comm.* 1,355 it exemplifies the destructiveness of passion, while it is allegorized in Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,68. J.'s application of the episode in the present passage would seem to have been his own idea. In the preceding lines (4–6) he has also been teasing the reader by withholding Dinah's identity while at the same time alluding with increasing clarity to her story; the same device was used at 1,5 (cf. n. on *non est sponsus tuus adrogans*).

surgam et circumibo in civitate, in foro et in plateis et quaeram, quem dilexit anima mea. In Cant. the bride does eventually find her lover. The search is also successful at *epist.* 66,10,1. Here however J. uses it as a warning example against going out. The present text (Cant. 3,2) recurs at *in Zach.* 8,4 l. 88 (for the word *platea*). It had been used by Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon) p. 203,7 and by Ambrose, *virginit.* 8,46.

25,3

sponsus in plateis non potest inveniri. J. would seem to have taken this statement from Ambrose, *virginit.* 8,46 *non in plateis Christus reperitur*. Like J. (cf. previous n.), Ambrose had used these words in conjunction with Cant. 3,2.

Much of Ambrose's *De virginitate* consists of what amounts to a commentary on Cant. Such an extensive treatment naturally invited emulation: it would accordingly appear that in this and the following chs. J. is seeking to outdo Ambrose in his handling of the same biblical book. While Ambrose had quoted twenty-three verses of Cant., J. cites sixteen. However in Ambrose these texts had occupied more than half of the treatise; J. on the other hand compresses his sixteen citations into a little over two chs. (24,6–26,4). The striking density and succinctness which mark J.'s treatment create an impressive contrast with Ambrose's long-windedness: J. evidently intends the reader to notice the difference.

Many of the verses from Cant. which J. quotes are the same ones that had also been cited in Ambrose's *De virginitate* (viz. 3,2; 3,4; 4,12; 5,2; 5,3; 5,4; 5,6; 5,7; a number of them do not recur elsewhere in J.'s *oeuvre*). At the same time there is a notable contrast between the abstractness of Ambrose's allegorical interpretation and J.'s vivid and concrete approach. Ambrose repeatedly applies the texts to the divine Word (e.g. at 13,79; 13,80; 13,81; 13,84; 14,91; 14,92; 15,95; 16,98); J. on the contrary speaks very graphically of the virgin's spouse.

arta et angusta via est. While Ambrose had proceeded to develop the idea that Christ 'cannot be found in the streets' (cf. previous n.) with a lengthy series of rather flaccid antitheses, J. on the other hand appends an eruditely arresting pun on *plateas* by quoting Mt. 7,14; the same *calembour* is repeated at *epist.* 121,2,10. J. has borrowed this characteristic piece of cleverness from Origen, whose commentary on Luke 10,10 (εἰς ἣν ὁ ἄν πόλιν εἰσεέλθητε, καὶ μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξελθόντες εἰς τὰς πλατείας αὐτῆς ...) had contained the following gloss (*fr. in Lc.* 161a): αἱ μὴ παραδεχόμεναι τοὺς ἀποστόλους ... πόλεις ἔχουσι πλατείας ἀνάλογον τῷ 'πλατεῖα ἢ πύλη καὶ εὐρύχωρος ἢ ὁδὸς ἢ ἄγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν' (Mt. 7,13).

J. cites Mt. 7,14 another twenty times. It had occurred in Cyprian's collection of *testimonia* (*bonos ... plus laborare ... quia probantur*; 3,6). Virginité is the narrow way according to Chrysostom, *Laz.* 7,5. The text had also been quoted in Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 21; it recurs in Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 10.

denique sequitur: quaesivi eum et non inveni eum. J. jumps from Cant. 3,2f. to 5,6. He thereby returns to a section of the book that was utilized at the beginning of the ch. (Cant. 5,4 and 5,8; p. 178,18ff.). Cant. 3,2f. was inserted in between for the sake of the 'going out' motif, which runs throughout the ch. J. does not cite Cant. 5,6 anywhere else. Ambrose had used it at *virginit.* 12,75 and 13,84 (*ib. amat ... Christus diu requirit*).

vulneraberis, nudaberis et gemebunda narrabis. Here J. is paraphrasing Cant. 5,7 (quoted in ll. 16–18 below). Whereas Ambrose had again given a spiritualizing interpretation of this verse (cf. next n.), J.'s *nudaberis* characteristically adds a prurient detail that is absent from the biblical text: removal of the bride's *theristrum* (a 'summer cape'; cf. next n.) has been converted into a scene of total feminine denudation. A similarly salacious expansion occurred at 25,1 above (cf. n. on *mitter manum suam ...*). Female nakedness was also described with relish at 6,3 above. In the present passage Hritz, p. 90, notes the homoeoteleuton (threefold *-is*).

invenerunt me custodes, qui circumcunt civitatem; percusserunt me,

vulneraverunt me, tulerunt theristrum meum a me. At *epist.* 107,7,3 the younger Paula should also stay indoors for fear the watchmen of Cant. 5,7 catch her. Ambrose had warned against them in *virginit.* 8,48; there the 'garment' that they take away was explained as an *amicus prudentiae*. At *ib.* 12,76 these watchmen had been *intelligibiles ... custodes*, while at *ib.* 14,92 they had removed the garment of *actus corporalis*. J.'s treatment of the same verse is by contrast typically down to earth: his unreflective concision differs markedly from Ambrose's philosophic expansiveness.

J. describes the *theristrum* as a summer cape worn by Arab women even in his own day at *in Is.* 2,3,22 l. 8 and *quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 38,21. It is a περιβόλαιον νυμφικόν according to Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Cant.* 12 p. 1029^B. The word also occurs at *Vulg. Is.* 3,23.

25,4

ego dormio et cor meum vigilat. J. is partial to this charming text (Cant. 5,2), which he cites another half dozen times. According to Ambrose (*epist.* 7,52,4) it shows that even the sleep of the saints is busy.

fasciculus stactae fratriuells meus mihi, in medio uberum meorum commorabitur. Typically J. selects a highly erotic text (Cant. 1,12; LXX 1,13). Elsewhere it is rare. J. gives an allegorical interpretation to the second half of the verse at *adv. Iovin.* 1,30 *in principali cordis, ubi habet sermo dei hospitium*. It is quoted for the word *uber* at *in Zach.* 9,5 l. 158. Scent experts said *stacte* was the flower of myrrh (*epist.* 65,14,2).

quid de nobis fiet. J. has a certain partiality for this vivid form of a *fortiori* argument; cf. its later occurrence at *in Ezech.* 16,3^b l. 868 (*si illa hoc audivit, quid de nobis fiet*); *in Matth.* 14,31 l. 1370 (*quid nobis dicendum est*). Its use in the present passage would seem however to have been suggested by Ambrose, *virginit.* 10,57 *cum hoc Petro dicitur, quid de nobis censetur?*, where it had been employed in conjunction with Cant. 5,3, which J. likewise cites shortly afterwards at 26,2 (for J.'s debt to Ambrose's treatise in this section of the *Libellus* cf. n. on *sponsus in platets ...* at 25,3 above). A similar *a fortiori* argument is found later on a number of occasions elsewhere: Chrysostom, *hom. in Phil.* 12,1; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 27; Epiphanius Latinus, *in euang.* 29 p. 51,8. However only Epiphanius repeats the particular formulation found in J. and Ambrose: *quid de nobis censendum est*.

quae adhuc adolescentulae sumus, quae sponsa intrante cum sponso remanemus extrinsecus. Here J. identifies himself with his addressee and speaks of himself as a woman. He has used the same vivacious device already at 18,3 (cf. n. on *nolo illi subiaccere sententiae ...*).

Hilberg fails to register that *adulescentulae* is a reference to Cant. 6,7 (LXX 6,8); J.'s second relative clause alludes of course to the parable of the foolish virgins (Mt. 25,10ff.). Again J. is using scripture to express his point: we are 'unworthy'. Here however he has borrowed this combination of texts from his own recent translation of Origen, *hom. in Cant.* 1,5 p. 35,1 *tale quiddam et adulescentulae sustinent, introeunte sponso forinsecus remanent*. The actual wording of the second clause has also been appropriated. At *epist.* 65,20,4 J. identifies the *adulescentulae* as the faithful who are not yet ready for the spouse's embrace and who cannot bear him children.

25,5

zelotypus est Iesus. The audacious and vivid idea of Jesus as the jealous spouse had already been employed with some frequency: Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 7,26 (*virginis ... neque motus neque cogitatus sponsum latent. habet zelum Christus*); 7,28 (*noli movere zelum Iesu, noli sponsum exacerbare*); Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon) p. 191,23 ('ton époux est jaloux'); p. 198,29 ('l'époux est jaloux'); *Sermon on virginity* (Casey) p. 1035 ('eifersüchtig ist der Gatte'); Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,2,105 (νυμφίον ἰμερόνευτα τῆς ζηλήμονα μορφῆς); 1,2,3,68 (Χριστὸν ἔχουσα νυμφίον, ζηλοῖ σου τὴν ἀγνείαν); 1,2,6,29 (χρηστός μὲν ἔστιν [sc. Χριστός] ἀλλὰ καὶ ζήλου πλέως). Origen had put forward the tentative suggestion that God felt 'a sort of jealousy': *si ... velut zelotypia quadam erga te utitur* (*hom. in Ex.* 8,5 p. 229,16); in this connection he had adduced Exod. 20,5 θεὸς ζηλωτής. When Augustine employs the concept of God as a jealous spouse, he too cites scripture (Deut. 4,24 *deus vester ... deus zelans; c. Adim.* 13); his treatment is notably more cautious than J.'s.¹⁰ The same biblical text evidently lies behind the statement of Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,19 *cave ... ne cui vel concupiscendi occasionem tribuas, quia sponsus tuus deus zelans est*.

non vult ab aliis videri faciem tuam. Here J. would seem to have taken his cue from Origen: cf. *hom. in Cant.* 1,8 p. 40,9 (*sum quippe sponsa formosa et alii nudam faciem non ostendo nisi tibi soli, quem iam pridem deosculata sum*); *Cant.* 2 p. 136,17 (*ego ... quae a nulla, inquit, alio videri volo, nisi a te solo*). Both texts are concerned with the exegesis of Cant. 1,6 (LXX 1,7), which J. himself cites in the following sentence (cf. next n.). In the present passage however it is Christ who does not want the virgin to be seen by anyone else. The same line of argument had already been employed by Tertullian, who had stated that

¹⁰ Augustine also explains Exod. 34,14 (*deus zelans*) by reference to a husband's jealousy (*quasi. hept.* 2,158).

if Christ wants other men's brides to be veiled, then much more so his own (*virg. vel.* 16,6). Similarly Cyprian (*epist.* 4,3,2) had remarked that Christ is angry when he sees his virgin in bed with another.

adnuntia mihi, quem dilexit anima mea, ubi pascis, ubi cubas in meridie, ne quando fiam sicut cooperta super greges sodalium tuorum. In the final section of the ch. J. introduces a dramatic dialogue. Before his citation of this verse (*Cant.* 1,6; LXX 1,7) J. inserts a gloss (*adducto velamine ora contexti*; l. 7) which indicates how he intends the difficult words *sicut cooperta* in it to be understood. When Origen had dealt with the same text at *hom. in Cant.* 1,8 p. 40,7, he had explained that the speaker starts to veil herself because she feels bashful in front of the other shepherds; she then enquires her beloved's whereabouts to avoid having to cover her face. At *Cant.* 2 p. 136,13 Origen suggests that the bride does not want to be like the women who don a veil and run about shamelessly to her spouse's companions. Later Augustine interprets 'covered' (he reads *operta*) to mean 'hidden and unrecognized': *epist.* 93,28 (the *sodales* are heretics) and *serm.* 46,36. Ambrose alludes to the text at *inst. virg.* 17,113. He quotes the first half in *exhort. virg.* 9,56, while in the second half (*ib.* 10,66) he makes the synagogue speak to the church. On the connotations of *meridies* cf. Simon, I, pp. 172f.

si non cognoveris temet ipsam. The text (*Cant.* 1,7; LXX 1,8) recurs nowhere else in J. On the other hand Ambrose has some seven allusions to it, Augustine nine. It is explained at Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 10,67 *hoc est, te prius quae sis ipsa cognosce et tunc pete ut meis gregibus appropinques.* J.'s interpretation is rather different; cf. next n.

25,6

omni custodia servaveris cor tuum. The verse just cited in l. 11 (*Cant.* 1,7; LXX 1,8; cf. previous n.) now requires some exegetical amplification so that J. can make his point; normally the biblical text alone is sufficient to express his meaning. Here he glosses it in characteristic fashion with another text of scripture: Prov. 4,23 (πάση φυλακῇ τηρεῖ σὴν καρδίαν). J. is extremely fond of this verse, which he quotes over twenty times. Ambrose and Augustine on the other hand have it only once each. In connection with J.'s use of the text in the present passage it may be noted that the last clause of *Cant.* 1,5 (1,6 LXX) similarly speaks of 'guarding' (ἀμπελάνα ἐμόν οὐκ ἐφύλαξα): J. has just cited *Cant.* 1,6f. (1,7f. LXX).

pascis haedos, qui staturi sunt a sinistris. J. concludes with a gloss on the goats of *Cant.* 1,7 (LXX 1,8): they are the goats which the Son of Man will set on his left hand at the Last Judgment (Mt. 25,33). J. is fond of this very striking device whereby a ch. ends with a text of

scripture that supplies a key to the understanding of what has preceded; it recurs at 6,6 and 26,4. Here the combination of Cant. 1,7 and Mt. 25,33 has been taken from Origen; cf. *Cont.* 2 p. 142,6; *hom. in Cant.* 1,9 p. 40,22; *schol. in Cant.* 1,7. It is found later at Gregory of Elvira, *in cant.* 2,20; Ambrose, *Isaac* 4,16; *in psalm. 118* serm. 2,15,1; Gregory of Nyssa, *hom. in Cant.* 2 p. 804^c; Augustine, serm. 46,37; 146,2. J. has a dozen references to Mt. 25,33. At *in Math.* 25,33 l. 935 (ad loc.) J. identifies the goats as sinners; in the same passage (l. 939) he also notes that they are a licentious animal (*feruens semper ad coitum*; cf. Origen, *Cont.* 2 p. 145,11).

Chapter 26

J. now concludes his very extensive treatment of the theme of seclusion. The ch. consists almost exclusively of biblical citation and allusion that is grouped very picturesquely around the twin *Stichwörter* 'door' and 'window'. Here J. would appear to have taken his cue from a brief passage of Ambrose's *De virginitate* (13,79-81), which had also combined the same two themes; however the Ambrosian treatise had not achieved the same striking density as the *Libellus*. J.'s scriptural cento is also interspersed with clever conceits that have been borrowed from elsewhere.¹

26,1

filia. The ch. opens with an extremely impressive *συναθροισμὸς* of titles (*filia, domina, conserva, germana*), each of which is then provided with its own gloss in a clause that combines the rhetorical figures of *regressio* and *distributio* (*aliud ... aetatis, aliud meriti, illud religionis, hoc caritatis ...*). Only the asyndeton is noted by Hritzu, p. 46. Though each of the titles in this list can be paralleled, it is significant that J. alone would seem to combine them all.

The apostrophe *filia* had opened the work (Ps. 44) and also recurs at 38,7 below. Eustochium is addressed as *filia* at *in Is. lib. 16 praef. l. 5; lib. 18 praef. l. 1; in Ezech. lib. 13 praef. l. 32*. In his letters J. uses this form of address at 65,2,1; 65,22,4; 75,5,1; 117,2,1; 127,14. *In Christo* *filia* is particularly favoured: it occurs at 54,6,1; 65,1,1; 79,11,3; 107,2,1; 123,10,1; 123,17,1. For the combination *domina filia* cf. *TLL* V,1, 1938,72ff. (add Augustine, *epist.* 92,6; 131; 150; 188,1; 208,7; 266,2; [Ps.]-Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 3,1,3 *o ... meritis domina sed ordine ... filia*); for the Greek equivalent cf. Julius Africanus, *ep. Or.* 1 (κύριέ μου καὶ υἱέ) and Origen, *ep.* 2,3 (κύριε υἱέ).

For the concatenation of titles cf. Salvian, *epist.* 4,2 *natura parentes fide fratres honore dominos*. J.'s fourfold accumulation is even more striking.

conserva. At *epist.* 58,9,1 J. has *conserve ... germane* (cf. next n.). Tertullian had used *conserva* in address at *cult. fem.* 2,1 l. 2 (*et sorores*); *uxor.* 1,1 l. 4; 1,8 l. 31; 2,1 l. 2. On the term *conservus* cf.

¹ Cf. Simon, I, p. 172: 'Es wird wohl nicht gelingen, den Sinn dieser Bildersprache ... eindeutig festzulegen. Es fällt indessen schwer ... darin wesentlich mehr als eine kunstvolle, gelehrte und zugleich biblisch-fromme Dekoration zu sehen'.

Pétré, pp. 161ff. (esp. Lactantius, *instr.* 5,15,3 *religione conservos*, cited p. 164).

germana. Eustochium is called *soror* at 38,7 below. For the combination with *domina* cf. Palladius, *h. Laus.* 8 M. *κυρία καὶ ἀδελφί;* Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 5 *domnus et germanus*. J. enumerates the four scriptural uses of 'brother' at *virg. Mar.* 14: they refer to nature, race, kinship and affection respectively. In the present passage J. has the last of these in mind. At *epist.* 4,2,1 he had employed the phrase *germanitatis caritate*; cf. *in Os.* 2,1 l. 18 *germanitatis ... affectu* (so Cassian, *conl. praef.* 3). On 'brotherly love' in general cf. *TLL* VI,1, 1259,72; 77; 80ff.; 84. Also pertinent are Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 15 and Gaudentius, *serm.* 19,1 (*carnis ac spiritus germanitate carissime*); cf. *Vulg. Rom.* 12,10 (*caritatem fraternitatis invicem diligentes*). Cf. further Pétré, pp. 104ff.

populus meus, intra in cubicula tua, claude ostium tuum, abscondere pusillum quantum, donec pertranseat ira domini. Again J. uses scripture very effectively to express his meaning. Here he employs *Is.* 26,20 to reiterate the precept that opened the foregoing ch.: *semper te cubiculi tui secreta custodiant*. J. cites this verse again at *c. Ioh.* 33 (the 'chambers' are tombs) and *in Am.* 5,18 l. 710. The outlandish phrase *pusillum quantum* had also occurred in his rendering of this text at *hom. Orig. in Ier.* 9 p. 656^B; the passage of *in Am.* on the other hand has simply *pusillum*, while *c. Ioh.* uses *aliquantum* instead (*Vulg. modicum ad momentum*).

The text introduces the theme of 'doors' (cf. *claude ostium tuum*), which runs through most of this ch. In it they are constantly being shut, knocked on, or opened: l. 4; 7; 9; 10; 12; 16; 17; p. 182,1. This theme is succeeded by a similar plethora of references to the opening of windows: p. 182,5; 6; 8; 9. In both sequences there is a transition from the literal to the figurative. The whole ch. in fact consists largely of a mosaic of biblical texts which are concerned with doors and windows: here we accordingly have an example of the *Stichwort* technique on the grand scale.

26,2

si ostium cluseris. At *epist.* 65,19,4 the 'door' of Mt. 6,6 is interpreted as the door of the lips and at *epist.* 130,9,1 as the door of the breast. Here it is a real door. J. again links the text to *Is.* 26,20 (cf. previous n.) at *in Is.* 8,26,20 l. 42; the same combination is also found in Ambrose, *sacr.* 6,3,13f. (the work is later than the *Libellus*).

ecce ego sto ante ianuam. J. refers to Apoc. 3,20 again at *in Eph.* 4,27 p. 511^C; cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 54 l. 149 (*ostium pectoris*); p. 80 l. 160; p. 117 l. 238. Ambrose had used it at *virginit.* 11,60 (cf. also n. on

surge et aperi at 26.3 below).

vox fratruellis mei pulsantis: aperi mihi, soror mea, proxima mea, columba mea, perfecta mea. Cant. 5,2 is found nowhere else in J. It had occurred at Ambrose, *virginis*, 12,70 (ib. *caritate proxima, simplicitate columba, virtute perfecta*).

dispollavi me tunicam meam, quomodo induar eam? lavi pedes meos, quomodo inquinabo eos? The first half of Cant. 5,3 is not cited by J. anywhere else. Ambrose had used it at *virginis*, 10,55 (where it signifies removal of the 'garment of bodily life') and 12,72. The second half recurs thrice in J.: the virgin should turn away visitors with it at *epist.* 107,7,3. Ambrose had quoted it in *virginis*, 10,57 (ib. 10,58 *quemadmodum spirituale debeamus actuum nostrorum diluere vestigium*). J.'s purpose in citing the verse here would seem to be purely decorative.

26.3

surge et aperi. J. has evidently taken this pair of arresting imperatives from Ambrose, *virginis*, 11,60, where they had occurred in exactly the same form: *surge, aperi*. Ambrose had moreover employed them in connection with Apoc. 3,20, which J. himself has just cited in ll. 9–11.

aperui ego fratruelli meo, fratruellis meus pertransiit. Cant. 5,6 does not recur elsewhere in J. It had been quoted in Ambrose, *virginis*, 11,67, where the spouse's passage had signified penetration of the mind's inner parts.

cordis tui ostia. The phrase 'doors of the heart' is not common; cf. *TLL* IV, 933,28f. (s.v. *cor*), which cites only the present passage of the *Libellus* and a 6th c. example from Cassiodorus. It is accordingly probable that J.'s use of this striking formulation here has been suggested by Ambrose, *virginis*, 12,72 *fores tui cordis aperire*. The same paragraph of the Ambrosian treatise had referred to Cant. 5,3, which J. cites just three lines earlier; shortly beforehand (12,70) Ambrose had quoted Cant. 5,2, which is employed by J. five lines earlier, while shortly afterwards (12,75) Ambrose had referred to Cant. 5,6, which in J. occupies the same line as the phrase currently at issue. If then the *De virginitate* has evidently prompted J.'s use of this idea, his substitution of *ostia* for the Ambrosian *fores* may be due to his own translation of Origen, *hom. in Is.* 2,2 p. 252,26 *ostiis principalis cordis nostri* (ib. Apoc. 3,20, which J. quotes at p. 181,9–11 above).³

³ The translation belongs to the late 370's according to Nautin (1988); others place it in 380–1 or after 392 (cf. Cavallera, I,2, pp. 20f.).

A number of later examples of these locutions can be adduced: the collocation *fores cordis*, for which *TLL* VI,1, 1057,13 – 1065,62 (s.v. *foris*) provides no other instance, is also found at Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 46,3 and Paulinus of Périgueux, *Mart.* 5,85, while *cordis ostium* recurs in Ambrose (*in psalm. 118 serm.* 8,59,2), Epiphanius Latinus (*in euang.* 42 p. 100,1; *ib.* *Apoc.* 3,20) and Caesarius of Arles (*serm.* 26,4 and 160,2; he has *cordis ianuae* at *serm.* 88,4 [cf. next n.]); cf. also *TLL* IX,2, 1156,53ff. (s.v. *ostium*). In Greek there are instances of such phraseology at (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 53,4,5 (*τὰς ... θύρας τῆς καρδίας*) and *hom. typ. III* (Klostermann-Berthold) 16,4.

aperiantur Christo, claudantur diabolo. J. has appropriated this striking formulation from Cyprian, *domin. orat.* 31 *cludatur contra adversarium pectus et soli deo pateat nec ad se hostem dei tempore orationis adire patiatur*. As in so many cases, J. has streamlined his source to produce an elegantly asyndetic isocolon which is further enhanced by twofold homoeoteleuton. Here he has fitted this borrowing very neatly into a ch. that is pervaded by the theme of 'opening' and 'closing'. J.'s improved version of Cyprian's sentence is in turn imitated by Niceta of Remesiana (*vigil.* 9 l. 15 *sir ... vigilantium pectus clausum diabolo, apertum Christo*)³ and by Caesarius of Arles (*serm.* 95,4 [*nostrum ... cor aperiatur Christo et claudatur diabolo*]; 227,1; Caesarius also takes over J.'s 'doors of the heart' at *serm.* 88,4 *ut ianuae cordis nostri semper aperiantur Christo et usque ad finem claudantur diabolo*). On the other hand the wording at Chromatius, *serm.* 40,1 is borrowed straight from Cyprian (*cludatur ... pectus nostrum contra insidias adversarii et soli deo pateat*).⁴ There would also seem to be an echo of the Cyprianic passage in Ambrose, *Isaac* 6,51 (written 386) *aperi ergo mihi (sc. Christo), noli aperire adversario neque des locum diabolo*; here Ambrose has also combined the injunction with Eph. 4,27 (cf. next n.).

si spiritus potestatem habentis ascenderit super te, locum ne dederis et. J. again combines scripture with an arresting formulation that has been borrowed from elsewhere (cf. previous n.). Here the biblical element consists of two separate texts which J. has condensed into one to produce a very impressive climax. The basic text is Eccles. 10,4 *si spiritus potestatem habentis ascenderit super te, locum tuum ne dimiseris* (this is J.'s rendering at *in eccles.* 10,4 l. 54; it matches the LXX). On this text J. has grafted Eph. 4,27 *nolite locum dare diabolo*;

³ This work belongs to the end of Niceta's career: cf. Garber, p. 231.

⁴ Chromatius' sermon probably belongs to the period 388–98; cf. Lemaire-Tardif, I, p. 52, n. 3.

the addition has not been noticed by previous commentators. St. Paul's *diabolo* fits J.'s *claudantur diabolo* (l. 2) perfectly. Nonetheless J. has once again borrowed his combination of texts from elsewhere: Eccles. 10,4 and Eph. 4,27 had been linked by Origen (*hom. in Num.* 27,12 p. 276,3; *comm. in Eph.* 20) and Basil (*hom. in Ps.* 32,1). J. again conflates the two texts at *in Eph.* 4,27 p. 512^A and 6,12 p. 544^C. He quotes the passage from Eccles. another seven times.

26,4

Daniel in cenaculo suo — neque enim manere poterat in humili — fenestras ad Hierusalem apertas habuit. J. now passes from 'doors' to 'windows'. The two themes had also been linked in Ambrose, *virginit.* 13,79ff., though without J.'s impressive inspissation.

With the parenthesis *neque enim manere poterat in humili* J. has been unable to resist inserting a clever conceit that is not strictly relevant to his argument here. Again it has been taken from elsewhere. Origen had maintained that in the Bible 'upper room' signifies the lofty and exalted mind (*hom. in Jer.* 19,13 [GCS 6]). A similar idea had occurred in Gregory of Nyssa, *Spir.* p. 697^C (on Acts 1,13 'they went up into an upper room'): τὰ ἄνω φρονουῖσι ... τοῦ ὑπερώου τῆς ὑψηλῆς πολιτείας ὄντες οἰκῆτορες; cf. also Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 41,12 (for dates of 375 and 379 respectively cf. Daniélou [1966], p. 162, and Bernardi, p. 157). Later Maximus of Turin observes that it was appropriate for Peter to go into an upper room to pray, for every saint at prayer *relinquens humilia vel terrena in altum mentis extollitur* (2,2). Eucherius gives the following gloss: *cenaculum altitudo meritum vel scientiae* (*form.* 9 p. 56,1). J. again refers to Daniel's worship at *in Ezech.* 8,15 l. 339, but without the conceit.

habeto fenestras apertas ... unde lumen introeat. *Fenestram aperire* meant opening the shutters; cf. Blümner, p. 102. We open the *fenestras* in order to let in the light according to Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 2,9,4; 14,9,2; 19,39,2.

civitatem dei. The Danieline Jerusalem is spiritualized. For the phrase *civitas dei* cf. *TLL* III, 1234,25ff.

mors intravit per fenestras vestras. Ambrose had used Jer. 9,21 (9,20 LXX) at *virginit.* 13,81: there the window was Eve's door. The text had also occurred in Origen, *hom. in Cant.* 2,12 p. 57,25, which J. had recently translated; there it had been given a sexual reference. At *in Jer.* 2,81,2 (ad loc.) J. himself sets out the spiritual interpretation: sin enters through the senses and the soul dies (cf. Horn, p. 54, n. 145). J. is fond of this verse: he cites it another nine times and refers it to the senses in general or to the eyes.

Chapter 27

J. warns against vainglory. A string of scriptural texts is prescribed for recitation as an antidote. J. then issues a series of practical admonitions. He notes that in Eustochium's case it is superfluous to warn against pride in her noble birth. There is however a danger that contempt for worldly pomp may itself generate pride. This observation leads J. to an impressive attack on various kinds of women who are guilty of exhibitionism in their ascetic practices.¹

27,1

illud quoque tibi vitandum est cautius. Twenty years later J. starts chs. 26 and 27 of his translation of Orsiesius' *Doctrina* with a similar phrase.

ne vanae gloriae ardore capiaris. At *epist.* 78,42,2 J. remarks that the unique danger of vainglory is one of his favourite themes: *nikil enim, ut crebro diximus, tam periculosum est quam gloriae cupiditas et iactantia et animus conscientia virtutum tumens.* In his extant works however the topic is rather infrequent. J. simply notes at *epist.* 77,2,2 that *adrogantia* is harder to dispense with than gold and jewels. The same precept as occurs in the present passage had already been issued by St. Paul in Gal. 5,26 *non efficiamur inanis gloriae cupidi.* At 2,1 above J. had said that he would avoid praise. On the vice of vainglory cf. Michel, pp. 1431f.

quomodo ... potestis credere gloriam ab hominibus accipientes? Frequently J. employs a text of scripture to introduce a fresh topic. Here however the text comes after the statement of the new theme (cf. previous n.). J. cites Jn. 5,44 again at *in Gal.* 5,26 p. 423^B. Later Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,16 also uses it when imparting instruction to virgins.

vide, quale malum sit, quod qui habuerit, non potest credere. J. had already used the same striking formulation to gloss scripture at *epist.* 12,3: *vide ... quale malum sit, quod adversarium habet deum.*

27,2

quoniam gloriatio mea es tu. J.'s instruction now takes the form of a list of biblical passages which are recommended for recitation by the virgin. This very impressive technique, which gives J. an excellent

¹ The final section of the ch. is discussed by Vogué (1991), I, pp. 263ff.

opportunity to display his scriptural expertise, has been employed earlier at 17,3; there the texts were linked by the *Stichwort* 'fire'. In the present passage they all inculcate an attitude which puts the Lord first; he is the sole cause for pride. These texts accordingly provide an effective response to the verse just cited (Jn. 5,44; Il. 11f.), which made 'men' the occasion for vainglory.

Hilberg identifies the first text as Ps. 3,4: σὺ δέ, κύριε, ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἶ, δόξα μου καὶ ὑψῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν μου (Vulg. *iuxta LXX tu autem, domine, susceptor meus es, gloria mea et exaltans caput meum*). He is followed by (e.g.) Labourt, I, p. 139; Mierow-Lawler, p. 242, n. 248; Camisani, p. 359. However Schade (1936), p. 94, had already pointed to Jer. 17,14 ὅτι καύχημά μου σὺ εἶ. Here the Vulg. reads *quoniam laus mea tu es*; Schade did not however record that J.'s translation of Origen, *hom. in Jer.* 4 p. 616^A (PL 25 [1845]) has *quoniam gloriatio mea tu es*, which exactly matches the wording of the *Libellus*. J. would not seem to refer to the text again.

qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur. 1 Cor. 1,31 (= 2 Cor. 10,17) recurs in J. five times; at *in Zach.* 10,11 l. 366 it is again combined with Gal. 6,14 (cf. Il. 16ff.).

si adhuc hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem. Gal. 1,10 also recurs in J. five times. It was popular; cf. Cyprian, *testim.* 3,55 (*non hominibus sed deo placendum*). Cyprian had also used it at *hab. virg.* 5. In the present passage this verse does not have the *Stichwort* 'gloriarī' ('gloriatio'), but it does pick up 'hominibus' in l. 12.

mihī absit gloriari, nisi in cruce domini mei Iesu Christi. Gal. 6,14 is a text of which J. is fond: he repeats it seven times. Cyprian had cited it at *testim.* 3,11 (*caelestia tantum ... cogitare debere*) and in *hab. virg.* 6.

in te laudabimur tota die. J. does not cite Ps. 43,9 elsewhere. It is also combined with Ps. 33,3 (cf. Il. 19f.) in Didymus, *Ps.* 33,3.

in domino laudabitur anima mea. Ps. 33,3 occurs only here in J. At *instit.* p. 52,19 Gregory of Nyssa recommends the text for recitation and joins it to Jn. 5,44 (cf. Il. 11f.). *Laudabitur* is glossed at Julian of Eclanum, *in psalm.* 33,3^a as follows: *glorificabitur atque erit in admiratione omnium*. While the Pi'el of לָלֶזֶן usually means 'to praise', in the Hithpa'el with פָּ (as here) the verb signifies 'to boast in'.

27,3

cum facis elemosynam, deus solus videat. After a string of verbatim quotations of scripture J. now continues with biblical allusion. Here he is referring to Mt. 6,2-4. The original has been very substantially streamlined; it runs as follows: (2) *cum ergo facies elemosynam, noli*

tuba canere ante te, sicut hypocritae faciunt in synagogis et in vicis, ut honorificentur ab hominibus; amen dico vobis, receperunt mercedem suam. (3) te autem faciente elemosynam nesciat sinistra tua quid faciat dextera tua; (4) ut sit elemosyna tua in abscondito; et pater tuus qui videt in abscondito reddet tibi.

cum ieiunas, laeta sit facies tua. Having referred to Mt. 6,2–4 (cf. previous n.) J. omits the prescriptions on prayer that follow (Mt. 6,5–15; 6,6 has already been cited in the preceding ch. at p. 181,7f.) and moves to Mt. 6,16–18. Again the biblical original is heavily compressed: (16) *cum autem ieiunatis, nolite fieri sicut hypocritae tristes: demoliuntur enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes* (the second of these sentences is echoed later in the ch. at p. 184,9f.); *amen dico vobis quia receperunt mercedem suam. (17) tu autem cum ieiunas ungue caput tuum, et faciem tuam lava; (18) ne videaris hominibus ieiunans, sed patri tuo qui est in abscondito: et pater tuus qui videt in abscondito reddet tibi.* J. has also taken care to avoid the repetition which an allusion to the last verse would have entailed (cf. Mt. 6,4, cited in the previous n.; J. did echo that). In *epist.* 24,4,2 J. notes that Asella looked happy when fasting; there he avoids any biblical reference.

vestis nec satis munda nec sordida. J. makes the same stipulation at 29,1 below. The subject recurs frequently in his letters. He commends Lea, Asella and Nepotian for achieving the happy mean here: *epist.* 23,2,2; 24,5,2; 60,10,2. He reports at *epist.* 39,1,3 that Blesilla wore humble clothes which exceptionally avoided the impression of ostentation; cf. also 58,6,3 and 125,7,1. In *epist.* 52,9,1 he states that black and white should be equally eschewed. The reader might gain the impression from the foregoing that this was a matter of great importance to J.: perhaps it would be more accurate to say that here we have one of those striking ideas which it was J.'s custom to repeat. At 27,6 below he warns against showing off in rags.²

References to the sartorial mean are found intermittently elsewhere: however nobody stresses the point as insistently as J. Here the following passages are pertinent: Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 22,2 (*decenter inculti ... et honorabiliter despicabiles*); Gaudentius, *serm.* 21,13 (*vilitate mundissimus*); Ps.-Athanasius, *syntag.* 4,5; Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,3,7. According to Tertullian a simple neatness had been sufficient (*cult. fem.* 2,5 l. 4). Similarly Ambrose (*off.* 1,19,83) requires that toilet should be natural and dress plain.

² On the other hand J. says at *epist.* 125,7,1 that rags indicate a pure mind. He also records how Paula was wont to remark that cleanliness of body and clothing betokened uncleanness of soul (*epist.* 108,20,5; copied in *Regula Tarnovensis* 19,5).

On *satis* meaning *multum*, *nimis* cf. Löfstedt (1911), pp. 73f. It recurs in l. 6 below. There are further examples of this usage at in *eccles.* 12,6 l. 272; *quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 14,17; *tract. in psalm.* I p. 126 l. 231; II p. 416 l. 82; *tract. in Marc.* p. 323,10; *praef. Vulg. Ezech.* p. 5,7; *Don.* p. 10,60. It is not rare in the Vulgate.

Here this locution is the first of a notably large number of colloquial elements which characterize the ch.: cf. the diminutive *corpusculum* (l. 4), *satis religiosa* (l. 6), *plus humilis* (l. 6), *ipsud* (p. 184,3), *in conventu ... veneris* (p. 184,6) together with fourfold *facies* (p. 183,1; 184,9; 11; 18). The reason for this unusual density is perhaps that in this ch. J. is speaking specifically to the juvenile Eustochium (cf. l. 18 *novi et apud te et apud matrem tuam ...*).

nulla diversitate notabilis. J. notes that in Jerusalem nobody dresses differently in order to impress (*epist.* 46,10,3). For the precept cf. Augustine, *epist.* 211,10 *non sit notabilis habitus vester*. On the other hand Basil (*reg. fus.* 22,3) finds unorthodox clothing useful for establishing religious vocation.

ne ad te obvia praetereuntium turba consistat et digito demonstreris. Luebeck, p. 161, and Hagendahl (1958), p. 110, compare Horace, *carm.* 4,3,22 *monstror digito praetereuntium*. Being 'pointed out with the finger' is an extremely common locution; cf. *TLL* V,1, 504,38ff.; 505,10ff. (s.v. *demonstro*); ib. 1124,45ff., esp. 53ff. (s.v. *digitus*); ib. VIII, 1441,64ff.; 1442,5ff. (s.v. *monstro*); Otto, p. 116 (ss.vv. *digitus*, *digitulus*, 8); Häussler, pp. 102; 156. Also pertinent to J.'s wording is Lucan 3,81f. *nec constitit usquam / obvia turba*, which closely matches the Hieronymian *ne ... obvia ... turba consistat*. This Lucanic parallel would seem to corroborate the text of the *Libellus* given by Hilberg, who adopts the lection *obvia* in preference to *obviam*, which is found in half his MSS; earlier editions had instead favoured the latter reading. J.'s own phraseology in the present passage has influenced his Vulgate version of 2 Reg. 20,12 *ne subsisterent transeuntes propter eum*; here LXX and Masoretic text have simply καθότι εἶδεν πάντα τὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐσθηκότα and וַיֵּקֶד עָלָיו כָּל־הַקָּבָא respectively. There is a further parallel at [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 56,89 *si pulla fuerit tunica, etiam praetereuntium digitis denotaberis*.

frater est mortuus, sororis est corpusculum deducendum. Avid funeral-going is said by J. to be one of the consequences of effective preaching (*in Gal.* 4,17 p. 384^A). On the other hand Ps.-Augustine (*sobr.* 2 p. 1109) instructs the virgin to avoid *vigiliae funebres*, since here the sexes mingle with particular freedom.

'Brothers' and 'sisters' are mentioned at 27,6 and 38,1 below. J. had remarked in *virg. Mar.* 15 that all Christians are called 'brothers'. Cf. further Pétré, pp. 113ff.

cave ne, dum hoc saepius facis, ipsa moriaris. J. would seem to have borrowed this striking conceit from Athanasius, *fr.* (Lefort [1955]) p. 86,16 ('il ne faut pas qu'elle aille pleurer celle qui est morte d'une mort commune à tous, s'égarer elle-même, et meure de mort éternelle'). According to Brakke (1994), p. 39, this quotation by Shenoute may come ('perhaps') from Athanasius' fragmentary 42nd *Festal Letter*, which is concerned with the tombs of martyrs. In view however of the citation's exclusive reference to the virgin a more likely provenance might seem to be Athanasius' similarly lacunose writing on the subject of virginity.³ Elsewhere in the *Libellus* J. can be shown to have borrowed extensively from Athanasius' great *Letter to virgins* preserved in Coptic (cf. [e.g.] nn. on *centesimus et sexagesimus fructus* ... at 15,2 above and on *neque enim undecim apostoli* ... at 38,1 below). It would accordingly appear that the present passage of the *Libellus* constitutes a further reminiscence of the same Athanasian work.

J. would not seem to have been the only author to imitate Athanasius' striking formulation. Anon., *περί πορθενίας* (Amand-Moons) 37 warns: μηδέ τινων τελευτησάντων ἕνεκεν ἐξελθοῦσα, αὐτῇ εὐρεθῆναι νεκρά. Other passages of this anonymous homily are apparently dependent on the Athanasian *Letter* (cf. the commentary of Amand-Moons *passim*); here we evidently have another such debt (overlooked by Amand-Moons *ad loc.*). In a typical *Selbstzitat* J. himself then reproduces the second half of the phrasing of the *Libellus* (*cave ne, dum hoc saepius facis, ipsa moriaris*) in a sermon delivered during the opening decade of the following century (for the date cf. Morin [1913], p. 234): *vide ne, dum vis sepelire mortuum, ipse moriaris* (*tract.* p. 505 l. 93).⁴ Finally this sentence of the *Libellus* would also appear to have inspired the phrasing of Augustine, *mor. eccl.* 34,75 (*cum ... epulas cadaveribus exhibentes super sepultos seipsos sepeliant*), which was evidently written just three years after J.'s treatise in the same city of Rome.⁵

³ This is the view of Lefort (1955), p. 136, where Shenoute's quotation is placed under the heading 'Sur la virginité'. The extant text of the 42nd *Festal Letter* on the other hand makes no mention of virgins.

⁴ Here the *hoc saepius facis* of the *dum*-clause in the *Libellus* has merely been replaced by *vis sepelire mortuum*, the last two words of which come from Mt. 8,22 (*dimitte mortuos ut sepeliam mortuos*; cited three lines earlier in ll. 89f.), while the initial *vis* has been prompted by Mt. 8,21, which is quoted in the previous line but one (*dimitte me ut vadam et sepeliam patrem meum* [ll. 90f.]; for *dimittere* 'i. q. sinere, permittere' cf. *TLL* V,1, 1215,55ff.). This passage of J.'s sermon accordingly supplies another instance of his partiality for self-imitations in which the wording at issue has in the first instance been suggested by someone else.

⁵ For date and place of composition of this Augustinian work cf. Rutenhöfer, p. 6 ('387/388 in Rom'), who also notes (p. 229) that J.'s *Libellus* has served as one of Augustine's sources for his description of Christian asceticism in chs. 65–80. The

Although none of the studies of the literary style of J.'s letters (viz. Ottolini, Harendza, Hritzu) mentions the present passage, this Hieronymian formulation achieves a stylistic finesse which distinguishes it from the others that were identified above: *frater est mortuus, sororis est corpusculum deducendum: cave ne, dum hoc saepius facis, ipsa moriaris*. The first two clauses are embellished by asyndeton, by parison with an element of *disiunctio* and by adherence to Behaghel's law; the two clausulae (double cretic and dispondee with antecedent cretic) are also notably choice. While moreover the opening clause is merely characterized by a modest anastrophe (*est mortuus*),⁶ the next one evinces by contrast the elaborate interdigitation of twofold hyperbaton (*sororis est corpusculum deducendum*).⁷ Finally the gemination of *mori* at the end of the third section generates an elegant instance of polyptotic *reditio* (*est mortuus ... moriaris*) that virtually enfolds the entire sentence. Such a profusion of rhetorical refinement is all the more noteworthy, since it is surrounded by an usually high incidence of colloquialism (cf. n. on *vestis nec satis munda ...* above, where J.'s specific address to Eustochium is suggested as the reason). In the present passage J. has evidently been at pains to impress his wider audience by providing suitably *soigné* phraseology for the clever conceit he has appropriated from Athanasius.

27,4

ne satis religiosa velis videri nec plus humilis, quam necesse est. Religiosity has been discussed in the preceding sentences (p. 182,20ff.). The following ones deal with humility. J.'s treatment of the second topic involves a certain inconcinnity: he commends Eustochium's humility in l. 16, while here he warns her against the same quality. *Religiosa* is again given a pejorative sense at 32,1 and 32,2 below (cf. *epist.* 39,3,6; 130,6,6). On the other hand the word denotes a virtue in *epist.* 15,4,4 and 58,1,1. For the colloquial *satis* cf. n. on *vestis nec satis munda ...* at 27,3 above. For the similarly colloquial *plus* with the positive cf. Goelzer, p. 427 (in J. it is extremely rare). At *in Is.* 16,58,2^c l. 74 J. demands a humility of the heart that does not seek glory.

⁶ *phrasis nuper sepultos seipsum sepelliant* cannot be indebted to Athanasius' Letter, since at this period Augustine was unable to read Greek; cf. Courcelle (1948), p. 141. His debt to J. in these words is overlooked by Rutzenhöfer's recent commentary (pp. 234f.), which fails to discuss them.

⁷ This transposition also enhances the overall symmetry, since *est* is now the second word in each of the first two clauses.

⁸ The non-hyperbatic order *corpusculum sororis est deducendum* would have produced the same cretic dispondee clausula, the same *cursus velox* and the same correspondence of ictus and accent.

ne gloriam fugiendo quaeras. Hritz, p. 82, cites this phrase as an example of the figure of 'oxymoron'. He fails however to note that this particular antilogy is simply proverbial; cf. Otto, p. 155, s.v. *gloria*, 2; Häussler, p. 104 (for '27,3' read '27,2'). After the conceit at the end of the previous sentence (l. 7) J. has accordingly concluded this one with an arresting proverb.⁸ Hritz also fails to observe that J.'s own formulation is distinguished by a unique concision; he repeats the proverb in similarly striking form at *epist.* 108,3,4 (*fugiendo gloriam glorium merebatur*). Cassian, *inst.* 11,4 describes the same dilemma as the present passage of the *Libellus*: he significantly avoids the proverb.

perturbationibus, quibus mens hominis gaudet, aegrescit, sperat et metuit. Here J.'s enumeration of the four cardinal passions is a gratuitous display of erudition. For J.'s other references to them cf. Hagendahl (1958), pp. 331ff. (add *adv. Pelag. praef.* 1 and *in Nah.* 3,1 l. 99; cf. also Canellis). In the Fathers they are mentioned intermittently: Origen, *fr. in Jer.* 25; Gregory Thaumaturgus, *pan. Or.* 9,120; Lactantius, *inst.* 6,14,7; Augustine, *conf.* 10,14,22; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 39,6; Cassian, *conf.* 1,14,7; Julian of Eclanum, *in Ioel* 2,4.⁹ *Passiones* was the usual translation according to Augustine, *civ.* 14,5 p. 12,10 and 14,8 p. 16,30; J. himself thought this rendering an example of *κακοζήλια* (cf. *in Zach.* 1,18 l. 492). Cicero had used *perturbationes*; J. follows him.

hoc vitio pauci admodum sunt qui caruerint. J. shows a certain partiality for such phraseology. Here he applies it to vainglory. At *adv. Pelag.* 2,13 it refers to hypocrisy: *quamvis et aliis vitiis carere possimus, hypocriseos maculam non habere aut paucorum est aut nullorum.* At *in Gal.* 5,19 p. 416^B the reference is to jealousy: *quo ... malo nescio quis nostrum careat.*

Cassian (*inst.* 11,9) agrees that vainglory is a particularly mischievous vice: whereas it alone is associated with the virtues, other faults are their opposites and can therefore be more easily mastered.¹⁰

ille est optimus, qui quasi in pulchro corpore rara naevorum sorde respergitur. Having opened this sentence with an impressive show of learning (l. 11), J. proceeds to round it off with a striking allusion to Horace. Hagendahl (1958), pp. 110f., compares Horace, *sat.* 1,3,68f. (*optimus ille est, / qui minimis [sc. vitis] urgetur*) and 1,6,66f. (*velut*

⁸ On the other hand Trisoglio, p. 278, discerns in this passage 'un'inflexibile sincerità morale e psicologica'.

⁹ Philo had referred to them at *conf. ling.* 90; *migr. Abr.* 219; *Abr.* 236; *Isr.* 79; *spec. leg.* 2,30; *praem. poen.* 71.

¹⁰ Similarly Orientius finds it especially hard (*praecipuus labor*) to scorn praise (*comm.* 2,13).

si egregio inspersos reprendas corpore naevos). J. juxtaposes verbatim quotations of both Horatian passages at *epist.* 79,9,4; he cites the first in *epist.* 133,1,4 (cf. *ib.* 2,4 *quasi in corpore pulcherrimo naevos*). The 'mole on a fair body' recurs at *adv. Pelag.* 1,23. It was proverbial; cf. Häussler, p. 255, whose evidence can however be substantially augmented: as well as the present passage of the *Libellus* and J.'s aforementioned *epist.* 133,2,4 and *adv. Pelag.* 1,23 add Augustine, *epist.* 93,40; *epist. Divj.* 11,5,4; 12,12,1; Orientius, *comm.* 1,341. It is highly significant that when J. employs such a widely used proverb he should be alone in imitating the specific formulation of a school author.

27,5

neque vero moneo, ne de divitiis gloriaris, ne de generis nobilitate te lactes, ne te ceteris praeferas. Cyprian had likewise declared that it was wrong for a virgin to boast of her affluence: *iactare divitias suas virginem non decet* (*hab. virg.* 10). Such a prescription is not a *topos* in writings of this kind: when Ps.-Augustine stipulates that *dominica virgo ... nec divitiis nec generis nobilitate se debet extollere* (*sobr.* 2 p. 1109), he would seem to be simply imitating the present passage of the *Libellus*, which similarly combines wealth with lineage (for the indebtedness of this Ps.-Augustinian treatise to the *Libellus* cf. Adkin [1993e]). However the vast wealth of J.'s addressee (cf. [e.g.] Kelly, p. 92) is an adequate explanation for his statement here: there is accordingly no need to posit a Cyprianic source. The *praeteritio* of the present passage recurs thirty years later in *epist.* 130,14,1, where J. likewise states that it is 'superfluous' to warn his similarly very wealthy addressee about money-mindedness.

Pride in birth is again deprecated at *epist.* 60,8,1 (it is alien property) and in *Soph.* 1,11 l. 504. The same prescription is found later in Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,21; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 22; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,16 (the last writer adds that it is futile to prefer ourselves in small things to those we know are equal in greater). J. again links noble birth with wealth at *in Tit.* 2,3 p. 581^C; they also occur in combination at Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 20,17,2. Harendza, p. 43, notes the striking parison in the three clauses of the present passage.

humilitatem tuam. J. lays great stress on the virtue of humility; for a person as arrogant as himself this emphasis is understandable. An elegant oxymoron at *interpr. Iob praef.* p. 75,6 makes Eustochium and her mother an *unicum nobilitatis et humilitatis exemplar*, while J. reports that he himself was 'said to be humble' (*epist.* 45,3,1) and that his friend Lea achieved a humility of astonishing magnitude (*epist.* 23,2,2). The importance of this virtue is also stressed in the following

passages: *epist.* 46,10,3; 47,1,1; 54,6,2; 58,1,1; 60,10,5; 66,4,2; 77,2,1; 77,9,1; 79,2,5; 82,1,1; 82,9,3; 108,3,4. It is declared to be chief of the virtues at *epist.* 108,15,2 and in *Mich. prol.* l. 12. In l. 6 above J. has just warned Eustochium not to be 'more humble than necessary'. Such inconsistency is characteristic: it may however be noted that in l. 6 'humility' was connected with religiosity, while here it has to do rather with wealth and station. On humility cf. further Adnes; Dihle.

scio te ex affectu dicere: domine, non est exaltatum cor meum. J. adroitly expresses Eustochium's state of mind by representing her as reciting an appropriate text of scripture. Ps. 130,1 recurs thrice in J.

superblam, per quam diabolus cecidit. While pride was identified by some Fathers as the reason for the Devil's fall, others ascribed it to envy; for documentation of the evidence cf. Adkin (1984d).

super ea scribere supersedi. The alliteration is noted by Hritzu, p. 43.

stultissimum quippe est docere, quod noverit ille, quem doceas. J. now inserts the fourth proverbial expression in the present ch. (cf. p. 183,3f.; 183,7; 183,13f.). This particular proverb is repeated at *epist.* 77,1,1. On it cf. Otto, p. 119, s.v. *docere*, 1; Häussler, p. 306 (no. 567).

27,6

cogitatio tacita subrepat. J. repeats this arresting phrase at *in Eph.* 2,1 p. 465^c (*cogitatio tacita subrepat*) and *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 6 p. 35,9 (*cogitatio ... tacita subrepsisset*, where the Greek has simply ἔγρω).

placere coneris in sordibus. J. also warns against showing off in rags at *epist.* 77,2,2 *interdum gloriosis tumemus sordibus et vendibilem paupertatem populari aurae offerimus.*

in conventu veneris. J. again uses *in* with the abl. instead of the acc. to express 'motion towards' at 30,2 below (*in manibus*). On this unliterary usage cf. *TLL* VII,1, 798,32ff. It recurs in the letters at 64,19,2 and 71,3,3. In the less careful style of the commentaries it is more frequent: *in Jer.* 1,100,3; 4,35,8; 5,2,8; 6,33,2; *in Ezech.* 11,2^b ll. 903, 939, 944; 19,1 l. 772; *in Dan.* 11,14^b ll. 1055 and 1076; *in Am.* 5,4 l. 177; *in Zach.* 5,5 l. 113; *in Mal.* 3,1 l. 37; *in Matth.* 9,17 l. 1353; 18,6 l. 529; 26,25 l. 1134; cf. *tract. in psalm.* l p. 23 l. 115; p. 75 l. 39; p. 96 ll. 31 and 32; p. 130 ll. 93 and 94; p. 135 ll. 66 and 68; p. 165 l. 114; p. 187 l. 177; p. 203 l. 70; p. 206 l. 157; p. 234 l. 101; *tract. in Marc.* p. 343,13; p. 344,15; *tract.* p. 514 l. 258. J. uses the abl. where his source has the acc. at *Victorin. Poetov. in apoc.* 11,5. In translating Origen he employs the abl. at *hom. in Cant.* 2,6 p. 49,25 and *hom. in Jer.* 2,7 p. 296,24 (GCS 33). It is common in the Vulgate.

humili sedeas scabello. Here J. counsels against sitting on a low stool. Basil's advice (*renunt.* 8) had been the direct opposite: *στεῦρον*

Section 101 - General provisions

101.1. The purpose of this Act is to provide for the orderly and efficient administration of the affairs of the State and to ensure that the public interest is protected. This Act shall be construed liberally in order to give effect to its purpose and to the intent of the Legislature. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States.

101.2. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States.

101.3. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States.

101.4. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States.

101.5. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of this Act shall be construed to be consistent with the provisions of the Constitution of the State of New Jersey and the Constitution of the United States.

statim ut aliquem viderint, ingemescunt. For the idea cf. Seneca, *epist.* 99,16 *cum aliquos videre, in fletus novos excitantur.*

demitunt supercillum. Ps.-Augustine advises the virgin to go out with downcast eyes (*sobr.* 2 p. 1108) *dominica virgo ... nec oculis erectis aut laetis sed prona ad terram cum vultu procedat.* J. notes at *in Eph.* 4,2 p. 494^A how some people affect a donnish air by sinking the eyebrows (*demisso supercilio*).

operta facie. Veils are also mentioned at 25,5; cf. 13,5. On the virgin's veil cf. *epist.* 38,4,2; 44,1; 108,26,5; 117,7,3; 130,2,3; 147,6,2. Athanasius (*virg.* 11) had stipulated that when a virgin met a man, her face should be covered and bowed.

vix unum oculum liberant ad videndum. In contrast to the present passage J. commends this practice at *epist.* 130,18,3 *illa sibi tibi ... habenda inter socias ... quae celat faciem et vix uno oculo, qui viae necessarius est, patente ingreditur.* J.'s choice of wording in the *Libellus* would seem to indicate that he has been inspired by Tertullian, *virg. vel.* 17,4 *iudicabunt vos Arabiae feminae ethnicae, quae non caput, sed faciem quoque ita totam tegunt ut uno oculo liberato contentae sint dimidiam frui lucem.* J.'s *operta facie ... unum oculum liberant* evidently echoes Tertullian's *faciem ... tegunt ut uno oculo liberato ...* Accordingly what at first looks like simple observation from life in fact turns out to be literary reminiscence. This concluding clause of J.'s description generates an elegant tricolon crescens.

vestis pulla. Black is worn at *epist.* 24,3,2; 38,3,1; 38,4,3; 66,6,1; 66,13,1; 79,7,7; 117,6,2; 128,2,1; *adv. Iovin.* 2,21; [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 56,88. Doubtful motives are imputed to its wearers at *epist.* 79,2,4; 117,7,2; 125,6,3. J. condemns the practice in *epist.* 52,9,1 (cf. 28,1 below).

cingulum sacceum. J. notes approvingly how after her conversion Blesilla wore a woollen waist-band (*epist.* 38,4,4). Paulinus of Nola (*epist.* 22,2) reports that his fellow-ascetics use string for belts.

sordidis manibus pedibusque. At *epist.* 77,4,1 J. records how the penitent Fabiola presented dirty hands and an unwashed neck to her bishop. *Vita Eupraxiae* (6) reports that none of the group in question ever washed their feet. Women go barefoot in Chrysostom, *hom. in Eph.* 13,3; this had been considered improper by Clement of Alexandria (*paed.* 2,11,117,1). Gregory Nazianzen calls monks ἀνυπόποδες (*or.* 4,71; cf. Homer, *Il.* 16,235).

venter solus, quia videri non potest, aestuat cibo. This striking formulation would seem to be J.'s own. He repeats part of it at *in Am.* 6,2 l. 106 *aestuans cibus aqualiculus.* The clause creates another tricolon crescens, which follows directly upon the preceding one (ll.

his cotidie psalmus ille cantatur: deus dissipavit ossa hominum sibi placentium. Earlier in the ch. (27,5) J. made the person he was describing recite a text of scripture herself in order to characterize her attitude; here he adroitly varies the procedure by making those he describes into the recipients of a scriptural text themselves. J. quotes Ps. 52,6 on just one other occasion at *praef. Vulg. Esth.* p. 4,5.

27,8

virili habitu, veste mutata. This compactly alliterative but somewhat tautologous phrase is a case of self-imitation: J. had used exactly the same words over ten years earlier in *epist.* 1,14, where they denoted simple disguise. Transvestism had been prohibited at Deut. 22,5. In the middle of the fourth century the wearing of men's clothes by women as an ascetic practice is anathematized by the Council of Gangra (*can.* 13).¹¹ The whole of ch. 27,8 upset Rufinus; cf. *apol. adv. Hier.* 2,5.

erubescunt feminae esse, quod natae sunt. A similar argument is used by Ambrose in a discussion of Deut. 22,5, which outlaws transvestism (*epist.* 4,15,2 *incongruum est quod ipsa abhorret natura. cur enim, homo, non vis videri esse, quod natus es?*).

crinem amputant. At *epist.* 147,5,2 J. records the custom in Egyptian and Syrian monasteries for virgins and widows to shave their heads and then bind and veil them in accordance with the Apostle's requirement (cf. 1 Cor. 11,6 'for if the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn: but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered'); in the present passage however these women make a point of exposing their bald heads (cf. next n.). Palladius similarly reports at *h. Laus.* 34 that virgins shave off their hair and wear cowls. On the other hand in the 340's canon 17 of the Council of Gangra had anathematized ascetic women who cut their hair off (it was there to remind them of their obedience), while they were actually excommunicated by a law of 390 (*Cod. Theod.* 16,2,27,1). Tertullian had also censured women who shaved their hair (*virg. vel.* 7,2 *si mulieri turpe est radi sive tonderi, utique et virgini*). Here however Tertullian evidently regards it as a sign of worldliness, since he continues: *proinde viderit saeculum aemulum dei si ita virgini caesum capillum decori mentitur, quemadmodum et puero permissum* (cf. Schulz-Fitügel-Mattei, p. 224).¹² Finally it may be noted that shaving of

¹¹ Ambrose notes at *epist.* 4,15,4 that women had started to wear shorter tunics in the Greek fashion like men.

¹² On Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,7 l. 2 (*crinibus ... modo substrictis, modo relaxatis, modo suscitatis, modo elatis*) cf. Turcan, pp. 122f.

the hair is prescribed as a penance in Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 35.

Impudenter erigunt facies eunuchinas. For the phrase cf. Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 3 p. 1110 *ebrietas ... inverecundos erigit vultus*. The adjective *eunuchinus* occurs only here according to *TLL* s.v. In the present ch. this is the fourth time that J. has employed the word *facies* (p. 183,1; 184,9; 11; 18). It was evidently the most popular term for 'face'; J.'s repeated use of it here with no attempt at variation through employment of the more literary *os* and *vultus* fits the somewhat colloquial style of this ch. (on 'Gleichförmigkeit im Ausdruck' as typical of the 'Umgangssprache' cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 820f.).

cilicis vestiuntur. At *epist.* 60,9,2 the cilice is worn underneath. It was very rough according to *epist.* 108,15,4. Demetrias slept on one (*epist.* 130,4,4). J. also mentions them at *epist.* 108,22,2; 147,8,1; *vita Hilar.* 4,2; 32,3. For the garment as a sign of penitence cf. *TLL Onomasticon* II, 438,3ff. (so J. at *in Ezech.* 7,17 l. 919; add Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 22,2 *conservuli ... horrentibus ciliciis humiles*). Cassian notes that the cilice is avoided as ostentatious (*inst.* 1,2,3). On several occasions the stipulation is made that sackcloth should not be visible: Epiphanius, *exp. fid.* 23,6; *haer.* 80,6,6; Ps.-Athanasius, *syntag.* 4,6. For the *cilicium* in general cf. (e.g.) Hermann; on the use of the term in J. cf. Antin (1947a), who thinks that in the present passage J. is referring to 'cilices de luxe, parure exotique où la haute mode recherchait je ne sais quoi de barbare' (pp. 60f.).

cucullis fabrefactis, ut ad infantiam redeant. On this monastic garb cf. *TLL* IV, 1281,9ff. and 31ff. For its symbolism cf. Lampe (1961) s.v. *κουκούλλον* 4, and Oppenheim, pp. 65ff. (quoting Cassian, *inst.* 1,3 *ut innocentiam ... parvulorum ... custodire ... imitatione ipsius velaminis commoneantur*). Very small ones were more likely to produce ridicule than edification according to Cassian, *inst.* 1,10. On *fabrefactis* cf. Fontaine (1988b), p. 183, n. 21 'il s'agit d'un objet "artistement fait", et donc, en l'occurrence, d'un vêtement ascétique dont la coupe est aussi impeccable et élégante que celle d'une *stola* "laïque"'.

Imitantur noctuas et bubones. J. mentions these two items of avifauna in a reference to the present passage at *epist.* 40,2,2 *placet mihi ... de noctua, de bubone ... ridere*. They recur together in *epist.* 107,2,2. For speculation on the point of J.'s comparison here cf. Capponi, pp. 165ff.

Chapter 28

J. continues his attack on various classes of Christian whose behaviour he finds objectionable. Having dealt in the previous ch. with women who were guilty of ostentation in their asceticism, he now turns to men. First J. warns against exhibitionist monks.¹ Then the priesthood itself comes under fire, as J. proceeds to denounce clerics who are coxcombs or whose sole concern is to worm themselves into the company of women. One particular representative of the second category is described in much detail and with considerable satirical flair.

28,1

catenatos. Here J. condemns those who wear chains. On the other hand only five years earlier at *epist.* 17,2,3 he had spoken admiringly of *catena, sordes et comae* in a description of desert monks. Chrysostom mentions anchorites who wear chains at *hom. in 2 Cor.* 4,13 1,9 (on the whole body) and at *hom. in Eph.* 13,3 (from the neck). In the fifth century Theodoret of Cyrillus refers to the practice on a number of occasions: the iron is said to be worn on neck, hips and hands (*h. rel.* 10 p. 1389^A; 11 p. 1393^C; 21 p. 1436^B), while at *h. rel.* 3 p. 1337^B he calculates the weight. Such behaviour was not restricted to men. Women too shackle themselves in Chrysostom, *hom. div.* 5,3 and Theodoret, *h. rel.* 29 p. 1489^D. At Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 40 on the other hand the chains sound figurative. J. was not alone in his criticism of the habit. In *Historia monachorum* 8,59 the wearers of irons are rebuked for showing off: ἐμέμφετο (sc. Apollo) δὲ πολλὰ τοὺς τὰ σιδηρὰ φοροῦντας ... οὗτοι γὰρ ἐνδεικτιῶσι, φησὶν; cf. also Epiphanius, *exp. fid.* 13,8 (παρὰ τὸν θεσμὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας); 23,6; Ps.-Chrysostom, *op. imperf. in Matth.* 48 p. 905. Vogüé (1991), I, p. 138, suggests that the individuals to whom J. refers in the present passage are Syrians who had come to Rome; cf. *ib.*, pp. 267f.

femine contra apostolum crines. J. had referred with approbation to the long hair of the hermit at *epist.* 17,2,3. According to Theodoret of Cyrillus the monk Theodosius grew his hair down beyond his feet and fastened it at the waist (*h. rel.* 10 p. 1389^A); he also wore chains. The monk Romanus had hair of similar length (*ib.* 11 p. 1393^C). Criticism of the practice was widespread. The habit is condemned as exhibitionism in *Historia monachorum* 8,59 and (Ps.)-Eusebius of

¹ For a discussion of this section cf. Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 267ff.

Alexandria, *serm.* 22 p. 460^{A-B} (κομῶσι τὰς κεφαλὰς ... ἐπιδεικνόμενοι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ κατορθώματα ἑαυτῶν, καὶ θέλονσι κληθῆναι ἅγιοι, καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι ὑπὸ πάντων). As in the present passage of the *Libellus*, the Apostle's commandment at 1 Cor. 11,14 is often cited to justify this disapproval ('doth not even nature itself teach you that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?'): Epiphanius, *exp. fid.* 23,3; *haer.* 80,6,6; Augustine, *op. monach.* 31,39; Ps.-Athanasius, *synag.* 4,8.

hircorum barba. The same sort of undesirable person as is described here has a long beard at *epist.* 125,6,3. The bearded are chidden at Ambrose, *epist.* 4,15,7 and Isidore of Pelusium, *ep.* 1,220. On the goatee cf. *TLL* VI,3, 2819,50f.

nigrum pallium. Martin wears such a garment at Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 2,3,2 *Martinum ... nigro ... pallio circumtectum*. It is also worn by the monk in Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 2,1,44,27f. (μέλαινα διπλοῖς); cf. Eunapius, *VS* p. 472,37 (μέλαινα ... ἐσθῆς).

nudi ... pedes. The practice of going barefoot is widely attested. J. records that the monk Jovinian went unshod (*adv. Iovin.* 1,40 and 2,21). Bare feet are a mark of the monk in a large number of passages: Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 2,1,44,25; *or.* 6,2; Chrysostom, *oppugn.* 2,2; 2,6; Epiphanius, *exp. fid.* 23,6. A certain ascetic in Theodoret of Cyrhus (*h. rel.* 4 p. 1349^B) is reported never to have worn shoes. Clement of Alexandria had noted that in men (except soldiers) the habit made for health of body and mind (*paed.* 2,11,117,2), while Ps.-Athanasius tells the reader that if he can go barefoot, he should (*synag.* 5,4). Augustine's friend Alypius did it to subdue his body (Augustine, *conf.* 9,6,14 *insolito ausu*). An imaginary interlocutor claims it is a fulfilment of the Gospel at Augustine, *serm.* 101,7 *RBen* 42, 1930 p. 312,178. The practice is prohibited over the Christmas period in canon 4 of the Council of Saragossa (c. 380). It is condemned as heretical by Filaster 81 and Augustine, *haer.* 68.

talem olim Antimum, talem nuper Sofronium Roma congemuit. Feder, p. 507, does not think that the Sophronius to whom J. refers here is the same as the person of that name mentioned at *vir. ill.* 135 (cod. Bamb.). J. speaks slightly of an ascetic by the name of Sophronia in *epist.* 127,5,2. Vogtlé (1991), I, p. 269, suggests that 'Sophronius' may simply be a 'sobriquet perfide' for someone who was unchaste. Sophronius and Antimus were remnuoth according to Gordini (1956), p. 249. The striking parison in this sentence is noted by Harendza, p. 40; he might also have referred to the equally impressive *adiunctio* (cf. Lausberg, pp. 371ff.).

postquam nobilium introierint domos et deceperint mulierculas oneratas peccatis, semper discentes et numquam ad scientiam veritatis pervenientes. J.'s thought finds natural expression in the language of scripture (2 Tim. 3,6f.) *ex his enim sunt qui penetrant domos et captivas ducunt mulierculas oneratas peccatis quae ducuntur variis desideriis (7) semper discentes et numquam ad scientiam veritatis pervenientes.* J. is very partial to this text, which he cites a dozen times besides.

J. again notes at *epist.* 50,3,3 that monks frequent the households of noble ladies. His disciple Asterius of Ansedunum also describes the practice (*ad Renat.* l. 423; *ib.* [l. 432] 2 Tim. 3,6); the diffuseness of his depiction highlights the skill and economy which characterize J.'s own. Monkish impostors are likewise said to dupe naive and tender-hearted women in the Ps.-Chrysostomic *op. imperf. in Matth.* 44 p. 880. An ill-wisher would of course have described J.'s own behaviour in precisely the same terms. Voglié (1991), I, p. 269, refers to *Codex Theodosianus* 16,2,20 (of July 370) *qui continentium se volunt nomine nuncupari viduarum ac pupillarum domos non adeant.*

tristitiam simulant. J. uses the same phrase again later at *in Matth.* 6,16 l. 801 (on Mt. 6,16 [*nolite fieri sicut hypocritae tristes*]) *demolitur ... hypochrita faciem suam ut tristitiam simulet.* In *epist.* 58,2,2 he observes that it is child's play to simulate fasting with a sad and ashen countenance. Ambrose also disapproves at *Hel.* 10,35 of faces that feign sadness: *ut (sc. vultus) neque tristitiam praetexat* (*ib.* Mt. 6,16; cf. also *Hel.* 10,36).

quasi longa letunia furtivis nocturno cibis protrahunt. The charge was made with some frequency. J. himself has just mentioned sham fasts at 27,6 above. At *in eccles.* 9,12 l. 293 he alleges that the abstinence of heretics is simulated. J.'s translation of a letter of Theophilus (*epist.* 100,6,4) speaks of people who during Lent eat meat in their bedrooms, while with sad countenance they make an outward show of fasting. Already Origen had noted how on the sly some individuals consume food which they have given up publicly (*comm. ser. in Mt.* 10 p. 18,9). Likewise Ps.-Cyprian had asked in *singul. cler.* 7 *quid per hypocrisin vult ab hominibus abstinens dici et in secreto carnibus et ebrietate distendi?* Recently Ambrosiaster had observed at *in 2 Tim.* 3,7,1 that fat Manicheans boast of fasting (on 2 Tim. 3,6; it is perhaps significant that the same text has just been cited by J. in ll. 6-8). Basil employs the word *λαθροφάγος* (*renunt.* 6).

puget reliqua dicere, ne videar invehi potius quam monere. Some months earlier in *virg. Mar.* 21 J. had been more outspoken: *ego tibi*

plus dico ... monachos impudicos. The present antithesis between obloquy and admonition (*invehi potius quam monere*) is repeated at *epist.* 52,17,2 and 130,19,4. It had occurred recently in Ambrose, *virginit.* 8,46 *cognoscat non obtrectandi me locutum illa studio, sed monendi.*

28,3

de mei ordinis hominibus. J. means the priesthood: he was himself a priest (cf. *epist.* 51,1,5 [Epiphanius] *sancti presbyteri Hieronymus et Vincentius*). It was in fact customary to speak of J. as *Hieronymus presbyter*: Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,8,2; Augustine, *civ.* 18,43 p. 321,28; 20,23 p. 465,6; 22,29 p. 626,6; *doctr. christ.* 4,48; *enchir.* 87,23; *epist.* 197,5; *gest. Pelag.* 35,66; *c. Iulian.* 2,10,33; 2,10,36; *nat. et grat.* 65,78; *quaest. hept.* 1,26; *retract.* 2,71,1; Paulinus of Milan, *vita Ambr.* 1. On the clergy as an *ordo* cf. *epist.* 51,1,6 and 54,5,4 (*nostris ordinis*); also *TLL* IX,2, 963,31ff. and 964,49ff. (s.v. *ordo*).

presbyterium. Editions before Hilberg's read *presbyteratum* instead. However J. uses *presbyterium* in the sense of 'office of a priest' again at *c. Ioh.* 41 *si sic presbyterium tribuis, ut monachum nobis non auferas.* This sense of the word is in fact quite well attested: Cyprian, *epist.* 39,5,2; 45,4,1; Pontius, *vita Cypr.* 3,3 (*vel sacerdotium*); Hilary, *coll. antiar.* p. 119,3 (ib. p. 119,13 *presbyteratum*); Council of Valence (a. 374) *can.* 4 (ib. *diaconatus*); *Collectio Avellana* 40,2; Siricius, *epist.* 1,9,13; Council of Toledo (a. 400) *can.* 1; Gaudentius, *serm.* 19,26; Aurelius of Carthage, *epist.* 2 (p. 157,31 Munier); 4 (p. 169,14 Munier); Augustine, *epist.* 126,2; Theodore of Mopsuestia, *in 1 Tim.* 3,8; *in Tit.* 2,3; Gelasius, *epist. frag.* (Thiel) 10 (ib. *presbyteratum*).

ut mulieres licentius videant. Here J. asserts that the priesthood was attractive to womanizers because it gave them better access. On the other hand he points out at *epist.* 52,15,1 that it was part of the priest's duty to know matrons and their houses. The consequent risks gave rise to some concern elsewhere: Theodore of Mopsuestia notes that such intercourse is an occasion for malicious attack (*in 1 Tim.* 5,19), while Ambrose accordingly stipulates at *off.* 1,20,87f. that instead the young clergyman should wait for widows and virgins to come and visit him.²

Even so J.'s allegations in the present passage made Rufinus ashamed to repeat them (*apol. adv. Hier.* 2,5). Sulpicius Severus on the other hand says that J. told the truth, which made him unpopular (*dial.* 1,9,1). J. himself had assured his readers at *epist.* 14,8,1 that he did not want to say anything disparaging about the clergy. In *virg. Mar.* 21

² When calling at women's houses, a priest must not intrude (Ps.-Basil, *ad. fil.* 7 l. 202).

however he had asserted that some clerics were *caupones*. At *tract in psalm*. I p. 187 l. 186 the point is made that Satan has brought many priests down.

omnis his cura de vestibus. For the priest's attention to dress cf. *epist.* 69,8,7 *comant se vestibus et munditiis corporis*. He should not bother about it according to *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* p. 171,76 *clericus ... nec vestibus ... decorem quaerat*. Sulpicius Severus describes how the freshly ordained cleric disdains coarse fabrics and craves soft ones (*dial.* 1,21,4). Doignon, p. 94, n. 32, mistakenly posits a link between J.'s description here and Cicero, *off.* 1,150 (*ludum talarium*).

si bene oleant. The clergy are again said to wear scent at *epist.* 125,17,1; cf. 147,8,3. Heretics use it at *in Ier.* 4,57,4. Clement of Alexandria (*paed.* 2,8,61,1) had laid down that the Christian has no need of perfume.¹

si pes laxa pelle non folleat. Godel, p. 67, compares Ovid, *ars* 1,516 *nec vagus in laxa pes tibi pelle natet*. Hagendahl (1974), pp. 219f., thinks the similarity of wording a coincidence (cf. Brandt ad loc.); however J.'s phrase is regarded as an Ovidian echo by Bauer (1975), pp. 14f. and Nazzaro, pp. 210f. A floppy boot is also described by Orientius, *comm.* 1,427 (it is worn by the sick and elderly): *qui nunc in laxa tremulus pes pelle vacillat*. Orientius' phraseology is strikingly close to J.'s and Ovid's; he may have been thinking specifically of J.'s (cf. n. on *vix imprimunt summa vestigia* below).

In the present passage the clergyman is worried lest his shoes should flop. The Fathers warn against such foppish attention to footwear on a number of occasions. It should be no concern of the priest according to *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* p. 171,76 *clericus ... nec calceamentis decorem quaerat*. Similarly Ps.-Athanasius cautions his reader against showing off in smart shoes (*syntag.* 5,5) μή θέλε κατακεκοσμημένους υποδήμασιν, έταιρισμού σχήμασιν, έταιριδέσθαι. Ps.-Basil complains about dissolute individuals who do so at *Is.* 5,170 μέχρι υποδημάτων τὸ περιεργὸν τῆς περι αὐτὸν (sc. καλλωπισμὸν) φιλοκαλίας ἐπιδεικνύμενος (sc. ὁ ἀκόλαστος).

On the other hand a floppy style of boot appears to have been favoured by the ascetically-minded. Thus Ferreolus in his rule (32) recommends a loose fit as a mark of holiness: a preference for *multi astrictus* would be a sign of dandyism. J. tells Eustochium at 34,3 below that the roving monks of Italy wear just such floppy boots (*caligae follicantes*): there he disapproves of the practice. A sarcastic reference to tightly-laced boots is also found at [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18

¹ Philo too had objected to its use (*sum.* 2,59).

p. 56,89 *cave, inquam, ut non strictae sint caligae, ne crura non candeanit, nisi formosus fueris, sanctus esse non poteris.*

crines calamistri vestigio rotantur. Hilberg identifies the source as Cicero, *p. red. in sen.* 16 *frons calamistri notata vestigiis*. One of Hilberg's MSS in fact reads *notantur* in the present passage. Kunst, p. 184, n. 5, remarks that this verb suits *vestigio* better than *rotantur*, which is more appropriate to the actual curling-tongs; *notantur* should accordingly be restored here. It may be observed that J. has again made a slight improvement by replacing Cicero's *frons* with the alliterative *crines*. Kunst notes further that J. tends to use Ciceronian language in the vicinity of passages where Cicero himself is mentioned (p. 183, n. 5); in the next two chs. Cicero's name occurs thrice (29,8; 30,1; 30,4; cf. Kunst, p. 184, n. 6). There would seem to be a further echo of Cicero at 28,6 below (cf. n. on *auctor aut exaggerator*). In the present ch. however these Ciceronian imitations are quite out of place: when J. speaks of Cicero in this section of the *Libellus*, it is in order to condemn those who read him and to describe the indictment passed upon himself a decade earlier in his dream: *Ciceronianus es, non Christianus*. J. could never resist a flashy phrase: such inconcinnities are often the consequence.

At *epist.* 52,5,6 J. says that churchmen should not frizz their hair. He notes that Jovinian and his fellows did (*adv. Iovin.* 2,21 and 2,36). The habit is also criticized by Ps.-Basil, *connub.* 6 (τι βρασανίζεις σου τὸς τρίχας;) and Ambrose, *epist.* 4,15,6 (cf. *ib.* 7).

digiti de anulis radiant. At *epist.* 147,8,2 the deacon Sabinian also loads his fingers with rings. For this use of *de* cf. *TLL* V,1, 65,45ff., esp. 66,43f.

vix imprimunt summa vestigia. J. makes two further references to such mincing gait: the first occurs at *adv. Iovin.* 2,14 (*formasuli nostri et torosuli et vix summis pedibus adumbrantes vestigia*; this passage would seem to be a self-imitation of the *Libellus*), while the second is found at *in Is.* 13,47,1 l. 39 (*ut terrae plantas vix imprimeret* [*ib. mollis et tenera et deliciis affluens*]; here J. would also appear to be echoing Deut. 28,56 [LXX: ἡ ἀκαλή ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ ἡ τρυφερά σφόδρα, ἧς οὐχὶ πείραν ἔλαβεν ὁ πούς αὐτῆς βαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ τὴν τρυφερότητα καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀκαλότητα]). Foppish tiptoeing is later described in the same terms by Orientius, *comm.* 1,428 *vix dederat tenui signa notata solo*. Here Orientius probably had in mind the present passage of the *Libellus*, since the poem's antecedent line (*qui nunc in laxa tremulus pes pelle vacillat*) closely echoes J.'s *si pes laxa pelle non folleat* (l. 14). As in the *Libellus*, it is in order not to bespatter his shoes that a dandy goes on tiptoe at Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 49,5 ἀκροβατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ λύπας καὶ ἀθυμίας ἐντεῦθεν τίκτων

ἑαυτῷ περιττός, μὴ μολύνῃ τῷ πηλῷ χειμῶνος ὄντος (sc. τὰ ἰσοδύματα); cf. J.'s *ne plantas umidior via spargat* (ll. 15f., where Lardet [1993], p. 177, suggests an echo of Vergil, *Aen.* 7,810f. *fluctu suspensa tumentis / ... celeris nec tingeret aequiore plantas* [sc. Camilla]; however J.'s comment would seem like Chrysostom's to be due instead to simple observation of everyday life).

sponsos magis aestimato quam clericos. The monk Jovinian is said to go about *quasi sponsus* in *adv. Iovin.* 1,40.

28,4

quidam in hoc omne studium vitamque posuerunt, ut matronarum nomina, domos moresque cognoscant. J. introduces those whose object is intimacy with women as if they were distinct from the foppish individuals just described in ll. 13–17. However these lines were themselves a description of people whose purpose was *ut mulieres licentius videant* (ll. 12f.). There is accordingly a certain inconsistency in J.'s presentation.

The very impressive description which follows of the *unus, qui huius artis est princeps* (l. 20) is largely J.'s own.

breviter strictimque. J. had used this phrase at *epist.* 20,6. The two words are reversed in *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 23 p. 144,15. The expression was something of a cliché; cf. *TLL* II, 2185,1 and 29 (add Ps.-Origen [= Gregory of Elvira], *tract.* 2,17; Paulinus of Milan, *vita Ambr.* 1 [*describam*, as here]; the comparative [*brevius strictiusque*] is found in Vincent of Lérins, *comm.* 16,1).

magistro cognito discipulos recognoscas. The *derivatio* is striking.

28,5

inportunus ingreditur. The alliteration that caps this sentence is noted by Harendza, p. 15.

si pulvillum viderit. At *epist.* 45,2,2 J. insists that he himself has always spurned presents, whether large or small. They are said to be incompatible with pastoral care in *epist.* 52,5,7. Sulpicius Severus echoes the present passage at *dial.* 1,21,4, where he also says that the priest gets his female parishioners to manufacture articles of clothing for him.

This impressive sentence contains two instances of tricolon crescens in immediate succession: *si pulvillum ... si mantele elegans, si aliquid domesticae suppellectilis / laudat, miratur, adtrectat.* It is further enhanced by anaphora and συναθροισμός.

veredarium urbis. On the *veredarius* cf. Audollent, esp. pp. 273f. At *in Abd.* 17 l. 575 J. identifies *veredarii* with the *agentes in rebus*: *eos ... quos nunc agentes in rebus vel veredarios appellant veteres*

frumentarios nominabant. The *agentes in rebus* were the spies of the imperial secret service; cf. (e.g.) Jones, pp. 578ff.; Piganjol, pp. 348f. This explains why the matrons are afraid; here J.'s wit is particularly mordant. He notes at *in Mich.* 2,9 l. 325 that clerics run all over the town. They tyrannize their flock according to *in eccles.* 10,19 l. 334.

inimica castitas, inimica letunia. This would appear to be a case of self-imitation: J. had employed a similarly arresting anaphora with *inimicus* in the previous year at *epist.* 21,9 *inimica deo, inimica virtutibus* (sc. *luxuria*). *TLL* VII,1, 1623,19 – 1634,28 (s.v. *inimicus*) offers no parallel.

prandium nidoribus probat. The *prandium* was usually very simple; cf. Janini Cuesta, p. 17. The presence of *nidores* accordingly indicates just what a gourmet the priest in question is. For the habit of sniffing them cf. Ammianus Marcellinus 28,4,34 *praeunte nidoris indagine*.

J. repeatedly accuses people he does not like of being gluttons. The taunt would seem to be unique to him. At *epist.* 52,6,3 J. again deplures how the modern priest parades his gastronomical expertise. He declares (*epist.* 69,8,7) that some in the priesthood are gourmands. In *epist.* 69,9,3 the Apostle's requirement of a bishop that he 'ruleth well his own house' (1 Tim. 3,4) is strangely interpreted to mean that he should not serve sumptuous feasts or be partial to pheasant: *non ut regias pareat epulas, non ut ... Phasides aves lentis vaporibus coquat, qui ad ossa perveniant et superficiem carnum non dissolvant artifici temperamento*. J. calls his detractors gluttons at *epist.* 27,1,3. He makes the same gibe at his contemporaries as a whole in *epist.* 33,3 (... *Paxamus et Apicius semper in manibus ...*). The only other person to make the same reproach would appear to be Asterius of Ansedunum in *ad Renat.* l. 555; he was J.'s disciple. Since Asterius' taunt takes the specific form of attention to culinary smells, he perhaps has the present passage in mind. For J.'s obsession with gluttony cf. also n. on *quod his difficilius est, consuetudine lautioris cibi* at 30,1 below.

'*altilis*', 'γέρων' vulgo 'παπύζων' nominatur. παπύζων is Hilberg's emendation for *pappizo* (or something similar) of the MSS. It would seem however that the correct reading is simply '*altilis γέρων*' nominatur. The words vulgo *pappizo* should accordingly be omitted as a gloss on γέρων (cf. παπυδίων, *pappus* etc., the latter of which is in fact attested as a gloss [*TLL* X,1, 257,16; its own meaning is given as *senex* ib. 257,5]; for *vulgo* before such glosses cf. Sofer, p. 229). The resulting collocation *altilis γέρων* is a characteristically striking and economical expression. For the extremely forceful application of *altilis* to a human being cf. *TLL* I, 1763,55ff., where only two instances are cited, one of which is Tertullian, *spect.* 18 p. 20,6 (*altiles homines*); this text may have influenced J.'s wording in the present passage. J.'s

formulation represents an improvement over Tertullian's: the Greek term γέρον adds an exotic touch, while it also enables J. to indulge his penchant for snobbery.⁴ J. uses the word again in the form ἀθηνογέρον at *adv. Rufin.* 1,17 and 3,6. On J.'s partiality for blending Greek and Latin elements in combinations of noun and epithet cf. Bickel, pp. 114ff. For a more detailed discussion of the present passage and in particular for an attempt to rebut other endeavours to solve the textual difficulty cf. Adkin (1993g).

28,6

os barbarum. J. taxes his adversaries with linguistic 'barbarism' at *adv. Iovin.* 1,1 (*scriptorum tanta barbaries*) and *adv. Rufin.* 3,6 (*soloecistam ac barbarum*). He repeatedly faults his opponent's diction: examples are given by Hagendahl (1958), p. 311, n. 4 (add *epist.* 61,3,4; 133,5,3); cf. also Opelt (1973), pp. 175; 178. J. would appear to be alone in his proclivity for making this kind of stricture: questions of style were enormously important to such a consummate stylist as himself. In the present passage the taunt comes immediately after J. has signalled his own mastery of Greek with the phrase *αἰτίλις γέρον*. It may also be noted that in this ch. he has scrupulously eschewed the colloquialism which is otherwise characteristic of this work. After *os barbarum* J. adds *et procaz et in convicia semper armatum* (l. 10): the reproach is eminently applicable to himself.

auctor aut exaggerator. J. repeats this very striking collocation eleven years later at *epist.* 54,5,2; according to *TLL* it occurs nowhere else. It would seem to have been inspired by Cicero, *Catil.* 4,19 *cogitate, quantis laboribus fundatum imperium, quanta virtute stabilitam libertatem, quanta deorum benignitate auctas exaggeratasque fortunas una nox paene delebit*. This sentence stands prominently at the very end of Cicero's final speech against Catiline; the climax of its grandiosely anaphoric tricolon crescens is the phrase *auctas exaggeratasque*. *TLL* V,2, 1148,84ff. gives three further instances in which these two verbs occur together in the same passage: in each case however they are being used as technical terms of rhetoric.⁵ Clearly none of these passages has any bearing at all on J.'s

⁴ On the knowledge of Greek in J.'s exclusive circle cf. Bardy (1939), pp. 41ff.; on his literary snobbery cf. *ib.*, p. 50.

⁵ Quintilian, *decl.* 329,8 (*ut cuiuslibet impudentiae + accusatores + sic quoque opus eius augere atque exaggerare conentur*); Fronto p. 141,22 (*auget in quantum potest, exaggerat, praemunit, merat, differt, recurrit, interrogat, describit, dividit, personas fingit, orationem suam alii accommodat*); *Schol. Cic. Gron.* A p. 344,19 (*mihilominus visus est tantum proponisse, non et exaggerasse, cum robustius non potuerit augere*). *TLL* *ib.* 1147,63f. also cites Augustine, *in euang. Joh.* 25,6 *augentur in isto mundo*

arresting phrase. Only the Ciceronian formulation juxtaposes the two words directly and is exceptionally striking. Moreover Cicero has employed the perfect participle: the forms he uses are therefore lexically the same as the nominal ones found in J.⁶ This passage of Cicero would accordingly appear to have been the source of J.'s *auctor aur exaggerator*. Finally it may be noted that by substituting nominal forms in *-tor* J. has 'improved' his source: the effect is further enhanced by homoeoteleuton.⁷

equi per horarum momenta mutantur tam nitidi, tam feroces. Sulpicius Severus likewise notes that after ordination the priest gives up his donkey and rides high-spirited horses (*dial.* 1,21,4; *ib.* 5 refers to J.'s description in the present passage). J. classes mettlesome ponies as a mark of luxury (*epist.* 66,8,3) or as an indication of rank (*in eccl.* 10,5 l. 104), while at *epist.* 27,3,3 he bids his enemies enjoy their Gallic geldings. Hilary had made owning thoroughbred horses the apex of human ambition (*in psalm.* 146,13) *quae maxima est humanae opinionis ambitio, habere equos nobiles*; cf. also Julianus Pomerius 3,17,1 *potentibus equis ad pompam*.

J. uses the phrase *per horarum momenta* again at 40,2 below and *in Abd.* 12 l. 438; *in Math.* 17,16 l. 358; cf. *TLL* VI,3, 2955,35ff. (add *Ps.-Cyprian, laud. mart.* 21; *Lucifer of Cagliari, non parc.* 18 l. 38). It would seem to be a rather elevated expression.

ut illum Thracii regis putes esse germanum. The hyperbaton is noted by Hritzu, p. 79. With the immediately preceding anaphora (*tam nitidi, tam feroces*) and the classical antonomasia (*Thracii regis*) it forms an impressive conclusion to this ch. The 'Thracian king' is of course Diomedes; cf. (e.g.) Lucretius 5,30f. (*Diomedis equi spirantes naribus ignem / Thracis ... propter*); Vergil, *Aen.* 1,752 (*quales Diomedis equi*). Again J. has sacrificed consistency in the interests of a striking phrase: in the following ch. (29,7) he condemns the pagan poets he here evokes.

tribulationes, augetur mala, augetur contritiones, exaggerantur haec omnia.

⁶ *Auctor* was of course recognized as coming from the perfect participle of *augere*; cf. (e.g.) *Schol. Verg. Bern. georg.* 1,27 'auctorem', *ab augendo dictus*.

⁷ A few examples of the combination of *auctor* with some other noun in *-tor* are recorded by *TLL* II, 1201ff. (s.v. *auctor. IV*); add *Lactantius, inst.* 1,2,2 (*auctor ... confirmator*), *Julian of Eclanum, epit. in psalm.* 147,19 (*a ... et moderator*), *Passio Petri* 15 p. 38,7 (*a. et perfector*), *Caesarius of Arles, serm.* 11,2 (*a. ... et exactor*). However the device is nowhere used as effectively as it is in J.; he employs it again later in the *Libellus* at 36,1 *hulus vitor auctor Paulus, illustrator Antonius*.

Chapter 29

The ch. consists of an assortment of miscellaneous precepts on general conduct. The virgin must avoid extremes of both squalor and cleanliness. Queries about scripture should be addressed exclusively to men of impeccable moral standing. Servants who are fellow-ascetics ought not to be treated condescendingly.¹ The weaker among them need to be supported; however shamblers should be told to marry. Worldly virgins and widows must be scrupulously shunned. Finally the virgin should avoid eloquence, poetry and affectations of speech; these concluding admonitions lead up to the account of J.'s dream in the next ch.

29,1

variis callidus hostis pugnat insidiis. Hritzu notes the hyperbaton (p. 79) and the antonomasia (p. 83). Both are instances of self-imitation. This particular hyperbaton comes from his translation of Origen, *hom. in Ezech.* 7,3 p. 393,13 *diversis diabolus pugnat insidiis*. J. now improves this phraseology by introducing the antonomasia *callidus hostis* from his *Vita Pauli* (2), where it had been used to designate the Devil. *TLL* VI,3, 3064,55f. (s.v. *hostis; de diabolo*) registers only three other instances of the collocation *callidus hostis*; all are considerably later (it is also absent from the survey of names for the Devil in Bartelink [1987]). In the present passage *callidus* fits Gen. 3,1 (*sapientior*; cf. next n.) admirably. The combination of both these striking elements within a short sentence of only five words creates a very impressive opening to the ch.

sapientior erat coluber omnibus bestis. J. again combines scripture with an arresting second-hand formulation (cf. previous n.). He cites Gen. 3,1 another six times.

non, inquit, ignoramus eius astutias. J. had a certain partiality for 2 Cor. 2,11, which he adduces on four other occasions.

nec affectatae sordes nec exquisitae munditiae conveniunt Christianis. 'Christian' is here synonymous with 'ascetic'; cf. *epist.* 54,5,2 *ubicumque viderint Christianum, statim illud e trivio: ὁ Γραικός, ὁ ἐπιθέτης*. The same precept as J. gives here has just been issued by him at 27,3 above: *vestis nec satis munda nec sordida*.

¹ This section is discussed by Vogué (1991), I, pp. 257ff.

29,2

si quid de scripturis dubitas, interroga eum, quem vita commendat, excusat aetas, fama non reprobat. The matter was of especial concern to J., who at this period was conducting his Bible-classes on the Aventine. He will accordingly have intended his criteria of suitability to be understood as applying to himself. In the previous ch. J. has depicted the sort of man Eustochium should avoid (he was reproached for it; cf. *epist.* 27,2,2): the exhibitionist monks and the foppish priests he described there were pushy individuals who liked to intrude themselves (cf. p. 185,6; p. 186,3f.). At *epist.* 128,3,6 J. counsels the virgin to ask in public, if she has a query about scripture. The topic had already been addressed before the appearance of J.'s *Libellus* by Ambrose, *virginit.* 8,47: he had thought it hazardous to seek elucidation in the homes of men who *sibi falso doctorum nomen adsumunt*. J.'s elegant twofold chiasmus in the present passage is recorded by Hritz, p. 96.

desponsavi enim vos uni viro, virginem castam exhibere Christo. 2 Cor. 11,2 was used at the consecration of virgins according to *epist.* 130,2,3. J. is extremely fond of the text, which he quotes on no fewer than fourteen occasions elsewhere. On it cf. also Hesbert.

29,3

memento quoniam in medio laqueorum ambulat. Hilberg should have printed the whole text as a direct citation of scripture, since it exactly reproduces the Septuagint version of Sirach 9,20 (= 9,13 LXX). The text had occurred in Origen, *hom. in Cant.* 2,12 p. 58,2, which J. had just translated. J. uses it again at *adv. Pelag.* 2,23. As in the present passage, the verse is given a sexual reference by Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 4,1. The same point had been made recently by Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,2,370 κρυπτῶν παγιδῶν αἰεὶ καθύπερθεν ὀδεύεις; cf. 1,2,3,72. J. characteristically chooses to express the same idea by means of direct biblical quotation; here it fits the context perfectly. On J.'s attitude to Sirach cf. Vattioni.

veteranae virgines. J. has taken this striking phrase from Ambrose, *virg.* 3,4,16. He repeats it sixteen years later in *epist.* 107,9,3. Ambrose himself is fond of using the adjective *veteranus* in such a context. He applies it to *continentia* at *in psalm. 118 serm.* 19,19,1; he uses it of a widow in *vid.* 4,22. The martial metaphor is explicit at *exc. Sat.* 1,67 (*veterana emeritis stipendiis pudicitia*) and *vid.* 14,85 (*vidua velut emeritis veterana stipendiis castitatis*). *Veteranus* could however simply mean 'old'; cf. Ambrose, *epist.* 6,31,12 *infans, puer, adolescens, iuvenis, vir, veteranus, senex* (where the sixth term denotes maturity).

castitatis indubitata in ipso mortis limine coronam perdidere. People are again said to lapse after long continence at *in Ezech.* 25,1 l. 146 and 26,15 l. 615; cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 193 l. 35 (twenty years). Similar statements had occurred at Origen, *hom. in Is.* 8,2 p. 287,9; *hom. in Ezech.* 8,3 p. 404,28 (a decade); *hom. in Lc.* 38 p. 214,24 (J.'s translation adds 'after some years'). Basil had noted that after twenty or thirty years some lost the chastity they had kept from youth (*hom.* 12,16).² 'Crown of chastity' is a phrase used also by Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 15,11,4. J. has characteristically embellished a rather commonplace observation with some striking phraseology (cf. also previous n.).

si quae ancillae sunt comites propositi tui. J. reports at *epist.* 130,6,2 that Demetrias' maids followed her example. Augustine likewise encourages servants to copy their celibate mistress in *epist.* 150, while Basil had told how a girl found a good mistress and was brought up to be a virgin (*hom. in Ps.* 32,5).

ne erigaris adversus eas. According to Gregory of Nyssa Macrina treated those of her servants who were virgins as if they were equals: μετὰ τῶν παρθένων ... ὅσας εἶχε μεθ' ἑαυτῆς ἐκ δουλίδων καὶ ὑποχειρίων ἀδελφὰς καὶ ὁμοτίμους ποιησαμένη (v. *Macr.* 7). Respect for servants was in fact a precept of patristic morality: it was also expected when the servants in question were not virgins. J. reports that Paula turned the slaves of her household into brethren (*epist.* 108,2,1), while he tells a widow not to despise her servants, but to feel bashful because they are men (*epist.* 79,8,1). Already Ignatius had stipulated that slaves should not be scorned; neither however should they be supercilious (*Polyc.* 4,3);³ cf. Ps.-Ignatius, *Ant.* 10. Ambrose remarks laconically: *noli despiciere servum* (*in psalm. 118 serm.* 20,17,2). The attitude was not of course exclusively Christian: Seneca had given the same advice in *epist.* 47. J.'s own egalitarianism was limited: he notes at *epist.* 3,3,2 that Hylas 'expunged the stain of servitude by his purity of character'.

unum sponsum habere coepistis. Master and slave have one Lord in Eph. 6,9.

simul corpus accipitis, cur mensa diversa sit? Here the table where meals are eaten is the same one at which the sacrament is received. J. records that in Rome communion was taken at home (*epist.* 49,15,6); cf. Dublanchy, pp. 555ff. For the sacrament at meal-time cf. Cyprian,

² On the other hand Eusebius of Emesa had stated that passion is not an embarrassment after adolescence (*serm.* 6,12; cf. 7,13).

³ Insolence from servants was an excuse for getting married according to J.; cf. *epist.* 54,15,2 and 55,4,4.

epist. 63,16,1. Macrina also 'shared the same table' according to Gregory of Nyssa, v. *Macr.* 11. The same recommendation had been given by Seneca, *epist.* 47,2.

honor virginum sit invitatio ceterarum. For this kind of incentive cf. Seneca, *epist.* 47,15 (*quidam cenent tecum quia digni sunt, quidam ut sint*); Terence, *Ad.* 968 (*prodesse aequomus; alii meliores erunt*).

29,4

quodsi aliquam senseris infirmiore in fide, suscipe. Hilberg fails to note that the words echo Rom. 14,1 *infirmum ... in fide adsumite*. Augustine tells the abbess that she too should *suscipiat infirmas* (*epist.* 211,15; so *Regula Tarnatensis* 23,8).

puclitiam illius fac lucrum tuum. J. uses a similar phrase thirty years later at *epist.* 130,15,3 *multarumque castitatem lucrum tuum facies*; cf. 58,5,1 (*aliorum salutem fac lucrum animae tuae*). It is perhaps influenced by 1 Cor. 9,19 (*ut plures lucrifacerem*).

si qua simulat fugiens servitatem. In the middle of the century canon 3 of the Council of Gangra had anathematized insubordination by servants in the name of religion.

huic aperte apostolum lege. The unlettered asks the literate to read out God's law for him at Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 6,8.

mellius est enim nubere quam uri. J. quotes 1 Cor. 7,9 another ten times. The widow is told to ignore it at *epist.* 79,10,2. It was Jovinian's teaching according to *adv. Iovin.* 2,36. In Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 21 the words are said to be meant for those not yet consecrated.

otiosae et curiosae domus circumveunt matronarum. Schade (1936), p. 99, n. 2, identifies J.'s source as 1 Tim. 5,13 *simul autem et otiosae discunt circumire domos: non solum otiosae, sed et verbosae et curiosae, loquentes quae non oportet*. It is typical that J. should choose to express his meaning through a text of scripture; here the biblical verse is so well integrated that Hilberg and his reviewers all failed to notice it. The cue for employing this text in the present passage would seem however to have come from Tertullian, who at *uxor.* 1,8 l. 23 had remarked: *loquaces, otiosae, vinosae, curiosae contubernales vel maxime proposito viduitatis officiant*. The influence exercised by the end of the first book of the *Ad uxorem* on this section of J.'s *Libellus* was noted in passing by Micaelli (1979), p. 426; however he did not enter into any particulars (for specific debts cf. nn. on *nulla illis nisi ventris cura ...* and *quidvis mali insinuant* at 29,5 below). J. again cites 1 Tim. 5,13 in *epist.* 123,17,2 and 128,4,4. Augustine also echoes this text when speaking of consecrated virgins at *bon. coniug.* 23,30 and in *psalm.* 99,13. Virgins and widows had been told not to go gadding

about from house to house at *Apostolic Constitutions* 3,6,4. The homoeoteleuton in this passage of the *Libellus (otiosae et curiosae)* is noted by Harendza, p. 16.

rubore frontis adtrito. The phrase signifies shamelessness.⁴ J. uses *adtrita frons* in this sense at *epist.* 52,5,4; 52,8,1; in *Ezech.* 3,7 l. 915; 23,36 l. 1197; in *Zach. lib.* 3 *praef.* l. 24; cf. also *TLL* II, 1127,57ff. (s.v. *attero*); VI,1, 1358,23ff. (s.v. *frons*). It may however be noted that besides the present passage the only other instance of the collocation of *atritus*, *frons* and *rubor* to be supplied by *TLL* is Juvenal 13,242 *quando recepit / eiectum semel atrita de fronte ruborem?* Possibly J. had the striking Juvenalian phrase in mind here.

parasitos vicere mimorum. On the attitude of the Fathers to the mime cf. Reich, pp. 109ff.; 744ff.; Weismann, *passim*; Jürgens, pp. 80ff.; 230ff. For the theatrical comparison cf. Chrysostom, *fem. reg.* 10 οὐ δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ παρατρέχεις γυναῖκας τῇ τῶν ἱματίων περιεργίᾳ.

quasi quasdam pestes abice. J. redeploys this striking expression at *epist.* 52,5,3 (*quasi quandam pestem fuge*) and 130,19,1 (*quasi quasdam pestes ... virgo deviter*). It recurs later in Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,17 (*velut quasdam pestes animae fuge*). Tertullian had said: *omnem afflatum eius vice pestis etiam de longinquo vitemus* (*idol.* 12,5). There is nothing in Otto or Häussler. Since J. imitates a directly adjacent passage of the *De idololatria* (12,2f.) in the next ch. but one (31,3f.; cf. n. on *at dices: puella sum delicata*) as well as at 21,8f. above (cf. n. on *tunc iacobus et iohannes ...*), it is perhaps possible that here too Tertullian's powerful formulation has supplied a cue for the wording of the *Libellus*. Cf. also 35,1 below (*his igitur quasi quibusdam pestibus exterminatis*).

corrumpunt mores bonos confabulationes pessimae. J. quotes 1 Cor. 15,33 another five times. It had occurred in Cyprian, *testim.* 3,95 (*bonis convivendum, malos autem vitandos*). However J.'s use of the text in the present passage has evidently been inspired by Tertullian, *uxor.* 1,8 l. 23 (cf. next n.).

29,5

nulla illis nisi ventris cura est et quae ventri proxima. Wiesen, p. 125, takes this statement to be the spontaneous ebullition of an outraged moralist: 'The last remark illustrates how in the heat of his

⁴ Reich, p. 766, misinterprets: 'Diese Jungfrauen und Matronen ... haben sich so dicke, rote Schminke aufgelegt, dass ihre Stirne noch röter ist wie die der Parasiten im Mimus'. One might also compare Chrysostom, *pan. Bab.* 2,1 ἀμνηστίασμένους καὶ θυμῷ ... τῇ κεφαλῇ.

indignation J. feels justified in employing the grossness so characteristic of pagan satire, even when he is writing to a young girl'. The heat of indignation has in actual fact had very little influence on the wording of this passage. Once again it can be shown that J. is parading a piece of second-hand cleverness. The particular wording which he uses here has been taken from Tertullian, *uxor.* 1,81, 29 *deus enim illis ... venter est, ita et quae ventri propinqua*. On the other hand the idea itself was used with great frequency by Greek writers; in the West however it is extremely rare. Its usual form was 'the belly and what is under it': ὑπό and *sub* take the place of Tertullian's *propinqua*.

It is in this form that J. uses the idea elsewhere: *epist.* 84,5,3 (*quae in ventre sunt et sub ventre*); 147,3,6; *adv. Iovin.* 2,11; in *Ezech.* 44,22 l. 1912; in *Gal.* 5,19 p. 415^D; in *Is. lib.* 18 *praef.* l. 34. According to Micaelli (1985), p. 125 and n. 48 (for 'p. 754' read 'p. 741'), this last passage from J.'s commentary on Isaiah (*post ... ventris ingluviem eo quae sub ventre sunt quaerant*) is suggested by the sentence from Tertullian's *Ad uxorem* cited above. Petitmengin (1986, sect. 4; for 'Ez.' read 'Es.') rightly rejects this assertion,⁵ however he himself finds the source for the wording of J.'s Isaiah commentary in the report of Cerinthus' views given by Dionysius of Alexandria and preserved by Eusebius, *h. e.* 3,28,5 and 7,25,3 γαστήρ καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γαστέρα πληρομοναῖς. This is certainly the appropriate formulation of the idea. However in this form it enjoyed very wide circulation. Before J. wrote his *Libellus* it had already been used in the following passages: *Sentences of Sextus* 428; 588; Clement of Alexandria, *paed.* 2,10,90,1; *str.* 1,5,30,2; Origen, *fr. in Lc.* 124; Basil, *hex.* 9,2; *hom.* 3,8; *leg. lib. gent.* 9 B; Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 1,31; *struct. hom.* (Smets-Van Esbroeck) 2,15; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 14,17; 27,3. It is therefore clear that in Greek the idea was a cliché.⁶ Instead of ὑπό it may be noted that Philo had used μετά: *Cher.* 93 (γαστήρι καὶ τοῖς μετὰ γαστέρα); *congr.* 80; *det. pot. ins.* 157; *fug.* 35 etc. The same formulation is preferred by Gregory of Nyssa: *beat.* 4 p. 1244^B; *Pss. tit.* B 12; *virg.* 4,5. In Latin the cliché is used by Rufinus of Aquileia at *apol. adv. Hier.* 1,5 and 1,8: however in both cases he is merely echoing J. (*epist.* 84,5,3).

⁵ It is significant that in order to demonstrate the influence on J. of Tertullian's phrase in *uxor.* 1,81, 29 Micaelli should have picked the rather different formulation at in *Is. lib.* 18 *praef.* l. 34 and ignored the exact parallel found in the *Libellus*; such indifference to J.'s penchant for the verbatim appropriation of other people's striking phraseology is common.

⁶ Ἰσχυρόστροφος is employed as a euphemism for 'sexual' in Ps.-Athanasius, v. *Syncl.* 29; 49; Ps.-Chrysostom, *puer.* 2; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,244; 3,33a; *ezenc.* 1; 58; *Magn.* 65; Ps.-Nilus, *narr.* 3,13. It had also been used in this sense by Philo; cf. Leisegang 1,9.

Since the cliché was hardly ever used in Latin, it supplied J. with an excellent opportunity to impress. The frequency with which J. himself employs it shows how strongly the phrase appealed to him: it is as flashy as it is prurient. There would seem in fact to be a tendency among more discriminating writers to avoid it. Chrysostom says instead γαστήρι δὲ καὶ ἡδονῇ δουλεύοντες (*hom. in Rom.* 13,7). When the phrase occurs in Eusebius, *h. e.* 7,25,3, Rufinus' translation has in its place *ventris et voluptatis*.⁷

A final point may be made. Tertullian uses the phrase in *Ad uxorem* after he has quoted I Cor. 15,33 (1,8 l. 23). This is the same collocation which is found in J.'s *Libellus* (cf. previous n.). In Tertullian however the text of I Cor. is separated by three substantial sentences from the striking phrase which caught J.'s fancy. J. on the other hand places the two elements directly alongside each other. Here then we have a large-scale example of J.'s propensity to streamline his source in the interests of rhetorical force.⁸ At the same time this is of course a palmary case of the juxtaposition of scripture with an arresting formulation that has been borrowed from elsewhere.⁹ J.'s words angered Rufinus; cf. *apol. adv. Hier.* 2,5.

mi catella. J. again employs the vivacious figure of *sermocinatio*. For *catellus* as a term of endearment cf. *TLL* III, 603,35ff. (read '2,3,259'). *rebus tuis utere*. Otto and Häussler supply no evidence that this maxim was in any way 'proverbial'.¹⁰ On the other hand Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,9 l. 25 contains the following dramatic *sermocinatio*: 'Non', inquit, 'utemur nostris?'.¹¹ Tertullian put these words into the mouths of materialistic and carnally-minded women; the context is therefore the same as in J. A further case of *sermocinatio* which occurs in the *De cultu* four chs. after this one has evidently inspired J.'s first example of

⁷ One might compare Lactantius' *ventri et Feneri* (*Inst.* 3,8,6). When Rufinus renders the cliché in *Sentences of Sextus*, he goes out of his way to avoid the repetition of *venter* (428): *ventrem et ea quae sub alvo sunt*.

⁸ It may be noted that J. has also streamlined on a smaller scale as well. In Tertullian the full text of the phrase that J. has borrowed is the following: *deus enim illis, ut ait apostolus, venter est, ita et quae ventri propinqua*. J. has omitted the reference to Phil. 3,19 (*quorum deus venter*) and grafted the second half of Tertullian's sentence on the traditional form of the cliché documented above.

⁹ A related formulation was juxtaposed with Exod. 32,6 at 8,4 above: *prout venter et statim cetera: manducavit enim populus et bibit, et surrexerunt ludere*. Again J. has taken over the first sentence straight from Tertullian; the source this time is *issus*. I p. 274,9 (cf. n. ad loc.). Finally it may be mentioned that J. makes the gravity of gastric and sexual vices correspond to the position of the relevant members at *epist.* 55,2,3 and in *Tir.* 1,7 p. 567^a; he has taken this idea too from Tertullian, *setun.* I p. 274,8.

¹⁰ Microw-Lawler, p. 164, oddly render *rebus* as 'charms'. J.'s phrase means of course 'geniesse doch deinen Reichum' (Schade [1936], p. 99).

¹¹ There is no comment on this sentence in Kok, p. 180, or Turcan, p. 140 (both ad loc.).

the figure in the *Libellus* (cf. n. on *istae sunt* ... at 13,3 above). Apparently he has also borrowed his *rebus tuis utere* from the same work.

Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,9 l. 25 is also the source of Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 7 (*sed sunt aliquae divites et facultatum ubertate locupletes, quae opes suas praeferant et se bonis suis uti debere contendunt*) and 11 (*locupletem te dicis et divitem et utendum putas his quae possidere te deus voluit*); cf. Keenan, pp. 16 and 19. J. characteristically retains Tertullian's arresting *sermocinatio*,

vive, dum vivis. J. adds a further exhortation to *rebus tuis utere*; the juxtaposition is extremely impressive. As regards *vive, dum vivis*, Otto, p. 376, merely adduced in a footnote Terence, *Hec.* 461 *vixit, dum vixit, bene*; here however the addition of *bene* sets the expression apart from the pregnant use of *vivere* found in the present passage. Sutphen, p. 389 (s.v. *vivere* 6), then proceeded to identify a new 'proverbial' application of *vivere*. The evidence he adduced was the following: Martial 1,15,12 (*sera nimis vita est crastina; vive hodie*); *CIL* II 391 (*vivite victuri moneo; mors omnibus instat*); *Inscr. Orelli-Henzen*, 4807 (*dum vivimus, vivamus*); 4806 (*vive in dies et horas*); Peter Damian, *epist.* 2,13,76 (*a quibus [sc. blandientibus] scilicet haec saepe dicuntur: 'vive dum vivis'*). Only the second, third and fifth passages are relevant to what J. says here. Of these only the last one presents the same wording as J.: this eleventh century text is clearly itself an echo of the *Libellus*.¹²

There is however one passage which does provide an exact parallel. Again it comes from Tertullian. Near the beginning of *De resurrectione mortuorum* he had remarked: *utar et conscientia populi contestantis deum deorum; utar et reliquis communibus sensibus, qui deum iudicem praedicant: 'deus videt' et 'deo commendo'. at cum aiunt: 'mortuum quod mortuum' et 'vive dum vivis' et 'post mortem omnia finiuntur, etiam ipsa', tunc meminero et cor vulgi cinerem a deo deputatum* (3,2f.). We accordingly have Tertullian's own testimony that in his day the sentiment to which J. gives expression in his *sermocinatio* had been a 'widely held attitude'. His statement is evidently borne out by the passages cited above. While however in these other cases the idea is the same, its formulation is not. Tertullian alone exhibits precisely the same form of words as recurs later in J. The *De resurrectione* was already well known to J. when he wrote his *Libellus*; cf. Petitmengin (1988), p. 55. It can moreover be shown that when J. uses a 'proverbial' expression elsewhere, he specifically selects the particular

¹² Very similar wording is found at *Inscr. christ. Diehl* 900 *dum vives. homo, vixit; nam post mortem nihil est*. However Diehl notes ad loc. that the inscription is evidently not ancient.

wording which had been used by a canonical author with whom he was deeply familiar.¹³ It would therefore appear that the second component in this *sermocinatio* has, just like the first (cf. previous n.), been inspired by a passage of Tertullian.¹⁴

numquid filiis tuis servas? J. proceeds to add a third element to the *sermocinatio*. This last idea does not seem to have been taken from any literary source. That it was current in this period is perhaps indicated by an undatable sermon of Augustine, which expresses the opposite view: *quod dicunt homines, 'filiis meis servo' (9,21; cf. 9,20 'filiis meis servo'; magna excusatio, 'filiis meis servo')*. J.'s words are of course quite inappropriate to Eustochium: as someone who had devoted her life to virginity, she could not 'save for her children'.¹⁵ The inconcinnity is characteristic. Finally it may be noted that the present *sermocinatio* accordingly involves the same combination of literary imitation and independent observation of life as characterized the two earlier ones in which J. presented contemporary Roman *mores* (13,3 and 24,1).

quidvis mali insinuant. J. has lifted this impressive phrase straight from Tertullian, *uxor.* 1,8 l. 27. For a further borrowing from this section of the *Ad uxorem* cf. n. on *nulla illis nisi ventris cura ...* above.

ferreas ... mentes. This arresting phrase would seem to have been J.'s own creation; *TLL* VI,1, 574,49 records no other instance. J. typically repeats it some twenty years later at *epist.* 117,6,4.

¹³ At *c. loh.* 37 J. says: *in porta, ut dicitur, naufragium*. Otto, p. 284, s.v. *portus* 1, and Häussler, pp. 78, 115, 202, 284, list various other instances of this particular proverbial expression. Of all these examples only Ps.-Quintilian, *decl.* 12,23 has the same wording: *in porta naufragium*. This work is also the only one of those cited which J. knows well, cf. Luebeck, pp. 218ff. It would seem therefore that even though J. qualifies his phrase with *ut dicitur*, it is rightly regarded as an echo of *decl.* 12,23 by Luebeck, p. 219, and Hagendahl (1958), p. 168. One further instance of this feature of J.'s compositional method may be cited. J. says at *c. Lucif.* 13 *uno, ut aiunt, digito*. Again several more cases of this 'proverbial' locution are adduced by Otto, p. 115, ss.vv. *digitus, digitalis* 4, and Häussler, p. 156. However only the wording of Terence, *Eun.* 284 is identical. J. quotes from this same scene of the *Eunuch* at 24,1 and 32,2 of the *Libellus* and again at *epist.* 50,4,4. Accordingly Luebeck, p. 112, is evidently correct in identifying the passage from *c. Lucif.* 13 as another echo of this Terentian play.

¹⁴ Petimengin (1988), pp. 49f., observes that J. uses several 'proverbial' expressions which had already occurred in Tertullian; none of the passages cited is from the *Libellus*. In this connection Petimengin asks: 'Y a-t-il là influence, ou simple rencontre?' It would seem that each instance has to be judged individually. The evidence adduced above appears to indicate that at least in the present passage we have a case of 'influence'.

¹⁵ As the passage stands, *tuis* refers perforce to Eustochium, to whom J. has just given the following specific advice in regard to women who say such things: *quasi quardam peccata abice* (29,4). Cf. also 29,7 *referam tibi meae infelicitatis historiam*.

cum luxuriatae fuerint in Christo, nubere volunt. J. passes imperceptibly into direct citation of scripture. He is very fond of 1 Tim. 5,1 ff., which recurs nine times in his works. The text had been adduced in Cyprian's collection of *testimonia* (3,74). The combination in this relatively short sentence of biblical quotation, striking phraseology from Tertullian and an impressive formulation of J.'s own (cf. previous two nn.) is characteristic.

29,6

nec tibi diserta multum velis videri. J. repeats the warning about eloquence at *epist.* 120 *praef.* 4 *nec fulgore saecularis eloquentiae delecteris.* Similarly Pelagius requires a virgin's speech to be embellished by modesty rather than eloquence (*epist. ad Demetr.* 19) *sit ... sermo virginis prudens, modestus et rarus, nec tam eloquentia pretiosus quam pudore.*¹⁶ The topic had already occurred in Juvenal (6,379ff.; 6,434ff.).

Use of *multum* with the positive is colloquial (cf. Hofmann, p. 77). The effect would appear to be accentuated by the anastrophe (cf. [e.g.] *Vetus Latina, eccles.* 7,17 [Jerome, *adv. Iovin.* 1,14] *instus multum*; only verse examples are given in *TLL VIII*, 1617,57; 64; 72). Since J. is warning against over-eloquence, he has accordingly made the language in which he expresses himself fit his own precept. It is however characteristic that he should straight away belie his own prescription by quoting Persius (cf. n. on *delumbem matronarum salivam* below).

lyricis festiva carminibus. According to Fontaine (1988b), p. 185, n. 29, 'il s'agit sans doute de vers à la manière des *Odes* d'Horace ou des *Bucoliques* de Virgile, puisque ces deux poètes sont mis sur la sellette quelques lignes plus loin'. This view would appear to receive corroboration from *epist.* 21,13,9 *at nunc etiam sacerdotes dei ... videmus comoedias legere, amatoria bucolicarum versuum verba cantare, tenere Vergilium.* Furthermore J. uses the phrase *lyricum carmen* with specific reference to Horace at *epist.* 130,7,3; in *Erech.* 1,8^b l. 320; in *Eph.* 5,20 p. 529^D.¹⁷ At the same time it might be felt that J. could also have more popular forms of composition in mind here. His later reference to Horace and Vergil is no obstacle to this assumption: J. was notoriously inconsistent. Gorce (1925), p. 223, paraphrases: 'chanter avec accompagnement d'instruments de musique des pièces de vers de leur composition'.

¹⁶ Gorce (1925), p. 223, would accordingly seem to be mistaken in paraphrasing this passage of the *Libellus* as 'déclamer'; cf. Fontaine (1988a), p. 333, n. 22 'jeux oratoires'.

¹⁷ He uses it of the Psalms at in *Jer.* 2,96; 5,3,2; in *Erech.* 29,171. 944; 30,20 l. 1441.

Such verse performances are often condemned in J.'s works. He calls *carmina poetarum* the food of demons at *epist.* 21,13,4. The widow Furia is told to kick out her *cantor*, *fidicinae* and *psaltria* (*epist.* 54,13,1). A *cantor* makes bad company according to *epist.* 79,9,1; similarly a gifted songstress is unsuitable as a companion (*epist.* 107,9,3). A virgin should have no knowledge of *cantica mundi* (*epist.* 107,4,1; cf. 107,8,3 *surda sit ad organa; tibia, lyra et cithara cur facta sint, nesciat*). At *adv. Iovin.* 2,8 J. states that poetry debilitates the mind; cf. *tract. in psalm.* l p. 302 l. 47 (*si lira aut organum aut calamus quasi dissolvat me*). Cf. further Antin (1963a).

The same opinions are frequently expressed by the Fathers in general; however no one puts them forward as insistently as J. The point that music and song have a debilitating effect is also made by Cyprian, *zel.* 2 and Evagrius Ponticus, *sent. virg.* 48; both identify them as the work of devils. The objection is partly that much poetry is licentious: Cyprian accordingly argues that God did not create the voice to recite erotic and obscene verse (*hab. virg.* 11); nor according to Prudentius (*ham.* 316ff.) did he make ears to listen to *lyricae modulamina vana puellae ... et convivale calentis carmen nequitiæ*. Such αἰσχροὶ ᾠδαὶ should therefore be left alone in the view of Chrysostom, *educ. lib.* 35. Ambrose notes how *cithara*, *psalteria* and *tympana* are employed at banquets to accompany song: the effect is to provoke lust (*Hel.* 15,54). Chrysostom commends a strict husband for not permitting undignified songs at *hom. in Eph.* 20,7; however Gaudentius of Brescia stipulates that feasts where the lyre and flute are played should be avoided altogether (*serm.* 8,17). It is wrong for a woman to sing according to Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 10. Virgins in particular are urged to desist: the same Ps.-Cyprian disapproves of virgins who sing in chorus (*singul. cler.* 26), while at *sobr.* 2 p. 1109 Ps.-Augustine orders the virgin to shut her ears and heart *contra omnes sonos musica arte prolatos, contra cuncta cantica saecularia, contra omnia quae dulciter delectentur audire*. Finally Origen observes that Ps. 102,9 ('I have eaten ashes like bread') is an apt warning to those who enjoy music and song over their cups (*sel. in Ps.* 101,10); likewise Ps.-Basil (*ls.* 5,157) recommends Is. 5,11 ('woe unto them ...') for people who keep lyres instead of Gospels in their homes.

metro ludere. For *ludere* with reference to '*carmina levioris generis*' cf. *TLL* VII,2, 1775,10ff., where no example with *metro* is given. J. however uses the phrase *metro ludere* again when he is describing the inmates of the fiery furnace in *praef. Vulg. Dan.* p. 8,35.

non delumbem matronarum salivam delicata secteris. J. now digresses as he proceeds to deal with affectations of speech. He returns to the topic of literary pursuits in l. 16 below. On *delumbem ... salivam*

Luebeck, p. 196, compared Persius 1,104f. *summa delumbe saliva / hoc*; on J.'s quotations from this author cf. Hagendahl (1958), p. 284. The present borrowing is discussed by Burzacchini, pp. 57ff., while Kissel, p. 250, n. 460, observes that 'nur in der Wortwahl, nicht jedoch in der Sache ist Hier. Epist. 22,29 ... von unserer Stelle beeinflusst' (Persius is discussing the superficiality of contemporary poetry, whereas J.'s concern is with pronunciation). Wiesen, p. 126, notes the incongruity of citing a classical author in the very passage that warns against reading the classics. However J. could never resist a striking phrase.¹⁸ Here *non* for *ne* is a somewhat unliterary usage; cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, p. 337.

strictis dentibus. *TLL* records no other instance of *strictis dentibus* (or *labiis dissolutis*; cf. next n.). J. on the other hand uses both phrases elsewhere in contexts that would seem to reveal his keen powers of observation. For the sense of *strictis dentibus* cf. *OLD* s.v. *stringere* 4 ('to bare, unsheathe'), esp. Calpurnius Siculus, *ecl.* 5,92 *non stringere dentes ulla (sc. serpens) potest uncas*. J. vividly describes the sound produced at *epist.* 20,5,1 (*quando silentium volumus imperare, strictis dentibus spiritum coartamus et cogimus in sonandum 'st'*) and in *Is.* 4,11,1 l. 28 (*est ... stridulus [sc. sonus sade] et strictis dentibus vix linguae impressione profertur*). Cf. further Antin (1963a).

labiis dissolutis. The same words describe the laughter of a bishop in his cups at *in Tit.* 1,7 p. 566^D, while the collocation *solutis labiis* is used in connection with the pronunciation of Hebrew (*ib.* 3,9 p. 595^B). The phrase *dissolutis labiis* again refers to laughter in Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 17 l. 465. In the present passage the mention of 'lips' may possibly have been prompted by Persius 1,104f. *summa delumbe saliva / hoc natat in labris*, the first half of which J. has echoed in the previous line. J.'s own formulation *nunc strictis dentibus, nunc labiis dissolutis* evinces an elegant chiasmus which follows Behaghel's law and generates a choice dichoree clausula.

In dimidiata verba. Infants should not be taught *dimidiata verba* according to *epist.* 107,4,6. They marked little Paula's enunciation (*epist.* 108,26,5). Cf. also *TLL* V,1, 1202,77f.

rusticum putantes omne, quod nascitur. Sneyders de Vogel argued that *nasci* could also have the meaning of 'être naturel': this sense is not recorded by Forcellini or *OLD* s.v. (the *TLL* article has not yet

¹⁸ Feichtinger (1991), p. 67, also notes J.'s 'Widersprüchlichkeit'; however she explains it by reference to his 'Psychogramm' (*ib.*, p. 68: 'Das Psychogramm des Hieronymus ... zeichnet einen Menschen mit unterentwickeltem Ich'), not to his method of composition.

The multiform further than the first occurrence of this word in the present passage has translated as 'propre vulgaire tout ce qui est naturel'. This sense is at first attested rather earlier. In a note on the 1550 words of the *Lectures Vaines*, l. p. 114, n. 'c', had already pointed out that the meaning was *naturum est sex naturale* and had proposed two further passages, one of which is significantly earlier, Valerius's that parallel to Rufinus, *Book hom. 3,1 ornatus arguitur et natura pariter omnia quod nascitur* (here the Greek is too succinct to be relevant). The second passage he adduces belongs to the first half of the fifth century: it is *Miscellanea Felix 38,1 omne quod nascitur, a mensurabile dei munus, nullu opere corrupitur*. To Vallarsi's evidence it is possible to add two further early examples, they also establish as indisputable the sense that he and *baeydens de Vogel* posit. Both texts attack cosmetics. The earlier use is *Tertullian, cult. fem. 2,5 l. 15 quod nascitur, opus dei est, ergo quod infingitur, diaboli negotium est*. This passage is then imitated by *Cyprian, hab. virg. 15 opus dei est omne quod nascitur, diaboli quodcumque mutatur*. Five lines earlier Cyprian had used the phrase *linimenta nativa contraponente medicamine*.¹⁹ This occurrence of *nativus* in conjunction with the antithetic use of *natura* in Cyprian and of *infringi* in Tertullian are clear proof that *nasci* can indeed mean 'être naturel'. For the use of the verb with a personal subject to signify 'be by nature' cf. n. on *serva, quod nata es* at 19,4.

adeo illis adulterium etiam linguae placet. Feichtinger (1991), p. 56, makes this statement the nub of J.'s case against the pagan classics and the reason for the ensuing account of his dream: 'Da für ihn die Lektüre heidnischer Literatur eine craste Gefährdung der Keuschheit darstellt, weil sie zur verbale Unkeuschheit verführe, *adeo illis adulterium etiam linguae placet*, ist nur konsequent, dass christliche Lebensform und heidnische Literatur nicht zusammengehen, *sicula bibere non debemus calicem Christi et calicem daemoniarum*'. It would seem however that in the present passage J. is simply following his normal procedure of borrowing impressive phraseology from elsewhere. Erasmus, l. fo. 61^D, remarks: 'elegantè dixit, "adulterium linguae"'. It can however be shown that the idea is not J.'s own.²⁰ The first patristic instance of the notion of the 'tongue's adultery' would seem to occur at Basil of Ancyra, *virg. 27 μοιχεύεσθαι ... γλῶσσοις*.²¹ The idea had

¹⁹ For the standard meaning of *naturus* as 'natural (as opp. to artificial)' cf. *OLD* s.v. 2 *baeydens de Vogel* opens his article by establishing that *naturus* signifies 'natural'.
²⁰ *TLZ* I 881,29 is v. *adulterium*; records only the present passage, which is altogether absent from the corresponding article on *lingua*.
²¹ For a somewhat fuller discussion of the phrase cf. *Maribel J. de J. quod nascitur sex naturale? non possumus / deo ... quod nascitur* ... which is significant for the meaning of the Russian phrase by *Constantin Baeydens de Vogel* in *de virginitate servanda* ... par la langue'.

also been employed shortly before the composition of J.'s *Libellus* by Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 43,47 τῆ γλώσση πορνείουσι. Earlier Methodius had spoken of the tongue's 'chastity' at *symp.* 6,3,139 ἀγνείαν ... εἶναι καὶ γλώσσης; cf. Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 20 παρθέρον ... τὴν γλώσσαν (where the translation by Coudreau-Miquel, p. 38 ['garde sa langue ... pure'], again fails to give adequate expression to this very striking phrase). Ambrose had recently used the expression *adulterium vultus* (*virg.* 1,6,28); cf. *ib.* 2,4,25 (*aestimare utrum adulterare potuerit corpus quae nec vocem adulteravit*).

Such an idea was naturally attractive to J.: it appealed to his taste for prurience as well as to his partiality for arresting language. He has accordingly appropriated it here in order to provide a very impressive conclusion to his portrayal of enunciative affectation in certain women. This depiction is itself a digression which enables J. to show off; he has spatchcocked it in characteristic fashion into his discussion of *belles lettres*. Feichtinger is evidently wrong therefore to turn the phrase *adulterium linguae* into the justification for J.'s attack on the classics and for the corroborative account of the dream: it has nothing whatever to do with them. The whole of this final section of the ch. is in fact an entirely typical congeries of striking conceits and scriptural citation; the attempt to impose on it a coherent line of argument ignores J.'s compositional method.

quae enim communicatio luci ad tenebras. J. reverts to the theme of secular literature which was introduced and then abandoned in II. 11f. Hagendahl (1958), p. 319, remarks that the transition is made 'rather abruptly'; he offers no reason for this 'abruptness', which is of course due to J.'s mosaic technique of composition. Typically it is a verse of the Bible (2 Cor. 6,14f.) that marks the change of subject; here we accordingly have a further instance of J.'s tendency to combine scripture with a striking second-hand formulation (cf. previous n.). The precise reference of this biblical citation, which dispenses with any form of introduction, is only made clear in the following sentence (p. 189,2f.; it too is a commonplace). The result is a certain incoherence.

2 Cor. 6,14f. is a text of which J. is extremely fond: he quotes it another eighteen times. The verse refers to marriage with a pagan at *epist.* 123,5,3 and *adv. Iovin.* 1,10; to good and bad at *adv. Iovin.* 2,2 and in *Gal.* 5,19 p. 418^b (cf. *tract. in psalm.* II p. 445 l. 164); to the admission of Arian bishops at *c. Lucif.* 5. As in the present passage, the text had been linked to 1 Cor. 8,10 at Tertullian, *coron.* 10,7. J. again combines it with 1 Cor. 10,20 at *in Is.* 9,28,16 l. 76.

29,7

quid facit cum psalterio Horatius? cum evangelis Maro? cum

apostolo Cicero? J. now deals specifically with classical literature. The kind of antithesis which he uses here was a commonplace (Antin [1960], p. 61, n. 5, sees it instead as simply exemplifying J.'s taste for juxtaposing pagan and Christian elements). J.'s formulation of the cliché is as usual especially striking; Harendza, p. 43, records the parison. Hagendahl (1958), p. 110, n. 2, states that 'the point in question seems to have been taken over from Tertullian, *praescr.* 7 L 33 *quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae? quid haereticis et christianis?*' It may however be noted that Tertullian also asks in *apol.* 46,18 *adeo quid simile philosophus et christianus, Graeciae discipulus et caeli?* (these two Tertullianic passages are discussed by Fredouille [1972], pp. 317ff.). There is an even closer parallel at Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Jo. 1,1* 2 τὶς τὸν Πλάτωνα προετίμησε τῶν εὐαγγελίων; According to Zellinger, pp. 37ff., this homily was delivered by Severian of Gabala at Constantinople in 380-1; J. was there at the time. A similar statement occurs in Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom. 1* p. 432^c (of the church) οὐκέτι τιμῶσα τὸν Πλάτωνα, ἀλλὰ τὸν παντοκράτορα θεὸν ἡμῶν, ... οὐκέτι προσκυνεῖς Ἀριστοτέλην σοφίσαντα, ἀλλὰ θεὸν τὸν εἰς τέλη τῶν αἰῶνων σε σοφίσαντα. J. himself repeats the antithesis at *adv. Pelag.* 1,15 (*quid Aristoteli et Paulo? quid Platoni et Petro?*); cf. in *Gal. lib. 3 praef.* p. 400^D (*ecclesia Christi non de Academia et Lyceo sed de vili plebecula congregata est*).

It may be noted further that already the *Didascalia Apostolorum* had forbidden the reading of pagan books (3,2); its author is confident that the Bible caters for all tastes and can equal the range of secular literature (3,7-16; cf. *Apostolic Constitutions* 1,6,4, where there is some expansion). The classics are likewise condemned in *Homiliae Clementinae* 4,19,3. A monk should not collect such works according to Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,73 (cf. 4,1). Finally *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* p. 167,12 forbids a bishop to read them.²²

If J.'s antithesis in this passage is traditional, the classical authors he mentions by name are his own choice: he singles out Horace, Vergil and Cicero. Hagendahl (1958), p. 110, n. 2, remarks that these writers are the ones 'whom J. himself admired and quoted most of all'. Later Rufinus used this passage to trap J.; cf. *apol. adv. Hier.* 2,7f. *si uno operis eius pagina est ... ubi non dicat: 'sed Tullius noster, sed Flaccus noster, et Maro'*. Horace is compared to the Psalter because J. 'sent et sait bien que le lyrisme, et même le lyrisme religieux, est à l'évidence commun aux *Psalmes* et aux *Odes*' (Fontaine [1988a], p. 333). In

²² When Caesarius of Arles started to do so, he too was warned in a dream to stop it (*vita Caes. Arif.* 1,9); cf. further Antin (1963b), pp. 363f.

epist. 53,8,17 J. makes David the Christian Horace; he notes that the Psalter is written in Horace's manner at *chron. epist.* p. 3,19 and *proef. Vulg. Job* p. 72,3. The antithesis of Vergil and the Gospels is an attack on Juvencus according to several scholars: Schwarz, p. 372, n. 29; Smolak, p. 14, n. 5 ('Die Evangelien und Vergil wurden offenbar in Kenntnis des Bibelespos des Juvencus ... einander gegentibergestellt'); Fontaine (1988a), p. 333. The supposition is perhaps unnecessary. Vergil had to be included as the most important Latin poet; the Gospels were the most obvious biblical equivalent to epic. Cicero is compared to Paul because of the former's letters and philosophical works rather than Paul's speeches in Acts (Smolak, p. 14, n. 5); according to Fontaine (1988a), pp. 333f., each of the two 'sait offrir des modèles à qui veut parler "de manière appropriée à la persuasion"'. Fontaine (1988b), p. 185, n. 29, sees in this final antithesis a counterpart to *nec tibi diserta multum velis videri* (29,6); he thinks that 'cette dernière interrogative ... fait probablement allusion à des exercices mondains de déclamation en prose' (cf. however footn. 16 to the comm. on this ch.). Fontaine (1974), p. 337 and n. 1 (cf. id. [1977], p. 448 and n. 2), suggests that all three antitheses are directed against Ambrose; the first alludes to Ambrose's *Hymns*, the second to the hexameter inscriptions on his churches and the third to his *De officiis*. This view is rejected by Testard (1988), pp. 232f.

nonne scandalizatur frater, si te viderit in idolio recubentem? J. again uses scripture as a substitute for argument. Here he has conflated and abbreviated 1 Cor. 8,10 (*si enim quis viderit eum qui habet scientiam in idolio recubentem, nonne conscientia eius, cum sit infirma, aedificabitur ad manducandum idolothya?*) and 1 Cor. 8,13 (*quapropter si esca scandalizat fratrem meum, non manducabo carnem in aeternum, ne fratrem meum scandalizem*). Fontaine (1988a), p. 333, n. 22, affirms that J.'s statement 'apporte quelque nuance aux apparentes condamnations précédentes'. It might however be thought inappropriate to look for such 'nuances' from a method of composition that is as patchwork and plagiaristic as J.'s in the *Libellus*. Evidently J.'s point is simply that, while reading pagan literature may be harmless in itself (cf. next n.), it sets a bad example. Some months earlier J. had quoted the same section of 1 Cor. 8 with the following gloss: *nonne tibi videtur sub aliis verbis dicere, ne legas philosophas, oratores, poetas, ne in eorum lectione requiescas? nec nobis blandiamur, si his, quae sunt scripta, non credimus, cum aliorum conscientia vulneretur et putemur probare, quae, dum legimus, non reprobamus* (*epist.* 21,13,7f.). In the present passage it may be noted further that J. has again combined scriptural citation with an arresting commonplace (cf. previous n.). 1 Cor. 8,10 had moreover already been linked to 2 Cor.

6,15 (cited in the preceding line) by Tertullian, *coron.* 10,7.

licet omnia munda mundis et nihil reiiciendum sit, quod cum gratiarum actione percipitur. J. combines Tit. 1,15 (*omnia munda mundis*) and 1 Tim. 4,4 (*nihil reiiciendum quod cum gratiarum actione percipitur*). The former has already been employed at 13,3 above. The latter recurs in *epist.* 79,7,6 and 121,10,23, the second of which again combines it with Tit. 1,15 (cf. also in *Tit.* 1,15 p. 576^A).

simul bibere non debemus calicem Christi et calicem daemoniorum. J. typically concludes his argument with a quotation of scripture (1 Cor. 10,20 *non potestis calicem domini bibere et calicem daemoniorum*). He shows a certain partiality for the text, which recurs five times in his *oeuvre*. J. again combines it with 2 Cor. 6,14f. (cf. p. 188, 16ff.) at *in Is.* 9,28,16 l. 76 and with Tit. 1,15 (cf. l. 5) at *in Tit.* 1,15 p. 576^B.

referam tibi meae infelicitatis historiam. The word *referam* is again used shortly afterwards to introduce the account of the avaricious monk in ch. 33 (p. 195,14). Thierry (1963), p. 37, argues that this sentence should open ch. 30.²¹

²¹ He also maintains that here *refero* bears the sense 'revert to something one has already touched upon': J. is accordingly connecting the account of his dream with the description of the desert in ch. 7. However Thierry's argument would seem to be undermined by J.'s use of the same word (*referam*) to introduce a further anecdote in ch. 33, where the avaricious monk at issue is new to the reader: hence J. cannot in this case be 'reverting to something he has already touched upon'.

Chapter 30

J. tells the story of his famous 'dream'. His starting-point in the previous ch. had been a warning not to be 'over-eloquent' (29,6). The point had then been elaborated in characteristic fashion by means of lavish scriptural citation interspersed with a flashy commonplace (p. 188,16ff.): the result was to broaden the issue from over-concern with eloquence to the propriety of reading the classics.

The personal anecdote which J. now proceeds to relate also starts from the question of literary refinement: J. was repelled by the uncouthness of the Bible's language and preferred to read classical literature instead. During an illness he then had his 'dream': this encounter with a judge who asks his *condicio* and orders him to be scourged is inspired by similar accounts in the acts of the martyrs.¹ To escape from this extremity, J. was more than happy to promise that if he ever 'read or possessed' secular texts, such action would constitute a 'denial' of the judge. At this point J. awoke. The ch. then concludes with an emphatic affirmation that the effect of this experience was a new and intensive study of scripture; J.'s aversion to its stylistic crudity had evidently been overcome. J. thereby returns to the beginning of the account and at the same time to the theme of 'eloquence', which was his point of departure in the previous ch.

Seventeen years after the publication of the *Libellus*, when the Origenist controversy was at its height and J. accused Origen's followers of deliberate dishonesty, Rufinus tried to answer the charge by accusing J. himself of acting dishonestly in breaking his 'vow' (*apol. adv. Hier.* 2,6ff.); to this J. replied quite reasonably that it was only a dream (*adv. Rufin.* 1,31). Rufinus' attack has diverted scholarship from the real significance of the dream, which is indeed momentous. However it does not lie, as is commonly supposed, in J.'s 'renunciation' of the classics,² but rather in the assiduous study of the Bible which he undertook from that moment onwards. The final words of his account, which unlike the 'vow' lie outside the dream itself and are therefore clearly to be taken seriously as a description of reality,

¹ J. himself had already produced two hagiographical works: these were the *Vita Pauli* and the *De septies percussis* (epist. 1). He will accordingly have been very familiar with the acts of the martyrs: for their influence on the *Vita Pauli* cf. Fuhrmann (1977a), p. 81; Koch, pp. 134ff.

² Cf. (e.g.) Tillemont, XII, p. 24 (title to art. IX) 'S. Jérôme renonce à la lecture des auteurs profanes'; Cavallera, I, I, p. 31 'renoncement absolu'.

proclaim resonantly that this was its consequence: *tanto dehinc studio divina legisse* (30,6). There is no mention whatever of 'abandoning' the classics. Hence J. will have felt no compunction in reading them subsequently; evidence for such reading is reviewed by Hagendahl (1958), pp. 320ff. (cf. also Adkin [1999b]). For evidence of J.'s new preoccupation with scripture, once the dream enabled him to overcome his distaste for it, cf. Adkin (1995b). J.'s problem was not with the classics, but with the Bible.

It may be noted further that the details of the dream narrative itself do not suggest that J. took this 'vow' very seriously. In the first place it is only the bystanders who make the suggestion about reading no more profane authors (p. 191,1ff.). J. goes out of his way to stress that in the circumstances he would have been happy to make 'even bigger' promises (ll. 4f.). Finally the initial stipulation 'not to read' works of secular literature any more is transformed in J.'s mouth into a promise not to possess them at all (ll. 4 and 6). Since his account is characterized by such indications of apparent insouciance, it is no surprise that in *epist.* 21,13,6, which was written just a few months before the *Libellus*, J. should speak airily in the first person of reading philosophers and books of worldly wisdom.

Since the dream is generally associated with 'renunciation' of the classics rather than with the start of an intensive study of the Bible, it is understandable that J.'s remarkable decision to learn Hebrew has not been linked to it.³ In a letter written towards the end of his life (125,12,1) J. describes how he set about this task while in the desert; the motive he gives is repression of prurient imaginings. Modern scholarship customarily adds intellectual curiosity (e.g. Kelly, p. 50, referring to Barr, pp. 285f.). Perhaps it is also possible to see in J.'s decision a determination to come to grips with the linguistic problem of the Old Testament: it was the *sermo* of the *propheta* that put him off (30,2).⁴ There is in fact a clear piece of evidence for connecting the decision to learn Hebrew with J.'s dream. When at *in Gal. lib.* 3 *praef.* p. 399^c J. speaks of not having read the classics 'for over fifteen years', it is customary to regard the statement as confirmation that J. has kept his 'vow' (cf. [e.g.] Grützmacher, I, p. 154). Perhaps it is more

³ Broglie, VI, p. 264, had placed the study of Hebrew after the dream ('forcé de détourner ses regards de Virgile, il aborda David dans le texte'). On the other hand Labourt, I, p. xii, assumes that J. began Hebrew before he had his dream.

⁴ Cf. also *chron. epist.* p. 3,12 (earliest of the works J. produced in Constantinople; cf. Kelly, p. 72): the scriptures seem minus compta et sonantes because *diserti homines interpretatas eas de Hebrano nescientes, dum superficiem, non medullam inspiciunt, ante quasi vestem orationis sordidam perhorrescunt quam pulchrum intrinsecus rerum corpus iuventant.*

significant that J. makes the remark in the context of his study of Hebrew; reading Hebrew has spoiled his Latin style. The implication is that this activity is also what has prevented him from reading the pagan classics:⁵ it was not J.'s nature to do things by halves. Finally it may be noted that in *epist.* 125,12,1 J. proceeds to learn Hebrew after the stylistic beauties of the pagan classics; the sequence perhaps points to J.'s account of his dream.⁶

Some final remarks may be made on the function of this narrative within the *Libellus* itself. Firstly of course it supplies a very arresting illustration of the traditional warning against eloquence; this object-lesson is a masterpiece of narrative skill, in which J. uses all the devices of rhetorical *δεινότης* to marvellous effect. The account also serves the purpose of *variatio*: it provides relief from the series of precepts and prohibitions which make up the bulk of the work. In addition this autobiographical *διήγημα* creates a pendant to the similar account of J.'s desert tribulations in ch. 7; J. thereby achieves a very effective diptych spanning both halves of the work. Finally and perhaps most importantly this ch. offers a rationale for what is by far the most salient and significant feature of the *Libellus*: its ubiquitous citation of scripture.

On the dream cf. Pease, pp. 154ff.; Labriolle (1920); Antin (1951), pp. 51ff.; id. (1959) pp. XXIII; id. (1963b); Rapisarda; Eiswirth, pp. 10ff.; Hagendahl (1958), pp. 318ff.; Thierry (1963); id. (1967), pp. 125ff.; Memoli, pp. 124ff.; Schwarz; Siniscalco, pp. 715f.; Ciccarese, pp. 84ff.; Feichtinger (1991); ead. (1997); Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 281ff.; Lardet (1993), pp. 123ff.; Zelzer; Miller (1994), pp. 205ff.; Allen; Conring, pp. 233ff.

30,1

ante annos plurimos. J. begins his account by setting it as far back in the past as he can.⁷ His purpose is evidently to emphasize his youth and immaturity at the time. Similarly those who intercede on his behalf are represented as entreating the judge to grant him pardon in view of his youthfulness (*adulescentia*; 30,5). The date and place of the dream cannot be determined with certainty; cf. Adkin (1993h); id. (1993i). According to some scholars it took place at Antioch around 374: so (e.g.) Grützmacher, I, pp. 152f.; Cavallera, I,2, p. 153; Penna, pp. 26

⁵ Cf. *adv. Rufin.* 1,31 (J. does not even have time to read the scriptures, let alone the classics).

⁶ Cf. also *proef. Vulg. Dom.* p. 6,12. Learning Hebrew is not of course mentioned in the dream narrative itself, since *brevitas* is a requirement of a *narratio* (cf. Lausberg, pp. 169ff.).

⁷ On the other hand the anecdote in ch. 33 concerning the avaricious monk is said to have taken place *ante non plures annos*.

and 439; Kelly, p. 41. It is located at Antioch, but in 369 by Booth (1981), p. 258, and in 372 by Nautin (1988), p. 39. On the other hand it is assigned to the desert around 376 by Rapisarda; Thierry (1963); Antin (1963b), pp. 376f. If the last date were correct, the events which J. is now describing would have occurred barely eight years earlier.

domo, parentibus, sorore, cognatis. J. describes how he abandoned home, parents, sister and kin. In the *Libellus* he has already warned Eustochium not to let her family impede her ascetic resolve (24,3); he has also told her how James and John left their father behind (21,8). In the present passage J.'s mention of this detail from his own past is not surprising, for the monk leaving his family is a theme of which he is remarkably fond.⁸ In his partiality for it he is exceptional among the Fathers. One of his earliest letters (3,4,2) tells how his friend Bonosus spurned mother, sisters and brother to become a hermit. Heliodorus is reminded that he has pledged never to spare either mother or father (*epist.* 14,2,2; the same letter mentions J.'s own leave-taking at 3,2). Paula too renounced motherhood to prove herself Christ's servant according to *epist.* 108,6,3; J. commends her for it on her tomb (cf. *ib.* 33,3). He had already admonished her when her daughter Blesilla died that 'monk' and 'mother' were irreconcilable terms (*epist.* 39,5,2). At *in Agg.* 1,2 l. 171 attachment to family is disparaged; at *in eccles.* 3,8 l. 131 the martyr is said to hate his own. This kind of cruelty is repeatedly described as kindness: *epist.* 14,2,3; 38,5,1; 125,7,6. Piety towards the members of one's family is impiety to God in *epist.* 39,6,1; on the other hand hatred of them is piety towards God at *in Matth.* 10,37 l. 1797. The same commentary gives a novel interpretation of Christ's dictum 'If thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out': according to J. he is referring to love for wife, children and kin (*in Matth.* 5,29 l. 627).

J. might have pointed to a number of New Testament texts to support his extreme view. At Mt. 10,37 Christ says that whoever loves father or mother more is unworthy of him. In Lk. 14,26 whoever does not hate his father, mother, wife and children, cannot be Christ's disciple. Finally Mk. 10,29 promises a rich reward to those who abandon their families. J. appears to echo these texts at *epist.* 64,4,1; *c. Ioh.* 7; *in Matth.* 18,8 l. 544. He would seem to be virtually alone in his preoccupation with the sentiments they inculcate: elsewhere in the Fathers the subject is much rarer. Ambrose speaks at *fug. saec.* 2,6 of leaving family behind when he interprets the Levite as the fugitive from the world whose duty this is. A similar requirement is also found several times in (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt: *hom. typ. 1* (Berthold) 15,2,1;

⁸ The speaker at Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra, *narr.* 1,3 records that he was obliged to do the same.

50,4,11; 54,1,2; 54,4,5; *hom. typ. II* (Dörries–Klostermann–Kroeger) 45,1.⁹ St. Antony had shared the same concern; cf. Athanasius, *v. Anton.* 3 (he wished to avoid distraction).

Cavallera, I,2, p. 9, states that J.'s sister was born about 361, while the birth of his brother Paulinian (who is not mentioned here) is assigned to a date around 364. According to Booth (1981), p. 247, Paulinian had not yet been born when J. left for the East. Courcelle (1950), p. 184 and n. 3, implausibly identifies the sister mentioned here as J.'s 'ex-fiancée'.

quod his difficillius est, consuetudine lautioris cibi. More difficult than abandonment of parents was abstinence from luscious food. Gorce (1949b), pp. 126f., supposed that J. required a careful diet because of his delicate health. Antin (1963b), p. 351, asserted that the priority which J. gives to food here is meant to be 'ironical'. The assumption is perhaps unnecessary. In the *Libellus* J. places the dangers of over-eating first (chs. 8ff.). The prominence and urgency of his warnings against it are exceptional: they evidently reflect the writer's private obsession. It is also significant that the taunt of gluttony in an enemy is unique to J. (cf. n. on *prandium nidoribus probat* at 28,5). J.'s relations with his parents are discussed by Kelly, p. 6, who notes a certain reticence.

For the phrase *lautioribus* cf. *TLL* VII,2, 1054,82ff., esp. 1055,12 and 18ff. J. uses it again at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 201 l. 174 and *hom. Orig. in Is.* 3,1 p. 253,9. He says *lautioribus ... mensae* at 9,2 above; cf. *epist.* 69,8,7. For the gastronomic practice to which these phrases refer cf. Janini Cuesta, pp. 6ff.

propter caelorum me regna castrassem. Hilberg fails to note that these words come from Mt. 19,12 *sunt eunuchi, qui se ipsos castraverunt propter regnum caelorum.* J. refers to the same text at 19,2 above. *TLL* III, 547,71ff. gives examples of *castrare* with the preposition *a*; here it is omitted.

Hierosolymam. J. says he left his parents to go to Jerusalem. Schöne, p. 239, compared *epist.* 5,1 (*reaccensus est animus Hierosolymam proficiscendi*). However J. never reached Jerusalem. For this reason Rapisarda, pp. 10ff., suggested that in the present passage J. had instead the heavenly city in mind. There is however an objection to this assumption. Here J. uses the form *Hierosolyma* (as opposed to *Hierusalem*). In Hilberg's first volume of J.'s letters *Hierosolyma* denotes the celestial Jerusalem only twice; on the other hand the same

⁹ Keeping in touch with family should not be allowed to distract the monk according to Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,66; 3,290.

form is used twenty-four times in the topographical sense: this disproportion makes Rapisarda's view unlikely. Lausberg, p. 172, notes the suitability of a brief evocation of a locality as a means of introducing a narrative. Here J. also wishes to stress the antithesis between Jerusalem and Rome (cf. *Romae* in the next line). Eight lines earlier he had asked *quid facit cum psalterio Horatius?* ...; one of his sources had been Tertullian, *praescr.* 7 l. 33 *quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis?* These words of Tertullian would also seem to have been in his mind in the present passage: Rome has merely replaced Athens in order to fit J.'s biography.

Romae. J. was in Rome for his education between 359–67 according to Cavallera, I,2, p. 153.

summo studio ac labore. At the time of writing J. was partial to this phrase, which he had employed recently at both *epist.* 21,13,4 and *hom. Orig. in cant.* 1,6 p. 38,5. It is evidently a hitherto unidentified echo of Cicero, *de orat.* 2,363, which had also been copied by Lactantius, *inst.* 4,2,2. Monceaux (1930), p. 145, notes that J. will have copied the text himself.

itaque miser ego lecturus Tullium ieiunabam. During his mortifications J. still preferred the classics to scripture. For his estimate of Cicero's style cf. Hagendahl (1958), pp. 289f. J.'s statement here is paraphrased by Quadlbauer, p. 190, n. 6: 'Die Stärke dieses Reizes (sc. the *venustas eloquii* of pagan literature) demonstriert besonders deutlich das Bekenntnis des Hieronymus, er habe seines unbändigen Verlangens nach der Lektüre Ciceros nicht einmal durch intensives Fasten Herr werden können (ep. 22,30,1)'. This interpretation is misconceived: J.'s purpose in fasting was not to conquer his passion for Cicero. J. merely intends to signify that mortification and reading of the classics were at that time his two main activities. Here the particular wording is determined by stylistic considerations. The whole sentence is printed by Hilberg as follows: *itaque miser ego lecturus Tullium ieiunabam. post noctium crebras vigiliis, post lacrimas, quas mihi praeteritorum recordatio peccatorum ex imis visceribus eruebat, Plautus sumebatur in manibus.* Hilberg's full stop after *ieiunabam* (which is further accentuated by the paragraph-break that he chooses to insert here) should be replaced with a semicolon. This modification brings out the elegantly chiasmic structure of the whole: *lecturus Tullium / ieiunabam : post noctium crebras vigiliis ... / Plautus sumebatur in manibus.* At the same time the sentence is marked by subtle *variatio*: the future participle *lecturus* is succeeded by the preposition *post*, while the accusative *Tullium* alternates with the nominative *Plautus*. Within the second half itself there is again chiasmus (*noctium / vigiliis : lacrimas / quas ... recordatio ... eruebat*)

and *variatio* (the nominal form *noctium* vis-à-vis the relative clause *quas ...*). The whole sentence follows Behaghel's law.

30,2

Plautus. Hilberg's MSS are equally divided between the readings *Plautus* and *Plato*. It would seem that the latter should be preferred; for a full discussion cf. Adkin (1994c). J.'s allusions to Plato are assembled by Luebeck, pp. 57ff. (add c. *Lucif.* 11); Plato's style is commended at 35,8 below. J.'s taste for vaunting his expertise in philosophy (cf. Rufinus, *apol. adv. Hier.* 2,7 and 2,9) was as great as his aptitude for the subject was small.

sermo horrebat incultus. J. was put off reading scripture by its want of elegance; to someone whose rhetorical sensibility was as exquisite as J.'s the crudity of the Old Latin versions will certainly have seemed intolerable.¹⁰ On the uncouthness of scripture cf. Fuchs, pp. 351f. The material set out by him can however be supplemented. He cites four passages from J.; to them can be added four more. At *in Ion*. 3,6 l. 227 D. those outside the church are said to despise the Bible's language; cf. also *tract. in psalm.* l p. 130 l. 118. J. himself admits to Marcella that the Latin translations from the Hebrew sound odd (*epist.* 29,1,3); he attempts a vindication in *epist.* 48,4,3, where he stipulates that a translation for the church must even try to hide such grace as it does possess. Augustine too observes in *doctr. christ.* 4,50 that the prophets are thought unlettered; he demonstrates in the following paragraphs the finesse of Am. 6,1ff. Similarly Ambrose is concerned in *epist.* 8,55 to show how the Bible conforms to the precepts of rhetoric.

The Greek as well as the Latin versions of the scriptures were criticized: though the evidence for attitudes regarding the Greek text is not inconsiderable, Fuchs fails to give it any attention at all. Origen records at *Jo.* 4,2 that the diction of the Greek Bible was despised (ib. 2 Cor. 4,7 'we have this treasure in earthen vessels'). Two centuries later Proclus of Constantinople also notes that God's word is in earthen vessels (*hom.* 2,1); a similar view is expressed by Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,141. Scripture appears to dispense with grammar according to Origen, *Cont.* 3 p. 240,5 and *hom. in Num.* 9,6 p. 62,23. Origen however gainsays the general view about it at *hom. in Gen.* 15,1 p. 127,10, while in *Ps.* 118,172 he points out its neatness. Eusebius of Caesarea too thinks Hebrew achieves a euphony of its own (*p. e.*

¹⁰ Duval (1972), p. 569, notes the similarity of J.'s wording (*horrebat incultus*) to Cicero's description of his contemporaries' distaste for Latin translations of Greek philosophical texts: *sed ex eo credo quibusdam seu venire ut abhorreant a latinis quod inciderint in inculta quaedam et horrida de multis graecis latine scripta detertius* (*fn.* 1,8).

11,5,2). Its simplicity had won Tatian over; cf. *orat.* 29. If the reading *Plato* is adopted in l. 16 (cf. previous n.), J. may be referring in the present passage to the LXX as well as to the Old Latin.

Hagendahl (1958), p. 313, n. 6, is wrong to complain of 'inconsistency' between the attitude expressed here and J.'s statement in *epist.* 53,10,1 (*nolo offendaris in scripturis sanctis simplicitate et quasi vilitate verborum ...*). J. overcame his initial aversion to the language of the Bible as a result of his dream: the lavish scriptural quotation of the *Libellus* shows how thoroughly he did so. Accordingly it entails no inconsistency for J. to describe his earlier repugnance in the present work and to deprecate the same attitude later.

lumen caecis oculis non videbam. For this proverbial locution cf. Otto, p. 326, s.v. *sol* 3, and Häussler, p. 321 (no. 1663). Their evidence can be supplemented with two further passages from J., besides the present one: in *Os.* 14,10 l. 223; in *Zach.* 4,1 l. 10. At 30,3 below on the other hand the judgment seat is bathed in light.

non oculorum putabam culpam esse, sed solis. The same analogy occurs in Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 4,19.

30,3

antiquus serpens inluderet. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compares Apoc. 20,2 *serpentem antiquum qui est diabolus*; cf. also 12,9. Of J.'s twelve other references to these words four have instead *coluber*. Here the 'mocking' is perhaps an echo of Ps. 103,26 (*iuxta LXX*) *draco iste quem formasti ad inludendum ei*.

medullis infusa febris. It was customary to represent fever as attacking the marrow; cf. *TLL* VIII, 600,32ff. (add Paulinus of Périgueux, *Mart.* 1,320 and 4,100). The fever-stricken Blesilla also feared judgment (*epist.* 38,2,2). At *epist.* 3,3,2 J. had complained of always being ill: *ego semper infirmus*. The nature of his illness here is discussed by Janini Cuesta, pp. 26ff.

infelicia membra depasta est. Thierry (1963), p. 33, compares Vergil, *Aen.* 2,215 *miseros morsu depascitur artus*.

ossibus vix haererem. Cf. Vergil, *eccl.* 3,102 (*vix ossibus haerent*); also Otto, p. 260, s.v. *os* ('*ossa ac pellis ... est*'), with Häussler, p. 316 (no. 1314), to which should be added Palladius, *h. Laus.* 42 and Oribasius, *syn.* 6,21,11. Typically J. chooses to echo Vergil in giving expression to this 'proverbial' idea; he repeats the same striking formulation at *epist.* 117,7,1; *vita Hilar.* 3,7; in *Ier.* 3,37,1. Cf. also 7,1 above (*vix ossa haerentia*).

Interim parabantur exequiae. J. is near to death: preparations are already under way for his funeral. Antin (1963b), p. 352, n. 2, suggests

a practical reason for the hurry: he thinks the idea was to stop the corpse decomposing in the heat. It seems however that literary St. Martin also mentions preparations for the funeral after saying that the patient was hardly breathing any more (*Mart.* 2,494): however Gaul, unlike Syria, has a temperate climate.

vitalis animae calor. Warmth about the heart when the rest of the body is cold also appears to be something of a literary commonplace. It recurs in J.'s obituary of Paula at *epist.* 108,28,1: there warmth of soul alone remains in Paula's breast after her other limbs have gone cold. Again Paulinus of Périgueux supplies a parallel: he records twice how faint breath comes from a chest that is in this case itself already cold (*Mart.* 2,489f. and 2,521). In Augustine, *cur. mort.* 12,15 it is a feeble exhalation from the nostrils that prevents burial.

J. describes a different kind of warmth in a cold body at 7,2 above (*mens desiderii aestuabat in frigido corpore*).

in solo tantum tepente pectusculo. That *solo tantum* belong together in this passage was recognized by Hagendahl (1922), pp. 74f. The collocation had been identified a little earlier by Löfstedt (1918), pp. 37f.; he gave several examples of it, including a single instance in the Vulgar Latin translations of Oribasius, viz. *syn.* 1,7,4 Aa. However neither he nor Hagendahl noticed that there is a second occurrence of the locution in these translations. Given the vulgarity of their language, this is significant, for it underlines the colloquial nature of the phrase. The passage in question is *exp.* 2,111 *non supriles tantum solos*. Here the Greek has simply $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu$. Two further instances can be added to those assembled by Löfstedt and Hagendahl. The first is Julian of Eclanum, in *Os.* 1,8. The second occurs in Isidore, *reg. monach.* 9,3. In the preface of the same work (1) Isidore had said that he would use *sermone plebeio vel rustico*; this is more than the 'modesty *topos*'. It would appear therefore that in the present passage J. has chosen to employ an emphatic colloquialism. The emotional effect is further enhanced by the use of the pathetic diminutive *pectusculum* and by the striking twofold alliteration: *tantum tepente pectusculo palpitabat*.

raptus in spiritu. For this sort of translocation cf. 2 Cor. 12,2 and 4; Acts 8,39; Apoc. 12,5.

ad tribunal iudicis pertrahor. J. does not identify the judge; he is addressed merely as *domine* on p. 191,6 and again in a citation from Ps. 56,2 on p. 190,17. It is Rufinus who names the participants in *apof. adv. Hier.* 2,7 and 2,8; cf. 2,46. According to him the judge is Christ and the bystanders angels.

Two New Testament texts say that we shall all stand before Christ's judgment seat (*ante tribunal Christi*): Rom. 14,10 and 2 Cor. 5,10. Thierry (1963), p. 33, preferred to think that J. had instead a mythical judgment in mind; he did not observe that the parallel between the two had struck Tertullian on a number of occasions (*apol.* 23,13; 47,12; *nat.* 1,19,5; *spect.* 30 p. 29,5; cf. also Tatian, *orat.* 6; 25). In view of what follows however (cf. n. on *interrogatus condicionem* at 30,4) it may be more significant that J. makes the persecuted Christian stand before *tribunal iudicis* at *epist.* 42,1,4 and 120,9,10; cf. also in *Dan. prof.* 1. 37 and *hom. Orig. in Ier.* 11 p. 675^c (J.'s translation). The Christian is also brought before it at Rufinus, *hist. mon.* 19 and *Passio Pontiani* 2. It is interesting that Augustine records how, just like J., a certain bishop had a nightmare and also found himself before *tribunal iudicis* (*epist. Divj.* 11,15,3).

tantum luminis et tantum erat ex circumstantium claritate fulgoris, ut proiectus in terram sursum aspicere non auderem. For the light cf. (e.g.) Lk. 2,9 (the angel to the shepherds); Mt. 17,2 (the transfiguration); Acts 9,3 (the road to Damascus); Ps. 103,2 (of God: 'who coverest thyself with light as with a garment'). Schwarz, p. 373, n. 34, compares *Apocalypse of Peter* A (Preuschen) 6ff. (p. 84,19ff.). For J.'s reaction cf. (e.g.) Ezek. 1,28f. *hic erat aspectus splendoris* (LXX φέγγους) *per gyrum. haec visio similitudinis gloriae domini; et vidi et cecidi in faciem meam.*

30,4

Interrogatus condicionem. It was customary for the persecuting judge to ask the martyr his *condicio* in order to establish his religion. This use of the word is most clearly demonstrated in *Passio Caeciliae* 28. There the judge enquires *cuius conditionis es?* Caecilia however is awkward and instead gives her pedigree: she is *ingenua, nobilis, clarissima*. Hereupon the judge retorts: *ego te de religione interrogo*. His reply is a neat and indubitable proof that in this context the term *condicio* has a more or less technical sense. There are further examples of it at *Passio Saturnini, Dativi etc.* 5,1 and *Passio Symphoriani* 4 (here the judge asks *conditionem ... designa*; the martyr replies *Christianus sum*). Though not rare, this usage is not recorded in *TLL*: its omission is the more regrettable, inasmuch as it provides clear-cut confirmation that J. is describing his experience in the language of martyrdom. None of the numerous earlier treatments of J.'s dream has recognized this feature.

Christianum me esse respondi. J. answers that he is a Christian. *Christianus sum* was the martyr's standard reply. There is an instance of it in *Passio Symphoriani* 4 (quoted in the previous n.). Others are

given by Holstenius, pp. 128f.; Mayor, pp. 159f.; Bremmer, pp. 15f. J. refers to this formula himself at *epist.* 42,2,1 and in *Eph.* 5,16 p. 527^B. The structure of the present sentence is elegantly chiasmic: *interrogatus condicionem Christianum me esse respondi*. The chiasmus is accentuated by the alliteration: -rr-ic-/C-/-...r-.

Ciceronianus es, non Christianus. J. makes a striking transition from indirect to direct speech. This would seem to be the only place where *Ciceronianus* is used in the sense of literary discipleship; cf. *TLL Onomasticon* s.v. Here it has been chosen for the paronomasia (Thierry [1963], p. 34, n. 22); on its appropriateness cf. Kunst, p. 177 and n. 2. Cicero has been mentioned at 29,7 and 30,1 above. For the conflict between Christianity and the classics cf. (e.g.) Fuchs, pp. 353ff.

ubi thesaurus tuus, ibi et cor tuum. J. again combines an arresting formulation (cf. previous n.) with scripture. He quotes Mt. 6,21 on just three other occasions: in *Ezech.* 28,11 l. 321; in *Eph.* 1,3 p. 445^D; 2,6 p. 469^A.

caedi me iusserat. After his interrogation the judge orders J. to be beaten. The same thing happens to the martyr in the following accounts: *Acta Felicis et Fortunati* 3; *Acta Maximi* 2; *Passio Pontiani* 3; *Passio Quirini* 2; *Passio Saturnini, Dativi etc.* 5,2; *Passio Symphoriani* 7. This was the *quaestio*; cf. n. on *quaestionem* at 30,6 below.

conscientiae ... igne torquebar. J. had a certain fondness for the striking expression 'fire of conscience'. Elsewhere the phrase is rather rare. In the present passage J. is evidently imitating his translation of *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 10,5 p. 423,7 *perpetuo conscientiae meae igne discrucior*; the earlier formulation has undergone some streamlining. The wording he uses in the *Libellus* is repeated in the same year at *epist.* 36,2,4 *conscientiae tuae igne torqueberis*. In *epist.* 124,7,1 he has *conscientiae ardor*. *TLL* VII, 296,27f. cites this passage of the *Libellus* and Victor of Vita 3,37; to this evidence can be added Rufinus, *Orig. in psalm.* 38 *hom.* 1,7; Cassian, *conf.* 20,7,1; *Epist. Migne suppl.* 1,1704. For an isolated instance of the 'fire of conscience' metaphor in Greek cf. Chrysostom, *hom. in Is.* 6,1 1,5 ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδήτου ὡς ὑπὸ πυρὸς κατεκαίετο.

The conscience pangs at death of which J. speaks here are not a common theme; for a further example cf. Rufinus' translation of Basil, *hom.* 7 p. 1789^B. J. says here that the pangs are worse than the torturer's blows. They had been more excruciating than prison chains in the *Acts of the Martyrs of Lyons* (ap. Rufinus, *hist.* 5,1,34).

in inferno autem quis confitebitur tibi? It is Ps. 6,6 which comes to mind in J.'s extremity. He is especially fond of citing this verse, which

occurs thirteen times in all. The 'confession' of which it speaks could be interpreted in two different ways. Several texts point out that according to ecclesiastical usage confession can be either of sin or of praise: Hilary, *in psalm.* 137,1; Augustine, *in psalm.* 94,4; *serm.* 29,2; cf. Chrysostom, *exp. in Ps.* 9,1. As to the particular interpretation of this term in Ps. 6,6, two Hieronymian passages maintain that here it denotes 'praise': *in Is.* 11,38,15^b l. 39 and *in psalm.* 6. More frequently however J. thinks that the word refers to sin in this verse, which he accordingly takes to mean that there is no place for repentance after death: *in Is.* 6,13,9 l. 7; *in Matth.* 25,10 l. 778; *tract.* p. 510 l. 103; *tract. in psalm.* I p. 192 l. 15 (the last passage is directed against those who say there is). This is the sense which he gives the words here. While it would appear that the first interpretation of the text (in terms of praise) is extremely rare, this second one was well-established. It had already been given in Cyprian's collection of proof texts (*testim.* 3,114; the writer concludes that confession should therefore be made during life), in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (2,13,2), and somewhat later by Hilary, *in psalm.* 51,23. Among J.'s contemporaries it recurs in two letters of Paulinus of Nola (25*,2; 40,11) and in Chrysostom, *hom. in Eph.* 24,5 (with the gloss 'in that place is judgment and no longer time for repentance'); according to Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Mt.* 57 the text should not be cited, since repentance is possible.¹¹ Later the same interpretation is repeated by Epiphanius Latinus, *in evang.* 56 p. 152,5; Ammonius of Alexandria, *1 Petr.* 3,19-20; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 68,2. The text was a useful one when given this sense, inasmuch as the Fathers repeatedly declare (apparently in allusion to it) that in the world below there is no scope for confession or amendment. Statements to this effect occur in Cyprian, *epist.* 55,17,3; 55,29,2; Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 49; 51; Pacian, *paraen.* 12,1; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 16,7; Gregory of Nyssa, *Ps.* 6 p. 613^A; (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 40,3,3; Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 19 l. 540.¹²

J. discusses the concept of 'infernus' at *in Eph.* 6,12 p. 548^C.

clamare tamen coepi. J. begs for mercy. Cyprian too had begged the judge for a reprieve in his vision before martyrdom (Pontius, *vita Cypr.* 12,6). This is not the only correspondence between the two accounts (cf. n. on *oculos aperio* ... at 30,5 below).

It may be noted that J.'s wording in the present passage (*clamare tamen coepi et heulans dicere*) finds an exact parallel six lines later (p. 191,5f.): *deiurare coepi et nomen eius obtestans dicere*. Both clauses

¹¹ The reference is also to penitence at Julian of Eclanum, *in psalm.* 6,6; Theodoret of Cyrhus, *Ps.* 6,1; 6,6.

¹² Cf. also 2 Clement 8,3. The idea receives fivefold expression in Isidore, *ymon.* 1,51.

share an identical structure: in particular *coepi* and *dicere* with a participle are common to each. Both also use alliteration (*clamare ... coepi; deirare ... dicere*).

miserere mei, domine, miserere mei. Ps. 56,2 is the burden of J.'s entreaty. The form in which he quotes it (*domine* instead of the *deus* that is found in the Vulgate version after both LXX and Hebrew) is extremely rare. (Cavallera, I,1, p. 30, and Fremantle, p. 35, for example do not mark the words as a quotation.) This version of the text does however occur in Augustine, *serm.* 20A *tir.* J.'s entreaty characteristically takes the form of a citation of scripture.

30,5

qui adstiterant, precabantur. The pardon is due to the judge's attendants, who intervene on J.'s behalf. Such intercession may have been something of a stereotype, for Rufinus' translation of Basil, *hom.* 3,5 reports as something unusual that among the host of saints who surround God's judgment seat there is none to say: 'Lord, he deserves forgiveness'.

locum paenitentiae. Souter (1912), p. 150, compares Heb. 12,17, where the same phrase occurs. It is also found in 4 Esd. 9,12. J. has combined the biblical reminiscence with an elegant chiasmus in two asyndetically anaphoric clauses: *ut veniam tribueret adolescentiae, ut errori locum paenitentiae commodaret.*

tanto constrictus articulo. J. repeats the phrase at *adv. Rufin.* 1,11 (*tali constrictus articulo*). TLL II, 694,24f. adds Gaudentius, *serm.* 16,3 (*conclusus*).

si unquam habuero codices saeculares, si legero. J. accepts the attendants' stipulation. For the combination of verbs used here cf. Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,6,1 *ne quis Origenis libros legeret aut haberet.*

te negavi. Lardet (1980), *Addenda*, p. 100, notes that *negatio Christi* is 'contraire du martyre'; this observation is however omitted in id. (1993), p. 124. Schwarz, p. 375, compares Mk. 14,72 *priusquam gallus cantet bis, ter me negabis*. One might add Mt. 10,33 *qui autem negaverit me coram hominibus, negabo et ego eum coram patre meo.*

revertor ad superos. J. returns. Thierry (1963), p. 33 (cf. id. [1967], pp. 125ff.), argued that J. had been thinking of Vergil's account of Rhadamanthus sitting in judgment in the underworld. Against this view Antin (1963b), p. 376, maintained that here *superi* simply meant the living: consequently there was no suggestion that J. had been in the underworld himself. Antin did not however note that Lactantius uses exactly the same phrase (*reverti ad superos*) of souls returning from the

underworld at *inst.* 7,22,16. Christ too comes back *ab inferis ... ad superos* in Maximus of Turin 14,1 (cf. 39,4 for the same contrast); similar wording is also used of Christ by 'Eusebius Gallicanus', *hom.* 18,2.¹³ It seems likely therefore that J. has the same sort of picture in mind.¹⁴

Schwarz, p. 375 (cf. Thierry [1967], p. 127), observes that in *tract. in psalm.* I p. 192 l. 20 (on Ps. 6,6 *in inferno autem quis confitebitur domino?*) J. states: *ibi sedet iudex*. It would accordingly appear that in this passage of the *Libellus* J. is thinking of a divine judgment in the underworld. Nazzaro, pp. 214ff., sees here a case of 'agrammaticalité', *oculos aperio tanto lacrimarum imbre perfusus*. When J. opens his eyes, they are wet with pain. Similarly when Cyprian awoke from his vision, his heart had still throbbed with anxiety (*Pontius, vita Cyp.* 12,9). For the wording here Thierry (1963), p. 33, compares Vergil, *Aen.* 12,64f. *lacrimis Lavinia .../ flagrantis perfusa genas*. J. says he surprised people by opening his eyes; evidently they had not expected him to recover. The tears convinced them of the reality of his 'experience'.

30,6

nec vero sopor ille fuerat aut vana somnia, quibus saepe deludimur. Despite his protestation here J. calls it *somnus* just four lines further on. Thierry (1963), p. 33, compares Vergil, *Aen.* 3,173 (*nec sopor illud erat*) and 10,642 (*aut quae sopitos deludunt somnia sensus*). Later J. argued that it was only a dream (*adv. Rufin.* 1,31f.). In the present passage J.'s asseveration is of course part of the $\delta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$.

teste est tribunal, ante quod lacui, iudicium teste est, quod timui. Neue-Wagener, I, p. 906, gives three examples of the masculine *testis* with a neuter noun and one example of *teste*: Alcimus Avitus, *carm.* 6,576 (*caelum teste vocat*). Kunst, p. 113, n. 3, compares Cicero, *Manil.* 30f. for the 'anaphora' (his term) of *teste*. The parison is noted by Harendza, p. 41. It may be added that this very impressive formulation is also marked by chiasmus, *redditio* (*teste est*) and two-fold alliteration. The parallel account of J.'s desert tribulations in ch. 7 also ends with a similar invocation: *testis est dominus*.

¹³ This wording applies to Hercules in Seneca, *Herc. f.* 48; cf. *ib.* 318; 568; *Phaedr.* 626; *Oed.* 573.

¹⁴ *Superi* is in fact often the opposite of *inferi* in contexts where the two words denote respectively those on earth and those in hell. They are so used in connection with Dives at Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 25* 3; Augustine, *in psalm.* 36, *serm.* 2,4; 48, *serm.* 2,8; *serm.* 113A,3. They also form a contrasting pair in Maximus of Turin 22a,3 and 53,3. At Ambrosiaster, *in Rom.* 3,26,1 *apud superos* is balanced by *in inferno*.

quaestionem. This was the beating described above at 30,4; cf. Waldstein. A list of passages where the martyr undergoes such a *quaestio* is given by Ruinart, index s.v. To it can be added Tertullian, *scorp.* 10 p. 167,22; Cyprian, *epist.* 10,2,1; 10,4,4; 66,7,3; Ps.-Cyprian, *laud. mart.* 14; 25.

liventes habuisse me scapulas. According to Augustine, *serm.* 308,5 (quoted by Cavallera, I,2, p. 78) Tuluslymeni also had traces of the scourging on his back when he woke up from his dream. A similar phenomenon is described in Eusebius of Caesarea, *h. e.* 5,28,12 (quoted by Labriolle [1920], p. 234). On the medical aspect cf. Janini Cuesta, pp. 26ff.

tanto dehinc studio divina legisse. The conclusion of this account embodies the real significance of J.'s 'dream'. His statement here is customarily ignored: most recently Schwarz, p. 375, has dismissed it with the comment '*rhetorice*'. In these words J. is however signalling the start of his momentous preoccupation with scripture. At the same time he is addressing the question of the work's unique style; while accounting for the pervasive use of scriptural language, J. is implicitly inviting the reader's admiration as well. He does so in a context which attacks eloquence. Not only therefore is J. drawing attention to his 'biblical' mode of expression; by professing scorn for rhetorical finesse he is simultaneously making his very considerable mastery of the 'classical' style seem all the more impressive.

Chapter 31

J. turns to the theme of avarice. Wealth is no concern of the Christian: it is incompatible with faith. The objection that money is a protection against old age or sickness is dismissed by reference to various texts of scripture. The whole ch. is in fact especially dense in biblical citation; it would seem that J. wishes to corroborate his statement at the end of the preceding ch. that scripture is now his all-consuming passion.

31,1

avaritiae quoque tibi vitandum est malum. Avarice in the virgin is a theme which receives considerable attention from the Fathers. Augustine was struck by the frequency with which virgins become misers (*bon. viduit.* 21,26) *intuentes ... hominum conversationem saepe experti sumus in quibusdam lascivia compressa crevisse avaritiam.* Chrysostom thinks that love of money in a virgin is worse than concupiscence (*poenit.* 3,3; cf. also *hom. in 2 Cor.* 4,13 1,7). Her avoidance of it is due to God's mercy according to Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1109. The entire seventh book of Cassian's *Institutes* is devoted to the 'spirit of greed' (*de spiritu filargyriae*). Sulpicius Severus remarks that in the *Libellus* J. particularly attacked avarice (*dial.* 1,8,6).

non quo aliena non adpetas. On the popular view only the person who took another's property was avaricious, not someone who looked after his own: *Tractatus Pelagianus* 3,3 p. 26 (*sed ille, inquires, avarus est, qui aliena diripit, non, qui privata custodit*);¹ cf. Zeno 2,1,18 (*sed, inquires, iustum est ut mea servem, aliena non quaeram*); Rufinus, *Basil. hom.* 3,7 (*sed dicis: quid iniustum est, si, cum aliena non invadam, propria diligentius servo?*); the Greek text, which is somewhat different, is cited in the next n.).

tua, quae sunt aliena. J. perhaps has in mind Tertullian, *patient.* 7,5 *quod nostrum videtur alienum est* (*ib. nihil enim nostrum quoniam dei omnia*); *TLL* 1, 1567,8 – 1581,64 (s.v. *alienus*) offers no parallel (for another phraseological debt to the first half of the *De patientia* towards the end of the *Libellus* cf. n. on *decem mensibus in utero* ... at 39,2 below). A similar argument is found later in Basil, *hom.* 6,7 (*τίνα φησίν, ἀδικῶ συνέχων τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ; ποῖα, εἰπέ μοι, αὐτοῦ;* here Rufinus, *Basil. hom.* 3,7 renders: *propria dicis?*; *ib.*, as in J. [p.

¹ *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4,25,35 gives the following example of the figure of *definitio*: *diligentia est accurata conservatio suorum, avaritia iniuriosa adpetitio alienorum.*

[93,8f.], 1 Tim. 6,7 'we brought nothing into this world ...'; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,177 (ὅπερ ... κτῶσθαι γενόμενος, οὐχ ὑπάρχουσι σὰ ... διὰ τὴν οὖν ὡς περ οἰκειῶν τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ἀντιποιῆ; ib. εἰς γὰρ ἕτερα μετελεύθονται πρόσωπα); Eriphanus Latinus, *in euang.* 19 p. 22,19 (*quod enim possedit vel concupivit, suum non fuit; ib. ante ipsum alter possedit, post ipsum alter habebit*). J. himself repeats the idea at *epist.* 58,7,1 (*iam non sunt tua, quae possides; ib. dispensatio tibi credita est*); 130,14,6 (*tua non tua sunt*).

si in alieno, inquit, fideles non fuistis, quod vestrum est, quis dabit vobis? J. characteristically introduces a text of scripture that is connected by the *Stichwort* 'alienus' with the striking phrase that precedes. Here Lk. 16,12 is particularly appropriate, since Lk. 16,11 refers to 'mammon': *si ergo in iniquo mammona fideles non fuistis, quod verum est, quis credet vobis?* J. quotes Lk. 16,12 nowhere else; there is merely an allusion to it in *epist.* 121,6,14, where everything worldly is said to be alien.

aliena nobis auri argentique sunt pondera, nostra possessio spiritalis est. J. proceeds to gloss the foregoing text (Lk. 16,12). A similar gloss on this text had occurred at Origen, *hom. in Lev.* 3,8 p. 313,8 (*praesentis saeculi divitias non esse nostras proprias sed alienas*); cf. also Ambrose, *in Luc.* 7,246 (of c. 390). It would seem that here J. is in fact borrowing from this passage of Origen; cf. next n. The same antithesis which the *Libellus* employs between material and spiritual possessions is also found later at Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 40,11 (*non ... pecuniam tantum et fundos, extraneas facultates, sed etiam animi nostri internas opes, quae vere nostra substantia est, possidemus*) and Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 9 l. 265 (*alienae sint a nobis huius saeculi facultates, nostra autem possessio regnum caelorum est*). In the present passage Harendza, p. 60, notes that *-que* in *auri argentique* has been chosen for the sake of the clausula; on the double cretic cf. Herron, pp. 27ff. The hyperbaton in *aliena ... pondera* is recorded by Hritzu, p. 79.

redemptio viri propriae divitiae. True riches are salvation. J. shows a remarkable fondness for Prov. 13,8, which occurs no fewer than sixteen times in his works. At *epist.* 71,4,2 he explicitly prefers the 'spiritual' interpretation, which is of course the one found in the present passage; cf. also *in Ezech.* 40,17 l. 641; *in eccles.* 9,11 l. 261; *in Gal.* 2,10 p. 338^A. Significantly Origen had already combined this text with Lk. 16,12 (cf. p. 191,18ff.) at *hom. in Lev.* 3,8 p. 313,1 and 7; J. is evidently following him here. The reflective fullness which had marked Origen's treatment contrasts notably with J.'s arresting compression; at the same time J. achieves a greater elegance of expression (cf. previous n.).

31.2

nemo potest duobus dominis servire. J. cites a further text of scripture (Mt. 6,24 = Lk. 16,13). The preceding verse (Lk. 16,12) has been quoted immediately above (p. 191,18ff.). J. is partial to this saying about 'serving two masters'; he repeats it nine times.² The text had also been used by Tertullian at *idol.* 12,2 (for J.'s extensive debt to this passage of the *De idololatria* in the present ch. of the *Libellus* cf. nn. on *et dices* ... [31,3] and *si esurieris, beatos audies* ... [31,4]). Whereas however Tertullian had cited no more than the first five words of the verse, J. quotes it in its entirety: his citation accordingly ends with *mammonae*, which enables him to introduce a learned gloss (cf. next n.).

gentili Syrorum lingua. J. takes a further opportunity to advertise his linguistic expertise.³ The language to which he refers is Aramaic. At *epist.* 17,2,4 J. ironically describes himself as *eloquentissimus homo in Syro sermone*. Coptic is also a *gentilis lingua* at 34,1 below. For this application of *gentilis* cf. *TLL* VI,2, 1868,19f.; 28ff. (for J. add *adv. Pelag. praef.* 1; in *Is.* 7,19,5 l. 49).

mammona 'divitiae' nuncupantur. J. supplies a similar gloss at *epist.* 121,6,13 (*iniquus autem mammona non Hebraeorum, sed Syrorum lingua divitiae nuncupantur*) and in *Matth.* 6,24 l. 828 (*mammona sermone syriaco divitiae nuncupantur*). On the other hand 'mammon' is Hebrew for wealth according to *tract. in psalm.* I p. 96 l. 27 *mammona in lingua hebraea divitiae nuncupantur* (cf. Morin [1897], p. 86, ad loc.); the same passage of the *Tractate* notes that some wrongly think the word means gold. 'Mammon' is used without explanation in *epist.* 52,10,2; 125,20,4; in *Is.* 13,50,1 l. 41; in *Os.* 14,2 l. 106; in *Soph.* 3,1 l. 97; in *Eph.* 3,14 p. 487^D; 4,28 p. 512^D. Hilberg's punctuation should be altered to '*mammona*' *divitiae nuncupantur*.

cogitatio victus spiniae sunt fidei, radix avaritiae, cura gentilium. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compares Mt. 13,22 (*qui autem est seminatus in spinis, hic est qui verbum audit, et sollicitudo saeculi istius et fallacia divitiarum suffocat verbum*); 1 Tim. 6,10 (quoted p. 194,7: *radix malorum omnium est avaritia*); Mt. 6,32 (*haec enim omnia gentes inquirunt*, the preceding passage is cited in ll. 13-19 below). It might be added that *cogitatio victus* would seem to be an echo of Mt. 6,25 (quoted ll. 13-16: *ne cogitetis in corde vestro, quid manducetis* ...). J.'s short sentence is accordingly a highly condensed evocation of no fewer than four scriptural texts.

² The two masters are flesh and spirit in *epist.* 49,20,3, the text is applied to the admission of Arian bishops at c. *Lucif.* 5.

³ In his early period J. was especially partial to learned glosses: cf. *epist.* 7,2,2 (parchment); 8,1 (the carriers of writing-tablets); 31,3,1 (cherry-trees).

31.3

at dices: puella sum delicata. J.'s biblical extravaganza (cf. previous n.) is now followed straight away by a lively *sermocinatio*. It would seem to have been suggested by Tertullian, *idol.* 12,2 *quid enim dices? 'egebo'* (for the influence of this section of the *De idololatria* on the present ch. cf. n. on *si esurieris, beatos audies ...* at 31,4 below).⁴ Cyprian too had anticipated the reader's fear of poverty at *elem.* 9 *sed vereris et metuis ne si operari plurimum coeperis patrimonio tuo larga operatione finito ad penuriam forte redigaris*. It is therefore noteworthy that J. should differ from Cyprian in choosing to express the same idea in the form of a vivid *sermocinatio*. It is also significant that in employing this rhetorical device J. should have had recourse to Tertullian's *De idololatria*: despite its appearance of spontaneity this vignette is a plagiarism.

Here Eustochium is first made to argue that she is 'delicate': *sum delicata*. Exactly the same argument had been employed in *epist.* 14,10,4 (*delicatus es*), where Petitmengin (1988), p. 50, n. 50, identified these words as a borrowing from Tertullian, *spect.* 28 p. 27,8 (*delicatus es, Christiane, si et in saeculo voluptatem concupiscis*).⁵ Duval (1974c), p. 213, n. 85, observed that in this passage of *epist.* 14 J. had also imitated ch. 12 of the *De idololatria*. Since J.'s technique of composition is so derivatively centoistic and self-repetitious, it would be no surprise if the same combination of sources were involved in the present passage of the *Libellus*: perhaps therefore the phrase with which Eustochium is made to register her initial protest ultimately comes from the *De spectaculis*. A similar objection had moreover been put into Eustochium's mouth earlier in the *Libellus* at 11,1 *quodsi volueris respondere te ... semper in deliciis*. Here too J. had also borrowed from the *De idololatria* (cf. nn. on *vivere districtus, respondebo* and *vive ergo lege tua ...* at 11,1 above). Conceivably therefore his use of the term *deliciae* in this passage of ch. 11 also goes back to the *De spectaculis*.

The term *delicatus* is used as a reproach in two further passages of *epist.* 14 (1,1 *quasi parvulus delicatus*; 2,1 *delicate miles*) as well as on two occasions in the later *epist.* 117 (7,1 *quid tu facies, puella sani corporis, delicata, pinguis, rubens, aestuans inter carnes, inter vina et balneas*; 8,1 *trossulum et in sordibus delicatum*).

⁴ It may be noted that Tertullian has also influenced the *sermocinationes* which J. uses at 13,3 and 29,5 (cf. nn. ad loc.).

⁵ Petitmengin did not observe that J. had again improved his source by adding a clever antithesis: *delicatus es, carissime, si et hic vis gaudere cum saeculo et postea regnare cum Christo*.

meis manibus laborare non possum. Manual labour is a subject to which J. returns with particular frequency. He notes with approbation that Asella worked with her hands (*epist.* 24,4,1; *ib.* 2 Thess. 3,10 'this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat'); J. himself had followed the same practice in the desert (*epist.* 17,2,4; *ib.* 2 Thess. 3,10). He stipulates in *epist.* 107,10,1 that the virgin should learn wool-working, while at *epist.* 130,15,4 Demetrias is informed that there is nothing more precious in Christ's sight than what she has made with her own hands either for personal use or in order to set an example to others. At *epist.* 52,3,2 *labor manuum* is recommended as a source of goods that can then be distributed as alms. Finally J. reports that work is the criterion of admission in Egyptian monasteries (*epist.* 125,11,5).⁴

References to manual work are frequent elsewhere; however nobody deals with the topic as often as J. It is prescribed in the following passages: Basil, *ascet. disc.* 1; *renunt.* 9; Ps.-Ambrose, *ad virg. dev.* 3 p. 584^A; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,135; 3,101; Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,7,1. Virgins are said to earn their livelihood by it at Ambrose, *virg.* 1,10,60; Augustine, *mor. eccl.* 31,68; 33,70. Work in wool is specified by Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,13 l. 42 and Ps.-Augustine, *sobr.* 2 p. 1108. Chrysostom lays down that it should be non-stop and much harder than for domestic servants (*hom. in Eph.* 13,3). Cf. also Holzapfel; Caner, p. 13, n. 41.

Though the theme was a common one, it may nonetheless be possible to suggest a specific source for J.'s mention of it in the present passage. If Eustochium's first point (*sum delicata*) was inspired by Tertullian (cf. previous n.), her second one (*meis manibus laborare non possum*) would seem to be due to the Bible. J. has just quoted at very considerable length the two verses which conclude the Lucan parable of the unjust steward (viz. Lk. 16,12f.; cf. ll. 4ff. and p. 191,18ff.), in the course of which the steward says: *fodere non valeo* (Lk. 16,3). These words may accordingly have suggested the point which Eustochium now makes that she is incapable of manual work.

si ad senectam venero. For the argument cf. (Ps.-)Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* 21 p. 437^B (of the 5th or 6th c.) καλόν ἐστὶ τὸ ποιεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην τις (sic) ἀλλ' ἴσως συμβαίνει μοι μακρὸν γῆρας· πῶς ἔχω ποιῆσαι; ἐάν ἔτι διανεμῶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντά μου, τίς ὁ ἐμὲ διοικῶν; τὸ παρὸν κρατήσω. For the combination of old age and sickness cf. next n. On old age in J. cf. Antin (1971).

si aegrotare coepero, quis mei miserebitur? In the event of illness

⁴ In the description of Egyptian monasticism at 35,6 below J. states that *opus divinarum est.*

Athanasius had told the virgin not to rely on others but to look after herself, so that people could not say austerity had been the cause (*virg.* 12). At *Vita Eupraxiae* 6 the sufferer waits for God's help and regards sickness as a blessing sent by him. Trust in divine rather than human assistance is also recommended by Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,61. According to (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ.* 1 (Berthold) 62,19 neither illness nor old age should cause overmuch concern, since God will look after his servants.

It is perhaps significant that illness had already been connected with old age (cf. previous n.) by Gregory Nazianzen, who had likewise identified the same two contingencies as the drawbacks of the virgin state: οὐκ ἄλκιρα παθῶν, οὐ γήραος ἀδρανέοντος / φάρμακον (*carm.* 1,2,1,290f.). These words occur in Gregory's famous comparison between marriage and virginity, to which J. refers twice (*adv. Iovian.* 1,13; *vir. ill.* 117); it had been published shortly before the *Libellus* (cf. Dubedout, p. 22, who places the *carmina moralia* in 382). Perhaps then Gregory's lines have had some influence on the final section of J.'s *sermocinatio*.

At 31,4 below J. suggests a text of scripture to read in case of pain. Sick monks on the other hand are well cared for at 35,7 below. J. himself of course had poor health (cf. *epist.* 3,3,2 *ego semper infirmus*).

audi ad apostolos loquentem Iesum: ne cogitētis in corde vestro, quid manducetis ... J. now employs another substantial citation of scripture (Mt. 6,25f.) to answer the objections advanced in the foregoing *sermocinatio*. Mt. 6,26 had been included in Cyprian's *testimonia* (3,11 *caelestia tantum ... cogitare debere*). In J. however Mt. 6,25f. is surprisingly rare: there is an allusion to the second of these verses a quarter of a century later at *epist.* 123,13,4 (cf. also the paraphrases of it at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 319 l. 190 and p. 326 l. 100). It is therefore noteworthy that the first of these verses had occurred in Tertullian, *idol.* 12,2, where his short opening *sermocinatio* ('*egebo*') had been followed by a second one ('*victum non habeo*'), to which he had then replied with a paraphrase of Mt. 6,25 *sed nolite, inquit, cogitare de victu*. This passage of the *De idololatria* is evidently the source for J.'s own use of the same text here: he has employed Tertullian's answer to his second hypothetical objection in order to answer his own *sermocinatio*, which was itself inspired by Tertullian's first use of the figure in this passage (cf. n. on *at dices* ... above together with next two nn.). J. has subjected the scriptural text he found in the *De idololatria* to considerable amplification: in ll. 4ff. he similarly expands Tertullian's citation of the previous verse (Mt. 6,24; cf. *idol.* 12,2). In the present passage J. also enlivens his source with a vivacious imperative (*audi*); it is redeployed at 32,5 below.

31.4

si vestis defuerit, lilia proponentur. In the interests of *variatio* extensive quotation of scripture (cf. previous n.) is now replaced by paraphrase. The biblical original (Mt. 6,28ff.) begins: *et de vestimento quid solliciti estis? considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt: non laborant neque nent ...* In place of this long-windedness J. employs a very incisive formulation: *si vestis defuerit, lilia proponentur.* Again it comes straight from Tertullian, *idol.* 12,2 *et vestitus habemus exemplum lilia* (cf. next n.). Tertullian had placed this sentence immediately after his allusion to Mt. 6,25: the same sequence recurs in the *Libellus*. In particular the Tertullianic term *exemplum* would seem to be reflected in J.'s choice of the word *proponentur*.⁷

si esurieris, beatos audies pauperes et esurientes. J. continues with further paraphrase. The text involved here is Lk. 6,20f.; Hilberg inaccurately compares Mt. 5,3 and 5,6. The same text had been adduced in similarly paraphrastic form at Tertullian, *idol.* 12,2 (*sed felices egenos dominus appellat*); there it had supplied the response to Tertullian's first *sermocinatio* ('egebo'). The term *egenus* was colloquial (cf. Waszink-Winden, pp. 214f.); J. prefers *pauper*. The same Tertullianic statement had already been imitated by J. at *epist.* 14,10,3 (*paupertatem times? sed beatos pauperes Christus appellat*), where J. also utilizes *idol.* 12,4 (*fides famem non timet*): whereas both these imitations in *epist.* 14 were recognized by Duval (1974c), p. 213, n. 85, the debt of the *Libellus* to *idol.* 12 has not been identified by previous commentators.

Since in the present ch. J. has been imitating this passage of the *De idololatria* extensively (cf. previous two nn.), it may be cited in full here: *quid enim dicis? 'egebo': sed felices egenos dominus appellat. 'victum non habebō': sed nolite, inquit, cogitare de victu. et vestitus habemus exemplum lilia.* It may be noted how J. has consistently chosen to expand his source. He replaces the laconic 'egebo' of the *De idololatria* with a substantial *sermocinatio* that is full of vivid emotion. Tertullian's two succeeding references to scripture (*sed felices ...; sed nolite ...*) undergo a similar amplification. In the first the *De idololatria* had been content with the simple idea 'blessed are the poor'; the

⁷ Here J.'s imitation would also appear to have some bearing on the constitution of Tertullian's text. Kroymann (1893), p. 27, proposed the following punctuation: *et vestitus (sc. non habebō) habemus exempla (sic) lilia.* He assumed that the construction was analogous to that of the immediately preceding sentence: *'victum non habebō'. sed nolite, inquit, cogitare de victu.* Kroymann's suggestion is rejected by Waszink-Winden, p. 215. However J.'s imitation (*si vestis defuerit, lilia proponentur*) would seem to indicate that he too read Tertullian's text in the manner proposed by Kroymann, who nonetheless failed to adduce this passage of the *Libellus*.

Libellus on the other hand adds Lk. 6,21 ('blessed are ye that hunger'). J. has likewise expanded the quotation of Mt. 6,25 as far as the statement *pater vester caelestis pascit illa*; Tertullian had merely said *nolite ... cogitare de victu*. While J.'s extensive citation of scripture is unquestionably impressive, the result of this attempt to outdo his source is also a certain inconcinnity. No sooner has Eustochium now been assured of heavenly provision of food (*pascit*; I. 18) than she is informed instead that hunger is blessed (*beatos ... esurientes*; II. 19f.). This slight but very characteristic inconsistency is absent from Tertullian; it is typical of the centoist (cf. Axelson, p. 70 '... aus ungeschickter Variation bzw. "Übertrumpfung" einer Vorlage').

si aliquis afflixerit dolor, legio: propter hoc conplaceo mihi in infirmitatibus meis. J. now answers the objection raised at p. 192,11f. *si aegrotare coepero*. The present passage is the only time J. quotes this text, which is the opening of 2 Cor. 12,10. It had however occurred in his translation of Origen, *hom. in Jer.* 11 p. 673^B (PL 25 [1845]). The last part of the same verse (*cum enim infirmor, tunc potens sum*) is echoed at 21,2 above. The text which introduces this section of St. Paul's letter (2 Cor. 12,7) is cited immediately below (cf. next n.).

datus est mihi stimulus carnis meae, angelus satanae, qui me colaphizet, ne extollar. J. quotes 2 Cor. 12,7 another eight times. It was popular: Cyprian had cited it at *testim.* 3,6 (*bonos ... plus laborare ... quia probantur*).

exultaverunt enim filiae Iudae in omnibus iudiciis tuis, domine. Ps. 96,8 recurs four times in J. As in the present passage, it is combined with 2 Cor. 12,10 (*quando ... infirmor ...*) at *epist.* 39,2,7. In its biblical context the verse is a celebration of God's righteousness; here J. has converted it into an expression of joyful acquiescence in calamity.

31,5

nudus exivi de utero matris meae, nudus et redeam. J. cites Job 1,21 with some frequency; it recurs five times in his works. Cyprian had quoted the verse at *testim.* 3,6 (with 2 Cor. 12,7; cf. II. 2-4). Here J. also links the text to 1 Tim. 6,7 (cf. next n.). This combination was traditional; cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *mart.* 2 p. 768^C; Chrysostom, *laed.* 4; Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Job* 3,3; Gaudentius, *serm.* 13,34; Cyril of Alexandria, *hom. pasch.* 27,3; Orientius, *comm.* 1,561f. The two texts are conflated in Ps.-Augustine, *serm. cod. Guelf. app.* 4,7 p. 185,130.

nihil intulimus in hunc mundum nec auferre quid possumus. J. does not cite 1 Tim. 6,7 again. It had occurred in Cyprian, *testim.* 3,61 (*pecuniam non adpetendam*). The next verse (1 Tim. 6,8) is quoted by J. in the following ch. (32,4), while he refers to 1 Tim. 6,10 at 31,2 and 32,3.

Chapter 32

J. continues his discussion of avarice. Having used the previous ch. to set out a collection of scriptural evidence condemning it, he now proceeds to describe how people ignore such prescriptions in practice and indulge freely in this vice. Some of its manifestations are described; the vivaciously satirical tone of this passage contrasts notably with the sombre mood of the preceding two chs. The second half of the ch. is then made up chiefly of a very impressive array of further biblical texts that condemn avarice and assure providential supply; they are interspersed in the author's manner with clever formulations that have been taken from elsewhere.

32,1

armaria stipare vestibus. The same idea is found at *tract. in psalm. 1* p. 326 l. 108 *accipe tunicam quae corpus tegat, non quae arcas impleat.*

tineas non posse superare. J. uses this striking notion again nearly thirty years later at *epist. 127,4,2 qui Croesi divitiis tumet vilique opertus palliolo pugnat contra tineas vestium sericarum.* Hilberg compares *Jas. 5,2 vestimenta vestra a tineis comesta sunt.* Mt. 6,19 (*ubi ... tinea demolitur*) and Lk. 12,33 (*neque tinea corrumpit*) are also pertinent. Gregory Nazianzen had made a similar point to J.'s in *or. 14,16 τὰ δὲ (sc. ὑπόσματα) ἔνδον ἡμῖν ἀποκείσεται ... σιτηῶν θανάτῃ.* However J.'s satiric flair gives his own formulation an incomparable pungency.

plenis arcis pannos trahit. J. was extremely fond of this arresting contrast, which is repeated with various modifications in the following passages: *epist. 52,9,1 (ridiculum et plenum dedecoris referto marsuppia, quod sudarium orariumque non habeas, gloriari); 58,2,1 (pleno marsuppia gloriosas sordes adpetis); 58,2,2 (possessionum reditibus abundare et vile iactare palliolum); 125,16,4 (pannis aurum tegimus); in Is. 4,9,14 l. 38 (praeferens paupertatem et replens marsupium); in Jer. 2,34,2 (regum quondam opes vile aut certe non vile palliolum possider); in Ezech. lib. 8 praef. l. 15 (paupertatem vili palliolo praeferentes Croesi opibus incubare); in Mich. 3,9 l. 294 (pauper habitus non quaerat divitias senatorum ... quid iuvat esse μονοχίτωνας et praeferre habitu paupertatem cum marsupium nostrum universa pauperum turba suspiret?).* The antithesis is taken over by the author of *Epist. ed. Caspari 7* p. 175, who ascribes it specifically to J.

although this individual's formulation is different from any of J.'s own: *sicut sanctus Hieronymus scribit, vilem in scapulis iactare pallium et plenum marsupium habere reconditum*. The contrast would not seem to have occurred elsewhere.

Inficitur membrana colore purpureo. J. makes a number of disparaging references to bibles of this type, which he generally contrasts elsewhere with the textually correct editions naturally preferred by himself: *epist.* 107,12,1 (*divinos codices amet, in quibus emendata et erudita distinctio*); *praef. Vulg. Iob* p. 73,8 (*habeant qui volunt veteres libros vel in membranis purpureis auro argentoque descriptos vel uncialibus, ut vulgo aiunt, litteris onera magis exarata quam codices, dum mihi meisque permittant pauperes habere scidulas et non tam pulchros codices quam emendatos*); cf. *interpr. Iob praef.* p. 75,5 (*dum magis pulchros habere malunt codices quam emendatos*). The same combination of purple, gold and jewels as occurs in the present passage is also applied to such bibles at *in Zach.* 8,6 l. 168 *ut ... divinos libros quos prius tradebat incendio, nunc deauratos et purpuratos et gemmarum varietate distinctos in custodiam Romani veneretur status* (sc. *regalis potestas*). This trio is used in a different connection at *in Zach.* 4,8 l. 183 (*cum viderimus potentes saeculi fulgere auro, purpura gemmisque rutilare*). Chrysostom shares J.'s dislike of sumptuous bibles; he notes at *hom. in Jo.* 32,3 that people are more interested in calligraphy than content: οὐδενὸς ... ἀκούω φιλοτιμουμένου, ὅτι οἶδε τὰ ἐγκείμενα ἀλλ' ὅτι χρυσοῖς ἔχει γράμμασιν ἐγγεγραμμένον (ib. ἡ πᾶσα αὐτοῖς σπουδὴ περὶ τὴν τῶν ἱμένων λεπτότητα καὶ τὸ τῶν γραμμάτων κάλλος). For surviving specimens of the kind of bible to which J. is referring cf. Gorce (1949b), p. 121.

gemmis codices vestiuntur et nudus ante fores earum Christus emoritur. J. repeats the paradox at *epist.* 58,7,1 (*quae utilitas parietes fulgere gemmis et Christum in paupere fame mori?*) and 128,5,1 (*auro parietes, auro laquearia, auro fulgent capita columnarum et nudus atque esuriens ante fores nostras in paupere Christus moritur*); cf. 54,12,2 (*cave ne mendicante domino tuo alienas divitias augeas*). Again it is Chrysostom who provides a parallel. He in fact is unusually fond of this particular antithesis: *hom. in Ps.* 48,17 l. 6 (ἡμίονοι ἀλογοὶ καλλωπίζονται, ὁ δὲ κένης ... τῇ θύρᾳ σου προσεδρεύει καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς λιμῷ τήκεται); 2,2 (τὸ μὲν ἀλογον ... ὑπὲρ εὐδρεύει καὶ ὁ Χριστὸν λιμῷ τηκόμενον ὀρῶν καὶ τὴν χρειαν καλλωπίζων ... τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν λιμῷ τηκόμενον ὀρῶν καὶ τὴν χρειαν ἀπολαύειν τροφῆς); *hom. in Mt.* 49,5 οὐδὲ τῆς ἀναγκαίας ποιῶν ἀπολαύειν τροφῆς; *hom. in Mt.* 49,5 οὐδὲ τῆς ἀναγκαίας ποιῶν ἀπολαύειν τροφῆς (ἐκείνον [sc. τὸν Χριστὸν τὸν λιμῶντα, τὸν γυμνόν] μὲν τροφῆς ἀναγκαίας ἀποροῦντα περιορῶντας, τὰ δέρματα δὲ μετὰ πολλῆς καλλωπίζοντας τῆς σπουδῆς); 50,4 (τί γὰρ ὄφελος, ὅταν ἡ τράπεζα

αὐτῷ [sc. Χριστῷ] γέμη χρυσῶν ποτηρίων, αὐτὸς δὲ λιμῷ δια-
 φθειρήται); *hom. in 2 Cor.* 17,3 (ὁ μὲν κύων ἐμπέπλησται, ὁ δὲ
 Χριστὸς λιμῷ τήκεται); 19,3 (ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γάρ τὸ σῶμα τῶν
 ἐταιριζομένων καὶ χρυσίῳ περιβάλλουσιν ἀφάτω· σὺ δὲ οὐδὲ
 ἱματίῳ ψιλῷ τὴν σάρκα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα γυμνὴν ὀρών.); *hom.*
in Phil. 10,5 (ἔδωκεν ἱμάτια ... οὐχ ἵνα ταῦτα μὲν ἢ πολὺ ἔχοντα
 χρυσιον, ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς γυμνὸς ἀπολλύηται); *hom. in 1 Tim.* 2,3 (ὕπερ
 τοῦ μηδενός [sc. clothes] τοσαύτην ποιεῖσθαι σπουδὴν ... καὶ
 περιορῆν τὸν Χριστὸν πεινῶντα).¹ On this passage of the *Libellus*
 Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compares Lk. 16,19ff. *homo quidam erat*
dives et induebatur purpura et bysso et epulabatur cotidie splendide.
(20) et erat quidam mendiculus nomine Lazarus qui iacebat ad ianuam
eius ulceribus plenus ... (22) factum est autem ut moreretur mendiculus.
 On Christ's nakedness cf. Mt. 25,36 *nudus (sc. eram) et operuistis me.*

cum manum porrexerint, bucinant. Hilberg compares Mt. 6,2 *cum*
ergo facies elemosynam, noli tuba canere ante te. In Ambrose, *off.*
 2,1,2 (*qui velut tuba canente vulgare liberalitatem suam quam faciunt*
circa pauperes gestiunt) the trumpet is explicitly metaphorical. J.
 himself speaks of gifts to *bucinatores* in the context of almsgiving at
epist. 108,16,1 (*solent pleraeque matronarum bucinatoribus suis dona*
conferre); both here and in the present passage of the *Libellus* the
 trumpets are also merely metaphorical according to *TLL* II, 2233,49ff.
 and 67ff.

At *in Ezech.* 18,5 l. 386 J. describes how in church the deacon reads
 out the donors' names and the amounts donated: *'tantum offert illa, ille*
tantum pollicitus est'. The point is made at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 288 l.
 151 that some Christians only give before onlookers: *si quando pauper*
rogat, huc illucque circumspiciunt; et nisi testem viderint, pecuniam
non dant (cf. also p. 307 l. 167). Similarly Ambrose notes that some do
 it just for show (*paenit.* 2,9,84).

cum ad agapen vocaverint, praeco conducitur. J. repeats the phrase
praeco conducitur in a similar context at *adv. Pelag.* 2,11 *ad*
largiendum frustum panis et binos nummulos praeco conducitur. On
 the *agape* cf. (e.g.) Leclercq (1907; esp. p. 820 on the present passage);
 Richter.

32,2

vidi nuper. The same phrase is used at *epist.* 54,13,3 *vidimus nuper*
ignominiosum per totum orientem volitasse.

¹ A similar example is also found in Augustine, *serm.* 32,20 *donat res suas bestiarum*
exerente Christo in pauperibus

nomina laceo, ne saturam putes. J. had mentioned Sofronius by name at 28,1 above. On the other hand he had refrained from naming the gadabout priest satirized in 28,4. In the present passage J. associates mention of names with satire. However at *epist.* 125,5,1 it is connected instead with Old Comedy: *ego enim neminem nominabo nec veteris comoediae licentia certas personas eligam atque perstringam.* J. again states that he will name no one at *epist.* 133,11,6 (*nullius in hoc opusculo nomen proprie tangitur*); cf. in *Soph.* 3,14 l. 468 (*si quis ergo christianorum et maxime novorum prudentium, quorum nomina laceo, ne quemquam laedere videar ...*). He denies the charge of being a 'satirist' in *epist.* 40,2,3 *in quodcumque vitium stili mei mucro contorquetur, te clamitas designari ... et satiricum scriptorem in prosa stulte arguis.* Nevertheless he elsewhere associates himself with both Horace and Lucilius: *epist.* 50,5,2 (*possum remordere, si velim, possum genuinum laesus infigere: ... de nobis quoque dici potest: 'taenum habet in cornu, longe fuge'* [Horace, *sat.* 1,4,34]); 117,1,2 (*'ubi illa quondam constantia, in qua multo sale urbem defricans Lucilianum quippiam rettulisti?'* [cf. Horace, *sat.* 1,10,3f.] *'hoc est', aio, 'quod me fugat et labra dividere non sinit'*). Neither J.'s standpoint nor his use of terms would seem to be entirely consistent. On the present passage of the *Libellus* cf. Wiesen, pp. 248ff.; Classen, p. 107.

nobilissimam mullerum Romanarum. J. had used the same phrase to describe Melania the Elder at *chron. a. Abr.* 2390.

in basilica beati Petri semiviris antecedentibus propria manu, quo religiosior putaretur, singulos nummos dispertire pauperibus. Paulinus of Nola relates how Pammachius gathered the poor of Rome into St. Peter's to receive alms (*epist.* 13,11). Pammachius too made the distribution in person; however he was more generous than J.'s curmudgeon (*ib.* 13,14 *quantum pecuniae gravi dextera geminatis excipientium palmis hilaris dator et infatigabilis distributor infuderat*).

ut usu nosse perfacile est. *Nosse perfacile est* recurs in *adv. Iovin.* 1,12. The phrase is imitated by Asterius of Amseodunum, *ad Renat.* 1, 298 *ut ... nosse perfacile est.* Ambrose has *usu ... cognovimus* (*epist.* 8,56,8).

anus quaedam annis pannisque obsita. Luebeck, p. 112, noted that J. has borrowed this phrase from Terence, *Eun.* 236 *pannis annisque obsitum.* Hagendahl explains the presence of this and other classical reminiscences in the very work which describes J.'s 'renunciation' of the classics (30,5) as due to the stylistic character of the *Libellus*: its style is 'as refined and rhetorical as ever it can be' ([1958], p. 111). It may however be doubted whether J.'s choice of this particular phrase is a sign of 'refinement'. Donatus' commentary on the line in question

makes the following observation: *'pannis et annis' morologiae parasitorum sunt ... parasitica vernilitate κατὰ τὸ ἑνωριόλετρον dictum (Ter. Eun. 236,4f.)*.² In Terence the phrase occurs at the start of the opening speech of Gnatho, who is a particularly bumptious parasite: Donatus is therefore making the point that these words characterize their speaker perfectly. It is evident from *adv. Rufin.* 1,16 (cf. Lammen, p. 7) that J. had read Donatus' commentaries on Terence: he did not simply listen to his teacher's exposition in the classroom. J. will accordingly have been familiar with Donatus' negative estimate of these words. Nonetheless 'the sort of silly thing a parasite would say' has an irresistible appeal for J., who cannot refrain from using the phrase again at *in Soph.* 1,15 l. 674, where he is describing how the Jews congregate at the site of the Temple on the anniversary of its destruction: *videas in die quo capta est a Romanis ... Hierusalem ... confluere decrepitas mulierculas et senes pannis annisque obritos*.³ It would seem that J. is alone in his partiality for these words: no one else appears to use them. J. on the other hand could never resist a flashy and meretricious phrase: its provenance — whether classical or otherwise — was unimportant.

On J.'s reminiscences of Terence before 386 cf. Hagendahl (1958), pp. 273f. They were more numerous than he supposed; cf. id. (1974), p. 217, and n. on *quidquid dixeris, laudant ...* at 24,1 above.

ad quam cum ordine pervenisset, pugnus porrigitur pro denario. The alliteration is noted by Hritz, p. 42. Here it underlines J.'s indignation.

tanti criminis reus sanguis effunditur. For a comparable expression cf. Augustine, *epist.* 50 *innocens effusus est sanguis* (on 'innocent blood' cf. *TLL* VII,1, 1705,3ff.).

32,3

radix malorum omnium est avaritia ideoque et ab apostolo idolorum servitus appellatur. Social satire is now followed by a string of biblical passages. J. quotes 1 Tim. 6,10 (*radix ... avaritia*) with some frequency: it recurs seven times in his *oeuvre*. Only here however is it glossed by Eph. 5,5 (*avarus, quod est idolorum servitus*; cf. also Col. 3,5). This text of 1 Tim. has already been echoed at 31,2 above (*radix avaritiae*). Cyprian had included it in his *testimonia* (3,61).

quaere primum regnum dei et haec omnia adponentur tibi. In its original context Mt. 6,33 concludes the exhortation to abandon worldly

² The paronomasia is noted by Harendza, p. 17.

³ It may be noted how in the same passage (l. 660) J. stresses that his description is based on autopsy: *nobis praesertim qui nunc in ista aemula provincia licet videre ...*

cares which J. had cited at length in 31,3f. In the present passage J. has streamlined the text *à sa façon*; after *regnum dei* he omits *et iustitiam eius*. J. had already employed this verse at *epist.* 14,1,3. He repeats it at *epist.* 123,13,4; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 55 l. 17. In all three passages it is quoted in the same abbreviated form.

non occidet dominus fame animam iusti. This sentence is the second of a concatenation of three direct quotations of scripture that are cited in characteristically impressive fashion without introduction or commentary of any sort. These particular words are so well integrated that Hilberg failed to recognize them as a biblical text. It was left to Vaccari (1920), p. 389, to identify them as Prov. 10,3 οὐ λιμακτονήσεται κέρτος ψυχὴν δικαίαν (for the variant δικαίου cf. [e.g.] Asterius the Sophist, *hom.* [Richard] 5,16). Hilberg's terminal colon should accordingly be replaced with a full stop. J. quotes this verse again at *in Is.* 18,65,13 l. 32, where it is instead given a spiritual interpretation. In the present passage the text is linked with Mt. 6,33 and Ps. 36,25. The second combination was traditional; cf. Origen, *hom. in Gen.* 16,3 p. 139,14; Cyprian, *domin. orat.* 21; Basil, *hom.* 2,8; Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 5,165; Chromatius, *in Matth.* 32,1. J. himself repeats it at *in Is.* 18,65,13 ll. 26 and 32.

iuventor ful et senul et non vidi iustum derelictum nec semen eius quaerens panem. J. turns a general assertion of God's righteousness into an assurance of his continued material support for the voluntarily impoverished. He cites Ps. 36,25 again at *in Is.* 2,5,13 l. 19; 18,65,13 l. 26; *in Am.* 8,11 l. 297 (in the last two passages a spiritual interpretation is given). J.'s application of the text in the *Libellus* finds a parallel in Cyprian, *testim.* 3,1 (*de bono operis et misericordiae*).

Hellas corvis ministrantibus pascitur. The words *corvis ministrantibus pasci* were a cliché (at 3 Reg. 17,6 LXX has simply καὶ οἱ κόρακες ἔφερον αὐτῷ ἄρτους τὸ πρῶν καὶ κρέα τὸ δεῖλιν). The same formulation had been used by Cyprian at *elem.* 11 (*Hellas ... corvis ministrantibus pascitur*). It recurs at Rufinus, *Orig. in psalm.* 36 *hom.* 3,10; Maximus of Turin 2,1; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 124,1. J. refers to Elijah's ravens again at *epist.* 78,26,3 and *in Ezech.* 4,9 l. 1450. They are identified with the gentiles at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 334 l. 160. Gregory Nazianzen had combined them with the widow of Zarephath (cf. next n.) in a passage that likewise recommended poverty (*carm.* 1,2,2,172ff.; cf. 1,2,3,85f.); the two episodes are of course also consecutive in the biblical account.

vidua Sareptena ipsa cum filiis nocte moritura prophetam pascit esuriens. The story of the widow of Zarephath had already been told as an incentive to almsgiving by Cyprian (*elem.* 17; cf. also

Epiphanius Latinus, *in evang.* 42 p. 101,5; 51 p. 128,21). It is cited to encourage trust in providence at Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,266; cf. Leo the Great, *serm.* 42,2. J. himself mentions this woman as a pattern of virtuous widowhood in *epist.* 54,16,2, where she is described as *ipsa nocte moritura cum filio*; the words echo J.'s formulation in the present passage (*ipsa cum filiis nocte moritura*). The saintly Exuperius is later said to follow her example (*epist.* 125,20,3; old women and widows are told to do the same in Ps.-Athanasius, *pat.* 8). In addition J. refers to her at *in Abd.* 20 l. 696. Cf. also the previous n. and the n. on *qui alendus venerat* ... below.

capsace completo. The word *capsaces* occurs in the Old Latin version of this episode (3 Reg. 17,14) cited in Cyprian, *elem.* 17; the Vulgate has instead *lecythus*. J. uses *capsaces* again at *epist.* 54,16,2. On the vessel in question cf. Epiphanius, *haer.* 30,12 ἐν ἄγγει, ἐν καμψάκῃ φημί, κακοῦβιον δὲ τοῦτο οἱ ἐπιχώριοι καλοῦσι.

qui alendus venerat, alit. Once again J. embellishes a biblical episode with second-hand rhetorical trappings (cf. also n. on *Helias corvis ministrantibus pascitur* immediately above). The present conceit had been used in Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 26 *qui ... venerat pasci, pastus ... miserias egestatis fecit excludi* (sc. *Helias*). It had also occurred in Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,10,530 τρέφων τρεφούσας (sc. Ἡλίας). Gregory had employed the conceit in a slightly different form at *or.* 26,12 ἵνα ... τρέφῃ τὸν τρέφοντα (sc. ἡ Σαραφθία τὸν Ἡλίαν); J. will probably have heard this *Oration* when it was first delivered (cf. Gallay, p. 252).

32,4

argentum, inquit, et aurum non habeo. After a series of texts dealing with divine provision (ll. 8–13) J. returns to the subject of avarice (cf. ll. 7f.). The present text introduces a further attack on contemporary niggardliness (p. 195,1–3; cf. p. 193,16ff.). J. quotes Acts 3,6 on six further occasions. It had been cited in Cyprian, *resim.* 3,61 (*pecuniam non adpetendam*); Cyprian had also referred to this verse at *hab. virg.* 10.

Ilcet sermone taceant, re loquuntur. *re* is the reading suggested by Hilberg in place of the meaningless *ore* of most MSS; his emendation would seem to be correct. For the antithesis *verbo (-is) ... re* cf. Lactantius, *inst.* 5,13,15; Rufinus, *apol. adv. Hier.* 1,34 (*re atque opere*); Cassian, *inst.* 12,13 (*re et opere*); c. *Nest.* 7,3,1; and for the earlier period cf. *OLD* s.v. *verbum* 11b and 12b. For the proverbial expression *res loquitur* cf. Otto, p. 297, s.v. *res* 1; Häussler, p. 319 (no. 1522; *TLL* VII,2, 1673,25ff. [s.v. *loquor*; cf. 1667,35ff.] adds passages of Cicero). Parallels for the particular formulation employed in the

Libellus can be adduced from Basil (*hom.* 13,5 ἀπὸ βουῆ τὰ πρόγματα, κἂν τῇ φωνῇ σιωπῆς) and Chrysostom (*hom. in 2 Cor.* 20,3 οὐ μὲν σιγῆς, τὸ δὲ ἔργον βουῆ). J.'s own wording is as usual very striking; he typically repeats it with slight modifications on a number of occasions: *adv. Iovin.* 2,36 (*licet sermone taceant, habitu loquantur et gestu*); *in Jer.* 4,57A (*quod cum sermone non pandant, ostendant operibus*); *in Matth.* 23,28 l. 252 (*etiam si sermone non dicant, opere loquantur*); *tract. in Is.* p. 109,3 (*licet sermone taceat, consequentibus loquitur*). All of these Hieronymian passages together with the two Greek texts should be added to the evidence in Otto and Häussler.

habentes igitur victum et vestitum his contenti sumus. Here J.'s habit of letting biblical texts express his meaning has confused Hilberg, who erroneously includes the present text (1 Tim. 6,8) in the foregoing *sermocinatio*, in which all three verbs (*habeo ... habeo ... do*) are however singular: a plural *sumus* would accordingly be out of place. This citation of 1 Tim. in fact goes instead with what follows: its *victum et vestitum* corresponds exactly to *panem ad manducandum et vestem ad induendum* in the immediately succeeding quotation of Gen. 28,20. J. again links 1 Tim. 6,8 and Gen. 28,20 at *in Ezech.* 46,19 l. 847. The same combination is also found in Chrysostom at *hom. in 2 Cor.* 6,4 and *pan. Bern.* 2. In the present passage Hilberg's paragraph marker ['5'] should accordingly be placed before instead of after this quotation of 1 Tim., which J. is in fact using to introduce the concluding section of this ch. For the sense of *igitur* here cf. *TLL* VII,1, 270,10ff. (*initium vel transitio per ipsum 'igitur' significatur ... ut post digressionem quasi resumatur oratio*); *igitur* is attested in the Old Latin versions of the text (cf. Frede [1975], p. 600). The preceding verse (1 Tim. 6,7) had concluded the previous ch. (31,5), while 1 Tim. 6,10 had introduced the second half of the present ch. (p. 194,7). Cyprian had already cited 1 Tim. 6,8 as a warning against avarice in *testim.* 3,61 (*possidendi concupiscentiam et pecuniam non adpetendam*). J. is remarkably fond of this verse, which recurs some twenty-five times in his works.

32,5

si fuerit dominus deus mecum et servaverit me in via hac, per quam ego iter facio, et dederit mihi panem ad manducandum et vestem ad induendum. Jacob's appeal for bread and raiment (Gen. 28,20) is mentioned again at *epist.* 120,2,4 (the bread is Christ's body); *adv. Pelag.* 3,8 (an anti-Pelagian interpretation); *in Ezech.* 46,19 l. 847. The text is regularly cited by eastern Fathers as an example of frugal living: Basil, *reg. fus.* 20,3; Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,10,496ff.; Chrysostom, *hom. in Gen.* 54,5 (ib. οὐ κλοῦπον, οὐ περιουσίαν τινα

ἦπασεν ἀλλ' ἄρτον καὶ ἰμάτιον, τὸ μὲν εἰς τὴν τοῦ σώματος περιβολήν, τὸ δὲ εἰς τροφήν τῆς χρείας); *exp. in Ps.* 140,4; Palladius, *v. Chrys.* 12; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 1,179. It had already been used in this way by Philo, *som.* 1,126.

dives dominus et ditior pater. J. has lifted this impressive phrase straight from Cyprian, who in *patient.* 18 had applied it to Job: *dives in censu dominus et in liberis pater ditior.* Once again J. has streamlined the material he has borrowed; the result is a very arresting paronomastic isocolon. He uses the same formulation again over twenty years later in *epist.* 118,3,1 (*dives quondam dominus et ditior pater*; of Job) and 123,14,4 (*dives dominus et pater ditior*; of Jacob). In addition Cyprian's phrase has evidently influenced the wording of J.'s version of Origen at *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 4,8 p. 370,17 *dives in liberis pater ... dives in censu dominus* (sc. *Job*); the translation antedates J.'s arrival in Rome. In the *Libellus* this formulation provides a sparkling climax to the ch. However it is altogether inappropriate here. On the one hand *dives dominus* clashes with the immediate context, which is of course a tirade directed precisely against *divitiae* (chs. 31–2). On the other *ditior pater* is grotesquely out of place in a treatise on the subject of virginity. Deléani, p. 66, has noticed how J. sometimes inserts 'une rapide réminiscence de Cyprien'; she does not record the present passage. Deléani explains such allusiveness as 'telle une signature authentifiant le contenu d'une page'. This is hardly the case here. Once again J.'s own desire to dazzle at all costs has led him to perpetrate a significant infelicity. It is noteworthy that no one else would seem to have imitated Cyprian's striking phrase.

Infinita de scripturis exempla subpeditant, quae et avaritiam doceant esse fugiendam. On the second half of this sentence (*avaritiam ... fugiendam*) Fremantle, p. 37, needlessly compares Lk. 12,15 *cavete ab omni avaritia*. J.'s wording here merely picks up *avaritiae quoque tibi vitandum est malum* at 31,1; accordingly the phrase which rounds off his treatment of avarice neatly echoes the words that had introduced it. The striking hyperbaton in the present passage is noted by Hritzu, p. 79.

The first half of this sentence (*infinita de scripturis exempla subpeditans*) is closely paralleled by the words that conclude a similar list of biblical *exempla* at 10,1 above: *innumerabilia sunt scripturis respersa divinis* (cf. n. ad loc.). Both statements are followed immediately (pp. 157,11ff.; 195,12ff.) by a declaration that the respective topic has only received summary treatment and requires a separate work; in each case this excuse is introduced by exactly the same phrase (*verum quia nunc*). In both passages J. then proceeds in

spite of his disclaimer to supply additional exemplification: he is clearly eager for an opportunity to include further impressive items.

Neither transition to the new material has been adequately motivated; this is especially the case here. At 10,1 J. had told Eustochium that she could discover it for herself. Such a device cannot however be employed in 33,1, which relates an anecdote from Egypt. Here J. simply allows an affirmation that he will reserve discussion of the topic for an independent treatise to be followed directly by an announcement of further exemplification. Since moreover J. repeats the formula *verum quia nunc*, the second of these statements (... *referam*) is actually represented as being the 'consequence' of the first (... *reservatur*): additional illustration is now furnished 'because' the subject is being kept for a separate treatment.

In this passage of the *Libellus* J. wishes to introduce his digression on Egyptian monasticism (chs. 33-6) as an appendix to the treatment of avarice. In order to do so he has taken over mechanically the sequence of ideas employed in an earlier ch. of the work (10,1f.); however he has not troubled to adapt it to the exigencies of the fresh context. A similar line of argument, which again involves the formula *verum quia nunc*, is used to introduce J.'s third type of monk at 36,1 below; again it has not been properly integrated (cf. n. ad loc.). The inconcinnities which result from such intellectual inertia are a serious indictment of the author's compositional method.

Chapter 33

In the preceding two chs. (31–2) J. has provided a theoretical discussion of avarice. Typically this disquisition consisted largely of biblical citation; it had also contained a lengthy anecdote drawn from contemporary Rome (32,2). As a further illustration of the foregoing discussion J. now relates a second anecdote concerning a monk of Egypt who on death left behind a sum of money which he had accumulated from his handicraft. After debate it was decided to bury the money with its owner. The account leads in turn to the extensive description of Egyptian monasticism which occupies the following chs. (34–6).¹

33,1

verum quia nunc. This phrase as well as the argument of the present sentence have been taken over from 10,1f. above (cf. also 36,1); on the resultant inconcinnity in *referam* (l. 14) cf. n. on *infinita de scripturis exempla ...* at 32,5 above.

si Christus adnuerit. J. is extremely fond of such phrases, which match his vivacious and sometimes colloquial style; their frequency may also reflect his self-doubt. On the other hand Gorce (1949b), p. 128, sees them as due to J.'s weak health. Antin (1956), p. 16, n. 3, assembles examples; since however his collection is far from complete, it will be appropriate to set out the material in full here. J. repeats the phrase *si Christus adnuerit* at *in Is. lib. 10 praef.* l. 8 (so too Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad Ruric.* l. 37); cf. also *in Is. lib. 5 praef.* l. 37 and *lib. 6 praef.* l. 2, which both have *si ... voluntati nostrae Christus adnuerit*. Elsewhere J. uses a variety of expressions: *si Christus iusserit* (*epist.* 112,2,5; *in Gal.* 2,11 p. 341^c); *si concesserit dominus* (*hom. Orig. in cant.* 1,3 p. 32,25; *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 7 p. 46,24); *si dominus gratiam dederit* (*epist.* 133,13,1); *si ... vitam dominus dederit* (*vita Malchi* 1; *c. Ioh.* 22 [Christus]; *adv. Rufin.* 2,23 [*vitae huius ... spatium*]); *si ... dominus dederit occasionem* (*tract.* p. 514 l. 238); *si ... dominus sanitatem dederit* (*Victorin. Poetov. in apoc. praef.*); *si dominus ... dederit com meatum* (*hom. Orig. in Luc. praef.* p. 2,3). Tertullian notes that even pagans say *si deus voluerit* (*test. anim.* 2 p. 136,7; Scholte, p. 57 [ad loc.], compares Cyprian, *idol.* 9 and Minucius Felix 18,11; one might add Jas. 4,15 *pro eo ut dicatis 'si dominus voluerit'*).

¹ The present ch. is discussed by Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 288ff.

J.'s announcement here of a special work devoted to avarice (*suo, si Christus adhaerit, volumini reservatur*) naturally allows him to impress; however the treatise never appeared (cf. also n. on *alio tempore* ... at 36.2). On this method of advertising forthcoming publications cf. *Arns*, pp. 159f.

parcior magis quam avarior. J. is sarcastically indulgent. The παραδυστολή (cf. *Lausberg*, pp. 373f. [no. 749]) is enhanced by the paronomasia; only the latter is noted by *Harendza*, p. 18.

centum solidos, quos lina texendo quaesierat, moriens dereliquit. Two parallels may be adduced from *Aporrhēgmata patrum* (Nau [1907]). The first reports that on the death of a monk fifty coins were found (74 p. 397). In the second another monk leaves a pot of gold; as in J.'s anecdote, the abbot says θάψατε αὐτὸ μετ' αὐτοῦ (30 p. 62).

For the monk selling goods that he has produced cf. *Aporrhēgmata patrum* p. 436^A Φιλόγριος ἦν τις ... οἰκῶν ... ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Ἱεροσολύμων ... καὶ ὡς ἴστατο ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πωλῶν τὸ ἐργόχειρον αὐτοῦ J. notes at 34.2 below in connection with the remuoth that *quidquid vendiderint, maioris est pretii*.

in eodem loco circiter quinque milia divisis cellulis habitant. Rufinus reports a similar arrangement: *commenent ... per eremum dispersi et separati cellulis, sed caritate connexi* (*hist. mon. praef.*; cf. *ib.* 21 *in hoc ... loco* [sc. *Nitriae*] *quinquaginta fere aut non multo minus cernuntur vicina sibi et sub uno posita patre tabernacula, in quibus aliqui plures simul, aliqui pauci, nonnulli etiam singulares habitant et mansione quidem aliqui divisi, animo autem et fide et caritate coniuncti et inseparabiles manent*). For J.'s figure of 5,000 cf. *Palladius*, *h. Laus.* 7.

33,2

alii pauperibus distribuendos esse dicebant, alii dandos ecclesiae, nonnulli parentibus remittendos. J. achieves a very impressive sentence combining anaphora, *distiunctio*, alliteration, parison and twofold chiasmus (for the last two cf. *Harendza*, p. 55; *Hritzu*, p. 96).

Macarius vero et Pambos et Isidorus. J. indulges in a piece of name-dropping after his manner. Rufinus includes these names among the *eremi magistri* (*apol. adv. Hier.* 2,15). At *hist.* 11,4 he says they lived in Nitria, while he reports (*ib.* 11,8) that he himself saw the two Macarii from the upper and lower desert respectively, Isidore of Scete and Pambo from Cellia. On the Macarii cf. *Rufinus*, *hist. mon.* 28. J. records Rufinus' encounter with one of them in *epist.* 3,2,2. He refers to the name again at *epist.* 58,5,3 and 108,14,2. Melania paid a visit to Pambo according to *Palladius*, *h. Laus.* 10 (cf. *Butler*, II, pp. 190f.). *Palladius* also records that an Isidore had become known to the wives

of Roman senators by accompanying Athanasius during his exile (ib. 1; cf. Butler, II, p. 185). Another monk of that name received Melania in Nitria (ib. 46); this was the 'bishop and confessor' to whom J. himself refers at *epist.* 108,14,2.

quos patres vocant. The name is used again at 35,2 and 35,6 below. The deacon is a *parens* at 35,4. J. employs the expression *pater monasterii* in *epist.* 125,13,1f. and 125,15,2; cf. Boon, index s.v. One might also compare (e.g.) *Apophthegmata patrum* 28 (Nau [1907], p. 60) εἰς Σκήτην πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας. At *in Matth.* 23,8 l. 119 J. records that the name 'father' was especially common in Palestinian and Egyptian monasteries. He disapproves of it at *in Gal.* 4,6 p. 374^B *cum ... dominus noster in evangelio praecipiat nullum patrem vocandum nisi deum, nescio qua licentia in monasteriis vel vocemus hoc nomine alios vel vocari nos acquiescamus* (cf. *tract.* p. 555 l. 92).

sancto in eis loquente spiritu. J. uses this phrase again at *in Tit.* 1,8 p. 568^B and 2,15 p. 590^A. Gregory of Nyssa, *Pss. tit.* B 10 has τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ... ἐν αὐτῷ λαλοῦντος. Cf. Mt. 10,20 *spiritus patris vestri qui loquitur in vobis*.

pecunia tua tecum sit in perditionem. J. does not have occasion to quote Peter's reply to Simon Magus (Acts 8,20) elsewhere. It had been included in Cyprian's collection of *testimonia* (3,100 *gratiam dei gratuitam esse debere*). It had also occurred in J.'s translation of *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 6,5 p. 383,9.

nec hoc crudeliter quisquam factum putet. For the argument cf. Paulinus of Périgueux, *Mart.* 6,263f. *nec quisquam dura ista putet, cum pauca timorem / signa acuunt, poena exterret, formido medella est*.

tantus per totam Aegyptum cunctos terror invasit. J. perhaps has in mind Acts 5,11 *factus est timor magnus in universa ecclesia*. These words conclude the story of Ananias and Sapphira, who were also condemned for avarice; the burial motif (cf. II. 5f.) is also present in the biblical account (Acts 5,6 and 5,9f.). Moreover J. has just quoted Acts 8,20 (II. 6f.). J.'s actual wording shows a close similarity to *Vulg.* 2 *par.* 14,14 (*grandis ... cunctos terror invaserat*) and *Esth.* 8,17 (*grandis ... cunctos ... terror invaserat*). The striking hyperbaton in the present passage (*tantus ... terror*) is noted by Hritzu, p. 78 (for the cretic spondee clausula here and for the double cretic in the next line cf. Herron, pp. 12ff. and 27ff.). J.'s sentence supplies a rhetorically effective conclusion to this anecdote, while the mention of Egypt also paves the way for the ensuing excursus on Egyptian monasticism.

Chapter 34

J. begins his long excursus on the monks of Egypt. At the time of the *Libellus* J. had no direct experience of Egyptian monasticism; he had only spent time as an anchorite in the Syrian desert.¹ Interest in the subject was strong; Rufinus had already visited Egypt with the Elder Melania, while J. himself was to do so shortly afterwards in the company of Paula and Eustochium. The two Latin translations of Athanasius' *Life of Antony* and J.'s own *Life of Paul* had been attempts to satisfy western curiosity. Cf. further Fontaine (1979).

J.'s treatment of the topic in the *Libellus* is introduced as an appendix to his discussion of avarice; in the preceding ch. he has described how an Egyptian monk had been condemned for hoarding money. While this digression on monasticism does have some relevance to the theme of avariciousness (cf. [e.g.] p. 199,16ff.), more importantly the cenobite and anchorite provide a perfect exemplification of the life that is devoted to the preservation of virginity. On this treatment of Egyptian monasticism cf. Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 288ff.; for its influence cf. id. (1961), pp. 52ff.

In the present ch. J. divides Egyptian monasticism into three classes: the cenobite, the anchorite and the remnuoth. The last form was also found in Italy; J. now describes it in detail. He represents the conduct of its adherents as undisciplined and exhibitionist: they are dismissed with scorn.

34,1

quae sancta sunt. J. uses these words again at *epist.* 52,4,4; 133,9,5; *reg. Pachom.* 60 p. 32,7; *Orsies. doctr.* 9; 25. They also occur in Ambrose, *off.* 1,14,52; Peter Chrysologus, *serm.* 70,11; *Regula Tarnatensis* 8,7; Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 2,6,23; *serm.* 54,6; 73,5.

aurem paulisper adcommoda. J. is fond of the striking phrase *aurem adcommodare*, which he also uses at *epist.* 20,6; 52,14,2; 125,18,1. *TLL* I, 332,63ff. adduces no example from any other author. At *epist.* 21,41,1 J. had employed a similarly vivacious imperative: *aditende paulisper.*

tria sunt in Aegypto genera monachorum. Cassian uses the same

¹ Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 222f. suggests that J.'s source of information about Egyptian monasticism was the Praesidius to whom [Ps.]-Jerome, *epist.* 18 is addressed.

words at *conf.* 18,4,2. On J.'s classification cf. Lorenz, p. 31 and n. 40; Goehring.

coenobium, quod illi sauhes gentili lingua vocant, nos 'in commune viventes' possumus appellare. *Coenobium* occurs here for the first time in latinized form; cf. Sainio, pp. 66f. It is distinguished from *monasterium* in Cassian, *conf.* 18,10 *monasterium nomen est diversorii ...; coenobium ... etiam professionis ipsius qualitatem disciplinamque designat.* On the form *sauhés* cf. Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 292f. For the technical term from the Coptic cf. Cassian, *conf.* 18,15,4 *plectas palmarum, quas illi siras vocant.* The explanation *coenobium ... 'in commune viventes'* is taken over by *Gloss.* V 412,54 and by Isidore of Seville, *eccl. off.* 2,16,2; *orig.* 7,13,2.

anachoretæ ... ab eo, quod procul ab hominibus recesserint, nuncupantur. So Isidore of Seville, *orig.* 7,13,3; cf. *Gloss.* II 169,24 *marg.* (*anachorita: recessor*); Cassian, *conf.* 18,6,2 (*secessores*). This is the first occurrence of the word *anachoreta* in Latin according to *TLL* II, 13,42ff. (cf. also Vogüé [1991], I, p. 322, n. 264).

remnuoth. On the form cf. Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 292f. with n. 114 (and addendum in id., [1991], V, p. 349).

deterrimum atque neglectum. A similar statement about the *sarabaitæ* is found in Cassian, *conf.* 18,7,1; *Regula Magistri* 1,6; Isidore of Seville, *eccl. off.* 2,16,9 (*sarabaitæ sive remobothitæ*). Some of J.'s MSS read *tererrimum* in place of *deterrimum*; cf. Weyman (1910), p. 1006 (it may be added that the passage of Isidore cited above has *tererrimum atque neglectum*).

in nostra provincia. Antin (1947b), p. 94, n. 125, as well as Gordini (1953), p. 48, and (1956), pp. 247f., rightly assume that here J. is referring to Rome; cf. most recently Vogüé (1991), I, p. 271. On the other hand Dölger (1950), pp. 65f., thinks the reference is to Illyria. Martianay ad loc. had affirmed that J. meant Syria or Palestine. On this form of monasticism in the West cf. Lorenz, p. 8. Cassian reports that outside Egypt *sarabaitæ* were virtually the only sort of monk (*conf.* 18,7,8). For the presence of such monks in Constantinople cf. Dagron, pp. 255ff.

aut solum aut primum. For the phrase cf. Lactantius, *opif.* 10,24 (*vel solus vel praecipue*); Donatus, *gramm. mai.* 2,5 p. 619,13 (*vel principalia vel sola*).

34,2

binī vel ternī. The *sarabaitæ* are said to live in twos and threes by Cassian, *conf.* 18,7,4; Benedict, *reg.* 1,8; *Regula Magistri* 1,8; 7,25.

simul habitant suo arbitratu ac ditione viventes. Cassian notes that *sarabaitæ* do not follow the cenobite's discipline but please themselves

(*conf.* 18,7,3); cf. Isidore of Seville, *eccl. off.* 2,16,9. They live without a rule according to Benedict, *reg.* 1,6 and *Regula Magistri* 1,6.

J. uses *habitant* again two lines later (l. 5). In addition he again describes these monks as 'living as they please' at ll. 7f. (*suo viventes cibo*). On such repetitions cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 820f.; they suggest that here J. is writing with rather less than his customary care. Further instances are found at 11,3 (*facere*); 19,3f. (*nasci*); 27,7f. (*facies*); 28,3 (*vestigium*); 39,3 (*tacere*).

in medium partes conferunt, ut habeant alimenta communia. This habit of sharing goods and the indolence it induces are described at *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,3 p. 102,7 *proprium, quod alicui suppetit, non est; et est commune, quod deficit: ideo cunctis execrabilis torpor*.

in urbibus et castellis. At *epist.* 58,5,1 these words denote the very opposite of the true monk's habitat: *vive in urbibus et castellis ...; sin autem cupis esse ... monachus, id est solus ...*

quidquid vendiderint, maioris est pretii. In *epist.* 125,16,3 J. again reports that certain monks earn more than the profane. The cenobite on the other hand sold at slightly less than the market price; cf. Leclercq (1914), pp. 2387f. *Sarabaitae* are said by Cassian to hoard their earnings (*conf.* 18,7,5). Abba Isaiah tells his audience not to haggle over the price like the worldly (*or.* 11,52). The present passage of the *Libellus* is quoted by Isidore of Seville, *eccl. off.* 2,16,9f.

34,3

certare ieiuniis. Gordini (1956), p. 250, compares Augustine, *mor. eccl.* 33,70 *ieiunia ... prorsus incredibilia multas exercere didici (sc. Romae)*. Here J. disapproves. At 35,8 cenobitic fasting is said to avoid excess. J. has condemned long fasts at 17,2 and 28,2; ostentatious ones were denounced at 27,3 and 27,7.

laxae manicae, caligae follicantes. J. alone would seem to have been struck by baggy sleeves. Here they are worn by men. At 13,5 tight-fitting sleeves had been a sign of the loose virgin. Floppy boots were carefully eschewed by the dandified priest described at 28,3.

In this *συνορθοποιός* Harendza, p. 58, notes the very striking three-fold parison with chiasmus; the asyndeton is registered by Hritzu, p. 47. *vestis grossior.* The ascetic wears a coarse shirt at *adv. Iovin.* 2,11; cf. also Chrysostom, *oppugn.* 2,6. J. had stipulated that dress should be unobtrusive at 27,3. In place of *grossior* Harendza, p. 58, reads *crassior* for the sake of the resultant alliteration (*crassior, crebra*).

crebra suspiria. Cf. Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 20 *perfacile est ... suspirare crebrius*. The sighs of the cenobite are said to be moderate at

35,3 below.

visitatio virginum. A monkish detractor is said to enjoy visiting the cells of virgins at *epist.* 50,3,2. If a clergyman has to call on a virgin, he is advised not to do it alone (*epist.* 52,5,6).

detractatio clericorum. J. himself decries the clergy at 28,3; the contradiction is characteristic. The ascetic is told to malign nobody at 37,2. At *epist.* 54,5,4 J. insists that the monk ought to respect the clergy.

saturantur ad vomitum. *Regula Magistri* 1,21 likewise states that gyrovagi eat and drink until they are sick. J. observes at *epist.* 31,3,3 that it is silly to commemorate a martyr by over-eating. Weyman (1910), p. 1006, notes the reference to the present passage at Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,8,5, where J.'s words are said to have caused great offence; the speaker expresses the view that oriental monks were meant.

Chapter 35

Having dismissed the undisciplined remnuoth with contempt, J. proceeds to deal with the strictly regulated cenobitic communities of Egypt. They are described at considerable length and with enormous enthusiasm. On J.'s treatment cf. Byrne. J. had not yet visited Egypt himself; for his possible sources of information cf. Byrne, p. 280. J. deals in turn with the organization of the monks, their daily round and the general running of the monasteries; his account is marked by great vividness. There is a further contemporary instance of the idealized depiction of monastic life in Chrysostom, *hom. in 1 Tim.* 14,3ff.

35,1

his igitur quasi quibusdam pestibus exterminatis veniamus ad eos, qui plures in commune habitant, id est, quas vocari coenobium diximus. At the beginning of ch. 15 J. had already employed a closely parallel sentence structure with similar vocabulary in order to make the same transition from bad to good examples: *explosis igitur et exterminatis his, quae nolunt esse virgines, sed videri, nunc ad te mihi omnis dirigitur oratio ...*

prima apud eos confoederatio est oboedire maioribus. Obedience is the monk's obligation according to *epist.* 125,15,2 and 130,17,3; cf. *reg. Pachom.* 39 p. 22,12; 157 p. 57,16. It is discussed by Frank (1976), pp. 418ff. In addition to the passages collected there the following stress its importance: *Apophthegmata Patrum* 290 (Nau [1909], p. 376); 292 (ib. p. 377); Basil, *ascet.* 1,3; Cassian, *conf.* 18,7,4; 24,26,14; Augustine, *epist.* 211,15; Ps.-Augustine, *reg.* III 7,1; Caesarius of Arles, *reg. virg.* 18,1; Benedict, *reg.* 4,61. According to Basil, *ascet.* 2,2 perfect obedience precludes even meritorious acts, if done without the superior's consent, while the reward for it is greater than for chastity itself. As in the present passage, obedience is again said to be the most important principle of cenobitic life at Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,10,1; 1,17,8; 1,19,1.

The term *confoederatio* occurs here for the first time according to *TLL* s.v.

decem praepositos sub se centesimus habeat. On the *praepositus* cf. Boon, index s.v. This man has forty brothers under him at *reg. Pachom. praef.* 2 p. 5,13. The number is ten in *Regula Magistri* 11,27.

35,2

quasi iustitium. J. had a certain partiality for this word; cf. *TLL* VII,2,

718,51ff.

quos decanos diximus. For the term cf. *TLL* V.1, 119,16ff. (and 117,26ff.).

ut, si cogitationibus forte quis fluctuat, illius consoletur alloquitur. A concern with the problem of temptation runs through this section of the ch.; cf. p. 199,6 (*si infirmum viderint, consolantur*); p. 199,10 (*quem tardiozem deprehenderit ...*). The same problem had figured very prominently in the early chs. of the *Libellus* (3–7). Similar vocabulary to that of the present passage was used at 6,5 *cum paululum interior homo inter vitia atque virtutes coeperit fluctuare*. The difficulty of resisting temptation was illustrated in particularly horrific terms by the description of J.'s own experience as an anchorite in ch. 7. In cenobitic communities on the other hand J. repeatedly points out that the support of others is always available to help in combatting temptation.

post horam nonam in commune concurritur. On the ninth hour as the start of communal activity cf. Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 298f. The alliteration in the last two words is noted by Harendza, p. 15.

psalmi resonant, scripturae ex more recitantur. Cassian reports that throughout Egypt twelve psalms are followed by two readings from the Old and New Testaments respectively (*inst.* 2,4). On the Sabbath both readings come from the New Testament (*ib.* 2,6).

completis orationibus. The prayers are discussed by Cassian at *inst.* 2,7.

cunctisque residentibus. Cf. Cassian, *inst.* 2,5,5 *sedentibus cunctis, ut est moris nunc usque in Aegypti partibus*.

medius, quem patrem vocant, incipit disputare. A talk should be given by the heads of houses three times a week according to *reg. Pachom.* 21 p. 18,4 (people went to sleep during it, *ib.* 22 p. 18,8). Augustine records that at least three thousand monks gather in the evening to hear the abbot's discourse (*mor. eccl.* 31,67). Cf. further Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 299f. J. had used a similar phrase at 33,2 above: *quos patres vocant*.

tantum silentium fit. From the context it is not evident why J. should want to single out this *minutia*, whose mention here might seem to be something of a red herring. However consideration of a number of other texts from various writers reveals that J. had good reason for laying special emphasis on the silence that accompanied the sermon. Though he does not refer to the matter again himself, complaints about noisy congregations are quite commonplace in the Fathers. In the light of such protests it becomes clear that here J. means this particular detail for imitation: the churchgoer is being encouraged to copy the silence of

the monk. J. is not the only one to think the monk exemplary in this regard. Augustine too draws attention to the amazing silence and concentration with which monks hear the abbot's address (*mor. eccl.* 31,67); he is followed later by Isidore of Seville (*eccl. off.* 2,16,14). Conversation in the assembly is forbidden by Abba Isaiah (*or.* 8,7).

Noise in church was in fact a serious problem. Though individual Fathers make only occasional reference to it, the evidence is impressive when taken together. Ambrose for example deplores the effort that is needed to silence a church congregation (*in psalm.* 1,9,4). Similarly the author of *Epist. Migne suppl.* 1,1701 complains that during sermon and reading the deacon is unable to hush mutterers.

The most serious cause of disturbance was conversation. Already Athanasius had warned that God's house must not become a house of chatter (*Letter to virgins* [Lebon], p. 193,14). Later Nilus of Ancyra at *ep.* 2,294 admonishes priests not to tolerate conversation or even whispering during the service. Women in particular were blamed for the problem. Such an accusation had been directed against them by Origen at *hom. in Ex.* 13,3 p. 272,27 *praecipue mulieres ... tantum garrunt, tantum fabulis obstrepunt, ut non sinant esse silentium*. At a later date the same complaint is repeated by Caesarius of Arles in *serm.* 50,3 and 55,4, where women are said to talk so much that they neither hear God's word themselves nor allow others to do so. Finally there is one piece of evidence from the same period as the *Libellus*. Chrysostom asserts that the hubbub women make in church is worse than anywhere else: *παρ' αὐταῖς (sc. γυναιξίν) πολὺς ὁ θόρυβος, πολλὴ ἡ κραυγὴ, πολλὴ ἡ διάλεξις, οὐδαμοῦ ἀλλαγῆ τοσαύτη, ὅση ἐνταῦθα. πάσας διαλεγόμενας ἴδοι τις ἄν, ὅσα οὔτε ἐν ἀγορᾷ οὔτε ἐν βαλανείοις* (*hom. in 1 Tim.* 9,1). Chrysostom took as his text 1 Tim. 2,11 ('let the woman learn in silence'). In this homily he has given it a rather different sense, for the apostle is merely forbidding a woman to teach.

In view of the foregoing evidence it is understandable that patristic injunctions to silence should be frequent; this is especially the case for the lesson. Such precepts are found in Athanasius, *virg.* 23; Ambrose, *virg.* 3,3,11; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 13,3; 19,3. Similarly the *Apostolic Constitutions* had enjoined silence at 2,57,8; they quoted in support Deut. 27,9 *σιῶπα καὶ ἀκουε Ἰσραὴλ*. For a general discussion of silence in J. alone cf. Antin (1964).

nemo ad alium respicere. Glances are not to be exchanged either at prayer or during rope-making (*reg. Pachom.* 7 p. 15,1). Cassian notes (*inst.* 4,17) that the Egyptian monk at dinner pulls down his hood and stares at the table.

nemo audeat excreare. Violent clearing of the throat ought to be

avoided according to Clement of Alexandria, *paed.* 2,7,60,1. In particular a virgin is told to refrain from clearing her throat during divine service at Ambrose, *virg.* 3,3,13 (a quotation of Terence, *Haw.* 373 *screatus ... abstine*; Ambrose is reproducing Liberius' sermon). Cassian (*inst.* 2,10,1) records how in assembly and especially at prayer no one spits, hawks, coughs or yawns. However the same author (*ib.* 12,27,3) also complains of clearing the throat even when there is no tickling. Abba Isaiah (*or.* 10,17) thinks that a monk should leave the room before expectorating.

35,3

dicentis laus in fletu est audientum. J. repeats the conceit in *epist.* 52,8,1 *dicente te in ecclesia ... lacrimae auditorum laudes tuae sint*. In the *Libellus* he achieves a very striking chiasmus; two present participles in the genitive enclose the sentence (for the spondee dichoree clausula cf. Herron, pp. 23ff.). J. would seem to have taken a cue from his recent translation of *hom. Orig. in Ezech.* 3,3 p. 351,16 *cum aliquis docuerit ea, quae ... strepitum potius laudatorum quam gemitum moveant*. When Augustine describes how monks listen to the abbot's homily at *mor. eccl.* 31,67, he makes the same point without the conceit: *affectiones animorum suorum, prout eos pepulerit disserentis oratio, vel gemitu vel fletu vel modesto et omni clamore vacuo gaudio significantes*.

volvuntur per ora lacrimae. This is evidently an echo of Vergil, *Aen.* 10,790 *lacrimaeque per ora volutae*. J. had already used the phrase at *epist.* 1,3,3 (*volutis per ora lacrimis*). The present passage of the *Libellus* is accordingly a further *Selbstzitat* in which the wording has come initially from another writer. J. redeploys the same formulation later at *epist.* 60,13,3 (*volvuntur per ora lacrimae*). *TLL* VII,2, 839,75f. gives no other example. This Vergilian echo would hitherto seem to have escaped notice.

ne in singultus quidem erumpit dolor. J. uses exactly the same words at in *Nah.* 2,3 l. 148 *ne in singultus quidem ... erumpat dolor*. J. has chosen to stress this particular point in the *Libellus* because he again wishes to supply an example for imitation by church congregations. It was not only conversation that disrupted church services (cf. n. on *tantum silentium fit* at 35,2 above); nor was inattentiveness the only reason for complaint. It sometimes happened that exactly the opposite was the case, since the fervour of an over-zealous congregation might also give occasion for annoyance. This problem was apparently considered less serious. Hence the evidence for it is correspondingly smaller; it does however exist. The pilgrim Aetheria repeatedly describes how on her travels moans and wailing had accompanied the

lesson: 24,10 (*quod [sc. evangelium] cum coeperit legi, tantus rugitus et mugitus fit omnium hominum et tantae lacrimae*); 34; 36,3. There is also one passage where a churchman protests explicitly. About the time when J. himself was writing Bishop Niceta of Remesiana makes an appeal to congregations not to disturb the lesson through obstreperous private devotion: *cum lectio legitur, facto silentio aeque audiat a cunctis, non legente lectore, alius orans clamoris vocibus obstrepat* (*psalm.* 13 l. 40). Cf. also n. on *moderato suspirio* below.

cum vero de regno Christi, de futura beatitudine, de gloria coeperit adnuntiare ventura. The concluding sentence of J.'s description of the assembly opens with a very impressive tricolon crescens which also includes triply asyndetic anaphora, twofold chiasmus and an elegant hyperbaton enfolding the final limb, which also evinces a cretic spondee clausula equivalent to the *cursus planus* with coincidence of ictus and accent. *Futura beatitudo* was a common expression; cf. *TLL* II, 1795,76ff. At *in eccles.* 10,19 l. 326 J. notes that this topic was a favourite for homiletic purple patches.

moderato suspirio. Cassian records approvingly at *inst.* 2,10,1 that in the assembly there are no groans or sighs to annoy even neighbours; in fact there is no sound at all save intermittent gasps of uncontrollable spiritual fervour. J. charges the remnuoth with *crebra suspiria* at 34,3 above.

oculis ad caelum levatis. Cf. Kötting (1954); Severus, pp. 1230f. J. himself had stared into heaven as an anchorite at 7,4 above.

quis dabit mihi pinnas sicut columbae, et volabo et requiescam? The climax of J.'s description of the assembly typically consists of a citation of scripture. Here the biblical quotation is all the more effective, since it is the only one in the whole of this very long ch. J. is highly partial to Ps. 54,7, which he cites on fourteen other occasions. In its scriptural context the verse is an appeal for relief from affliction; here it becomes an expression of the yearning for heaven. On the subject of spiritual 'wings' cf. Courcelle (1972), pp. 40ff. (J. is discussed on p. 56); on 'flying' in J. cf. Antin (1961f).

35,4

mensas, quibus per singulas ebdomadas vicissim ministrant. On the seven-day rota cf. *reg. Pachom. praef.* 2 p. 6,1 (*ut ... in ebdomadarum ministerio sibi succedant per ordinem*; *ib.* p. 5,12 *ebdomadarios*); *Benedict, reg.* 35 tit. (*de septimanariis coquinae*); *Regula Magistri tit.* 23 (*quomodo debeant ebdomadarii inservire mensis*); 18,2 (*qui decem fratres in cocinae servitio vicibus combinati septenos explant dies*). Cassian distinguishes between Egypt and the rest of the East: *inst.* 4,19,1 (*per cunctam ... Mesopotamiam, Palaestinam et Cappodociam*

ac totum Orientem singulis ebdomadibus vicissim fratres ad haec officia sibi reddenda succedunt): 4,22 (ceterum apud Aegyptios ... non est ebdomadatum mutua vicissitudo ... sed uni probatissimo fratrum cellarii vel coquinae cura committitur, qui perpetuo ... iugiter opus istud exerceat). Cf. further Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 301f.

nullus in cibo strepitus, nemo comedens loquitur. This statement about monastic table-manners receives only a single sentence in Vogüé (1991), I, p. 302, who compares just four other passages.¹ Numerous additional texts might have been cited which concern the obmutescent messing of monks: while prescriptions to this effect are common in monastic rules,² it is more significant for J.'s own formulation here that such statements are also to be found in authors with pretensions to stylistic refinement. Vogüé himself mentions Palladius (*h. Laus.* 32 οὐκ ἔστι λαλῆσαι ἐσθίωντα)³ together with Cassian, who makes the point twice: *tantum silentium ab omnibus exhibetur, ut, cum in unam tanta numerositas fratrum refectiois obtentu consederit, nullus ne mutire quidem audeat ... tantaque vescentibus eis silentii huius disciplina servatur ...* (*inst.* 4,17). Reference might also have been made to Basil (*ascet. disc.* 1 δὲ τὸν μοναχὸν ... μετὰ ἡσυχίας ἐσθίειν),⁴ to Sozomen (*h. e.* 3,14 σιγῇ τε ἐσθίειν) and to Isidore of Seville (*eccl. off.* 2,16,14 *corpus deinde cum silentio magno reficiunt*).⁵ Vogüé fails to say anything whatsoever about the particular language in which J. has chosen to express this commonplace. It is however

¹ *Viz. reg. Pachom.* 31 p. 21,3 (*quod si aliquis ... locutus fuerit ... in versando, agri poenitentiam* ... here the fragmentary Greek [ib., p. 173,1] reads εἰ δὲ τις ... λαλήσει [ἐν τῇ τῶπῃ τῆς ἐστρώσεως add rec. B] ἐπιτιμίαν λάβη [λαμβάνει rec. B]); Rufinus, *hist. mon.* 3 (*est autem eis et in capiendo cibo summum silentium*; here the Greek has only ἀσθενῆ ἀσθενῶς πολλήν [Festugière, p. 39]); Palladius, *h. Laus.* 32; Cassian, *inst.* 4,17. The wording of the last two passages will be adduced below.

² So *Regula Patrum* I rec. E 2,42 (*nulli [itaque add rec. Π] licebit loqui*; ib. 2,41 *venientibus vero ad refectioem* ...), *Regula Patrum* II 7, *Regula Patrum* III 7, *Regula Macarii* 18 (all of these three have *ad mensam autem specialiter nullus loquatur*), *Regula Tarnovicensis* 8,8 (*ad mensam loqui specialiter ... non praesumat*); Ps-Augustine, *reg.* II 7; Aurelian, *reg. virg.* 32; *reg. mon.* 49; Caesarius of Arles, *reg. virg.* 18,2 (all four have *sedentes ad mensam taceant*); *reg. mon.* p. 150,25 (*ad mensam dum manducam, nullus loquatur*), Benedict, *reg.* 38,5 (*et summum fiat silentium*; ib. 38,1 *mensae fratrum* ...). Cf. also Ps-Basil, *poen. mon.* 28, where the meal-time chatterbox should be urged to pray.

³ The Latin translation reads: *nec loqui cuiquam dum edit liceat* (Palladius, *hist. mon.* I 19).

⁴ The last three words are omitted from the Latin version (Basil, *ad mon.* I. 8). The authenticity of the Greek original has been doubted; cf. Geerard-Glorie, II, p. 157 (no. 2890).

⁵ Isidore himself makes the same stipulation at *reg. monach.* 9,2 *tempore convescentium fratrum omnes disciplinae gerant silentium*. It is also found in *Vita Pachomii* II 32 (οὐδὲ ἐσθίων λαλεῖν ἐσθίωντα).

noteworthy that in literary terms his formulation is vastly superior to those of all the other writers who have just been discussed: the wording in which J. couches this chestnut evinces the *ne plus ultra* of stylistic elaboration.

The two halves of J.'s *nullus in cibo strepitus, nemo comedens nullus* matches *nemo*, *in cibo* and *strepitus* correspond respectively to *comedens* and *loquitur*.⁶ The result is a superfine instance of the rhetorical figure of *interpretatio*,⁷ whose effect here is further enhanced by a careful isocolon⁸ as well as by an anaphoric *disiunctio*⁹ that is also graced by asyndeton, *homoeoprophoron*¹⁰ and *derivatio*.¹¹ At the same time this symmetry is also tempered by an elegant *variatio*. Whereas the anterior clause employs exclusively nominal forms (*cibo strepitus*), the next is instead marked by verbal ones (*comedens loquitur*). While moreover a homoeoteleutic hyperbaton (*nullus ... strepitus*) encloses the first half, which is also tautened by omission of the verb, the second displays normal word-order without ellipse. Throughout the entire sentence J. has avoided the types of *structura* classified by rhetoricians as *aspera* and *hiulca*.¹² He has also invested both halves with a graceful cretic tribrach clausula,¹³ which corresponds accentually to the *cursus*

⁶ For *cibus* signifying 'actio edendi' cf. *TLL* III, 1041,36ff. (the present passage of the *Libellus* is adduced in II, 60f.); for *strepitus* used of 'talking' cf. *GLD* p. 1827 (sect. 2).

⁷ Cf. Lausberg, p. 374 (no. 751), citing *Rhet. Her.* 4,28,38 *interpretatio est, quae non iterans idem redintegrat verbum, sed id commutat, quod positum est, alio verbo, quod idem valet, hoc modo: 'rem publicam radicibus eversisti, civitatem funditus delictisti'; item: 'patrem nefarie verberasti, parenti manus scelerate attulisti'; necessarium est eius, qui audit, animum commoveri, cum gravitas prioris dicti renovatur interpretatione verborum.*

⁸ Both clauses exhibit a syllabic ratio of 2:3:3 (*nullus / nemo : in cibo / comedens : strepitus / loquitur*).

⁹ *nullus ... / nemo ...* For the figure cf. Lausberg, pp. 368ff. (nos. 739ff.), quoting inter alios Quintilian, *inst.* 9,3,45 *aliquando ... inna quoque et clausulae sententiarum alit, sed non alio tendentibus verbis inter se consonant, inna hoc modo: 'dediderim periculis omnibus, obtulerim insidiis, abiecerim insidiis'; ... hoc ... disiunctionem vocant.*

¹⁰ *nullus in cibo ... / nemo comedens ...*

¹¹ For *nullus / nemo* as an example of 'etymologisierende Stammwiederholung' (so Lausberg's definition of *derivatio*, pp. 328f. [no. 648]) cf. Donatus, *Ter. Andr.* 506,3 *est 'neminem' nullum hominem*. Donatus was J.'s own teacher.

¹² Cf. Lausberg, pp. 475ff. (nos. 968ff.). For the importance which J. himself attached to such avoidance cf. *adv. Rufin.* 1,17 *asperitatem vitare consonantium, huiusmodi fugere dictionem.*

¹³ For evidence that the first syllable of *comedens*, which here also bears the word accent, could be treated as long cf. *TLL* III, 1763,37.

tardus.¹⁴ The outcome of all these refinements is a formulation distinguished by a rhetorical elaboration that is simply *sans pareil*.¹⁵

The foregoing analysis of this sentence's oratorical polish has a bearing on both textual criticism and on the interpretations offered by translators. J.'s elegantly balanced concision has proved too heady for many scribes: half of Hilberg's MSS insert an *est* at the end of the first clause and thereby wreck the symmetry of the whole.¹⁶ Translators on the other hand fail to understand J.'s use of the figure of *interpretatio*. His tasteful parallelism is accordingly ruined by Moricca, who attempts to introduce a wholly unwarranted *variatio*: 'durante il pasto, non si ode alcun rumore, e fra i commensali regna assoluto silenzio' (p. 78). The most recent English translation is likewise mistaken in its anxiety to avoid an overlap of meaning between *loquitur* and *strepitus*, which it therefore misrenders as 'confusion' (Mierow-Lawler, p. 171). The latest German version instead debases *comedens* to a mere 'dabei',¹⁷ while Bareille (I, p. 105) eliminates the word entirely: 'personne ne parle'. Finally J.'s parallelism is destroyed altogether by Carroll (p. 58), who telescopes this elegant pair of formulations into a single pedestrian clause: 'silence is maintained during meals'.

The rhetorical glamour of J.'s wording is skilfully highlighted by the absence of such refinement in each of the immediately adjacent sentences. The antecedent one reads simply *post hoc concilium solvitur et unaquaeque decuria cum suo parente pergit ad mensas, quibus per singulas ebdomadas vicissim ministrant*, while the one following the words currently at issue is equally plain: *vivitur pane, leguminibus et olere, quae sale et oleo condiuntur*. On such stylistic chiaroscuro cf. Cicero, *de orat.* 3,101 *sed habeat tamen illa in dicendo admiratio ac summa laus umbram aliquam et recessum, quo magis id, quod erit infusum, extare atque eminere videatur*. On the other hand both of the sentences which in turn frame these specimens of down-to-earth prose have again been subjected to considerable stylistic adornment; cf. nn. on *cum vero de regno Christi ...* at 35,3 above and on *ut aliorum fessa sustentetur aetas* below.

¹⁴ *m* is linked proclitically to the succeeding *cibo*.

¹⁵ The present passage of the *Libellus* is imitated by Fructuosus of Braga, who significantly spoils the Hieronymian concinnity: *in cibo aut strepitus nullus, nemo comedens loquatur* (*reg. monach.* 5).

¹⁶ This reading (*nullus in cibo strepitus est*) is also adopted by Vallarsi, I, p. 120, which is reprinted in *PL* 22 (1845), p. 420. Hilberg's own edition rightly omits the *est*. For a similar case of scribal expansion of such concinnously succinct phraseology in the *Libellus* cf. n. on *prae venter et statim caetera* at 8,4 above.

¹⁷ Bauer (1983), p. 76. Similarly Leipelt, I, p. 245, had translated *comedens* as simply 'während desselben'.

leguminibus et olere. At *epist.* 54,10,2 J. notes that for the young Christian there is nothing more beneficial than eating vegetables; cf. 107,10,1. The heavier sort causing flatulence should however be avoided (*epist.* 54,10,2); moreover some people eat too many, though moderate consumption is harmless (54,10,4). At *epist.* 58,6,1 they make a humble evening-meal; in *epist.* 79,4,3 they go with bread.

There is some evidence that the stricter ascetic tended to avoid such fare. Bread and vegetables are abandoned for beans, chick-peas, olives and figs in Chrysostom, *hom. in Eph.* 13,3. Peeled barley replaces them at Theodoret of Cyrhus, *h. rel.* 13 p. 1401^A.¹⁸ It is the weaker monk who eats greens in Chrysostom, *hom. in 1 Tim.* 14,4; cf. Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,160. On the other hand the speaker eats them in *Apophthegmata Patrum* 162 (Nau [1908], p. 53), while Cassian observes at *inst.* 5,5,2 that not everyone can manage a frugal diet of vegetables and bread.

oleo. Oil is a necessity of life according to Basil, *reg. fus.* 19,2. Monks use it during Whitsuntide in Theodoret of Cyrhus, *h. rel.* 5 p. 1357^A. However it was a luxury at 9,1 above. Cf. in addition Arbesmann (1969a), pp. 498f.

vinum tantum senes accipiunt. Wine should not be used outside the infirmary according to *reg. Pachom.* 45 p. 24,10. Even the sick drank water at 7,2 above.

quibus et parvulis saepe fit prandium. J. mentions a special meal for young, old and ill at *reg. Pachom. praef.* 5 p. 7,6; cf. *Regula Magistri* 28,26 (*perinfantuli et senio pervicti ... aequali debent refectioinum iudicio relaxari*). The children were there to be educated; cf. Rufinus, *apol. adv. Hier.* 2,11.

ut aliorum fessa sustentetur aetas, aliorum non frangatur incipiens. This very *soigné* formulation, whose two parallel sections display an exact syllabic parity, is also characterized by anaphora together with a chiasmically circumambient antithesis (*fessa ... incipiens*)¹⁹ and an element of *disiunctio* (*sustentetur ... non frangatur*), which is further embellished by homoeoteleuton; the spondee dichoree and cretic tribrach clausulae are also particularly choice. The elegant economy of J.'s language is conveniently underscored by comparison with Isidore of Seville, *reg. monach.* 11,3 *ne aut senescens aetas, antequam moriatur, deficiat; aut crescens, priusquam proficiat, cadat, et ante*

¹⁸ Abraam gave up bread and cooked vegetables while archbishop (*ib.* 17 p. 1424^A). They are eaten raw in Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra, *narr.* 3,4.

¹⁹ The noun to which these epithets belong (*aetas*) generates a graceful hyperbaton in the first clause, while its absence from the second produces an instance of ellipsis.

intereat quam bonum facere discat; for Isidore's likely debt here to the present passage of the *Libellus* cf. Vogüé–Neufville, VI, p. 1115. Again J. himself has adroitly brought the literary finesse of his formulation into relief through the contrasting artlessness of the immediately succeeding sentence: *dehinc consurgunt pariter et hymno dicto ad praesepia redeunt*.

hymno dicto. Cf. Mt. 26,30 (*hymno dicto*).

praesepia. Cf. Nonius Marcellus p. 49,27 *praesepia non tantum quibus aut cantheri aut iumenta cetera aut veterina animalia pabulantur; sed et omnia loca clausa et tuta dicta praesepia*. TLL gives no other example of the particular sense which the word has in the present passage.

cum suis unusquisque loquitur. Monks are encouraged to discuss the sermon at *reg. Pachom.* 20 p. 18,1; 122 p. 46,4; 138 p. 49,9. They used to sit together of an evening and have devout conversations according to *Vita Pachomii* Φ 34 (they searched the scriptures *ib.* 125). Abba Isaiah forbids the practice (*or.* 8,16ff.). Vogüé (1961), p. 52, n. 1, and (1991), I, p. 303, thinks that the *unusquisque* of the present passage refers only to deans.

quanta in ipso sit gratia. Here *gratia* means 'charme' according to Vogüé (1991), I, p. 304. However the word would seem rather to have a theological sense; cf. TLL VI,2, 2227,70ff.

quantum silentium. J. records with approbation that Asella and Nepotian seldom spoke (*epist.* 24,5,2; 52,5,4). As in the present passage, silence and gait are again linked at *epist.* 24,5,2; 52,15,2; *in Tit.* 2,3 p. 580^B. Basil says that silence is good for the novice (*reg. fus.* 13). It befits the monk according to *Apophthegmata Patrum* p. 136^B. Cf. in addition Ingenkamp, pp. 832ff.

quam moderatus incessus. J. deals with the matter of gait on two further occasions: in a letter of the same period (24,5,2) he reports with admiration that the virgin Asella's step was neither quick nor slow, while in an old woman he thinks it should show a holy dignity (*in Tit.* 2,3 p. 580^B). J. was not alone in his concern: at the very time that he wrote the *Libellus* people in Rome were criticizing the way he himself walked (cf. *epist.* 45,2,2).

The subject was in fact one that preoccupied the Fathers a good deal. Both Ambrose (*off.* 1,18,71) and Chrysostom (*Is. interp.* 3,8) assert that movement is a reflection of character; to support his argument Chrysostom quotes Sirach 19,30 βῆμα ποδός ἀναγγελεῖ τὸ περὶ αὐτοῦ. Basil gives an example (*ep.* 2,6): in his view sluggishness and haste betray slackness and impetuosity respectively.

Origen had stipulated at *hom. in Num.* 2,1 p. 10,19 that gait should fit calling. This was especially the case with the virgin. Hers is said to possess a distinctive dignity in Rufinus, *Basil. hom.* 7 p. 1786^c; cf. Chrysostom, *virg.* 63,3. It is specifically designated as *virginalis* by Ps.-Sulpicius Severus (*epist.* 2,14). Accordingly the virgin receives detailed instructions concerning it. Augustine forbids her to strut or shuffle (*virg.* 53,54). Ambrose prescribes sobriety of gait in *virg.* 3,3,13. It should not be jerky like a crow's according to Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lebon), p. 196,1; cf. p. 191,8. Gregory Nazianzen (*carm.* 1,2,2,81f.) thinks a haughty gait incompatible with virginity.

Monks too have a walk which marks them out; J. draws attention to it in the present passage of the *Libellus*. He was not the only one to do so. Gregory Nazianzen notes the firmness of a monk's walk (*or.* 6,2 βᾶδισμα εὐσταθές, which Rufinus, *Greg. Naz. orat.* 7,2,3 renders as *incessus ordinatus*); cf. Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 4,41 (τὸ εὐσταθές καὶ ἀπέρπερον). It owes its steadiness to fasting according to both Ambrose (*Hel.* 10,35) and Basil (*hom.* 1,9). The question is also addressed in one of the monastic rules: the author of *Regula Tarnatensis* (17,4) specifies that a monk's gait has to be one that avoids unseemliness. In the view of (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ.* 1 (Berthold) 62,1ff. it should be neither hasty nor hesitant and should eschew an overweening daintiness. According to Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 3,134 it must be πρὸς εὐτέλειαν ἡσκημένον.

Ordinary Christians as well are expected to take trouble in the matter. Already Clement of Alexandria had wanted them to have a carriage that was stately and unhurried, not a wild and indecisive one (*paed.* 3,11,73,4). In Chrysostom's opinion their deportment should achieve such poise that the eye is caught (*catech.* [Wenger] 4,26); in particular the feet must not shamble. Again Chrysostom quotes Sirach 19,30 in support. For Gaudentius of Brescia (*serm.* 4,18) 'placidity' (he says *mitis*) is the quality which should characterize gait.

35,5

si infirmum viderint. J. is speaking of spiritual weakness; cf. 29,4 (*infirmiorem in fide*) and *TLL* VII,1, 1443,34ff. The passage is mistranslated by Labourt, I, p. 151 ('un malade'); Mierow-Lawler, p. 171 ('unwell'); Bauer (1983), p. 77 ('krank'). However illness is dealt with in 35,7 below.

extra orationes publicas in suo cubili unusquisque vigilat. Cassian reports at *inst.* 2,13,3 that private vigils are added to the canonical ones; the same passage also gives the reasons.

circumeunt cellulas. This practice is said to be a serious vice at *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 252 l. 185 (*grande vitium est ... circumire cellas*); there

however J. is talking about malicious gossip. Theodoret of Cyrhus tells how a monk called Publius was accustomed to pay surprise visits and rebuke the sleepy (*h. ref.* 5 p. 1353^B). Vogüé (1961), p. 52, n. 1, and (1991), I, p. 303, thinks that it is only the deans who are involved in this and the other activities described in 35,5.

35,6

ad oeconomum. Here the goods which the monk produces are given to the dean, who in turn hands them over to the *oekonomus*. J. speaks of each monastery's *dispensator* at *reg. Pachom. praef.* 2 p. 5,11. A *προβύτης* organizes the work at Basil, *ascet.* 1,3. In Cassian the *oekonomus* is in charge of clothing (*inst.* 4,6) and food (*ib.* 4,18); it is also to him that the monk hands over his day's work (*ib.* 10,20). Similarly in *Vita Pachomii* Φ 83 an *οικονόμος* collects the artifacts.

qui et ipse per singulos menses patri omnium cum magno reddi tremore rationem. Having received the goods from the deans, the *oekonomus* presents the accounts to the abbot every month. At *reg. Pachom. praef.* 6 p. 8,4 J. says that the *praepositi* render a weekly account to the abbot. It is the deans who do this in Augustine, *mor. eccl.* 31,67. Isidore of Seville inserts a *praepositus* between the deans and the abbot (*eccl. off.* 2,16,13). In *Vita Pachomii* Φ 83 it is the *μέγας οικονόμος* who receives the accounts.

a quo etiam cibi, cum facti fuerint, degustantur. Only the 'hebdomadarius' is allowed to do this according to Isidore of Seville, *reg. monach.* 9,7.

non licet dicere culquam. The monk is similarly forbidden to ask for anything at *Vita Fulgentii Ruspensis* p. 115.

sagum. Monks wear this instead of a *chlamys* in Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 22,2. It is slept on (*ib.* 29,13).

textaque iunctis strata. They were for sleeping on; cf. *Consultationes Zacchaei et Apollonii* 3,3 p. 102,9 *iunctea ... lectulis strata*. At *reg. Pachom.* 88 p. 39,4 the monk sleeps on a *psiathium*, *id est matta*.

ita universa moderatur. At *reg. Pachom.* 25 p. 19,6 the *ebdomadarius* goes round the houses on the abbot's instructions and is briefed on everyone's needs. In Basil, *ascet.* 1,5 the *καθηγούμενος* has authority to supply individual wants from the common stock.

dehabeat. Not a literary word; cf. *TLL* s.v.

35,7

tanto senum ministerio confavetur. The sick are moved to the infirmary in *reg. Pachom.* 42 p. 23,14. J. observes at *reg. Pachom. praef.* 5 p. 7,1 that the care shown them is amazing; there is also food

galore. Even pillows should be provided according to *epist. Pachom. 5* p. 90,4. The *titulus* of *Regula Magistri* 70 runs: *de caritate fratrum ut nec delicias urbium nec matris quaerat affectum*. As a tormented anchorite J. had seemed *Romanis interesse delictis* at 7,1. The chiasmus in the present passage is striking; it is enhanced by the cretic spondee clausula (cf. Herron, pp. 12ff.).

dominicus diebus orationi tantum et lectionibus vacant; quod quidem et omni tempore completis opusculis faciunt. Sundays should be reserved for study according to Benedict, *reg.* 48,22. Augustine states that in well-organized monasteries prayer and reading occupy the monk when not at work (*op. monach.* 29,37). Study takes up the first two hours of the day in Caesarius of Arles, *reg. virg.* 19,1, while it occupies the first three at Ferreolus, *reg.* 26; the monk reads from the sixth to the ninth hour in Ps.-Augustine, *reg.* 11 3 and in *Regula Tarnatensis* 9,5. Monks are said to be keen readers at Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,82 and Augustine, *op. monach.* 1,2. Prayer while at work is discussed by Cassian, *inst.* 3,2. Cf. further Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 308ff.

cotidie de scripturis aliquid discitur. The observation is appropriate to a treatise that is packed with scriptural citation and allusion.

35,8

quadragesima, in qua sola conceditur restrictius vivere. The ascetic really 'goes to town' in Lent according to *epist.* 24,4,2 and 107,10,3; cf. Arbesmann (1969b), pp. 515ff.; Vacandard.

pentecoste cenae mutantur in prandia. Cassian records how in Whitsuntide tradition is kept up and over-eating avoided by having the meal at the sixth instead of the ninth hour (*conf.* 21,23,2). J.'s statement in the present passage is repeated at *Regula Magistri* 27,36 and 28,38. The word *quingagesima* does not occur in J.

tales Philo, Platonici sermonis imitator, tales Iosephus, Graecus Livius. J. concludes his impressive description of Egyptian cenobitism with a very striking display of erudition. In the present work however the references to Plato and Livy are somewhat out of place, since J. has just pronounced the classics and scripture to be incompatible (29,7). Both authors moreover are adduced here as models of stylistic refinement;²⁰ however it was precisely in the context

²⁰ This is stated explicitly in the case of the first (cf. *Platonici sermonis*). It would accordingly seem to be implicit in the case of the second (cf. Schrockenberg, p. 92); on J.'s esteem for Livy's style cf. *epist.* 53,1,3 *Titum Livium lacteo eloquentiam fonte manantem* (the phrase is borrowed from Quintilian, *inst.* 10,1,32).

of an attack on eloquence (29,6) that J. had pronounced his condemnation of the classics.²¹ The inconsistency is typical: J. cannot resist a further opportunity to impress.²²

It may also be noted that J. has taken over the comparison of Philo to Plato second-hand: cf. *vir. ill.* 11 *uulgo apud Graecos dicitur, ἡ Πλάτων φιλονίζει ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίζει*: *id est, 'Aut Plato Philonem sequitur aut Platonem Philo'* — *tanta est similitudo sensuum et eloqui*. In the *Libellus* J. evidently wishes to dazzle his Latin audience with a literary judgment that is meant to reflect an intimate acquaintance with Plato; on the limitations of his knowledge cf. however Courcelle (1948), pp. 53ff. On J.'s probable familiarity with the works of Philo cf. *ib.*, pp. 70f.; however Lampe (1950), p. 60, points out that J.'s knowledge of Philo's treatment of the Essenes may simply come from Eusebius of Caesarea (cf. next n.). Philo is again said to be the 'Jewish Plato' at *epist.* 70,3,3.²³ This judgment is repeated later by Augustine (*c. Faust.* 12,39): while however in the *Libellus* J. had implied in characteristically braggart fashion that the verdict was his own, Augustine merely ascribes it to the Greeks.

On J.'s penchant for this kind of comparison with classical authors cf. Pease, p. 164, n. 105. Here J. also compares Josephus to Livy; the parallel is reproduced by Cassiodorus, *inst.* 1,17,1. On J.'s familiarity with Josephus cf. Courcelle (1948), pp. 71ff.: for his knowledge of Livy cf. Luebeck, pp. 201ff. While J.'s chief object in the present passage is to parade his knowledge of both Jewish and classical literature, there would also seem to be some concern on his part to enhance the former by association with the latter.

Essenos refert. J. would seem to be the first to compare the Essene and the monk. His principal reason for introducing the comparison here would appear to have been the opportunity it offers for a display of learning (cf. previous n.).

Here J. refers specifically to Josephus' discussion of the Essenes in *BJ* 2,8,2–13 (*in secunda Iudaicae captivitatis historia*). For Philo's treatment however J. gives no reference. Hilberg compares *omn. prob. lib.* 75–91 (it is quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea, *p. e.* 8,12,1ff.). Philo had also dealt with the Essenes in his lost *Defence of the Jews*; the passage in question is again cited by Eusebius of Caesarea, *p. e.*

²¹ It is noteworthy that in *epist.* 29,7,1 Philo and Josephus are commended for their learning, not for their style: *Josephus ac Philo, viri doctissimi Iudaeorum*, cf. *epist.* 70,3,3 and *adv. Iovin.* 2,14.

²² Hagendahl (1958), p. 110, is wrong to say in connection with J.'s 'dream' that 'no pagan author is mentioned' in the *Libellus*.

²³ Philo is described as *disertissimus Iudaeorum* at in *Ezech.* 16,10^b l. 1160; in *Am.* 2,9 l. 314 (*Hebraeorum*); *nom. hebr. praef.* p. 12; *vir. ill.* 8.

8,11,1ff. Lampe (1950), p. 60, accordingly suggests that J. may have known of Philo's account of the Essenes only through Eusebius. At *adv. Iovin.* 2,14 J. refers to a *volumen proprium* of Philo on the subject; the same passage also mentions Josephus' treatment.

The hyperbaton in *tales ... Essenos* is noted by Hritcu, p. 78. Together with the anaphora of *tales* it gives an effective ending to this long ch. For the spondee cretic clausula cf. Herron, pp. 36ff.

Chapter 36

J. concludes his treatment of Egyptian monasticism with a description of the anchorite. It is much shorter than the preceding treatment of cenobitism. This disproportion might seem all the more remarkable, since J. had been an anchorite himself. On the other hand J. has already described his experiences in the Syrian desert in ch. 7. The picture he drew there was a predominantly negative one;¹ J. evidently prefers the cenobitic form of monasticism.

Here J. devotes no more than a single line to the anchorite's way of life (p. 200,12f.). He then proceeds to trace its historical origins. A fuller treatment of the anchoritic life is promised elsewhere. J. concludes by returning to the theme of avarice, which was the starting-point for his treatment of monasticism. The final words of the ch. are a very effective quotation of scripture; biblical citation also occupies the centre.

36,1

verum quia nunc de virginibus scribens paene superflue de monachis disputavi, ad tertium genus veniam. J. repeats the same formula (*verum quia nunc*) that was used at the beginning of his excursus on monasticism (33,1; cf. also 10,1). He also reproduces the same argument: further exemplification is justified on the ground that his treatment of the matter at issue is really an intrusion. The reasoning is of course a *non sequitur*. On J.'s motive for introducing it cf. n. on *infinita de scripturis ...* at 32,5.

anachoretas ... de coenobitis exeuntes. The hermit undergoes a long probation in the monastery according to Benedict, *reg.* 1,3. Cf. further Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 317ff.

excepto pane et sale amplius ad deserta nil perferunt. Bread and salt is regularly described as the anchorite's fare. Antony had subsisted on it according to Athanasius, *v. Anton.* 7 ἦν αὐτῷ ἡ τροφή ἄρτος καὶ ἄλας. So did the monks of Scete (*Apophthegmata Patrum* p. 213^B ἐσθιοντες οἱ πατέρες τῆς Σκήτεως ἄρτον καὶ ἄλας; cf. p. 169^C; 173^A; Theodoret of Cyrthus, *h. rel.* 11 p. 1393^B; 20 p. 1429^D). A monk is said to have made do with it for forty-five years at *Apophthegmata Patrum*

¹ J.'s unpleasant experiences with his quarrelsome fellow-anchorites are described in *epist.* 17.

23 (Nau [1907], p. 58). Palamo boasts of such a diet in *Vita Pachomii* Φ 6 οὐδὲν ἐσθίω ... εἰ μὴ ἄρτον καὶ ἄλας; cf. A 11; 35. As in the present passage, the monk carries bread and salt on his shoulders when he goes out into the desert at Theodoret of Cyrillus, *h. rel.* 2 p. 1316^B καὶ τοὺς ἄλας.² J. reports that Asella too lived on bread and salt (*epist.* 24,3,1).

huius vitae auctor Paulus, inlustrator Antonius. At *vita Pauli* I J. had insisted that Paul of Thebes was the first hermit (he is followed in this view by Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,17,1). In the same passage J. had contradicted the popular belief that it was Antony who founded the movement: he was merely responsible for its spread. In the present passage J. now takes the opportunity to reinforce this assertion: *auctor Paulus, inlustrator Antonius.* Antony was of course widely known thanks to Athanasius' biography and its two Latin translations; cf. also *epist.* 127,5,1 and Kelly, p. 92 with n. 9. Paul and Antony are again named together at *epist.* 58,5,3; cf. Cassian, *conf.* 18,6,1.

For the homocoteleuton in *auctor ... inlustrator* cf. footn. 7 to comm. on ch. 28. *TLL* s.v. *inlustrator* wrongly says that this word is first used by Lactantius. It occurs already in Cyprian, *testim.* 2,7 *tit.*

princeps Iohannes baptista. J. had noted in *vita Pauli* I that John and Elijah were regarded by some as the first practitioners of anchoritism: *quidam enim altius repetentes a beato Elia et Ioanne sumpsere principium: quorum et Elias plus nobis videtur fuisse quam monachus, et Ioannes ante prophetare coepisse quam natus sit.* J. himself identifies John as the first monk at *adv. Iovin.* 2,15; *tract. in Marc.* p. 321,26 (*monachorum princeps Iohannes Baptista est*); *tract.* p. 517 l. 24. The same view had been expressed by Serapion of Thmuis at *ep. mon.* 11 Ἰωάννην τὸν Βαπτιστὴν ... τὸν τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀσκήσεως εὐρετὴν. John is mentioned together with Elijah as a founder of monasticism in Ammonas, *ep.* 1 p. 433 and Sozomen, *h. e.* 1,12. Elisha is added by Cassian, *conf.* 18,6,2; *inst.* 1,1,2 (with Peter and Paul); cf. Isidore of Seville, *ecccl. off.* 2,16,1. At *Vita Pachomii* Φ 2 it is said that Antony lived like Elijah, Elisha and John. The perfect monk is urged to imitate these three in Ps.-Athanasius, *pat.* 7. However according to Asterius of Ansedunum, *ad Renat.* l. 111 monasticism started with Adam.

36,2

bonum est viro, cum portaverit iugum ab adolescentia sua. Lam.

² The abbot sends two boys with bread to the hermit in Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 1,10,2; cf. Isidore of Seville, *ecccl. off.* 2,16,3.

3,27ff. is again made to denote the monk at *epist.* 50,4,1. The application is suggested chiefly by *sedebit solus* (v. 28); cf. *sedebam solus* at 7,1 above. In its biblical context the passage is simply a description of affliction. J. is very partial to the text, which recurs seven times in his *oeuvre*. Here he has followed the LXX in omitting v. 29 (*ponet in pulvere os suum, si forte sit spes*). Cassian also applies the text to the anchorite in *concl.* 18,6,4 and 19,8,4. It had been adduced at Orsiesius, *doctr.* 52 and Pachomius, *epist.* 3 p. 85,15; it was used as an argument for a celibate clergy in Ps.-Cyprian, *singul. cler.* 9.

in carne, non carnis. This is a conceit of which J. is extremely fond. He repeats it at *epist.* 54,9,3 (*in carne non carnaliter vivere*,¹ where the reference is to the ascetic); 60,3,4 (*in carne non secundum carnem*); 107,13,2 (*in carne sine carne*; here again the words are a description of the ascetic regimen); in *Eph.* 4,2 p. 494^A (*in carne non carnaliter*). The antilogy is especially striking in the present instance owing to the asyndetic polyptoton.

Further evidence for the antithesis can be found outside J.: it was not his own creation. Ultimately the idea itself goes back to the New Testament. At 2 Cor. 10,2ff. Paul had made the following response to a charge of 'worldliness': *arbitrantur nos tamquam secundum carnem ambulemus. (3) in carne enim ambulantes, non secundum carnem militamus. (4) nam arma militiae nostrae non carnalia, sed potentia deo ad destructionem munitionum.* One might also compare Rom. 8,12 *ergo, fratres, debitores sumus non carni, ut secundum carnem vivamus.* However it would seem to have been Gregory Nazianzen who first gave the idea the same terse and striking formulation which is found in J.

At *or.* 6,2 Gregory rounds off a description of the monastic life with an impressive series of paradoxes: monks enjoy riches in poverty, residence in absence, esteem in disesteem, strength in weakness, offspring in celibacy; in their austerity they are voluptuous, in their humility they aspire to heaven, in their unworldliness they transcend the world. Gregory then adds the following paradox: οἱ σαρκὸς ἔξω καὶ ἐν σαρκί. The wording of this very arresting phrase is close to J.'s in *epist.* 107: *in carne sine carne.* It also recalls J.'s earliest use of the antithesis in the present passage of the *Libellus*: *in carne, non carnis.* Perhaps it is significant that here J., like Gregory, is referring specifically to monks.

¹ Here the conceit is destroyed by the punctuation of Hilberg and Labourt (*superare, quod natus sis in carne, non carnaliter vivere*), which accordingly requires modification: *superare, quod natus sis, (sc. 'are by nature'; cf. n. on *serua, quod natus es* at 19,4 above) in carne non carnaliter vivere.*

Gregory also employs the paradox on two occasions in *or.* 37, which is an exposition of Mt. 19,1–12; it therefore deals with the question of virginity. While he is evoking the sublimity of the virgin state, Gregory exclaims: πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἀγγελικόν τὸ σαρκὶ συνδεδεμένην μὴ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν; (37,11).⁴ A little further on Gregory insists that only chastity which is voluntary deserves praise. Again there follows a brief series of paradoxes, whose climax is the following statement: ἐὼν σαρκὶ συνδεθείς ὑπὲρ σάρκα φανῆς (37,16).

Gregory and J. resembled each other in their predilection for flashy phraseology. It is therefore characteristic that each of them should employ this antithesis on several occasions. Gregory's sixth *Oration* had been written in 364 (cf. Bernardi, p. 103). His thirty-seventh *Oration* was delivered in Constantinople between the end of 380 and the middle of 381 (cf. Moreschini [1985], p. 48). At this time J. was himself in Constantinople as Gregory's 'student'. It would therefore seem to be a legitimate inference that J. has taken this arresting paradox straight from Gregory.

This conclusion is borne out by the infrequency with which the antithesis occurs elsewhere. In Greek there is an isolated instance at Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 69,3 (it belongs to 390; cf. Meyer, p. xxxi) ἀνθρώπων ... ἐν σαρκὶ σαρκὸς ὑπεροπῶντα. Here again the reference is to a monk. Among Latin authors the evidence is similarly sparse. Around 401 Augustine speaks of the celibate in the following terms at *virg.* 13,12: *habent aliquid iam non carnis in carne*. Here the wording is evidently modelled on that of the present passage of J.'s *Libellus: in carne, non carnis*.⁵ Later in the fifth century the paradox is repeated by Peter Chrysologus, who once again applies it to virginity: *in carne praeter carnem vivere* (*serm.* 143,3). The extreme rarity of a phrase which appealed so strongly to J. is significant: he is unique in his zeal for flashy formulations.

alio tempore, si volueris, explicabo. Like the separate treatise on avarice announced at 33,1 (cf. n. on *si Christus adruerit* there), this special treatment of anchoritism never materialized. Accordingly an unfulfilled promise of forthcoming publications stands both at the beginning and the end of J.'s digression on monasticism. The same appeal to the reader's willingness as J. makes here (*si volueris*) occurs also at *in Is. lib. 5 praef. l. 37 si ... tu volueris*; cf. also Chrysostom,

⁴ It may be noted that the comparison with angels also occurs in conjunction with the conceit in J.'s *epist.* 107,13,2.

⁵ Augustine's words are cited as an embodiment of his conception of virginity by Saint-Martin, p. 448. No indication is given either there or in the note ad loc. (p. 128) that they are simply a commonplace which Augustine has borrowed from J.'s *Libellus*.

hom. in 2 Thess. 1,2 ἀνάγνωθι, εἰ βούλει; ib. εὐρίσκεις, εἰ βούλει, τὰ ὑποδείγματα.

36.3

nunc ad propositum redeam, quia de avaritia disserens ad monachos veneram. J. returns with a certain awkwardness to the theme of avarice, which was the starting-point for his excursus on the monks of Egypt. Accordingly the treatment of monasticism is in formal terms a parenthesis within J.'s discussion of avariciousness; however the parenthesis is three times as long as the main subject that encompasses it.

The form *redeam* evidently embarrasses the most recent translator of this sentence (Vogüé [1991], I, p. 316), who renders it ambiguously as 'je reviens': somewhat earlier (ib., p. 245, n. 88) he significantly mis-cites the word as an unambiguously subjunctive plural: *nunc ad propositum redeamus*. The immediately antecedent first-person singular future *explicabo* (l. 4) would however seem to indicate that here *redeam* is in fact a similar future. Moreover J. has just quoted (31, 5) the Old Latin version of Job 1, 21 (*nudus exivi de utero matris meae, nudus et redeam*), in which *redeam* is indubitably future (LXX ἀπελευθόμαι). Both of these foregoing futures would naturally lead the reader to take the *redeam* of the present passage as another one.⁶

The discussion of this much rarer form of the future of *eo* and its compounds in Neue-Wagener, III, pp. 326ff., fails to adduce any instance whatsoever of such a first-person singular in *eam*; all their examples belong instead to the second and third persons (-ies, -iet). They do however cite (ib., p. 326) Pompeius' commentary on Donatus' *Ars: si autem i non habeat ante o, sed e habeat, futurum tempus in bo mittit, exeo exibo: exiam (exeam: pars codd.) non dicimus, soloecismus est: eo eam non dicimus (Gramm. V 225,13).*⁷ The article on *eo* in *TLL*

⁶ In the whole of J.'s vast literary output there is only one other case of a *redeam* which could be a future indicative rather than a present subjunctive (*adv. Rufin.* 2,11). Translators of this text evince a tellingly similar embarrassment to Vogüé's: while Barcille, III, p. 100, gives the same equivocal rendering 'je reviens', the same unwarranted transformation into a plural ('revenons-en') is found in Lardet (1983), p. 129, scribes also succumbed to a similar temptation, since *redeamus* is a *varia lectio*. It is however noteworthy that the phrase in which *redeam* occurs here (*sed ad causam redeam*) exactly matches that of the *Libellus (nunc ad propositum redeam)*: both declare J.'s intention of returning to his theme. It would seem therefore that in the *Adversus Rufinum* as well *redeam* is future.

⁷ Neue-Wagener might have added that Pompeius repeats his point on two subsequent occasions: *Gramm.* V 225,21 and 225,34. It has been suggested that the presence of the rarer type of future in J. is due merely to the influence of the Old Latin Bible; cf. Paucker, p. 149 ('... in -ies, -iet . . . exempla, . . . quae forsitan non Hieronymianae sint latinatae, sed transumpta de S. S. vet.'): Goeltzer, p. 287 ('je ne pense pas en effet

(V,2, 626,38ff.; Rubenbauer) adds only one other text that dis-countenances such future forms of this verb: *sed s littera* (sc. of *munis*) *in am mutata fit futuri temporis eiusdem modi prima persona, ut muniam, excepto ibo, et siquid inde nascitur, quamvis Terentius 'non eam ne nunc quidem' et 'redeam'* (Sacerdos, *gramm.* VI 434,10; Rubenbauer points out that these Terentian forms [*Eun.* 46 and 49] are in fact deliberative subjunctives). *TLL* ought however to have cited three further passages which deprecate these futures in far stronger terms: Cledonius, *gramm.* V 57,11 (*ibo, non eam, ne sit coniunctivo temporis praesentis similis, cum eam*); Charisius, *gramm.* p. 222,9 (*in <verbis> quarti ordinis futurum in am est; sed tum in bo effertur, quotiens est ex eo quod est eo noperiuar et quae ex ipso derivantur ...*); *Gramm. suppl.* 153,30 (*si i autem non habeat prima persona, sed e, idest ante o, futurum tempus in bo tantum mittit, ut puta eo ibo, exeo exibo: exeam non possumus dicere*). It might therefore be thought that J.'s use of the future *redeam* here is a solecism.

On the other hand grammatical texts can also be adduced which appear to sanction such future forms of *eo*. Again Rubenbauer quotes the views of just two grammarians in this regard (*TLL* V,2, 626,37f.). Once again he fails to cite the most significant texts: the doyen of *grammatici* himself, Donatus, takes *eam* for granted as a normal future of *eo* on no fewer than two occasions. In his *Ars minor* he asks: *quando tertia coniugatio futurum tempus non in am tantum sed etiam in bo mittit? interdum, cum i litteram non correptam haberit sed productam, ut eo is ibo, queo quis quibo, eam vel queam* (4). Similarly the *Ars maior* observes that *quidam ... negant in bo et in bor rite exire posse tertiam coniugationem, nisi in eo verbo quod in prima persona indicativi modi temporis praesentis numeri singularis e ante o habuerit, ut eo queo eam queam ibo quibo* (2,12 p. 635,1). Since the eminent and authoritative Donatus was J.'s own mentor, employment of the future *redeam* here might accordingly be supposed to have appeared to its author as wholly free from the taint of solecism.

Evidence can nonetheless be adduced from J. himself to indicate that such was not in fact his attitude to these future forms of *eo*: his Vulgate shows a tendency to eliminate Old Latin readings of this type. Here the *Libellus* itself provides two convenient illustrations. It was noted above that ch. 31,5 cites the Old Latin wording of Job 1,21 *nudus exivi de utero matris meae, nudus et redeam*. However J.'s Vulgate version of the same passage significantly replaces *redeam* with *revertar*. The

qu'il faille attribuer à S. Jérôme des formes comme *deperiet ...*). The evidence adduced in the present discussion would seem however to show that such a view is untenable.

second Old Latin text is Isaiah 11,1, which the *Libellus* quotes in ch. 19,4 *exiet virga de radice Iesse*. This time the Vulgate substitutes *egredietur* for *exiet*.⁸ The foregoing evidence would accordingly appear to warrant the conclusion that such futures of *eo* were marked by a certain colloquial flavour.⁹

non dicam aurum et argentum et ceteras opes, sed ipsam terram caelumque despicias. The words in which J. here endeavours to establish the relevance of his monastic digression to the overall theme of avarice are a further example of self-imitation. He has adapted them from his recent translation of Origen, *hom. in Cant.* 1,2 p. 31,11 *si omnia corporalia despexisti, non dico carnem et sanguinem, sed argentum et possessiones et ipsam terram ipsumque caelum — haec quippe 'pertransibunt' —, si ista omnia contempsisti ... potes amorem capere spiritalem*.

J. again improves the stylistic level of his source by streamlining its rather diffuse string of accusatives: the first half of the *incrementum* in question (cf. Lausberg, pp. 221f.) now evinces an elegant tricolon crescens (*aurum et argentum et ceteras opes*), while the second eliminates a battological *ipse* (*ipsam terram ipsumque caelum* is tautened to *ipsam terram caelumque*). Despite its formal refinement however J.'s imitation again entails an inconcinnity. It was appropriate for Origen to speak of 'contempt for heaven', since he here refers explicitly to Mt. 24,35 *caelum et terra transibunt*. In J.'s *Libellus* on the other hand such language is quite out of place, for in this work heaven is repeatedly described as the object of the virgin's aspirations: 19,1 (*tuum agmen in caelis est*); 24,6 (*electa generitrici suae, caelesti videlicet Hierusalem*); 40,5 (*nisi vim feceris, caelorum regna non capies*).¹⁰

J.'s *aurum et argentum* (Origen has only *argentum*) picks up the formulation which opened his discussion of avarice at 31,1: *auri argentique*. What J. says next (*Christo copulata*) would seem to have been suggested by Origen's reference in this passage to 'spiritual love' (*potes amorem capere spiritalem*).

Christo copulata. For the probable source of this idea cf. preceding n.

⁸ J. also cites an Old Latin *exiet* at *epist.* 39,4,8 (= Lev. 21,12) and at *in Mich.* 4,1 l. 205 (= Is. 2,3); in the first case the Vulgate again replaces this reading with *egredietur*, while *exiet* takes its place in the second.

⁹ The other passage in which J. employs the same confabulatory *redreum* (*adv. Rufin.* 2,11) follows a castigation of his opponent's linguistic incorrectness. Such apparent 'inconsistency' is entirely in character; cf. Adkin (1988), pp. 185f.

¹⁰ Accordingly J. has both begun and ended his excursus on monasticism with an instance of self-imitation which is in each case bosched (cf. n. on *infinite de scripturis* at 32,5 above).

As usual, J. invests it with a very striking form of expression. The threefold alliteration (*Christo copulata cantabis*) is recorded by Hritz, p. 42. *Copulari* was used of sexual union at 21,3 above; cf. *TLL* IV, 922,20ff. Here J. employs it in a spiritual sense (cf. *ib.* 923,6ff.).

pars mea dominus. Once again J. ends a ch. very effectively with a citation of scripture. Moreover this final sentence is a further example of J.'s predilection for combining biblical quotation with an arresting formulation that has been appropriated from elsewhere (cf. n. on *non dicam aurum* ... above). Hilberg identifies the present citation as Ps. 72,26 *pars mea deus* (LXX θεός) *in aeternum*. It would seem however that Fremantle, p. 38, was right to point instead to Lam. 3,24 *pars mea dominus* (LXX μερίς μου κύριος). Not only is there an exact correspondence in the wording; J. has just quoted the succeeding verses (Lam. 3,27ff.) in 36,2. (The verse in question is however omitted in most MSS of the LXX). One might also compare Ps. 118,57 *iuxta LXX: portio mea dominus* (LXX μερίς μου κύριε). Whatever its exact source, the text is one of J.'s favourites; he cites it on fourteen further occasions. According to Ambrose, *exhort. virg.* 6,40 only the unmarried can quote it.

Chapter 37

After concluding his treatment of avarice in the previous ch. J. now proceeds to issue instructions on a variety of topics. Prescriptions concerning prayer occupy the first half of the ch.,¹ among them is spatchcocked a precept on the nocturnal recitation of scripture. They are followed by an admonition to make the sign of the cross at every juncture. J. then counsels against criticism of others. The fault is illustrated by the pridefulness which results from fasting. The choice of this particular example leads in turn to a lengthy attack on excessive fasts and the cantankerousness they entail. The second half of the ch. is marked by extensive citation of scripture.

37,1

quamquam apostolus semper orare nos iubeat. The ch. opens with a reference to scripture; here Souter (1912), p. 150, compares 1 Thess. 5,17 *sine intermissione orate*. This is a difficult text; with regard to it Origen speaks of τὰ παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἀπορούμενα (*sel. in Ps.* 1,2). Elsewhere Origen struggles at some length to make sense of the apostle's prescription (*or.* 12,2). Similarly Tertullian had devoted the whole of ch. 24 of his *De oratione* to the elucidation of this injunction; for J.'s indebtedness in the present ch. to this section of Tertullian's treatise cf. n. on *nec prius corpusculum* ... at 37,2 below. J. would accordingly appear to have taken his cue for the citation of 1 Thess. 5,17 from the *De oratione*. It is therefore noteworthy that in marked contrast to the reflectiveness of his source J. avoids all discussion of this problematical text; he is content simply to cite it and to tack on a striking second-hand *bon mot* (cf. next n.).

sanctis etiam ipse somnus oratio sit. J. again combines scripture (cf. previous n.) with a clever conceit that has been taken over from elsewhere. In a commentary on Ps. 1,2 ('in his law doth he meditate day and night') Origen had already put forward the view that sleep too could be a time of prayer (*sel. in Ps.* 1,2; *ib.* 1 Thess. 5,17).² Similarly

¹ This section is discussed by Vogüé (1991), I, pp. 254ff.

² It may also be noted that in *or.* 12,2 Origen had asserted that the whole life of the saint was one continuous prayer (*ib.* 1 Thess. 5,17); here Hamman, p. 46, n. 12, comments: 'idée de Clément, *Strom.* VII,7,40, empruntée aux philosophes grecs'. The same concept had occurred in Hilary: *sancti cuiusque vni vno omnis oratio sit* (*in psalm.* 1,12).

Basil had required sleep to be a μελέτημα τῆς εὐσεβείας (*hom.* 5,4); he explains that this is possible because our thoughts while we sleep are a reflection of our daily preoccupations. The idea is also found in J.'s contemporary, Prudentius, who concludes a hymn with the words Assendelft, p. 244, refers to Ps. 62,7 *si memor fui tui super stratum meum, in matutinis meditabar in te*, which is scarcely germane).¹

J.'s own formulation of this concept in the *Libellus* is again more succinct and arresting than those adduced above. It is also notable that he dispenses with any kind of elucidatory argument: his treatment of the preceding text of scripture was marked by a similar superficiality. Finally it may be remarked that in the present passage this striking conceit is somewhat at odds with the precept given in ll. 15ff. below (*noctibus his terque surgendum, revolvenda de scripturis, quae memoriter tenemus*); cf. also next n.

tamen divisas orandi horas habere debemus, ut, si forte aliquo fuerimus opere detenti, ipsum nos ad officium tempus admoneat. Though the canonical hours are said in the very next words of the *Libellus* to be common knowledge (ll. 12–14), it would seem that in his treatment of them here J. has found himself obliged to depend on Tertullian's *De oratione*. Previous scholarship has failed to identify a debt to this treatise anywhere in J.'s oeuvre. However in a passage which is conspicuous because it stands very near the end of the work Tertullian had made the following statement concerning these hours: *bonum tamen sit aliquam constituere praesumptionem, quae et orandi admonitionem constringat et quasi lege ad tale munus extorqueat a negotiis interdum* (*orat.* 25 p. 197,23). These words would appear to have been the source of J.'s own; his dependency would seem to be confirmed by his imitation six lines later of Tertullian's next sentence but one (cf. n. on *nec prius corpusculum ...* at 37,2). It is all the more remarkable that J. should borrow other people's formulations even when he is dealing with material that is entirely conventional (cf. also n. on *ad omnem actum ...* at 37,2).

Again J. has increased the stylistic refinement of his source. There is perhaps an echo of Tertullian's *admonitionem* in J.'s *admoneat*; for the rest however J. has smoothed out the tortuosities of Tertullian's language. On the other hand J.'s imitation once again involves an

¹ The notion of 'sleep as prayer' would also seem to have been in Augustine's mind when he asks in *serm.* 80,7 *quando dormiat oratio?*; cf. Adkin (1996b). On the other hand J. gainsays the idea at *tract. in psalm.* I p. 5 l. 83 *numquid eo tempore quo dormio orare possum?* (the work is possibly a translation from Origen). Cf. further Gain, pp. 1037f.

inconcinnity. In the *De oratione* this argument had followed an enumeration of three biblical episodes that occurred at the third, sixth and ninth hours respectively, but which Tertullian does not regard as having prescriptive value for Christian prayer; the immediately preceding concessive clause runs *quae etsi simpliciter se habent sine ullius observationis praecepto*. In its original context therefore the argument for canonical hours had been entirely appropriate. In J.'s *Libellus* however this is no longer the case. J. has been unable to resist inserting directly in front of it the second-hand conceit that sleep itself is a prayer (cf. preceding n.): J.'s own preceding concessive clause accordingly runs *quamquam ... sanctis etiam ipse somnus oratio sit*. This interposition means however that it is no longer quite *à propos* to adduce Tertullian's argument that canonical hours are necessary to ensure that we cease work in order to pray: if we can pray 'even when asleep', there should be no problem in doing so while at work.

The present passage of the *Libellus* would seem to be imitated in turn at *Epist. ad Casp. 7* p. 177 *licet apostolus sine intermissione nos orare praecipiat, tamen ... vel statutis horis ... iam dominum exorare ... non desistamus*. It is therefore highly significant that the author of this tract has omitted J.'s statement that sleep is prayer. The slight inconcinnity which marks the *Libellus* is wholly in character: it is again due to J.'s second-hand and scissors-and-paste method of composition. The same inconcinnity is also convenient verification that here J. has borrowed from Tertullian.⁴

horam tertiam, sextam, nonam, diluculum quoque et vesperam. The same five times are stipulated at *epist.* 107,9,3. Midnight is added to them in *epist.* 108,20,2; 130,15,1; cf. *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 257 l. 321. Only Terce, Sext and None are mentioned at *in Dan.* 6,10 l. 302 (on Dan. 6,10 'three times a day'). Cf. further Severus, pp. 1213ff.; 1219ff.

nec cibus a te sumatur nisi oratione praemissa nec recedatur a mensa, nisi referantur gratiae creatori. J. does not repeat this injunction to say grace at meal-times. Examples from other authors are assembled by Baudot; Jungmann; Lumpe (1966a), pp. 631f.; Mayor, pp. 397ff.; Scudamore (1875a). To their evidence may be added Basil, *ascet.* 1,4; *hom.* 5,3; Chrysostom, *Anna* 2,5; *Laz.* 1,8f. In the present

⁴ It is instructive to compare Origen, *or.* 12,2. Here a number of points are made which bear some resemblance to those occurring in J.; however Origen's line of reasoning is by contrast entirely consistent. Origen begins by noting that the injunction to 'pray without ceasing' only makes sense if a person's entire life is regarded as a single continuous prayer; he then identifies prayers at set times throughout the day as a part of this 'continuous prayer': *ἡς εὐχῆς μέρος ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ συνήθως ὀνομαζομένη εὐχή*. Finally it may be noted by way of appendix that Cassian also finds set prayer-times necessary for busy people (*nar.* 3,3,8).

passage J. would appear to have taken his cue from Tertullian, *orat.* 25 p. 198,2 *sed et cibum non prius sumere ... quam interposita oratione fideles decet*; both the sentences enclosing Tertullian's precept are imitated in this section of the *Libellus* (cf. nn. on *tamen divisas orandi horas* ... above and on *nec prius corpusculum* ... at 37,2 below). In particular Tertullian's ablative absolute *interposita oratione* has evidently inspired J.'s *oratione praemissa*.⁵

However J. has also expanded his source to include grace after the meal as well as before it; here he may have had his eye on Ambrose, *virg.* 3,4,18 *orationes ... sunt deferendae ... cum cibum paramus sumere, cum sumpserimus* (for other possible echoes of Ambrose's recent treatment of prayer in this section of the *De virginibus* cf. next two nn.). The result of J.'s expansion of the *De oratione* is a very elegant parallelism (for a similar procedure cf. n. on *egredientes hospitium* ... at 37,2 below): stylistically J. again improves on his Tertullianic source.⁶ The parison is noted by Hritzka, p. 87. It is further enhanced by an elaborate chiasmic arrangement (*cibus ... sumatur / recedatur ... mensa; oratione praemissa / referantur gratiae*).

37,2

noctibus bis terque surgendum, revolvenda de scripturis, quae memoriter tenemus. The instruction to get up during the night and recite passages of the Bible by heart interrupts the sequence of J.'s prescriptions on prayer.⁷ The virgin had also been told 'to learn as much of scripture as she could' at 17,2 above; there the precept had been inserted into a discussion of fasting. The fact that in both passages the exhortation to occupy oneself with the Bible is something of an

⁵ *Cibum sumere* also occurs in both passages. The locution is not uncommon; cf. *TLL* III, 1045,6ff. However *cibum copere* was the standard expression; cf. *TLL* III, 1044,33ff.

⁶ It is also instructive to contrast the simplicity of Ambrose's own formulation that was cited above. Nauroy, p. 179, has speculated on the reason for the relative infrequency of J.'s borrowings of phraseology from Ambrose; in particular he is struck by the contrast with Tertullian in this respect. Nauroy concludes that a lack of 'spiritual affinity' is the cause: 'il est exceptionnel qu'on rencontre des formules, des *unctorum verborum* typiques d'Ambroise sous la plume du docteur de Bithélie, comme si ce dernier n'avait jamais lu les traités de l'évêque de Milan qu'avec une sorte de distance sans cette sympathie et cette authentique communauté de vues, faute de quoi il n'y a pas d'assimilation intime, de mémorisation spontanée, d'imprégnation inconsciente, et donc ni *imitatio* littéraire ni véritable *aemulatio*'. A more likely reason would seem to be that Ambrose, unlike Tertullian, had little flair for coining impressive formulations; cf. J.'s own verdict: *nihil tibi dialecticum, nihil virile atque distinctum ... sed totum flaccidum, molle ... (Dudym. spir. praef.)*

⁷ It may also be observed that the clever conceit about 'sleep as prayer' which J. has introduced at the beginning of the ch. makes this injunction to get out of bed and recite scripture superfluous.

intrusion evidently reflects its peculiar importance for J.⁸

At *epist.* 54.11.1 the widow Furia is likewise advised to recite selections from the Bible before going to sleep. In Rufinus, *Clement.* 2.1.6f. the speaker had described how he too woke up every night in order to go over scripture he had learned by heart. Later on Cassian also encourages nocturnal reflection on scripture; here however it is recommended as an aid to understanding (*nocturna meditatione taciti revolventes clarius intuemur; conf.* 14.10.4). Finally it may be noted that recitation of biblical passages learned by heart had been prescribed in Pachomius, *reg.* 122 p. 46,5 *referant ... quae memoriter teneant.*

On two occasions J. stipulates that the virgin should memorize the whole Bible (*epist.* 107.12.2 and 128.4.2). He notes admiringly that Paula did so: *scripturas tenebat memoriter (epist.* 108.26.1). The feat is mentioned with some frequency in monastic circles; cf. Reitzenstein (1916), pp. 162ff.; Klauser, pp. 1037f.⁹ It would seem however that J. was the first to recommend the practice outside such a milieu; this attitude is not surprising in a biblical scholar of his distinction. The evidence adduced by Reitzenstein and Klauser can be supplemented. Monks also boast of having the Bible by heart at *Apophthegmata Patrum* 222 (Nau [1909], p. 359); 385 (Nau [1913], p. 143). A monk is told to commit the Gospels to memory and ponder the rest at *Vitae Patrum* 5.18.9. Another's knowledge of scripture is a topic of general conversation in Basil, *ep.* 44.1.

egredientes hospitium armet oratio, regredientibus de platea oratio occurrat ante, quam sessio. Ambrose's parallel treatment of the subject had likewise recommended prayer before going out: *sollemnes orationes ... sunt deferendae ... cum prodimus (virg.* 3.4.18). The precept would not seem to have occurred elsewhere. J. may accordingly have had the Ambrosian passage in mind here once again; cf. previous

⁸ When Ambrose dealt with times of prayer at *virg.* 3.4.19, he had included the following prescription: *sed etiam in ipso cubili volo psalmos cum oratione dominica frequenti contexas vice.* Here the combination of psalms with the Lord's Prayer makes the statement entirely appropriate to such a precatory context. It is perhaps possible that these words of Ambrose have also inspired J.'s precept in the *Libellus*; however J. has modified them to reflect his own preoccupation with scripture. The result is accordingly a certain intrusiveness. At the same time J. may also be offering a corrective to Ambrose by stipulating a more rigorous regimen: while Ambrose had merely prescribed such recitation on waking up and before falling asleep (*vel cum evigilaveris, vel antequam corpus sopor invigeret*), J. requires it throughout the night: *noctibus his terque surgendum.* For further possible influence of *virg.* 3.4.18f. on this section of the *Libellus* cf. nn. on *nec cibum a te sumatur ...* at 37.1 above and on *egredientes hospitium ...* below.

⁹ Ἀποσθηθίζειν is the term used to describe it in Palladius, *A. Laus.* 11 (καλοῦσάν τε καὶ κοινὴν γραφήν ἀποσθηθίζουσι); 18; 32; 37; *Historia monachorum* 2.5; 8.50 (ἀποσθηθίζοντας τὰς γραφὰς ἄλλην τὴν νόστον), 10.7.

two nn. In that case J. has again expanded his source, as he did in the last sentence but one (cf. n. on *nec cibus a te ...* at 37,1). In each of these passages J. enjoins prayer both before and after the respective activity described; a corresponding balance is also achieved in the formulation. In the present passage J.'s artistry is particularly notable. Each of its two asyndetically parallel clauses begins with the present participle of a cognate verb and ends with the same abstract noun as subject. At the same time the symmetry is tempered by unobtrusive *variatio*: *egredientes / regredientibus*; *oratio / oratio ... ante, quam sessio*. The sentence accordingly presents an instance of modified *complexio*; cf. Lausberg, p. 321 (nos. 633f.). Finally it may be noted that its two clauses also follow Behaghel's law (as in ll. 14f.). To this very elegant formulation J. proceeds to append a striking antithesis appropriated from Tertullian (cf. next n.).

nec prius corpusculum requiescat quam anima pascatur. The arresting antithesis with which J. now rounds off his prescriptions on prayer has been borrowed from Tertullian, *orat.* 25 p. 198,4 *piora enim habenda sunt spiritus refrigeria et pabula quam carnis* (for additional debts to this section of the *De oratione* in the present ch. cf. nn. on *quamquam apostolus ... tamen divisas orandi horas ...* and *nec cibus a te ...* at 37,1 above). As in the *Libellus*, the antithesis is used by Tertullian in order to conclude the discussion on times of prayer. Again J. has refined Tertullian's striking but rather rugged formulation: in particular *refrigerium* is not a literary word (cf. Janssen, p. 237). In place of his source's heavy reliance on nominal forms J. introduces an elegantly parallel sequence in which each noun is immediately followed by its own verb. The two words which make up the first unit (*corpusculum requiescat*) each have four syllables, while those forming the second (*anima pascatur*) each contain three; here Behaghel's law is accordingly inverted. For the fourth peon and spondee clausula cf. Herron, pp. 57f. It is no less typical that J. should also have omitted the theoretical justification which Tertullian had appended to his formulation: *quia priora caelestia quam terrena*.

It is also significant that J. would seem to be alone in appropriating Tertullian's striking antithesis. The only passage which is remotely similar would appear to be Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,18 *illos potius quaere cibos, quibus anima magis quam corpus reficiatur*. This tract often betrays the influence of the *Libellus*; cf. (e.g.) n. on *grandis labor, sed grande praemium* in the very next ch. (38,6). If then the particular antithesis which Tertullian has employed here would only seem to be imitated by J., it may be noted that the idea of 'food for the soul', which forms part of it, is on the other hand extremely common in the Fathers (for pagan antecedents cf. Perrin, p. 108). Statements that

the soul is fed 'just like the body' are found at Chrysostom, *exp. in Ps.* 110,5 (ib. Mt. 4,4 'man shall not live by bread alone'); *hom. in Is.* 6,1 4,1 (ὡσπερ ... τρέφεται τὰ σώματα, οὕτω τρέφεται καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἄρτω, ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ λόγῳ); (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 23,1,4; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 5,3; cf. *Sentences of Sextus* 413. J. himself speaks of the 'food of the soul' in *epist.* 5,2,3; 15,1,1; 35,1,3; cf. *tract. in psalm.* I p. 264 l. 105. Origen had even referred to the 'kitchen table of the soul' (τὸ ἐλεὸν τῆς ψυχῆς; *ser. in Ps.* 16,15), while Ambrose uses the expression *animae ... venter* (*bon. mort.* 5,21). The verb *pasci* is frequently employed with *anima*: Ambrose, *bon. mort.* 9,41; *epist.* 8,55,7; *Iob* 3,4,11; *Isaac* 4,11; *parad.* 3,18; *in psalm. 118 serm.* 7,7,2; 12,33 (*athleticis epulis*); *virginit.* 17,110; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 26,3; Rufinus, *Orig. in gen.* 10,3 p. 96,7; *Orig. in lev.* 16,5 p. 500,16; *Orig. in num.* 5,3 p. 29,9; 9,7 p. 64,8; *Orig. in psalm.* 36 *hom.* 4,3; Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 7,13; 8,1; 8,10; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 23; Augustine, *beat. vit.* 8; *in evang. Ioh.* 15,1; *gen. c. Manich.* 2,9,12; Faustinus, *trin. praef. (velut divinis epulis)* etc. Ambrose uses *epulari* with *anima* in *Hel.* 3,5; he is particularly fond of applying this verb to *animus* (so *Cain et Ab.* 2,6,19; *Joseph* 4,19; *in Luc.* 7,113; *Noe* 15,53; *off.* 1,31,163; *in psalm.* 35,9,2; *in psalm. 118 serm.* 7,29,2). Finally it may be noted that prayer is food according to Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 6,13,3.

ad omnem actum, ad omnem incessum manus pingat crucem. J. now follows his prescriptions on prayer with a somewhat abrupt injunction to make the sign of the cross in every situation. Tertullian had made a similar statement at *coron.* 3,4 *ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calciatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quacumque nos conversatio exercet, frontem signaculo terimus.* This sentence occupies a prominent position near the beginning of the treatise; it concludes the third ch. Tertullian's striking formulation has evidently inspired J.'s own: *ad omnem actum, ad omnem incessum manus pingat crucem.*¹⁰ Having just borrowed a phrase from the *De*

¹⁰ TLL s.v. *ad* supplies no parallel for J.'s formulation. The article on *actus* does give two other examples of *ad actum* (TLL I, 451,496; ib. 453,71). The first of them is not relevant *quomodo quis institueretur ... ad quaecumque sensum vel actum* (Tertullian, *idol.* 10,4). The second occurs in Ps-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,15 *ad omnem igitur actum, ad omne verbum, ad omnem etiam cogitationem.* It is evidently an imitation of the present passage of the *Libellus*. Like J.'s *Libellus* the work in question is a letter of direction to a virgin. Its very next ch. opens with the injunction *nulli ... detrahas.* Exactly the same precept (*nulli detrahas*) follows immediately after the sentence presently under consideration in the *Libellus* (l. 2). This formulation is unattested elsewhere according to TLL s.v. *detraho* (J.'s use of it in *epist.* 125,18,1 is a *Seibertzian*). TLL s.v. *incessus* offers no parallel for J.'s *ad ... incessum.*

oratione (cf. previous n.), J. now borrows another one from the *De corona*: he has therefore directly juxtaposed material taken from two different works of Tertullian. This concatenation of second-hand formulations is a good illustration of J.'s patchwork technique and his phenomenal memory.

Tertullian's sentence is extremely impressive. Fontaine (1966), pp. 67f. (whose very substantial commentary does not register the Hieronymian echo), notes Tertullian's use of nominal forms in place of temporal clauses (*ad omnem progressum = quotiescumque progredimur* etc.); he aptly comments that 'cette série brachylogique renforce la figure d'accumulation'. J. however has again improved his source. He preserves the arresting anaphora which opens Tertullian's sentence (*ad omnem ... ad omnem*); the device is made all the more effective by elimination of Tertullian's pleonastic pairs (*ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum*). All four words are telescoped into J.'s succinct *ad omnem incessum*,¹¹ while the second half of Tertullian's list (*ad vestitum ... ad sedilia*) is summed up in J.'s initial phrase (*ad omnem actum*).¹² The result is a very striking concision which is far more forceful than the long-windedness of the original. J. has also replaced Tertullian's rather inelegant *terere* with the picturesque *pingere* (for this sense of the word *OLD* [section 4] lists only examples from the poets); similarly the graphic term *crux* is substituted for *signaculum*. On the resulting spondee cretic clausula cf. Herron, pp. 36ff.

It is all the more noteworthy that J. should have utilized this formulation of Tertullian, since the precept he issues here is again traditional (cf. n. on *tamen divinas orandi horas* at 37,1 above). Cyril of Jerusalem had already prescribed frequent employment of the sign of the cross at *catech.* 13,36 ἐπί μετώπου μετὰ παρηρησίας δακτύλοις ἢ σφραγίς καὶ ἐπί πάντων ὁ σταυρὸς γινέσθω. ἐπί ἄρτων βιβρωσκομένων καὶ ἐπί ποτηρίων πινομένων ἐν εἰσόδοις, ἐν ἐξόδοις, πρὸ τοῦ ὕπνου κοιταζομένοις καὶ διανισταμένοις; ὀδεύουσι καὶ ἡρεμοῦσι. Similarly Gaudentius of Brescia stipulates: *sic ... signum Christi in corde, in ore, in fronte, inter cibos, inter pocula, inter colloquia, in lacrimis, in cubilibus, in ingressu, in egressu, in laetitia, in maerore* (*serm.* 8,18). J. himself instructs his reader to cross the forehead in *epist.* 14,6,3 (*crux antennae figatur in frontibus*) and 130,9,1 (*ut ...*

¹¹ J.'s phrase is strictly superfluous, since 'comings and goings' have already been covered by the preceding *ad omnem actum*; its presence is clearly due to Tertullian

¹² J. reverses Tertullian's order for the sake of Bchaghiel's law: *ad omnem actum, ad omnem incessum*.

crebro signaculo munias frontem tuam). He again refers to the crossing of the forehead at *in Ezech.* 9,4 l. 526; it is the face and stomach which are crossed in *epist.* 108,21,4 and the lips in 108,28,2. The eyes are crossed at *Canones Hippolyti* 78,28. Cf. further Severus, pp. 1232ff.; Dölger (1958), pp. 5ff.; (1965/6), pp. 28ff.¹³

nulli detrahas nec adversus filium matris tuae ponas scandalum. J.'s point is made in the first two words: *nulli detrahas*. His injunction to eschew detraction then passes imperceptibly into a citation of Ps. 49,20 *sedens adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris et adversus filium matris tuae ponebas scandalum*. In the present passage therefore we have a further case of J.'s tendency to combine scripture with a striking formulation that has been lifted from elsewhere; this time however it is a total of two borrowed phrases that are involved (cf. previous two nn.).

J. repeats the warning against detraction at *epist.* 52,14,1 and 125,18,1. In both passages Ps. 49,20 is again quoted (cf. 125,19,1) and the subject receives extended treatment; the second passage also reproduces the wording of the *Libellus*: *nulli detrahas*. The same admonition to avoid slander occurs in two other treatises addressed to virgins: Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 19 (*numquam detractio ex ore virginis procedat*); Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,16 (*nulli umquam omnino detrahas*; here the language resembles J.'s, cf. previous n.). Both of these writers likewise employ scriptural texts in connection with the precept. However in these works the texts are adduced simply to corroborate the point; J. on the other hand uses scripture in order to formulate the injunction itself. Moreover the texts at issue in these other two treatises are commandments from the legal or sapiential books of the Old Testament (viz. Prov. 20,13; Lev. 19,16f.; Sirach 28,28); they are accordingly somewhat dull and insipid. J. by contrast employs a picturesque verse from the Psalms. He shows a certain fondness for this text (Ps. 49,20), which occurs altogether eight times in his *oeuvre*. The verse had been included in Cyprian's *testimonia* at 3,107 (*non detrahendum*). J. himself was of course peculiarly prone to the vice of detraction.

¹³ On p. 28 of his second article Dölger mentions this passage of the *Libellus* in conjunction with Tertullian's statement at *coron.* 3,4. However he notes only the similarity of content and misses the verbal debt: such indifference to J.'s custom of appropriating impressive phraseology from elsewhere is typical. Dölger connects J.'s statement with what precedes and accordingly assumes that here J. is referring specifically to the habit of making the sign of the cross before and after prayer: 'nachdem er vorher die verschiedenen Gebetszeiten genannt hatte, scheint er bei diesem Text hauptsächlich daran gedacht zu haben, dass das Gebet mit dem Kreuzzeichen begonnen und beschlossen wurde, auch das Tischgebet' (n. 43). However in view of the centostic technique of composition which has been documented above it would seem that such an assumption may in fact be unwarranted.

37,3

tu quae es, ut alienum servum iudices? J. moves straight from Ps. 49,20 to Rom. 14,4: two verses of the Bible have accordingly been juxtaposed with two borrowings from Tertullian (cf. previous 3 nn.). J. has six further references to Rom. 14,4, which had been quoted at partial to this verse than J. is Augustine, who cites it on some ten occasions; elsewhere however the text is infrequent. In the present passage J. adapts the interrogative pronoun of the original (*quis*) to fit his female recipient (*quae*). The scriptural context is a discussion of food taboos: *qui non manducat, manducantem non iudicet* (14,3). When J. resumes *in propria persona*, he too deals with food: *nec, si biduo ieiunaveris ...* Here a text of scripture has accordingly been used to effect a transition in the argument. It must however be said that J. has failed to supply the reader with any kind of explicit clue. While therefore the sequence of thought was quite clear to himself, his audience may find it rather abrupt.

nec, si biduo ieiunaveris, putes te a non ieiunante esse meliorem. For the connection with the foregoing cf. previous n. Pride that results from fasting is a problem which occupies J. no less than other Fathers: at *epist.* 46,10,4 he notes that in Jerusalem fasting makes nobody conceited, while in *tract.* p. 554 l. 59 he warns that fasts beget pride. J. had censured the competitive fasting of the remnuoth at 34,3 above; he also condemns ostentatious fasts in 27,3 and 27,6.

Similarly Ps.-Athanasius cautions against the pridefulness which comes from fasting at *syntag.* 2,16 νηστεύων ... βλέπε μή φυσιωθῆς; cf. also v. *Syncl.* 53. The faster must not think himself already a saint according to Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,22. He is told not to look down on non-fasters by (Ps.-)Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* I p. 321^c (ib. Rom. 14,3); cf. Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 15 l. 432. Finally Nilus of Ancyra argues (*ep.* 3,46) that immoderate fasting is encouraged by the demons because it induces a sense of superiority.

Hritzu, p. 32, cites the threefold use of *ieiunare* in this passage (cf. l. 7) as an example of paronomasia. However the repetition would seem rather to indicate that here the writing is not particularly careful. The impression is perhaps confirmed by the use of *a* after the comparative (*a non ieiunante ... meliorem*; here the presence of *non* admittedly has a mitigating effect); cf. Pompeius, *gramm.* V 157,25 (*doctior illo debeo dicere, non ... doctior ab illo*); Löfstedt (1942), I, pp. 329f.; Hofmann-Szantyr, pp. 111f. Hofmann-Szantyr's statement that J. has this form of the comparative thrice in the letters is wrong; there are seven examples. It occurs some twenty times in the commentaries, eleven times in the

tractates and seven in the translations from Origen. At 16,1 above J. had said *illis ... meliorem*.

tu ieiunas et irasceris. Here the apostrophe has a general application (contrast *tu quae es* in l. 3 with n. ad loc.). Similarly in a letter to the ascetic Asella J. declares: *tu attagenam ructuas* (45,5,1). Nepotian is stingy while J. starves at *epist.* 52,16,3. Finally J.'s friend Oceanus is dog-like in his promiscuity (*epist.* 69,4,2). J. states explicitly that he means his advice for a larger audience in *epist.* 79,7,4 and 123,17,2 (*non tam tibi quam sub tuo nomine aliis sum locutus*).

A number of passages in the Fathers censure the cantankerousness which is often the consequence of fasting. In J. the subject would seem to recur only once: *si ... ieiunavero, ... quid mihi prodest, si rixosus sum, si iracundus sum, si detractor sum, si invidiosus sum* (*tract in psalm.* I p. 250 l. 114; the work may be a translation from Origen). Eating is said to be better than spite in *Apophthegmata Patrum* p. 429^c; Isidore of Pelusium, *ep.* 1,446; (Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* I p. 320^a. Chrysostom asserts (*hom. in Mt.* 77,6) that the faster without mercy is actually worse than the glutton. Fasting and rancour are also juxtaposed in *Tractatus Pelagianus* 4,11,1 p. 86 (*abstinemus a carnibus, sed non a malitia; vinum non bibimus, sed ira inebriamur*); cf. Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 2,22. Finally Martin of Braga (*serm. patr.* 17) mentions a faster of unusual irritability.

tu vexationem mentis et ventris esuriem rixando digeris. It may be noted that *rixae* occurs in the version of Is. 58,4 cited by Ambrose, *Hel.* 10,34; this verse is quoted by J. himself immediately below (ll. 13ff.), where *lites* is used (LXX μάχαι). The chiasmus with twofold homoeoteleuton in *vexationem mentis et ventris esuriem* is striking.

ille moderatus alitur et deo gratias refert. Fremantle, p. 39, (but not Hilberg) notes that these words echo Rom. 14,6 *qui manducat, domino manducat: gratias enim agit deo*. J. has just quoted Rom. 14,4 in ll. 3ff. The stress on moderate fare tallies with J.'s teaching at 17,2 above: *moderatus cibus*.

37,4

non tale ieiunium elegi, dicit dominus. Hilberg wrongly identifies these words as a combination of Is. 58,5 and (e.g.) 54,1. They are in fact a citation of Is. 58,6. J. refers to the text again at *adv. Iovin.* 2,17; in *Ioel* 1,13 l. 426; in *Zach.* 7,1 l. 81. It was used by opponents of fasting according to Tertullian, *ieiun.* 2 p. 276,12; cf. 15 p. 294,18. The text is employed in the same way as in the present passage at (Ps.)-Basil, *jej.* 2 (ib. εὐν γὰρ τὸ στόμα νηστεύη, αἱ δὲ χεῖρες τὰ ἀλλότρια ἀρκόωσιν, ἀκούεις ...). The entire first half of this ch. of Isaiah had been quoted in Cyprian, *testim.* 3,1.

in diebus enim ieiuniorum inveniuntur voluntates vestrae. J. cites Is. 58,3f. again in *adv. Iovin.* 2,17. There too it is linked to Is. 58,6. On *ut quid* (l. 14) cf. Hofmann-Szantyr, p. 460; Goelzer, p. 431.

culius iram, non dicam nox occupat, sed luna integra<nt> derelinquit. Here Hilberg records an allusion to Eph. 4,26 *sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram*; however the Bible would not appear to have been J.'s only source in this sentence. Eph. 4,26 had been glossed in Athanasius' *Vita Antonii* 55 as follows: καλὸν γὰρ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον μῆτε τὸν ἥλιον περὶ ἡμερινῆς κακίας μῆτε τὴν σελήνην περὶ νυκτερινῆς ἀμαρτίας ἢ ὅλως ἐνθυμῆσεως καταγινώσκειν ἡμῶν. The translation of J.'s friend Evagrius had turned this simple statement into a very arresting formulation: *ne peccatorum unquam nostrorum aut in nocte luna aut in die sol testis abscederet* (*vita Anton.* 55 p. 921). Evagrius' impressive antithesis has evidently inspired the wording of the *Libellus*; however J. has improved his source by combining it with scripture. In Athanasius Antony had stated that Eph. 4,26 should be applied to every kind of sin: 'Ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω ἐπὶ τῷ παροργισμῷ ὑμῶν', καὶ τοῦτο κοινῶς περὶ πάσης ἐντολῆς εἰρῆσθαι νομίζειν (sc. συνεβούλευσε), ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ μόνῳ παροργισμῷ, ἀλλὰ μῆδὲ ἐπὶ ἄλλῃ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἡμῶν ὁ ἥλιος ἐπιδύνη. The striking phrase of Evagrius which J. borrows accordingly refers in general terms to *peccatorum*. On this formulation J. grafts a scriptural allusion: the *ira* of Eph. 4,26 is substituted for Evagrius' unspecified reference. J. also replaces the Evagrian disjunction (*aut ... aut*) with a forceful *incrementum* (*non ... sed*; cf. Lausberg, pp. 221f.). The result is a conclusion to J.'s sentence that is very impressive and close-packed indeed.

J. had already imitated this phrase from Evagrius' translation shortly after its appearance at *epist.* 13,2 (*super quorum ira non unius diei, sed tantorum annorum sol testis occubuit*), where *sol testis* has been taken straight from Evagrius: in both authors this striking collocation is directly followed by a verb signifying 'departure'. Here J. has also introduced the *incrementum* that is repeated in the *Libellus*, whose Pauline *ira* is likewise anticipated; however in *epist.* 13 a verbatim citation of Eph. 4,26 had immediately preceded.

The Evagrian antithesis which J. borrows in the *Libellus* would not seem to occur elsewhere. The only passages that are at all similar would appear to be two couplets from Orientius' *Commonitorium*, which belongs to the first half of the fifth century. Here however the parallel is no more than partial and imperfect: *ut te sol ... servansem vincula pacis / deserat abscedens, inveniat rediens* (1,617f.); *quos Christi in lege paratos / excipiunt noctes inveniuntque dies* (2,325f.). Neither of these passages contains the picturesque reference to *luna*,

which is found in both Evagrius and Jerome. A rather different gloss on Eph. 4,26 is found at Chrysostom, *hom. in Eph.* 14,1 ἄν γὰρ νύξ ἐπιλάβηται, οὐκ ἀρκέσει ἡ μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρα τὸ συναχθῆναι καὶ ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ σβῆσαι κακόν. It may be noted finally that Cassian (concl. 5,11,7) distinguishes a type of anger which lasts for days: *tertium* (sc. *irae genus*) *quod non ut illa effervens ad horam digeritur, sed per dies et tempora reservatur, quod mēnis dicitur.*

The identification of J.'s debt to Evagrius in the *Libellus* shows that Hilberg is wrong to read *integra* (*iram ... luna integra derelinquit*) in preference to *integram*, which is found in some MSS: in Evagrius it is our sins that are still intact when the moon departs. It may be noted that the collocation *luna integra* is in any case not attested elsewhere (cf. *TLL* s.v. *luna*). For the phrase *integrum relinquere* on the other hand cf. *TLL* VII,1, 2071,83ff.; one might add *adv. Rufin.* 3,14 *quare haereticorum mala tuleris et Origenis integra dereliqueris.*

te ipsam considerans noli in alterius ruina, sed in tuo opere gloriarī. No commentator would seem to have noted that here J. alludes to Gal. 6,1 (*considerans te ipsum, ne et tu tempteris*) and 6,4 (*opus autem suum probet unusquisque, et sic in semet ipso tantum gloriam habebit, et non in altero*). There may also be an echo of Prov. 17,5 *qui in ruina laetatur alterius, non erit impunitus* (Vulg.; the LXX has ὁ δὲ ἐπιχαιρῶν ἀπολλυμένῳ, for which Sabatier, II, p. 323, fails to supply an Old Latin version). J. accordingly rounds off the ch. with an effective evocation of scripture. At the same time these words also break off the excursus on the ill-temper that accompanies excessive fasting and return to the topic which opens the second half of this ch.: *nulli detrahas ...* (II, 2ff.; cf. esp. *tu quae es, ut alienum servum iudices?*). An admonition similar to the present one is found in *tract. in psalm.* I p. 252 l. 187 (*teipsum considera, ne cadas, quid in alterius ruina exultas?*); cf. also Basil, *renunt.* 4 (μὴ γίνου ἀλλοτρίων κραισιμάτων δικαστής).

Chapter 38

Eustochium is bidden to scorn the cares of everyday life. She must not follow the example of worldly virgins: it is doubtful whether the virginity of such people is genuine. Instead her model should be the Virgin Mary, whose purity enabled her to be the Lord's mother: she was so unused to male company that Gabriel's appearance in the shape of a man alarmed her. Eustochium is then informed that she too can become 'mother of the Lord'. This traditional conceit is elaborated in characteristically whimsical fashion by means of lavish citation of scripture. The ch. concludes with a virulent attack on heretical virgins.

38,1

nec illarum tibi exempla proponas, quae carnis curam facientes possessionum redditus et cotidianas domus impensas subputant. Here J. has been inspired by Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 71, l. 11 'ni non plus, si vous entendez parler de celui dont les soucis gravitent autour de propriétés, argent, affaires commerciales dans la vie, et si vous apprenez que d'autres sont devenues négligentes et déchues, que votre virginité ne ressemble pas à la leur' (cf. next two nn.). J. typically incorporates a biblical allusion: *carnis curam ne feceritis* (Rom. 13,14; there are further references to the same text at *epist.* 38,3,2 and *adv. Iovin.* 2,6). It is also significant that J. should have substituted a vividly concrete and specific detail for Athanasius' generalized description of worldliness: the chore of computing revenue and expenditure would not seem to have been noticed by anyone else. Only (Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria records much later how the materialistically-minded calculate their interest (*serm.* 4 p. 336^B). In the present passage J. is in fact imitating himself as well as Athanasius. Several months earlier at *virg. Mar.* 20 he had observed: *computantur sumptus, impendia praeparantur*. J. refers to the same activity again in *epist.* 43,2,2 (*ratiocinia subputamus*).

neque enim undecim apostoli Iudae proditione sunt fracti. J. has borrowed the idea from Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 71, l. 33 'De fait, lorsque Judas trahit, les disciples ne prirent point attention à lui, mais veillaient sur eux-mêmes, en demeurant auprès du Seigneur' (cf. also next n.). In both J. and Athanasius the example of Judas serves as a warning against copying the worldly (cf. previous n.). However J.'s actual phraseology has come from a different source: Athanasius was notoriously indifferent to rhetorical frills (cf. Puech [1928], III, pp. 128ff.). The striking formulation which J. uses here has

been taken from his 'mentor' Gregory Nazianzen, who shows a certain fondness for it:¹ *carm.* 1,2,1,682f. (ὁ μὲν [Ἰούδας] ὄκα / ἐξ ἀριθμοῦ λογάδων, οἱ δ' ἔνδεκα μίμμον ἄριστοι); 1,2,3,48 (Ἰούδας ἦρ προδότης, οἱ δ' ἔνδεκα λαμπτήρες); 1,2,6,22f.; 2,2 (epigr.),22,2f. J. would seem to be alone in his imitation of this favourite formulation of Gregory's. He uses it again at *c. Vigil.* 9.

In the present passage however J.'s eagerness to dazzle the reader with his stylistic brilliance has again produced a slight inconcinnity: he has neglected to establish a clear connection with the theme of money-mindedness addressed in the previous sentence. None of Gregory's sententious phrases is concerned with this subject. Athanasius on the other hand had taken care to point out earlier that Judas fell because of greed (p. 65, l. 20): 'C'est ainsi qu'agit le traître Judas; en effet, il accepta la parole comme en étant capable; devenu négligent et caressant l'avarice, il tomba sur sa face et creva par son milieu'. Scripture itself is not explicit that avarice was the cause of Judas' fall. A number of patristic texts state that this was the reason: Rufinus, *Orig. in cant.* 3 p. 236,20 (*Judas initium mali habuit in amore pecuniae*); *Acta Archelai* 37,11 (*primum quidem fuit ei semen pecuniae cupiditas, incrementum vero furtum*); Basil, *reg. br.* 75; Gregory of Nyssa, *paup.* 1 p. 456^A; Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 83,2; Lawrence of Novae, *paen.* p. 96^C; (Ps.)-Eusebius of Alexandria, *serm.* 14 p. 528^B; Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 9 l. 281. The relative frequency of these statements would seem to indicate that money-mindedness could not be taken for granted as the reason why Judas fell: J. should have made his meaning clear (cf. also next n.).

nec Phygelo et Alexandro faciente naufragium ceteri a cursu fidei substiterunt. J. has again appropriated this idea from Athanasius' *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]). At p. 71, l. 35 Athanasius had said: 'Quand Hyménée et Alexandre sombrèrent, les autres voguaient encore bien avec Paul dans le sillage de la vérité'. Lefort (1929), p. 255, had rendered the final words as 'avec Paul sur le vaisseau de la foi'; this matches J.'s *fidei*. Athanasius' statement comes immediately after mention of Judas (cf. previous n.); the same collocation would not seem to be attested in any other of J.'s predecessors. Again J. has improved his source: an elegant chiasmus is created by the alternation of nominative and ablatival phrases (*undecim apostoli / Iudae prodicione*;

¹ Gregory himself may well have borrowed the idea from Athanasius, while at the same time improving the rather artless language of his source; for Gregory's familiarity with Athanasius' works on virginity cf. Aubineau (1955), p. 143. J.'s statement in the second half of this sentence (cf. n. on *nec Phygelo* . . .) shows that here he is utilizing both Athanasius and Gregory.

Phygelo et Alexandro / ceteri).

At p. 65, l. 20 (quoted in the preceding n.) Athanasius had established that love of money was the reason for Judas' fall. He had then continued (p. 65, l. 23): 'Phygélos et Hermogénès, qui avaient d'abord montré un excellent ferme propos, finalement se retirèrent de Paul, pour avoir aimé le siècle'. It would appear that J.'s combination of Phygelus and Alexander here is due to a conflation of this Athanasian passage with the one quoted at the beginning of the present n. These two figures do not seem to have occurred together elsewhere; J. himself has two further references to Phygelus (*epist.* 64,2,4; *in Is.* 6,14,4^b l. 21) and one to Alexander (*in Ezech.* 21,8 l. 281). Again there is no hint in scripture that either of these individuals fell away through love of the world (cf. previous n.). In borrowing from Athanasius J. has accordingly failed once again to make the connection clear: intelligibility has been sacrificed to an arresting formulation.

nec dicas: 'illa et illa suis rebus fruuntur'. The monk Rusticus is urged not to make the same excuse at *epist.* 125,17,1 *neque vero peccantium ducaris multitudine ... ut tacitus cogites: ... ecce illi fruuntur suis rebus.*

honoratur ab omnibus; fratres ad eam conveniunt et sorores. Frequent visits are a mark of esteem at Ambrose, *epist.* 8,56,12 *visebatur frequenter a virginibus et mulieribus; in honore enim semper erat.* J. has warned against similar sociability at 24,1 above.

38,2

primum dubium, an virgo sit talis. In this section J. constructs an elaborate three-tier argument that is clearly meant to impress by its logical progression (*primum ... dehinc ... ad extremum*; ll. 6–13): firstly such a person may not be a virgin, secondly she may not be a virgin in spirit and thirdly she is in any case not to be imitated. J.'s starting-point would appear to have been the simple statement of Athanasius quoted in the next n. J.'s argumentation is however marred by a characteristic inconsistency which results from his 'mosaic' technique of composition (cf. n. on *dehinc, etiam si corpore virgo est ...*).

non enim, quomodo videt homo, videbit deus. homo videt in facie, deus videt in corde. J.'s argument predictably takes the form of scriptural citation. 1 Reg. 16,7 is quoted by J. on eight further occasions; it had also been included in Cyprian's *testimonia* (3,56 *deum nihil latere*). In the present passage the text has possibly been suggested by Athanasius' use of 'reconnaisse' in *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955], p. 71, l. 30 'pour que, comme il est écrit (sc. 1 Cor. 7,34), le Seigneur les reconnoisse pures dans leur corps et dans leur esprit'. J. himself cites this text of 1 Cor. (*ut sit sancta et corpore et spiritu*) in the following

line. Moreover these words of Athanasius occur immediately before his statement about Judas which is copied by J. at ll. 2-4. It may be noted that the final words of 1 Reg. 16,7 (*deus videt in corde*) are out of line with what J. says next: *dehinc, etiam si corpore virgo est* (cf. next n.).

dehinc, etiam si corpore virgo est, an spiritu virgo sit, nescio. Between two impressive citations of scripture probably suggested by Athanasius (cf. previous and next nn.) J. inserts a striking sentence which would appear to have been inspired once again by Gregory Nazianzen; again J. has evidently followed his habit of juxtaposing scripture and an arresting formulation that has been borrowed from someone else. At *carm.* 1,2,9,48 Gregory had uttered the following memorable verse: σώρκεσι παρθένοϛ εἶμι, καὶ εἰ φρεσίν, οὐ σάρκα οἶδα.² Unfortunately J. has failed to integrate the statement fully into its new context. It is not quite consistent with the immediately preceding biblical text (*deus videt in corde*), which has already taken J. beyond the merely physical aspect to the spiritual (*corde*): hence the impressive antithesis between body and spirit which he now transposes from Gregory is no longer quite *à propos*.

ut sit sancta et corpore et spiritu. J.'s use of 1 Cor. 7,34 in the present passage has apparently been suggested by Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 71, l. 31; J. appropriates ll. 33ff. in ll. 2ff. above. J. has some twenty references to the verse, which had also occurred at 21,9 above.

ad extremum habeat sibi gloriam suam, vincat Pauli sententiam, deliciis fruatur et vivat. J. concludes his tripartite argument against worldly virgins. The first of the points he makes here (*habeat sibi gloriam suam*) had also rounded off an attack on the same kind of virgins at 13,5 above: *habeant istiusmodi laudatores suas*. The *sententia Pauli* in the second half is 1 Tim. 5,6 *quae in deliciis est, vivens mortua est*. J. has quoted it already in 8,1, where it was preceded by the same contrast between mind and body as in the present passage.

38,3

propono tibi beatam Mariam, quae tantae extitit puritatis, ut mater esse domini mereretur. *Propono* picks up *proponas* in the first words of the ch. (*nec illarum tibi exempla proponas*; 38,1). In the present passage J. would seem to be imitating Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins*

² The poem belongs to the *carmina moralia*, which were composed in 382 according to Duboudou, pp. 20f. They could very quickly have reached J. in Rome via one of his eastern contacts. In fact there would already seem to be an echo of Gregory's formulation at the end of *urg. Mor.*, which was written some months before the *Libellus, nescio an corpore, quod scio, spiritu virgo non permanet* (21)

(Lefort [1955]), p. 62, l. 10 'Voilà l'image de la virginité, et de fait Marie fut telle. Que celle, qui désire être vierge, la considère; car c'est à cause de pareils faits que le Verbe l'a choisie pour prendre d'elle cette chair, et se faire homme pour nous'.³ Six lines earlier Athanasius refers to Mary with the phrase 'dans la pureté de son entendement'; this would appear to have been the source of J.'s *tantae existit puritatis*.⁴

Mary's role as a model for the virgin is a late development: it is absent from Tertullian, Cyprian and Novatian. By the beginning of the fifth century however this exemplary function was well-established; cf. Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom.* 1 p. 12 ἐν ἀσκητηρίοις παρθένων ἀγέλαι τῶν τὴν Μαρτίαν μιμουμένων. Mary's life had been a mirror of virginity according to Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 59, l. 26; cf. p. 72, l. 5; p. 76, l. 13.⁵ The same exemplary purpose recurs in Ambrose, *virg.* 2.2.6 (*sit ... vobis tamquam in imagine descripta virginitas vita Mariae*); cf. 2.3.19. Ambrose also notes that Mary was in her chamber when Gabriel called; the virgin should do likewise (*epist.* 8.56.16; cf. *off.* 1.18.69). Augustine says of a virgin: *facta est illa quod Maria (bon. viduit. 16.20)*. The virgin imitates Mary as men do Joseph and wives Susanna according to Chromatius, *serm.* 24.2. Mary is a model for virgins as Susanna is for wives and Anna for widows in the following passages: Augustine, *serm.* 196.2; 391.6; Quodvultdeus, *catacl.* 6.22; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 6.7.

ad quam cum angelus Gabriel in viri specie descendisset. Here J. inserts a description of Gabriel's visit to Mary (ll. 15–19): she was so unused to male company that his appearance in the form of a man alarmed her. Again J. is imitating Athanasius' *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955], p. 61, l. 34): 'C'est l'évangile qui témoigne de cette affirmation (sc. that Mary avoided the company of men); en effet, lorsque l'archange Gabriel lui fut envoyé, — attendu qu'elle était un être humain auprès duquel il venait, il avait pris la forme humaine, — il lui parla en ces termes: "Salut, Marie, toi qui as trouvé grâces, le Seigneur est avec toi". La jeune fille, en entendant qu'on lui parlait

³ According to Duval (1974a), pp. 64f., n. 271 (cf. also Niessen, p. 108 and n. 1), J. has been inspired here by Ambrose, *virg.* 2.2.7 *quid nobilitas dei matre? quid splendidus ea, quam splendor elegit, quod castitas ea, quae corpus sine corporis contagione generavit?* However the Athanasian passage presents an exact parallel to J.'s *Libellus* in two important respects. In Athanasius Mary's qualification to be mother of the Lord is also directly juxtaposed with the injunction to follow her example. Moreover Athanasius' words adjoin the description of Gabriel's visit (cf. n. on *ad quam cum angelus Gabriel* ... below). Neither is the case with the passage from Ambrose.

⁴ The words *puritas* and *purus* do not on the other hand occur in the second book of Ambrose's *De virginibus* (cf. footn. 3 above).

⁵ Brakke, pp. 70ff., argues that Athanasius' use of Mary as a model of virginal seclusion had been intended to deter the virgin from instruction by Arian males.

avec une voix masculine, aussitôt se troubla fort, parce qu'elle n'était pas habituée à une voix masculine; et Marie, dans la pureté de son entendement, songea à fuir, ou plutôt à mourir, jusqu'à ce que celui qui lui parlait enleva d'elle la crainte en lui révélant son nom en ces termes: "Ne crains pas, Marie, je suis Gabriel". Alors après cela elle demeura et eut confiance en lui répondant, sachant que les paroles des archanges adressées aux vierges sont vraies'.⁶ J. has streamlined his source considerably. Ambrose later repeats the idea of Mary's dismay at Gabriel's male appearance in *exhort. virg.* 10,71 and *off.* 1,18,69. It also recurs in Ps.-Jerome, *epist.* 42 p. 291^B. At Ps.-Chrysostom, *annunt.* p. 756 Mary tells Gabriel to begone, for her old man (πρεσβύτερος) is jealous.

consternata [perterrita] respondere non potuit. J. follows Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 62, l. 1 'La jeune fille ... se troubla fort ... Alors après cela elle demeura et eut confiance en lui répondant'. Cf. also Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,11 (*salutata obmutuit*); *off.* 1,18,69 (*salutata ab angelo tacet*).

Here Vallarsi, I, p. 122^C (= PL 22 [1845], p. 422) read *consternata et perterrita*. The second term (*perterrita*) is found in all eight MSS used by Hilberg for this passage. Three of them however omit the preceding *et*. Hilberg accordingly brackets *perterrita*; no comment is made in his *apparatus criticus*. In the most recent edition of the text Labourt, I, p. 154, accordingly proceeds to restore the reading of the majority of MSS: *consternata et perterrita*.⁷

⁶ Duval (1974a), p. 65, n. 271, identifies J.'s source in this section of the *Libellus* as Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,11 *Gabriel eam ubi revisere solebat invenit et angelum Maria quasi virum specie mota trepidavit, quasi non incognitum audio nomine recognovit, na peregrinata est in viro quae non est peregrinata in angelo ... denique salutata obmutuit et appellata respondit, sed quae primo turbaverat affectum postea promissu obsequium*. Duval in fact holds that J. was unfamiliar with Athanasius' *Letter* when he wrote his *Libellus* (p. 65 and n. 271). It is true that J. has incorporated the striking synthesis of *vir* and *angelus* from Ambrose (*ita peregrinata est in viro quae non est peregrinata in angelo*; cf. n. on *quae hominem formidavit* below). For the rest however J. can be shown to have followed Athanasius: His *in viri specie* (l. 15) has evidently been suggested by Athanasius' 'il (sc. Gabriel) avait pris la forme humaine' (p. 61, l. 36). Ambrose has simply *angelum Maria quasi virum specie mota trepidavit*. The detail is not of course biblical. It may be noted too that the first words of Gabriel's salutation are quoted by both Athanasius (p. 61, l. 37) and by J. (l. 16); in Ambrose however there is no direct speech. Finally it is Gabriel's masculine voice that disconcerts Mary in both J. and Athanasius; cf. '(Marie) se troubla fort, parce qu'elle n'était pas habituée à une voix masculine' (p. 62, l. 2) and *consternata respondere non potuit, nunquam enim a viro fuerat salutata* (ll. 16ff.). In Ambrose on the other hand Mary is upset by Gabriel's male appearance (*quasi virum specie mota trepidavit*, only *ut agnoscat aures religiosae* hints at the Athanasian version).

This reading also occurs in Bautista Valero, I, p. 254; cf. Duval (1974a), p. 65, n. 271. In addition it is encountered in the translations of (e.g.) Schade (1936), p. 111; Bauer

In this section of the *Libellus* J. is anxious to impress. The whole account of Gabriel's visit is in fact a striking intrusion which interrupts the sequence of his argument (cf. n. on *potes et tu* ... below); J.'s principal motive for this insertion is to show off. In particular J. has lavished the closest possible attention on the stylistic refinement of its final sentence (cf. n. on *quae hominem formidarat* ...). It is therefore surprising that J. should have allowed himself a pleonasm as pointless and inelegant as *consternata et perterrita* in the penultimate one.

The verb *consternare* is a relatively rare one. The *TLL* article devoted to it occupies only twenty-four lines: a quarter of them are taken up by grammarians' glosses. One of those given is *metu perterritus*. In this connection it is pertinent to adduce *epist.* 107,7,2, where J. again describes Mary's reaction to the appearance of the angel Gabriel. Here too J. is setting out the manner of life which befits a virgin: *imitetur Mariam, quam Gabriel solam in cubiculo suo repperit et ideo forsitan timore perterrita est, quia virum, quem non solebat, aspexit*. This section of *epist.* 107 is also characterized by considerable stylistic polish. It is therefore proper that J. should not disfigure it with two exactly synonymous participles: *perterrita* alone suffices.

J. no doubt avoided a similar blemish in the matching passage from his *Libellus*. There *perterrita* will have been introduced as a gloss: it was very probably taken from the analogous passage in *epist.* 107. In the present passage of the *Libellus* therefore what J. wrote was *consternata respondere non potuit*. The term *perterrita* should be eliminated from the text altogether.

numquam enim a viro fuerat salutata. This explanation comes from Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 62, l. 3 'parce qu'elle n'était pas habituée à une voix masculine'.⁸ It is also found in (Ps.)-Leo the Great, *serm. app.* 15,2 (*incognitum habens virile alloquium*) and Antipater of Bostra, *annunt.* 4 (ἀήθης ... ὡς πρὸς ἀνδρῶν ὁπασαμένῃ; here she is also said to have been surprised to see a denizen of heaven); cf. Ps.-Gregory Thaumaturgus, *annunt.* 2 p. 1157^a (ἀήθης ... πρὸς πάσας τὰς διαλέξεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων). At *epist.* 107,7,2 on the other hand J. suggests that it was the mere sight of a man which occasioned Mary's fright: *ideo forsitan timore perterrita est, quia virum, quem non solebat, aspexit*. The same reason is given by Ambrose: *virg.* 2,2,11 (*angelum Maria quasi virum specie mota trepidavit*); *off.* 1,18,69 (*ad virilis sexus speciem peregrinam turbatur aspectus virginis*).
nuntium discit. *TLL* V,1, 1334,81ff. correctly states that here *nuntius*

(1983), p. 80; and most recently Cola, l. p. 235.

⁸ J. reports that no man had ever spoken to Asella (*epist.* 24,4,1).

denotes the person. In the Gospel Gabriel does not introduce himself. Here however J. is following Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefon [1955]), p. 62, l. 6 'en lui révélant son nom en ces termes: "Ne crains pas, Marie, je suis Gabriel"'. Ambrose had also imitated this Athanasian passage at *virg.* 2,2,11 *quasi non incognitum audito nomine recognovit*.

quae hominem formidarat, cum angelo fabulatur Intrepida. Scholars are correct to say that J. has taken the antithesis of 'man' and 'angel' from Ambrose;⁹ it is absent from the passage of Athanasius' *Letter to Virgins* which J. is imitating in this section (cf. previous nn.). At *virg.* 2,2,11 Ambrose had declared: *ita peregrinata est in viro quae non est peregrinata in angelo*. J. has been unable to resist inserting this very striking formulation into a passage which otherwise depends on Athanasius. While Ps.-Jerome (*epist.* 42 p. 291^b) and (Ps.)-Leo the Great (*serm. app.* 15,2) also reproduce the idea of Mary's dismay at Gabriel's appearance in the form of a man, it is significant that J. is alone in borrowing the clever antithesis between 'man' and 'angel'.

Here J. has used the Ambrosian antithesis to achieve a very effective climax to his treatment of the meeting with Gabriel: in Ambrose on the other hand the contrast stands in the middle of the account. At the same time J. has taken considerable care to improve the stylistic finesse of the material he has borrowed. Whereas Ambrose had been content with a rather bald parallelism (*peregrinata est in viro quae non est peregrinata in angelo*), J. substitutes two different verbs with very elegant *homoeoprophoron* (*formidarat ... fabulatur*). They occur in two clauses of increasing length that are marked by subtle *variatio*¹⁰ and conclude with a choice *clausula* (for the cretic tribrach cf. Herron, pp. 43ff.). With marvellous economy J. has contrived to present a picturesque vignette of very great charm.¹¹

Mary's 'conversation' with the angel consisted of Lk. 1,34 and 1,38. Ambrose wrote later in *off.* 1,18,69 that Mary wanted information about her mode of conception, not a chat (*ut qualitatem effectus disceret, non ut sermonem referret*); here the wording is perhaps intended as a criticism of the present passage of J.'s *Libellus*. Mary's succinctness struck (Ps.)-Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 3,5,2 *cum angelo paucissimis conlocuta verbis*. On the other hand Hesychius of

⁹ Cf. Bardenhewer (1905), p. 104, n. 1; Niessen, p. 108, n. 2; Simon, I, p. 176; Duval (1974a), p. 65, n. 271.

¹⁰ Two instances may be cited. Whereas *formidarat* stands last, *fabulatur* occupies the penultimate position in its clause. While the first verb has a direct object, a preposition is employed with the second.

¹¹ Cf. Erasmus, I, fo. 61^r "Cum angelo fabulatur": *venuste usus est verbo familiari fabulatur enim inter se familiares, cum liberius colloquuntur*.

Jerusalem, *serm.* (Aubineau [1978]) 6,2f. pictures a longer conversation, while Proclus of Constantinople (*or.* 6,11) invents theological stichomythia.

potes et tu esse mater domini. With this assurance J. returns to the opening observation about Mary which he had derived from Athanasius: *tantae extitit puritatis, ut mater esse domini mereretur* (l. 14). Since the two statements clearly belong together, their separation inevitably shows up the intervening lines on Gabriel's visit as the clever intrusion they are.

The assertion that Eustochium herself can be mother of the Lord was taken by Grützmacher, I, p. 256, to be one of J.'s few original contributions to the debate about virginity. The idea can however be shown to have been already current in the East when J. wrote. In particular Gregory Nazianzen had given it the same strikingly concrete formulation as we find in J.: *γυναῖκες παρθενοῦσα, ἵνα Χριστοῦ γέννησθε μητέρες* (*or.* 38,1).¹² This oration would seem to have been delivered on Christmas day 380 (cf. Bernardi, p. 204). Since J. was in Constantinople at the time, he will have heard it in person.

At Mt. 12,49 Christ points to his disciples and says: 'Behold my mother ...!' (J. quotes the text in l. 7 below). In the next verse Christ explains that his mother is anyone who does the will of his father. Already Origen had referred this text to every virgin soul (*fr. in Mt.* 281), while at *comm. in Rom.* 4,6 p. 983^c he had made a sufficient purity of mind, body and action the qualification for this begetting of Christ; there he had cited not only Mt. 12,49 but also Gal. 4,19 ('whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you'). In 401 Augustine applies the Mt. text to the virgin herself (*virg.* 5,5).¹³

The idea of giving birth to Christ could also exist independently of this Mt. passage. Methodius had already affirmed Christ's conceptual birth in everyone at *symp.* 8,8,191. At the end of the fourth century Bachiarus reserves the begetting of Christ to the virgin (*epist.* 2 p. 298,5 *solis Christum parere virginibus licet*; *ib.* Gal. 4,19). According to (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. III* (Klostermann-Berthold) 28,2 (CR) the virgin should carry Christ in her heart as Mary did in her womb; like J. (ll. 4ff.) this writer also cites Is. 26,18. In 371 Gregory of Nyssa had said that what happened physically to Mary recurs in every virgin soul (*virg.* 2,2), while Ambrose declares at *virginit.* 4,20 that such souls give birth to Christ spiritually. Finally 'Eusebius Gallicanus'

¹² This opening section of the oration is aptly quoted as a specimen of Gregory's taste for arresting *κόμματα* by Norden, pp. 566f. Such *κόμματα* are of course especially suitable for borrowing.

¹³ On the other hand it refers to ourselves at Augustine, *serm.* 72A,8.

(*hom.* 1,8) urges his hearers to conceive Christ by faith and beget him by confession.

J. himself repeats this idea on a number of occasions. At *in Marth.* 12,49 l. 647 he states that Christ identifies as his mother those who daily beget him in the minds of believers. On the other hand in *epist.* 65,1,3 it is the virgin who is said to beget the godhead. More surprisingly Pammachius is told to give Jesus his breasts to suck in *epist.* 66,10,2 (in allusion to Cant. 7,12). Tropologically the divine word is born of the virgin soul at *in Am.* 9,6 l. 191, while at *in Gal.* 4,15 p. 381^D it is said to be reared as well. According to *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 108 l. 192 we too can give birth to Christ; cf. p. 155 l. 164 (in the heart; both passages may be translations from Origen).

38,4

accipe tibi tomum magnum, novum et scribe in eo stillo hominis velociter spolia detrahentis. J. again combines scripture (Is. 8,1) with a striking second-hand formulation (cf. previous n.). The initial imperative (*accipe ...*) is particularly arresting; J. begins the *Libellus* with the same technique (*audi, filia ...*; Ps. 44,11). Here the text introduces an extravagant passage in which J. proceeds to describe how the virgin can in fact become 'mother of the Lord'; in characteristic fashion the account consists largely of biblical citation. At *in Is.* 3,8,1 l. refers this text to the virgin birth (l. 24) and tropologically to the virgin soul's conception of God's word, which takes spoil from hostile powers (l. 67). Shortly before the appearance of the *Libellus* Epiphanius of Salamis had identified the *tomus* as the Virgin's womb (*haer.* 30,30,6ff.). According to Epiphanius it was so called to signify severance (τέμνειν) from intercourse; for the same reason it is also described as 'new'. Epiphanius explained further that 'a man's pen' is used because Christ himself was a man. J. cites the verse again at *epist.* 65,7,3 (on Ps. 44,2 *calamus scribae velociter scribentis*) and *in Is.* 17,62,4 l. 21. Elsewhere it is rather rare; cf. Allenbach. At the annunciation Mary is greeted as ὁ καινός κατὰ Ἡσάϊαν τόμος τῆς νέας συγγραφῆς in Theodotus of Ancyra, *hom. BVM et Sym.* 3. In the present passage J. appears to have made his own modification to the end of the quotation (*detrahentis*; LXX γραφίδι ἀνθρώπου τοῦ ὀξέως προνομῆν κοιῆσαι ...). The change is perhaps due to the influence of Ps. 44,2 (quoted above); the two texts are combined in *epist.* 65,7.

cum accesseris ad prophetissam et conceperis in utero et pepereris filium. J. continues his description of the virgin's motherhood with a paraphrase of Is. 8,3 καὶ προσήλθον πρὸς τὴν προφήτιν, καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβεν καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱόν. Fremantle, p. 39, complains that here the words *accesseris ad prophetissam* are 'meaningless' ('J. should have

substituted "prophet" for "prophetess"). At *in Is.* 3,8,1 l. 42 J. identifies the *prophetissa* of this text as the Holy Spirit; he also notes (l. 50) that most people think it was Mary. The latter interpretation is found in Novatian, *trin.* 28,7; Eusebius of Caesarea, *eccl.* 4,5 (the Holy Spirit comes to her); Epiphanius of Salamis, *haer.* 30,31,9 (some wrongly think that the wife of King Ahaz is meant); 78,16,5; 79,6,2 (both of these passages apply the text to Gabriel's visit); Cyril of Alexandria, *hom. pasch.* 17,3; Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 8,208 (Isaiah approaches her through knowledge).

In the present passage J. may conceivably have Elizabeth in mind. The annunciation has just been described (p. 203,15–19); in the biblical account it is followed immediately by Mary's visit to Elizabeth. Moreover J. has just used the phrase *mater domini* (l. 1); Elizabeth applies the same words to Mary in Lk. 1,43. Origen had twice referred to Elizabeth as *προφήτις* in connection with the same episode (*schol. in Lc.* 1,46 and *Jo.* 6,49,255); cf. J.'s own comment at *epist.* 65,1,5 (*Helisabet utero prophetat et voce*). Such an allusion here would certainly suit J.'s vivacious imagination. On the other hand it is true that J. does take over portions of scripture which do not fit the context; cf. n. on *posita base* ... at 6,3.

a timore tuo, domine, concepimus et doluimus et peperimus; spiritum salvationis tuae fecimus super terram. Is. 26,18 had occurred in Athanasius, *Letter to Virgins* (Lefort [1955]), p. 56, l. 8; there the reference it had been given was to virginity. Duval (1975), pp. 410f., detects an elliptical application of the same exegesis in Methodius, *symp.* 7,4,158f. and suggests that it could go back to Origen. One might add that the text is again put into the mouth of the virgin at (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. III* (Klostermann-Berthold) 28,2 (CR).¹⁴ The wording in Athanasius differs somewhat from J.'s in the present passage. Nonetheless since in this ch. J. is heavily dependent on the *Letter to Virgins*, it is not unlikely that Athanasius has had some influence on J.'s use of Is. 26,18 here. Whereas however in Athanasius the offspring of this pregnancy had been simply 'des pensées justes' (p. 56, l. 12), J. applies the text with typical extravagance to the virgin's own metaphorical begetting of Christ.

J. himself quotes this verse on no fewer than fourteen subsequent occasions. At *in Is.* 8,26,17 l. 12 J. makes the offspring not ones of flesh but spirit: it is God's word that is conceived (l. 31; cf. Origen, *hom. in Ex.* 10,3 p. 248,10; *comm. ser. in Mt.* 43 p. 87,2). At *in Gal.* 4,19 p. 386^A J. adds Mt. 12,50 (cf. l. 7). The text denotes the soul's

¹⁴ It also occurs in Augustine, *virg.* 38,39.

procreation of the saviour at *tract. in psalm.* l p. 117 l. 254 (cf. Origen, *hom. in Lev.* 12.7 p. 466,24 and 28). On the other hand it is given the following gloss at *in eccles.* 3.2 l. 13: *perfecto viro partus iste qui de timore natus est, cum deum amare coeperit, moritur.*

ecce mater mea et fratres mei. Christ's statement in Mt. 12.49 makes a very effective climax to J.'s description of the virgin's begetting of Christ; in particular it echoes the sentence which introduced this account (*potes et tu esse mater domini*; p. 203,19). However the second half of the text (*et fratres mei*) is strictly irrelevant here.

38,5

quem in latitudine pectoris tui paulo ante descripseras. Having shown how Eustochium can be Christ's mother, J. now describes how she then becomes his bride; again the description consists chiefly of scripture. At the same time J. achieves a high level of literary artistry in this sentence, which is marked by a twofold asyndetic anaphora (*quem ... quem; postquam ... postquam*), by parison (*in latitudine pectoris ... in novitate cordis*) with lexical variation (*pectoris / cordis*), and by an epiphoric *disiunctio* with homoeoteleuton (*descripseras ... signaveras*),¹⁵ which in conjunction with the anaphora of *quem* generates a form of *complexio*.

J. had opened his account of the virgin's motherhood with Is. 8,1 (*accipe tibi tomum magnum, novum et scribe in eo stilo hominis velociter spolia detrahentis*): J. now exploits this image in his own bizarre and picturesque fashion by making the virgin inscribe Christ in her heart. For J.'s wording Hilberg compared 3 Reg. 4,29 *dedit quoque deus sapientiam Salomoni et prudentiam multam nimis et latitudinem cordis* (LXX 5,9 χύμα καρδίας). However Fremantle, p. 39, had already identified the source correctly as Prov. 7,3 (so Vaccari [1920], p. 389) ἐπιγραψων δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ πλάτος τῆς καρδίας σου; cf. also 3,3 (*in parte codd.*) and 22,20. For the idea itself J. would seem to be indebted to Origen, who had rephrased Mary's words after the annunciation ('Behold the handmaid of the Lord') as πινυξ εἰμι γραφόμενος (*fr. in Lc.* 28). Origen's very striking formulation appears in fact to have enjoyed a certain popularity; it is also copied in the fifth century by Antipater of Bostra (*annunt.* 11).

quem in novitate cordis stilo volante signaveras. *In novitate cordis* perhaps echoes Rom. 6,4 *in novitate vitae. Stilo volante* would seem to be due to Is. 8,1 (cited in the form *stilo hominis velociter spolia detrahentis* in l. 2) and Ps. 44,2 (*calamus scribae velociter scribentis*):

¹⁵ There is a further homoeoteleutic element in the phrases *paulo ante* and *stilo volante* which on each occasion immediately precede the two verbs at issue in this *disiunctio*.

the two texts are combined in *epist.* 65,7. Ams, p. 33, notes that the *stilus* was used particularly in tachygraphy.

postquam spolia ex hostibus ceperit. The words are evidently an allusion to Is. 8,3f. κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ταχέως σκόλευσον, ὀξέως προνόμεισον. (4) διότι πρὶν ἢ γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον καλεῖν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα. λήμνεται δὴνάμιν Δαμασκοῦ καὶ τὰ σκόλλα Σαμαρείας ἐναντι βασιλέως Ἀσσυρίων. The first half of Is. 8,3 is quoted in II. 3f. above. At *in Is.* 3,8,1 l. 30 J. interprets Is. 8,4 to mean putting a stop to the Devil's rule. In *epist.* 66,10,2 J. repeats the sequence employed here: the baby Jesus whom Pammachius breast-fed grows up quickly and loots the enemy in him.

postquam denudaverit principatus et potestates et adfixerit eas cruci. J. inverts the order of Col. 2,14–15 in order to accommodate the text to the foregoing (cf. previous n.).

conceptus adolescit. This compendious phrase is repeated by Ambrose, *Isaac* 6,53.

sponsam te incipit habere de matre. It is noted at Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 5 p. 489^B that the Virgin Mary was νύμφη ὁμοῦ τε καὶ μήτηρ. Here J. puts the idea in a very striking form. A parallel conceit had occurred already in Origen, *Ps.* 18,6 ἡ ἁγία παρθένος ... νυμφίον ἔσχευ ... τὸν τικτόμενον. It is repeated by Ps.-Chrysostom, *annunt. et Ar.* p. 766 εὐρες νυμφίον ... υἱόν.

A similar transformation to the one described in the present passage had concluded the opening ch.: *nigra ... dealbata*. It is noteworthy that both are introduced by the phrase *mirum in modum* (I. 8 above and p. 145,13). With the mention of *sponsa* J. now returns after a very picturesque digression to the theme of the virgin.

38,6

grandis labor, sed grande praemium. J. rounds off the ch. with a plethora of impressive *topoi*. The argument employed here is repeated in *epist.* 125,20,5 *durum, grande, difficile, sed magna sunt praemia*. J.'s wording in the present passage would seem to be imitated by Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,2 *magnus quidem est pudicitiae labor, sed maius est praemium*. Hritzu, p. 88, notes the striking parison which marks the second half of J.'s sentence (*esse, quod martyras, esse, quod apostolos, esse, quod Christus est*); he might also have registered the equally impressive ἀντεισαγωγή (cf. [e.g.] Aquila Romanus, *rhet.* 14 p. 26,14) which distinguishes the first half (*grandis labor, sed grande praemium*).

esse, quod martyras. It is a commonplace to equate virginity and martyrdom. J. does so explicitly in *vita Malchi* 6 *habet et servata*

puccitia suum martyrium; he employs exactly the same formulation again in *epist.* 130,5,3. The idea is also found in Methodius, *symp.* 7,3,156 (the virgin's martyrdom lasts a lifetime); Ps.-Cyprian, *tract.* 17 (*carne peccati revincens martyrium celebrare non desinit*); Ambrose, in *psalm.* 118 *serm.* 20,47 (*temerandam mentis et corporis castimoniam non putasti: martyr es Christi*); Ps.-Chrysostom, *Theol.* p. 745; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 41,1 (*libidinem fugere ... pars magna martyrii est*); 214,1; 215,2. Monks are martyrs at *tract.* in *psalm.* 1 p. 245 l. 164; cf. Ps.-Athanasius, *doct. mon.* p. 1424^c. Similarly the desert is said to be full of virgins, monks and martyrs at Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 8,4 and *hom. in Rom.* 13,7. J. makes the Egyptian confessors 'martyrs by intent' in *epist.* 3,2,1 (cf. Basil, *hom.* 19,1 μαρτυρῶν τῇ προαιρέσει). Martyrdom of conscience is described at Athanasius, v. Anton. 47 and Rufinus, Basil. *hom. praef.* (*adversum libidinem per virginitatem ... indesinenti conscientiae suae martyrio coronatus*). J. asserts that the ascetic endures daily martyrdom in *epist.* 3,5,3; cf. 14,4,1; 108,31,1 (*non solum effusio sanguinis in confessione reputatur, sed devotae quoque mentis servitus cotidianum martyrium est*). A correspondent's household is said to abound in martyrs at *epist.* 7,6,2.

For the ending *-as* cf. *TLL* VIII, 416,40ff. The language of martyrdom recurs in 39,3 (*sanguis sanguine compensatur ...*); it was also used to describe J.'s dream in ch. 30. On the themes of virginity and martyrdom in J.'s *epist.* 24 cf. Recchia.

esse, quod apostolos. J. speaks of 'being like the apostles' with unusual frequency. He asserts at *epist.* 119,7,11 that those who live in Christ resemble them. In particular this is the case with the monk: *monachi apostolorum imitatores sunt* (*tract.* p. 505 l. 83). At *epist.* 57,12,4 J. insists that people who say they copy the apostles must show it; according to *in Mich.* 2,9 l. 316 not only the apostles' words but also their virtue and self-control should be our model. J. goes out of his way to add imitation of the apostles to his source at *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 37 p. 212,6 (Origen himself had required it at *hom. in Jer.* 14,14 [GCS 6]; cf. *hom. in Is.* 6,1 p. 270,7). Such imitation forms part of a tricolon similar to the present one at *epist.* 66,8,2 (cf. next n.).

If J. evinces an uncommon enthusiasm for *imitatio apostolorum*, the idea can be shown to occur sporadically in other Fathers as well. Again it is the monk who emulates apostolic zeal in Chrysostom, *hom. in Mt.* 8,5 (at *exp. in Ps.* 140,2 the same author says the apostles should be followed and enemies not cursed). Those who become monks imitate them closely according to Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 1,232 (cf. 2,49; 2,57), while *Historia monachorum* (1,20) notes that the apostles are read in church and ought to be copied. Ps.-Augustine, *reg.* II 4 makes an apostolic life our aim: in his view it is achieved through communism.

The ascetic Syncletica is said to have led such a life at Ps.-Athanasius, *v. Syncl.* 20. Ascetics also lead it in Epiphanius, *haer.* 61,4,3 (ἀποταξάμενοι καὶ ἀποστολικὸν βίον βιοῦντες). Antony himself is called 'mirror of the apostles' by Hesychius of Jerusalem in *serm.* (Aubineau [1978]) 8,1. For the origins of the idea of the 'apostolic life' cf. Frank (1971).

esse, quod Christus est. The same phrase again caps a similar tricolon in *epist.* 66,8,2 *desideras esse, quod prophetae, esse, quod apostoli, esse, quod Christus est.* For the idea cf. Cyprian, *idol.* 11 *quod homo est, esse Christus voluit, ut et homo possit esse quod Christus est. quae quidem universa tunc prosunt, cum in ecclesia fiunt.* J. proceeds to stress the importance of orthodoxy for the virgin. The present sentence is imitated by Ps.-Jerome, *epist.* 149 p. 206,8 *quia tunc omnia prosunt cum in unitate ecclesiae ... peraguntur.* Hilary had already pointed out that chastity and fasting do not advance holiness except in Christ (*in psalm.* 14,8); he had also pronounced the heretic's austerity futile (*ib.* 64,3). The same view is expressed later by Augustine, *in euang. loh.* 13,15 *nihil prodest istis (sc. haereticis) servare virginitatem, habere continentiam ... omnia illa quae laudantur in ecclesia, nihil illis prosunt.* On the present passage Deléani, p. 76, n. 49, compares Cyprian, *unit. eccl.* 14 *esse martyr non potest qui in ecclesia non est;* there is an echo of this work below (cf. n. on *Christum mentitur antichristus* at 38,7).

in una domo pascha celebramus. Having made his point quite clearly in the opening words of this sentence (cf. previous n.), J. now restates it thrice by employing three commonplaces of scriptural exegesis. This characteristic display of second-hand erudition is highly impressive. The effect is further enhanced by the formal artistry of the sentence: two clauses introduced by *cum* are matched by two that begin with *si*, while both pairs follow Behaghel's law.

In the present passage Hilberg fails to identify Exod. 12,46 as J.'s source, although the text had already been adduced by Fremantle, p. 39. J. again makes the 'one house' of the Passover symbolize the church at *epist.* 15,2,1 (*ib.* Noah's ark) and *tract.* p. 536 l. 16 (*ib.* Rahab and the ark). The same interpretation had been given by Origen, *sel. in Ex.* 12,46; Cyprian, *epist.* 69,4,1; *unit. eccl.* 8; cf. also Ps.-Chrysostom, *pasch.* 4 p. 731.

si arcam ingredimur cum Noe. J.'s use of the ark as a symbol of the church is discussed by Bodin, p. 69 (add *epist.* 15,2,1; *adv. Iovin.* 2,22; *tract.* p. 545 l. 21; cf. *tract. in psalm.* II p. 433 l. 114). Bodin, *ib.*, n. 17, refers to Hurter; to the latter's examples can be added Cyprian, *epist.* 74,11,3; 75,15,2; Hilary, *myst.* 1,13; Chromatius, *serm.* 2,5; *in Matth.*

54A,10; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 18,17; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 49,10; Ambrose, *in Luc.* 2,92; *off.* 1,18,78; Gregory of Elvira, *de arca* 4; Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira), *tract.* 12,22; Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 2 p. 452; Augustine, *c. adv. leg.* 1,21,45; *divers. quaest.* 58,2; *in euang. Ioh.* 6,19; *pecc. mer.* 2,10,12; *c. Secundin.* 23; Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 1,84; *Collectio Ariana, c. Iud.* 1,3; Eucherius, *form.* 9 p. 51,20. Cf. also the literature cited by Clarke, IV, p. 180, n. 11.

si pereunte Hiericho Raab iustificata nos continet. For J.'s use of Rahab as a type of the church cf. Bodin, pp. 84ff., who also refers (p. 84, n. 77) to Hummelauer, pp. 118f., and Daniélou (1949). In addition to the passages which they adduce cf. Ps.-Chrysostom (= Hesychius of Jerusalem), *hom. in Ps.* 86,4 (Ῥαὰβ διὰ τὴν πορνείαν ἢ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἐκκλήσια); *op. imperf. in Matth.* 1 p. 618 (a detailed interpretation); Evagrius Gallicus, *alterc.* p. 35,6; Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *qu. in Jos.* 2.

For *iustificata* Fremantle, p. 39, compares *Jas.* 2,25 (so Souter [1912], p. 150) *Rahab meretrix nonne ex operibus iustificata est. J.'s continet* is aptly chosen; cf. Origen, *hom. in Jos.* 3,4 p. 304,27 (*Raab ... interpretatur latitudo. quae ... est latitudo, nisi ecclesia haec Christi? ... ista ergo est latitudo, quae suscepit exploratores Iesu*); *sel. in Jos.* 2,1; Ps.-Chrysostom, *op. imperf. in Matth.* 1 p. 618.

38,7

quales apud diversas hereses et quales apud impurissimum Manicheum esse dicuntur. J. now begins an attack on heretical virgins. In connection with such virgins Chrysostom refers specifically at *virg.* 3 to Marcion, Valentinus and Manes. J.'s phraseology in the present passage would seem to reflect a general tendency to distinguish Manicheans from other heretics in this period; cf. Adkin (1993j). The present passage is discussed by Opelt (1980), pp. 144f. and 239, where she implies that J. is alone in calling the Manicheans 'filthy' and that his choice of language is due to the unique virulence of his polemical style. It can however be shown that here J. is merely availing himself of a cliché: the Manichean was regularly characterized as 'filthy'; cf. Adkin (1992c). For the collective singular (*Manicheum*) which J. employs here cf. Mohmann (1946), p. 953.

scorta sunt aestimanda, non virgines. Chrysostom had recently opened his *De virginitate* by denying that there was such a thing as a heretical 'virgin' (1,1; cf. *exp. in Ps.* 44,12): such people are unfaithful to their divine spouse and think marriage bad. Later in the same treatise (*virg.* 5,1) he had pronounced the chastity of heretics 'worse than any wantonness': the latter involved only men, whereas the heretic's conduct was an affront to God himself. Elsewhere (*hom. in Phil.* 2,3) Chrysostom asserts that heretical virgins should be punished 'like

fornicators', because they defame God's creation. The idea of the worthlessness of heretical virginity is also found in other Fathers. According to Ps.-Chrysostom (= Severian of Gabala), *hom. in Ps. 95, I viduit*. 15, 19 that even if a Catholic wife remarries more than once, she is still superior to a heretical virgin (cf. also *in psalm. 90, serm. 2, 9*); similarly Basil (*ep.* 199, 20) is not prepared to condemn a heretical virgin who subsequently marries.

It would seem that J.'s attack on heretical virgins here has been suggested by the extensive treatment of the same subject in Chrysostom's *De virginitate* (chs. 1-8); there is no example of a similar passage in any earlier treatise on virginity. It is noteworthy that J. has abridged Chrysostom's treatment considerably (for an analogous instance of Hieronymian 'compression' cf. n. on *sponsus in plateis* ... at 25, 3 above); unlike Chrysostom, J. has also packed his own discussion of the subject with arresting formulations that have been appropriated from a variety of other writers (cf. nn. on *quomodo possunt honorare* ... to *turpitudinem vitae* ... below). It is also significant that neither Chrysostom nor anyone else matches the grossness with which J. opens the attack: *scorta sunt aestimanda*. A more vitriolic antithesis to the adjacent *virgines* is inconceivable.

si enim corporis earum auctor est diabolus. The Manichean thought his body the work of the Devil; cf. Filaster 61, 3 (*Manichei ... corpus ... a diabolo factum arbitrantur*; the soul on the other hand is from God [ib. 61, 2]); Ambrose, *fid.* 2, 13, 119; *off.* 1, 25, 117 (*qui dicit diabolo, ut Manichaeus: auctor meus es tu*). In Augustine, *c. Faust.* 20, 15 the Manichean reproaches the Catholic for describing the artifact of demons as God's temple.

quomodo possunt honorare plasticam hostis sui. The sentence provides a good example of J.'s rather asthmatic 'dialectic'.¹⁶ The same point had already been made by Basil in a work against the Manicheans that has not survived; the fragment in question is however preserved by Augustine at *c. Julian.* 1, 5, 17. Here Basil expresses himself with a fullness and subtlety which contrast markedly with the compression of J.'s superficial but striking treatment. It is therefore instructive to cite Basil's argument in its entirety: *si castitas virtus est, corpus vero substantialiter malum esset, impossibile erat castum corpus inveniri; quia corpus turpitudinis virtutis non fieret corpus; cum autem sanctificatur, virtutis efficitur, et ita communicat virtus corpori*

¹⁶ Cf. J.'s criticism of Ambrose in *Didym. spir. proef.*: *nihil ibi dialecticum, nihil virile atque districum, quod lectorem vel ingratis in assensum trahat*. The attack would seem to betray J.'s awareness of the shortcomings of his own dialectical ability.

corpusque virtuti, per quam et templum efficitur dei, unde si omne corpus fornicationis esset, impossibile utique eras castitatem in corporibus inveniri: tumque demum naturae corporum possemus malum substantiale deputare. si vero usque eo corporis merito processerunt tantoque honore decoratum est ac tale indumentum pudicitiae suscepit, ut domus sui factoris esse mereretur ac fieret thalamus filii dei, ut venientes pater et filius habitationem corporum eligere dignarentur, quomodo non execrabilis et ridendus Manichaei sermo convincitur?

J. argues at *adv. Iovin.* 2,6 that Catholic ascetics honour their creator, who accordingly approves of their chastity and fasting; on the other hand this is not the case with Marcion, Tatian and the other heretics whose asceticism constitutes an attack on the creator's works (*ib.* 2,16). Similarly Origen had maintained at *comm. in I Cor.* 37 that Marcionites practise continence in order to thwart their maker, whereas in the church it is done to please him.¹⁷

Plastica had been used to denote God's creation in Tertullian, *cult. fem.* 2,2 l. 43; 2,5 l. 8; *spect.* 18 p. 20,5; Cyprian, *hab. virg.* 15. The form *plastique* goes back to Pliny, *nat.* 34,35. Cf. Hoppe, p. 44.

sciunt virginalē vocabulum gloriosum. On the 'glorious name of virgin' cf. Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 28; Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 1 (ἐχει [sc. ἡ παρθενία] τὸν πρέποντα ἔπαινον ἀπὸ τῆς προσηγορίας τῆς συνονομαζομένης αὐτῆς). Cf. also 13,5 (*sub virginali nomine*) and 38,2 (*habeat sibi gloriam suam*) above. J.'s *vocabulum* was perhaps suggested by Cyprian, *unit. eccl.* 3 (cited in next n. but one); in conjunction with *virginalē* it creates an impressive alliteration.

sub ovium pellibus lupos tegunt. Here commentators (e.g. Microw-Lawler, p. 246, n. 346; Bauer [1983], p. 82, n. 2) merely compare Mt. 7,15 *attendite a falsis prophetis, qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium: intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces*. However exactly the same strikingly concise formulation which J. uses here had already occurred in Lactantius, *inst.* 5,3,23 *vultu lupum sub ovis pelle celare*. The closeness of the phraseology might seem to suggest direct dependence on J.'s part.¹⁸ Similar wording is found later in Chrysostom, *hom. in*

¹⁷ It may be noted further that Gregory Nazianzen (*or.* 14,8) calls his body a friend because of its fashioner, though it is an enemy because of its passions. On the other hand Hilary (*in psalm.* 143,13) wants the virgin to hate her body.

¹⁸ Perrin, pp. 100f., notes that J. has utilized the same section of the *Institutiones* again at *epist.* 70,3,1 (for additional influence cf. Duval [1972], p. 555). While however Perrin's study established that the Hieronymian corpus was substantially indebted to Lactantius, it was unable to demonstrate that J. had anywhere borrowed a specific expression from him. The present passage of the *Libellus* would seem to be one such verbatim debt.

Gen. 2,3 (κρύπτουσιν ἐν τῇ δόρῃ τοῦ προβάτου τὸν λύκον); *serm. in Gen. 7,4*; cf. the Ps.-Chrysostomic *ap. imperf. in Matth.* 19 p. 739 (*si ovium cooperiat pelle ovina*). At *epist.* 147,11,3 J. has *sub vestitu ovium latebas lupus*. Here however he is copying Cyprian, *zel. 12 sub vestitu ovium lupus latitat*.

Christum mentitur antichristus. This very arresting phrase would seem to be an adaptation of Cyprian, *unit. eocl.* 3 *antichristum sub vocabulo Christi* (*mentiuntur* occurs three words later). As in J., the reference is to heretics. J. imitates Cyprian's phrase more closely at *In Ion.* 2,7 l. 285 D. *sub persona Christi mentiantur antichristum* (sc. *haeretici*).¹⁹ On the other hand at *In Am.* 5,25 l. 883 J. repeats with slight modification the wording of the *Libellus*: *Christum imitatur antichristus*.²⁰ Significantly J. would appear to be alone in appropriating this flashy Cyprianic phrase; it is also characteristic that he should redeploy it on a number of occasions. Moreover in the *Libellus* this phrase merely makes precisely the same point as the immediately antecedent phrase: it is therefore noteworthy that J. should have felt obliged to plagiarize from two different authors in order to make the not very remarkable point in question (cf. previous n.).

In the present passage J. has improved his source stylistically: Cyprian's rather diffuse formulation (*adherentes ... antichristum sub vocabulo Christi*) is condensed into a very taut three-word unit (*Christum mentitur antichristus*). Here the participle of the original has been replaced by a finite verb, which is in turn enclosed by a subject and object that reproduce the Cyprianic *adnominatio*, while at the same time heightening the effect considerably through their uncluttered concision. J. has also reversed the order of Cyprian's antithesis, so that *antichristus* now comes after *Christus*. This arrangement produces a tricolon crescens in which each component has one syllable more than the preceding; in addition the element which creates the *adnominatio* (*christu-*) now occupies the very beginning and end of the clause to generate a polyptotic *reditio*. The result of all these modifications is an extremely impressive formulation indeed.

¹⁹ Recognition of the Cyprianic origin of these words makes it possible to correct the translation of them by Duval (1985), pp. 247ff.: 'pour prêter au Christ les propos de l'Antichrist'. The same misinterpretation marks his commentary on this passage (p. 384, n. 7): 'il accuse donc les Origénistes de se parer de l'autorité du Christ en lui faisant tenir des propos en faveur de leurs thèses'. In Cyprian however the heretic is represented as simply using 'the name of Christ' as a mask for Antichrist. The meaning is the same in J.'s commentary on Jonah: here *mentiri* is no more than a synonym for *celare* (on this sense of *mentiri* cf. *TLG* VIII, 779,17ff.).

²⁰ In this passage the formulation is preceded by citation of 2 Cor. 11,14 (*Satanas transfiguratur se in anghram factus*); the same text had also been used immediately before the antithesis in Cyprian.

turpitudinem vitae falso nominis honore convestiunt. J. now makes the same point for the third consecutive time; as on the two previous occasions, he again has recourse to second-hand phraseology in order to do so (cf. preceding 2 nn.). Exactly the same antithesis between the Manicheans' veneration of sanctity and their disgusting manner of life had opened Ambrosiaster's recent excursus on the sect at *in 2 Tim.* 3,7,1²¹ *sanctimonium defendunt* (sc. *Manichei*) *et ... turpiter vivunt*;²² cf. in addition Ps.-Augustine (= Ambrosiaster), *quaest. test.* 127,18 (*sanctimonium enim profitentes latenter immunditiae studetis*; also of the Manicheans). Again J. achieves a more striking formulation; instead of the two clauses of Ambrosiaster's commentary the *Libellus* employs just one, while it also prefers the concision of a nominal form of expression (*turpitudinem vitae*) to Ambrosiaster's verb and adverb (*turpiter vivunt*). Finally J.'s *falso nominis honore* picks up *virginale vocabulum gloriosum* in ll. 3f.

gaude, soror, gaude, filia, gaude, mi virgo. The isocolon is noted by Hritzu, p. 86, who fails to add that Behaghel's law is also observed. J.'s asyndetically anaphoric injunction forms an impressive conclusion to the ch., while at the same time enabling it to end on a personal note after the virulent attack on heretics. J. employs a similar formulation at *tract. in Marc.* p. 357,12 *gaude monache, gaude qui in deserto versaris: quod in templo non invenitur, invenitur foras* (cf. *quod aliae simulant, tu vere esse coepisti*, which forms the sequel in the present passage).

For the string of titles cf. 26,1. *Soror* is again used in address at *epist.* 11,4; 117,2,1; 117,8,1. Tertullian had employed it in *cult. fem.* 1,1 l. 5; 2,1 l. 2; *monog.* 10,3; *virg. vel.* 16,4 (*oro te, sive mater, sive soror, sive filia virgo, secundum annorum nomina dixerim*). *Soror* is again combined with *filia* by Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 1,2 (*venerabilis soror et benedicta filia*); Ruricius, *epist.* 2,15; (Ps.-)Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 3,2,1 (*o virgo Christi, soror ac filia*).

quod aliae simulant. J. repeatedly asserts that the heretic's chastity is a sham: *epist.* 49,8,2 (*simulatae pudicitiae*); *in Os.* 7,13 l. 354; 9,10 l. 270 (*difficile est ... haereticum reperire, qui diligit castitatem; non quod eam praeferre desistat in labiis, sed quod non servet in*

²¹ For J.'s familiarity with Ambrosiaster's commentary on the Pauline epistles at the time of the *Libellus* cf. Vogels, pp. 16ff.

²² Here *defendere* has the sense of 'vindicare, asserere' (for this meaning of the verb cf. *TLI* V, 1, 295,80ff. and 298,14ff.); in the immediately adjacent sentence Ambrosiaster says: *quos constat aliud colere et aliud profiteri, aliud inuis gerere et foris aliud vindicare*. On Manichean *turpinitudo* cf. also Filaster 61,3 (*refundat turpitudinis servantes*).

conscientia, aliud loquens et aliud faciens); in *Am.* 5,21 l. 763; in *Zach.* 8,11 l. 321; in *Math.* 7,15 l. 948; 19,12 l. 812; cf. also in *Math.* 12,43 l. 595. Outside J. the same assertion is found only occasionally: Ambrose, *Noë* 14,49 (*multi sunt haereticorum, qui praetendere volunt corporis continentiam, ut adsertioni suae fidem testimonio sobriae carnis adquirant*); Augustine, *mor. eccl.* 1,2 (*vitae castae et memorabilis continentiae imaginem praeferrunt [sc. Manichaei]*); cf. *conf.* 6,7,12 (*amans in Manichaeis ostentationem continentiae [sc. Alypius] ... erat autem illa ... adumbratae simulataeque virtutis*). In the *Libellus* J. has denounced imposture at 13,5; 14,2; 15,1; 28,2; 29,4.

tu vere esse coepisti. J. adroitly inserts an encouraging compliment before he proceeds to stress the difficulty of the virgin's calling in the next ch.

Chapter 39

J. starts to round off the *Libellus*. He acknowledges that the regimen he has described is not easy. The difficulties it entails can however be overcome if the virgin really loves Christ. Since moreover Christ suffered for us, it is appropriate that we should endure tribulation in return. Scriptural evidence is then adduced to show that the saints have always had to bear ordeals. J. concludes by observing that such brief suffering is amply compensated by the perpetuity of the reward.

39,1

haec omnia, quae digessimus, dura videbuntur ei, qui non amat Christum. The theme of the love of Christ is dealt with almost exclusively by means of scriptural citation. It is picked up again at the beginning of the next ch.; it also concludes the work (p. 211,2ff.). Here the reference to hardness (*dura*) is apt, since Eustochium has twice been described as accustomed to a life of ease (11,1; 31,3).

qui autem omnem saeculi pompam pro purgamento habuerit. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compares Phil. 3,8 *omnia detrimentum feci et arbitror ut stercorea*. J. quotes the verse a further eight times. In four of them he uses *stercus*, while *purgamentum* recurs in three. The verse continues with the clause *ut Christum lucrifaciam*; J. reproduces these words in ll. 10f. (*ut Christum lucrifaciat*).¹ The phrase *saeculi pompa* is repeated at *in eccles.* 1,1 l. 24.

vana duxerit universa sub sole. Klostermann (1911), p. 194, refers to Eccles. 1,14 *vidi quae sunt cuncta sub sole et ecce universa vanitas* (cf. also 2,17 *videntem mala esse universa sub sole et cuncta vanitatem*).

qui conmortuus est domino suo et conresurrexit. Hilberg compares 2 Tim. 2,11 (*nam si conmortui sumus, et convivemus*) and Col. 3,1 (*igitur si conresurrexistis Christo, quae sursum sunt quaerite*). However neither of these texts comes at all close to what J. actually says. A passage of Ambrose's *De virginitate* on the other hand provides an exact parallel: *commoriare cum Christo et cum Christo resurgas* (13,82). The wording is made especially memorable by the very striking chiasmic anadiplosis. The context is the same as in J.: here Ambrose is referring to love of Christ and hatred of the world.

¹ On *pro purgamento* Klostermann (1911), p. 194, also compares 1 Cor. 4,13 *siquam purgamento huius mundi facti sumus*. However J.'s *ut Christum lucrifaciat* shows that *pro purgamento* comes from Phil. 3,8.

Moreover the Ambrosian passage occurs immediately after the play on the *Stichwörter* 'door' and 'window' which has evidently inspired J.'s 26th ch. It would seem therefore that J. is indebted to the *De virginitate* mannered anadiplosis, he inserts a discreet assonance (*con- ... con-*). J. uses the same formulation again some eight years later at *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 14 p. 83,15 *commortui sumus tunc illo moriente et con-resurreximus resurgenti*. Here J. has supplemented the assonance with a twofold *derivatio* (*commortui ... moriente; con-resurreximus resurgenti*). Significantly J. has added this very striking formulation to his original: Origen had made no mention at all of 'resurrection', but had simply said *συνωρεθῆναιμεν αὐτῷ ἀποθνήσκοντι τότε*.

crucifixit carnem cum vitis et concupiscentiis. J. cites Gal. 5,24 on only one further occasion (*adv. Iovin.* 1,38).

libere proclamabit. J. repeats the phrase at *in Eph.* 2,10 p. 471^A and *in Zach. prof.* 1, 11.

quis nos separabit a caritate Christi? J. turns Paul's subjective genitive into an objective one. He cites Rom. 8,35 another half dozen times, on three of which it is linked, as here, to v. 38. This combination was common; cf. Origen, *hom. in Num.* 26,2 p. 245,19; *comm. in Mt.* 13,29 p. 260,23; 14,17 p. 326,31; *comm. ser. in Mt.* 4 p. 8,27; *comm. in Rom.* 5,10 p. 1053^D; Tertullian, *scorp.* 13 p. 175,5; Hilary, *in psalm.* 65,24; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ps.* 65,14; 90,3; Augustine, *in psalm.* 7,14; Chrysostom, *compunct.* 1,8; Mark the Hermit, *opusc.* 4 p. 1009^C. Rom. 8,35 had been included in Cyprian's *testimonia* (3,18 *dilectioni ... Christi nihil praeponendum*); cf. *Fort.* 6.

39,2

dei filius pro nostra salute hominis factus est filius. The description of divine love in Rom. 8,39 (... *a caritate dei, quae est in Christo Iesu domino nostro*; II. 2f.) leads to an extended account of Christ's suffering on behalf of humankind. Such graphic catalogues of the stages of Christ's abasement at his incarnation are found on a number of occasions in Tertullian, who employs them as part of his polemic against heretical views of an incorporeal Christ: *carn.* 4 l. 3; *adv. Marc.* 4,21 p. 490,24; *patient.* 3,2ff. (the final passage is a demonstration of the divine *patientia*). They had also occurred in Melito of Sardis, *new fr.* (Hall) II,6 and Hilary, *trin.* 2,24.² Examples are found later in

² While there is no evidence that J. had any first-hand knowledge of Melito (cf. Sychowski, p. 116), J. was very familiar with Hilary's *De trinitate* (cf. [e.g.] *epist.* 55,3,2; *vir. ill.* 86); its afore-mentioned catalogue enjoyed a certain celebrity (cf. Priscillian, *tract.* 4,79; 6,104; Cassian, *c. Nest.* 7,24,3).

Chrysostom, *hom. in Gen.* 23,6; Augustine, *serm.* 14,9; Peter Chrysologus, *serm.* 158,1; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 10,2; 57,4. Such picturesque enumerations appealed strongly to J., who introduces them again at *epist.* 21,2,5; *virg. Mar.* 18; *tract. in psalm.* I p. 313 l. 71; II p. 410 l. 163. In the present passage J. has produced a catalogue which achieves greater concision than its models in Tertullian and Hilary, while also evincing a gracefully chiasmic structure (... *cruentus egeritur, involvitur pannis, blanditiis deridetur* ...). At the same time he has also lifted several phrases straight from these earlier treatments (cf. nn. on *decem mensibus in utero* ...; *blanditiis deridetur, taceo, quod* ... below).

In the opening clause of the present catalogue *homo* alone would have sufficed: instead J. says *hominis ... filius*, since he cannot resist availing himself of a striking antithesis which would seem to go back to Irenaeus: 3,16,3 (SC 211; *filius dei hominis filius factus*); 3,16,7; 3,17,1; 3,18,3. It had also been widely used by Hilary: *in psalm.* 53,5; 53,8; 54,2; *trin.* 3,16; 10,15; 12,48. Augustine too employs it with particular frequency in his sermons, where he is addressing a popular audience: *serm.* 119,5; 186,2; 191,1; 194,3; 342,5 (cf. also *cons. evang.* 2,3,6; *epist.* 140,12; 238,21; *c. Faust.* 5,4). There are further contemporary instances at Ambrose, *in Luc.* 10,63; Chromatius, *in Math.* 51A,1; Gregory of Elvira, *fid.* 8 l. 118; Gaudentius, *serm.* 19,4; Maximus of Turin 90,1. The antithesis had also occurred in Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 38,2 and 39,13. Somewhat later it is found in Hesychius of Jerusalem (*serm.* [Aubineau 1978] 9,24) and Quodvultdeus (*haer.* 5,6; *c. Iud. pag. Ar.* 10,1).

On occasion the idea underwent expansion: the son of God became the son of man in order to turn us from sons of man into sons of God. This formulation is found at Augustine, *civ.* 21,15 p. 518,11; *epist.* 140,10; *in psalm.* 52,6; *Collectio Ariana, serm.* 1,4; 10,2; cf. Irenaeus 3,19,1 (SC 211). The simple form of the antithesis which occurs in the *Libellus* had already been used by J. in *epist.* 21,2,5; he repeats it later at *epist.* 66,13,1. In the present passage J. has enhanced the effect of this cliché with a very elegant hyperbaton, which in turn generates a double cretic clausula (cf. Herron, pp. 27ff.).

decem mensibus in utero, ut nascatur, expectat. Deléani, p. 77, observes that here J. has borrowed from Tertullian, *patient.* 3,2 *nasci se deus patitur: in utero matris expectat.* It may be noted further that J.'s plagiarism confutes the emendation of this passage of *De patientia* by Kroymann (1906), p. 3,10f., who deleted *expectat* and connected *in utero matris* with the preceding. Fredouille (1984), p. 133, attempts to refute Kroymann's emendation, but without adducing the decisive evidence of J.'s imitation.

In the present passage J. states that Christ was in the womb for ten months; here he has Vergil, *eccl.* 4,61 in mind (*matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses*; cf. next n.). Despite the importance of the Fathers concerning the number of months which Christ spent in the womb: his sojourn there is sometimes said to have lasted for ten months and at other times for nine. For discussion of the evidence cf. Adkin (1994d).

fastidia sustinet. Fremantle, p. 40, compared Vergil, *eccl.* 4,61 *matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses*. Hagendahl (1958) does not recognize J.'s words as an echo of Vergil. It can however be shown that Fremantle was right. Hagendahl (1958), p. 113, does see an allusion to this line of the *Eclogues* in *epist.* 21,2,5 *ut filius dei hominis filius nasceretur, decem mensum fastidia sustineret*.³ This letter was written just before the *Libellus*. The passage in question is the beginning of an enumeration of Christ's humiliations exactly analogous to the one in the *Libellus*: both open with the antithesis *filius dei ... filius hominis*, which is immediately followed in each by a reference to 'ten months' and by the expression *fastidia sustinere*.⁴ Between these two final elements however J. has interposed in the later list a borrowing from Tertullian's *De patientia* (cf. previous n.).⁵ Apart from this insertion the parallelism is exact. It is accordingly evident that the words *fastidia sustinere* in the present passage are just as much inspired by Vergil's *Eclogue* as are the same words in *epist.* 21. At the same time this passage of the *Libellus* provides a very good example of self-imitation. It may be noted that *eccl.* 4,61 is also applied to Mary in Volusianus, *Aug. epist.* 135,2. J. speaks of *fastidia conceptum* at *adv. Iovin.* 1,41.

involvitur pannis. Hilberg fails to note that these words come from Lk. 2,12 *invenietis infantem pannis involutum et positum in praesepio*. In the space of a dozen words J. has accordingly borrowed from one Church Father (cf. n. on *decem mensibus ...*), one pagan poet (cf. previous n.), and scripture. The combination is characteristic: the rhetorical effect is certainly dazzling. J. then proceeds immediately to appropriate a phrase from a different work of the same Father (cf. next n.). The passage in question (*carn.* 4 l. 12) may also have served as a

³ According to Chaffin, p. 16, J. quotes the *Eclogues* in *epist.* 21 'as one still moving freely, if uneasily, in the traditional world'. Chaffin also finds it inconsistent that in the same letter J. should criticize the clergy for reading Vergil. However the inconsistency disappears along with the 'unease' when J.'s allusion is seen as due merely to his perennial search for striking phraseology.

⁴ With this phrase J. is in both passages 'applying to the unborn child what Vergil says about the mother' (Hagendahl [1958], p. 113, n. 3, with reference to *epist.* 21).

⁵ Typically J. thereby 'improves' his earlier formulation.

cue for mention of Christ's swaddling clothes; unlike Tertullian however J. characteristically expresses himself in the language of scripture. *blanditiis deridetur*. This vivid phrase has been lifted straight from Tertullian, *car.* 4 l. 13 *quod pannis dirigitur, quod unctianibus formatur, quod blanditiis deridetur*. Neither *blanditiis deridetur* nor the phrase from *De patientia* which J. borrowed in the previous line would seem to be copied by any other Father.

ille, cuius pugillo mundus includitur, praeseptis continetur angustiis. The impressive paradox with which J. concludes his description of Christ's incarnation can be shown to have been nothing more than a cliché that appealed particularly to the more popular, second-rate writer; for the evidence cf. Adkin (1984e). The cue for J.'s introduction of it here has perhaps come from Hilary, *trin.* 2,25, where it likewise forms part of a catalogue of Christ's humiliations: *qui omnia continet, et intra quem et per quem cuncta sunt, humani partus lege profertur*. The present passage of the *Libellus* couches this banality in characteristically elegant language: the structure is subtly chiasmic (*pugillo ... includitur ... continetur angustiis*; on the double cretic clausula cf. Herron, pp. 27ff.). It is also noteworthy that unlike Hilary J. has recourse to biblical phraseology: the first half of his own formulation echoes Is. 40,12, which in the Old Latin version runs *quis mensus est manu aquam et caelum palma et omnem terram pugillo?* (so Sabatier, II, p. 580).

This is the third cliché that it has been possible to identify in this four-line sentence, which turns out to be a mere string of chestnuts: the first was the antithesis *dei filius / hominis filius* and the second the catalogue of Christ's humiliations. This whole passage accordingly provides a fine example of J.'s technique of 'tesselation'. Weyman (1910), p. 1006, notes that it is quoted by Cassian, *c. Nest.* 7,26,1 *Hieronymus ... in libro ad Eustochium 'dei', inquit, 'filius pro nostra salute hominis factus est filius, decem mensibus in utero ut nascatur expectat, et ille, cuius pugillo mundus includitur, praeseptis continetur angustiis'*. Here Cassian has conveniently reduced the passage to its three constituent clichés. At the same time it is evident that Cassian was enormously impressed by the rhetorical glamour of these lines: immediately before making his abridged quotation he aptly remarks that J.'s writings *per universum mundum quasi divinae lampades rutilant*.⁴

⁴ Cassian is of course thinking mainly of J.'s doctrinal orthodoxy; however the particular wording suggests that he is also acknowledging the brilliance of J.'s style. This is certainly the case with the first author Cassian adduces (ib. 7,24,2): *Hilarius ... eloquentia insignis*.

taceo, quod usque ad tricesimum annum ignobilis parentum paupertate contentus est. Harendza, p. 27, notes this example of *figitur*; J. himself has *crucifigitur* in the following line. He had appropriated another phrase from an earlier section of the same ch. (*patient.* 3,2) in the previous sentence (cf. n. on *decem mensibus ...*). Further wording from this same section of the *De patientia* (3,2; *adultus non gestit agnoscī*) would seem to have inspired J.'s *usque ad tricesimum annum ignobilis* in the present passage. This is accordingly the fourth borrowing from Tertullian in the space of as many lines (for additional echoes cf. next n.).

Christ's poverty is not mentioned in this ch. of Tertullian's *De patientia*. It is in fact a theme which receives less attention from the Fathers than might be expected. J. refers to Christ's indigence again in *epist.* 52,10,2 *cum paupertatem domus suae (sc. ecclesiae) pauper dominus dedicavit*. Several references to 2 Cor. 8,9 (*propter vos egenus factus est, cum esset dives, ut illius inopia vos divites ereris*) occur in *tract. in psalm.*: I p. 18 l. 234; p. 74 l. 1; p. 320 l. 209 etc. Hilary had also noted that Christ was poor: *nasci inops voluit ex virgine: non pecuniam, non agrum, non pecus caelorum dominus elegit (in psalm.* 139,16); as in the present passage of the *Libellus* (and unlike 2 Cor. 8,9, where the reference is quite general), Hilary is here thinking specifically of the poverty of Christ's parents. Their impecuniosity is also mentioned by the following eastern Fathers: Basil, *reg. br.* 262; Ps.-Epiphanius, *hom.* 4 p. 480^A (παρχὴν μητέρα); Chrysostom, *Jud. et gent.* 3 (ἐν οἰκίᾳ τέκτονος ἐτέχθη, ἐν οἰκίᾳ ἀσήμῳ καὶ εὐτελεῖ); Chrysostom, *hom. in Jo.* 53,3; *hom. div.* 8,4; *hom.* (Bickersteth) 6 (Mary could not even afford a lamb).

verberatur et tacet. J.'s *verberatur* would seem to be an echo of Tertullian's arresting *despuitur verberatur deridetur* at *patient.* 3,9 (cf. previous n.; the Gospel accounts do not employ *verberare*). Likewise the detail concerning Christ's silence (*tacet*) is not biblical; it too has evidently been taken by J. from this passage of Tertullian: *non ... aperit os (patient.* 3,7; a paraphrase of Is. 53,7). J.'s reversal of Behaghel's law (*verberatur et tacet*) effectively underlines the sense: Christ says nothing.

crucifigitur et pro crucifigentibus deprecatur. Again J. is borrowing from Tertullian, *patient.* 3,9 *taceo quod figitur* (cf. n. on *taceo quod ...* above). Here too he has refined upon the original by introducing an impressively parallel structure, which is further enhanced by *derivatio* (*crucifigitur / crucifigentibus*; cf. Lausberg, pp. 328f.), *homocoteleuton* (*-itur / -atur*) and observance of Behaghel's law in contrast to the antecedent clause (cf. previous n.).

quid igitur retribuam domino pro omnibus, quae retribuit mihi? calicem salutaris accipiam et nomen domini invocabo. pretiosa in conspectu domini mors sanctorum eius. J. cites verses 3, 4 and 6 of Ps. 115. Here the text is being used as a substitute for argument. It is noteworthy that Hilary had anticipated J. by concluding his own catalogue of Christ's humiliations with exactly the same question, which is found in no other instance of these enumerations: *quid tandem dignum a nobis tantae dignationis affectui rependetur?* (*trin.* 2,25). These words may have given J. his cue; unlike Hilary however he characteristically uses a text of scripture to formulate the same question. The present passage is of course a further example of J.'s habit of combining scriptural quotation with material borrowed from elsewhere (cf. nn. on ll. 3-9).

J. again cites these three verses at *in Mich.* 6,6 l. 218 and *in Matth.* 20,22 l. 1063. The same combination of vv. 3, 4 and 6 had already occurred in Cyprian, *epist.* 76,4,1,⁷ where the reference had been to martyrdom, as in the *Libellus* (the biblical context is simply a thank-offering for recovery). However v. 5 is regularly omitted from the Old Latin version (cf. Sabatier, II, p. 228), while v. 6 is commonly applied to martyrdom (cf. [e.g.] Cyprian, *testim.* 3,16; *Fort.* 12); J. himself again gives it the same reference at *epist.* 109,2,3 and *in Ezech.* 40,35 l. 1010; cf. *tract. in psalm.* II p. 446 l. 186.

haec est sola digna retributio, cum sanguis sanguine compensatur et redempti cruore Christi pro redemptore libenter obcumbimus. The foregoing citation of scripture had been used in place of argument (cf. previous n.). J. now appends an explanatory gloss in order to make the meaning completely explicit. J. is notably fond of stressing that death is the only fit recompense: *epist.* 121,7,6; *in Mich.* 6,6 l. 215 (ib. Ps. 115,3ff.); *tract. in psalm.* I p. 243 l. 91 (on Ps. 115,3; here the wording echoes that of the *Libellus*: *haec est sola retributio digna, pro sanguine sanguinem retribuere ut liberati a salvatore pro salvatore libenter sanguinem fundamus*); cf. *in Matth.* 16,26 l. 183 (ib. Ps. 115,3f.). The same point had been made in Basil, *hom. in Ps.* 33,8.

If the *Tractatus in psalmos* are in fact a reworking of Origen, J. would here be indebted to the text just cited. On the other hand its particular wording is evidently a self-imitation of the present passage: while Origen was notoriously indifferent to stylistic ornament, the language of the *Tractate* marks an improvement even over that of the *Libellus*, since the second clause is now characterized by an elaborately chiasmic paronomasia (*liberati a salvatore pro salvatore libenter*). It is

⁷ Ch. 2.4 of this letter had been extensively imitated by J. in his own *epist.* 14,10,3.

perhaps possible that in the *Libellus* J.'s *sanguis sanguine conpernatur solvit, sanguinem debes at virginis*, 19,127. There has already been one echo of this work in the present ch. (cf. n. on *qui commoritur est ...* at 39,1), while the Ambrosian context is again the same as in J.: Ambrose J.'s formulation is stylistically superior. While Ambrose's sentence is undoubtedly impressive, the strict parallelism renders it syntactically rather monotonous. J. instead employs an arresting polyptoton (*sanguis sanguine*); he also restates the point with a second clause which follows Behaghel's law and contains an elegant *derivatio* (*redempti / redemptore*).

39,4

quis sanctorum sine certamine coronatus est? Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compares 2 Tim. 2,5 *qui certat in agone, non coronatur nisi legitime certaverit*. The point which J. makes here had already occurred in Orsiesius, *doctr.* 42 (*quis enim sanctorum non in luctu atque tristitia per mundi huius transivit viam?*; here too the question had been followed by two examples) and Ambrose, *Cain et Ab.* 1,5,17 (*non ... poterat corona esse sine certamine*); cf. shortly afterwards the latter's *in psalm. 118 serm.* 18,5,3 (*nemo sine certamine coronatur*). At Ps.-Basil, *cons.* p. 1690^B the same question (*quis enim aliquando sanctorum a periculis saeculi potuit esse immunis ac liber?*) is combined with the fate of Abraham's wife in Egypt (p. 1690^B; cf. l. 16 below); the passage is evidently dependent on the *Libellus*.

Abel iustus occiditur. Hilberg compares Gen. 4,8 ἀπέσθη Κάιν ἐπὶ Ἄβελ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέκτεινεν (Vulg. *interfecit*) αὐτόν. In addition Weyman (1910), p. 1007, refers to Mt. 23,35 *a sanguine Abel iusti* (cf. also Heb. 11,4 *testimonium consecutus est esse iustus* [sc. Abel]). Exactly the same wording which J. uses here had occurred in Cyprian, *epist.* 6,2,1 *Abel iustus occiditur*; cf. also *Fort.* 11 (*Abel iustus a fratre primus occiditur*), where Abel's decease had been adduced to show that *ab initio mundi boni laboraverint*.

Abraham uxorem periclitatur amittere. Abraham's tribulations are mentioned in Judith 8,22 *quomodo pater noster Abraham ... per multas tribulationes probatus dei amicus effectus est*. They are usually exemplified by the sacrifice of Isaac. This is the case in *epist.* 38,1; cf. (e.g.) Cyprian, *epist.* 58,5,1; *patient.* 10 (like the *Libellus*, each of these Cyprianic passages also refers to Abel); *testim.* 3,15; Ps.-Cyprian, *laud. mart.* 18. On the other hand Sarah's plight had already been used in

illustration by Hilary at *in psalm.* 127,7 and 138,4;⁸ in both passages her peril was associated with Isaac's sacrifice (for the same combination cf. also [Ps.]-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. 1* [Berthold] 48,4,12 and Ambrose, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 17,23; the first of these texts is probably and the second certainly later than the *Libellus*). Sarah is again linked with Abel by Philip, *in Job rec. long.* 4 p. 627⁰, who is evidently following the *Libellus*. Chrysostom notes that God refrained from instant punishment to let Abraham's patience be seen: *hom. in Gen.* 45,2 (ἵνα καὶ τοῦ δικαίου ἡ ὑπομονὴ ... ἐκλάβῃ); *p. redit.* 2,1. Sarah is a model of chastity at 41,3 below (cf. n. ad loc.).

quaere et invenies. This lively phrase recurs at *in Tit.* 1,2 p. 561^b; *tract. in psalm.* 1 p. 274 l. 54; *hom. Orig. in cant.* 1,8 p. 40,2; *hom. Orig. in Luc.* 6 p. 35,30 (*reperies*). At Origen, *hom. in Jer.* 2,6 (GCS 33; J.'s translation) the reader is told twice (pp. 295,20 and 296,7) that if he looks for examples, he will find them.

solus in delictis Salomon fuit et forsitan ideo corruit. This particular point would not seem to be made elsewhere. J. had referred to Solomon's womanizing at 12,2 above.

quem enim diligit dominus, corripit. J. is inordinately partial to Heb. 12,6 (= LXX Prov. 3,12), which he quotes on no fewer than twenty-six further occasions. It had occurred in Cyprian, *testim.* 3,66 (*disciplinam dei in ecclesiasticis praeceptis observandam*). In the present passage the text acquires a certain piquancy from J.'s immediately antecedent mention of its putative author's downfall (*Salomon ... corruit*).

nonne melius est brevi tempore dimicare, ferre vallum, arma, cibaria, lassescere sub lorica et postea gaudere victorem, quam impatientia unius horae servire perpetuo? The argument which rounds off this ch. is a commonplace. In typical fashion J. has enlivened it by means of an elaborate military metaphor. On *impatientia unius horae* Fremantle, p. 40, compares Mt. 26,40 *non potuistis una hora vigilare?*

Short toil wins lasting glory according to 2 Cor. 4,17. J. repeats the idea in *epist.* 23,3,1; 100,10,1 (Theophilus); 120,1,10. It is also found at Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 7,11 p. 1132^c; Athanasius, *virg.* 24; Ambrose, *in Luc. praef.* 6; *vid.* 6,35; Chrysostom, *hom. div.* 3,1; *Thdr.* 1,10; Pelagius, *epist. ad Demetr.* 28; Augustine, *in psalm. 118 serm.* 23,7; *serm.* 299C,3 coll. *Morin* p. 524,24; Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *carm. app.* 1,44; *Commonitiones s. patrum* 1,4. This is better than brief felicity and then long woe according to Lactantius, *inst.* 6,4,14; (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. 1* (Berthold) 60,3,2; Chrysostom, *hom. in 2 Cor.* 9,3;

⁸ J. had copied out Hilary's commentary on the Psalms with his own hand. cf. *epist.* 5,2,3

Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 208,1. Short-lived gratification is said to earn perpetual torment in Ps.-Cyprian, *laud. mart.* 10; Ps.-Athanasius, *exhort.* 1; Basil, *hom.* 13,8 (= Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 4,14); 18,8; Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 13,34.

Deléani, pp. 76ff., argues that in ch. 39,2–4 of the *Libellus* J. is epitomizing Cyprian's *De bono patientiae*. Such a view would appear to be untenable; cf. Adkin (1997a), pp. 163ff.

Chapter 40

J. continues to urge perseverance. Love of Christ will enable the virgin to overcome every difficulty. The example of St. Paul is also offered as an incentive. There is a brief and rather incongruous castigation of over-nicety in food and drink before the ch. ends with a ringing appeal for violent exertion in order to achieve the virgin's goal.

40,1

nihil amanti durum est, nullus difficilis cupienti labor. J. now picks up the theme of the love of Christ which was developed at some length at the beginning of the previous ch. With J.'s words here Luebeck, p. 133, compared Cicero, *orat.* 33 *sed nihil difficile amanti puto.*¹ However Hagendahl (1958) discounted the alleged reminiscence. The idea in question was certainly a commonplace; cf. Otto, p. 17 s.v. *amare* I, and Häussler, p. 300 (no. 74). To their material can be added Origen, *schol. in Cant.* 8,6 (πάντα ... στέγει, πάντα υπομένει [sc. ἡ ἀγάπη]; in allusion to 1 Cor. 13,7); Rufinus, *Orig. in cant. praef.* p. 74,4 (*nihil ... est, quod non toleret, qui perfecte diligit*; ib. p. 73,30 Jacob and Rachel, as in the present passage); Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 26,2 (κοῦφον τὸ κόμειν ἔρωτι; ib. Gen. 29,20, as here);² Augustine, *c. Iulian. op. imperf.* 2,142 (*laboriosa iustitia nisi amanti*); Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 23,1 (*quicquid non amanti grave est, amanti suave ac leve est*).³

Nonetheless it is perhaps possible to demonstrate that J.'s particular formulation is in fact indebted to the *Orator*. When J. employs a 'proverbial' expression, he can be shown to utilize the specific wording of an author he knows well (cf. footn. 13 to comm. on ch. 29). The phraseology of the *Orator* and of J.'s *Libellus* exhibits a notable similarity: both share an initial *nihil*, a present participle of *amare* in

¹ Luebeck merely juxtaposed the two passages without comment. Westman's edition of the *Orator* (p. 10; ad loc.) also suspected ('fort.') an echo in the *Libellus*.

² The oration was delivered in Constantinople during the first half of 380 (cf. Gallay, p. 252); J. presumably heard it in person, since he was there at the time as Gregory's 'student'.

³ Attention may also be drawn to three passages which make the same point as the *Libellus*, though without recourse to the afore-mentioned 'proverbial' form of expression. Both Athanasius, *virg.* 24 and Evagrius Ponticus, *sent. virg.* 52 state that chastity is hard but that nothing is more delectable than the heavenly bridegroom. Similarly Theodoret says virgins keep his comeliness in mind and find the going easier (*h. rel.* 29 p. 1492^b).

the dative, and the epithet *difficilis*. None of the other examples of the idea hitherto identified presents such a resemblance.

At the same time J. has again improved his source. While retaining the three elements of Cicero's simple and economical formulation (*nihil difficile amanti*), J. has expanded them by the figure of *interpretatio* (cf. *Rhet. Her.* 4,28,38) to create an asyndetic isocolon of great elegance in which each element now contains four words. Cicero's *difficilis* has been relegated to the second clause: J. has also juxtaposed the Ciceronian terms *nihil* and *amanti*, while converting the latter into a plural. *Nihil* is now matched by *nullus ... labor*: J. accordingly achieves the more subtle form of anaphora designated by the rhetoricians as *disiunctio*. An initial alliteration (*nihil ... nullus*) is also maintained, while the formulation *nullus ... labor* makes possible a graceful hyperbaton that enfolds the whole clause. J. also pairs Cicero's *amanti* and *difficile* with his own *cupienti* and *durum* respectively: besides lexical *variatio* the *amantibus* and *cupienti* of the *Libellus* also present a contrast of number. The result of this expansion is a triply chiasmic arrangement which is further enhanced by the alliteration in the neighbouring epithets *durum* and *difficile*: (1) *nihil* (2) *amantibus* (3) *durum ...* (3) *difficilis* (2) *cupienti* (1) *labor*. In addition the first two words of the second clause (*nullus difficilis*) exactly reproduce the syllabic pattern of the corresponding phrase in the first (*nihil amantibus*): in each a disyllable is followed by a word containing four syllables. On the other hand the greater length of the second half of the latter clause *vis à vis* the equivalent section of the antecedent one turns the whole sentence into an elegant exemplification of Behaghel's law. The terminal phrase in question (*cupienti labor*) at the same time replicates the architectonics of the sentence's opening words (*nihil amantibus*), though in reverse sequence: each consists of a four-syllabled dative participle and a disyllabic nominative noun (the concinnity is wrecked by the addition of *est* after *labor* in *PL* 22, p. 124). Ellipse of the verb in the second clause preserves the symmetry with the first in terms of overall number of words. Finally both halves are characterized by a choice clausula: while the first ends with a cretic spondee, the second exhibits a choriamb cretic. J.'s own formulation of this commonplace accordingly evinces a consummate artistry which far surpasses its Ciceronian source. Hritzu, p. 86, merely notes the isocolon.

et servivit, inquit scriptura, Jacob pro Rachel annis septem. et erant in conspectu eius quasi pauci dies, quia amabat illam. J. mentions Jacob's drudgery again in *adv. Pelag.* 1,35; he refers to its semblance of shortness at *in Ezech.* 4,8 l. 1378. Jovinian drew from it an argument in favour of marriage (*adv. Iovin.* 1,5). The text in question here (*Gen.*

29,20) is discussed by Augustine at *quaest. hept.* 1,88 *quaerendum quomodo dictum sit, cum magis etiam breve tempus longum esse soleat amantibus. dictum est ergo propter laborem servitutis, quem facilem et levem amor faciebat.*

in die urebar aestu et gelu nocte. Here Jacob's expostulation to Laban (Gen. 31,40) is strictly irrelevant, though very picturesque. J. quotes it again at *in Ezech.* 27,26^b l. 1352. It had also been paraphrased in Origen, *Cant. praef.* p. 73,30.

amemus et nos Christum. For this homiletic exhortation cf. Chrysostom, *hom. in Ac.* 44,4 (φιλήσωμεν οὖν τὸν Χριστόν); *hom. in Rom.* 5,7; Augustine, *in psalm.* 90, *serm.* 2,13; *serm.* 130,3; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 23,42.

facile videbitur omne difficile. The paronomasia is noted by Harendza, p. 18. One might add that the arrangement of the two terms also generates a species of antithetic *redditio*. At the same time the use of an attributive singular (*omne difficile*) presents an elegant contrast to the ensuing predicative plural (*universa, quae longa sunt*). These two adjacent sentences in fact constitute a fine example of parisonic *interpretatio*.

40,2

brevia putabimus universa, quae longa sunt. The same point had been made by Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 7,4 p. 1108^B.

iaculo illius vulnerati. Cupid's dart is canonized. Such baroquely erotic language naturally had a powerful appeal for J., who again makes Christ wound with his shaft at *epist.* 46,13,4; 65,12,1 (ib. *Cant.* 2,5 *vulnerata caritatis ego*); 107,7,2. The deceased Nepotian does so in *epist.* 60,1,1. Finally the bride of Canticles is 'wounded with a shaft' at *in Abac.* 3,10 l. 746.

heu me, quia peregrinatio mea prolongata est. Here the complaint of Ps. 119,5 (*heu ... prolongata*) is not entirely appropriate, since J. has just given the assurance that what is long will seem short (l. 10). J. had a certain fondness for this text, to which he refers on seven further occasions.

non sunt enim condignae passiones huius mundi ad futuram gloriam, quae revelabitur in nobis. Again scripture becomes a substitute for argument. With Rom. 8,18 reward now replaces love as motive. The text recurs half a dozen times in J.'s works. As in the present passage (cf. ll. 14ff.), it had been combined with Rom. 5,3f. by Tertullian, *scorp.* 13 p. 174,25 (ib. p. 175,16 2 Cor. 11,23; cf. ll. 18ff.

below)⁴ and Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 9,11 p. 1220^A; cf. later Chrysostom, *ep.* 207 and Ps.-Paulinus of Nola, *epist. app.* 1,3. Rom. 8,18 had also been adduced in Cyprian, *testim.* 3,17 (*minora esse quae ... patimur quam ... praemium*); cf. *Fort.* 13.

quia tribulatio patientiam operatur. J. cites Rom. 5,3 another eight times; cf. Cyprian, *testim.* 3,6 (*bonos ... plus laborare ... quia probantur*) and *Fort.* 9.

40,3

Pauli secundam ad Corinthios. For the ellipse of the word 'letter' cf. *epist.* 52,9,3 (*lege Pauli ad Corinthios*); 119,9,4; 119,10,5; 120,9,1; 120,11 *tit.*; 121,11,1; *in Is.* 13,49,8 l. 29; *in Gal.* 3,15 p. 364^C (*ad eandem in secunda*); 5,2 p. 394^C; 6,18 p. 438^C (*ad Corinthios ... prima ... docet*); *in Eph.* 3,13 p. 486^C; *vir. ill.* 5. It is found already in Irenaeus 3,7,1 (SC 211); 3,7,2; 4,28,3 (SC 100**); 4,29,1; 5,7,1 (SC 153); 5,13,3; 5,25,3; Tertullian, *ieiun.* 8 p. 284,9 (*in secunda Corinthiorum*); *praescr.* 33 l. 6; *puhic.* 13 p. 243,2; 14 p. 246,15; 16 p. 252,16; *resurr.* 24,12; 48,12; *uxor.* 2,2 l. 6; Cyprian, *testim.* 2,1; 2,28; 3,1; 3,3 etc.; cf. Origen, *Cels.* 2,65 (*ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ποτῆρα*); 3,47; 5,17 etc.

in laboribus plurimis, in carceribus abundantius, in plagis supra modum, in mortibus frequenter. J. quotes this text (2 Cor. 11,23ff.) again at *in Mich.* 5,5 l. 206 and *in Gal.* 6,17 p. 438^A. It is cited with abbreviations by Basil, *hom. in Ps.* 33,7 and with explanatory comment by Hesychius of Jerusalem, *serm.* (Aubineau [1978]) 13,7. Chrysostom shows a remarkable fondness for quoting the text in full, as J. does in the present passage: *compunct.* 1,9; *ep.* 3,8; *hom. in Gen.* 11,6; 55,3; *hom. in Phil.* 4,1; *hom. in 2 Cor.* 4,13 3,6. The impact of such extended citation of Paul's catalogue of tribulations is of course extremely impressive.

40,4

quis nostrum saltem minimam portionem de catalogo harum sibi potest vindicare virtutum? J. asks a similar question in *epist.* 45,6,3 (*quotam partem angustiarum perpessus sum, qui cruci milito?*); cf. *in Matth.* 14,31 l. 1370 (*quid nobis dicendum est qui huius modicae fidei ne minimam quidem habemus portiunculam?*). J. uses the phrase *ne minimam quidem habemus portiunculam?* again at *epist.* 69,2,1; 79,7,2; *adv. Pelag.* 1,23; *in Ezech.* 18,5 l. 213. Cf. *TLL* III, 590,51ff.

cursum consummavi, fidem servavi superest mihi corona iustitiae, quam retribuet mihi dominus. 2 Tim. 4,7f. recurs in J. a dozen times.

⁴ In addition *scorp.* 13 p. 175,5 cites Rom. 8,35ff. (cf. p. 205,13ff. above)

It had been quoted by Cyprian, *testim.* 3,16 (*de bono martyrii*).

40,5

si cibus insulsior fuerit, contristamur et putamus nos deo praestare beneficium. Food and drink occupy the end of the work, as they had the beginning (cf. chs. 8ff.). Here the mention of the subject is somewhat incongruous; its prominence evidently reflects J.'s own preoccupation. Commentators have failed to observe that the last clause of this sentence echoes Jn. 16,2 *ut ... arbitretur obsequium se praestare deo.*

aquatus. Sc. *vinum*. For the ellipse cf. *Gloss.* II 567,23.

calix frangitur, mensa subvertitur. Cups serve as missiles at *in Tir.* 1,7 p. 566^D (*videas alios pocula in tela vertentes scyphum in faciem iacere convivae*); cf. Ambrose, *Hel.* 12,43 *de ebrietate ad arma consurgitur, calicibus tela succedunt* (for classical examples cf. Nisbet-Hubbard, p. 312). As in the *Libellus*, smashed cups and upturned tables are due to temper in Seneca, *dial.* 3,19,4; cf. Suetonius, *Nero* 47,1.

verbera sonant. Cf. Maximus of Turin 36,3 *ut ... non dubitent ... si forte cum ad reficiendum venit tardius minister adfuerit, statim eum verberibus laniare et prius se satiare servuli sanguine quam convivii voluptate.* On violence at table in general cf. Ambrose, *Hel.* 8,25 (*in ipso convivio ... gemitus vapulantium*); Palladius, v. *Chrys.* 12; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 46,3.

aqua tepidior sanguine vindicatur. Cf. Ambrose, *Hel.* 12,43 *pro vino sanguis effunditur et ipsum sanguinem vina fuderunt.* The *aqua tepidior* in the last clause of J.'s sentence picks up *aquatus* in the first. This elegant ring-composition suggests that Vallarsi's punctuation (followed by [e.g.] Microw-Lawler, p. 178) is wrong: they join *cum aquatus bibimus* to the preceding.

regnum caelorum vim patitur et violenti diripiunt illud. Once again a text of the Bible takes the place of argument. Here it also introduces a fresh topic. By means of Mt. 11,12 J. moves from the culpable violence of the fastidious toper to the commendable violence which gets us into heaven; this particular use of scripture is accordingly related to the technique of the *Stichwort*. It may be noted that the final section of this ch. consists of two striking references to biblical texts (p. 208,18 - 209,1) and two arresting commonplaces (p. 209,2f.).

The interpretation which J. gives to Mt. 11,12 in this passage is in fact a common one. At *in Matth.* 11,12 l. 104 (ad loc.) J. states that great violence is needed to reach heaven from earth and achieve by exertion what nature denies; cf. also *epist.* 121,1,8 (a human being

wants to be an angel) and *tract. in psalm. II* p. 438 l. 151 (he mounts whence they fell; cf. n. on *illuc, unde angeli* ... below). At *in Is.* shows there is a holy violence and desirable rapine according to *in Ezech.* 18,5 l. 359. Mt. 11,12 had a certain appeal for J.: he quotes it nine times altogether.

The violence of Mt. 11,12 is said to be an exercise of virtue at Irenaeus 4,37,7 (SC 100**); Origen, *hom. in Lev.* 4,4 p. 320,7; comm. 15,17; Ambrose, *epist. extra coll.* 14,97; Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 13,26; 23,31; 24,8; 25,5; 34,6; Basil, *hom.* 12,13; Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 4; Chrysostom, *hom. in 2 Tim.* 10,5; *Serm. Caspari* p. 185,8; Epiphanius Latinus, *in ewang.* 19 p. 20,14; cf. Ps.-Athanasius, v. *Syncl.* 69. The violence to which the text refers is done to the self according to Basil, *renunt.* 9 (τὴν τοῦ αἵματος καταπόνησιν); Cassian, *conf.* 24,26,12 (the soul); (Ps.)-Macarius of Egypt, *hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 56,1,3; Hesychius of Jerusalem, *serm.* (Aubineau [1978]) 8,8; *Apophthegmata patrum* 211 (Nau [1908], p. 282); *Vita Melaniae iunioris* 44; *Vitae patrum* 5,7,43. On the other hand it is wrought on one's own perdition in Cassian, *conf.* 24,26,13.

nisi pulsaveris inopportune, panem non accipies sacramenti. Hilberg compares Mt. 7,7ff. However Fremantle, p. 40, was nearer the mark in referring to Lk. 11,5ff.: ... (8) *dico vobis, etsi non dabit illi surgens eo quod amicus eius sit, propter improbitatem tamen eius* (this is the source of J.'s *inopportune*) *surget et dabit illi quotquot habet necessarios* (sc. *panes*). (9) *et ego vobis dico: petite et dabitur vobis; quaerite et invenientis; pulsate et aperietur vobis.* J. exploits this passage in the same striking way at *epist.* 30,13,2 *nostrae deliciae sint ... pulsare ianuam non patentem, panes trinitatis accipere.* The phrase *panis sacramenti* recurs in Philip, *in Iob rec. long.* 42 p. 799^b (*sacramentorum*). Ambrose has *epulae sacramenti* (of the Eucharist) at *in psalm. 118 serm.* 15,28,3.

cum caro cupit esse, quod deus est. On the background to this idea cf. Gross; Capanaga. In the present passage it has no metaphysical depth; J. is merely employing an impressive and widely used topos in order to provide the ch. with an effective conclusion. Humans had also been 'gods' in 4,4 above: there the idea had merely subserved an adroit collocation of biblical texts.

At *in Gal.* 4,12 p. 379^b J. says that God became a man to let men become gods. The same idea is found at Hilary, *in Matth.* 5,15; *trin.* 1,33; 2,25; 9,4; 10,7; Athanasius, *fr. Lc.* p. 1396^a; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 1,5; 30,14; 30,21; 40,45; *carm.* 1,1,10,5f.; 1,1,11,9; 1,2,14,92; 2,1,1,16; Maximus of Turin 45,1. A variant is for the Word to be made

flesh, so that flesh could be made God: Ambrose, *virg.* 1,3,11; Gaudentius, *serm.* 19,37; cf. Tyconius, *reg.* 1 p. 7,11.

The following examples in which a man becomes God can be added to those given by Gross: Origen, *hom. in Lc.* 29 p. 171,15; Asterius the Sophist, *hom.* (Richard) 16,13; Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 2,22; 2,73; 7,22; 7,23; 17,9 (no effort is required); 25,2; 33,15; 39,17; *carm.* 1,1,2,48; 1,1,3,4; 1,2,1,210; 1,2,14,92; 1,2,33,222; Gregory of Nyssa, *beat.* 5 p. 1249^B; *or. dom.* 5 p. 1180^A; cf. also Hilary, *in psalm.* 2,47; Maximus of Turin 81,3. The transformation is due to virginity according to Basil of Ancyra, *virg.* 2 and Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 1. It is the effect of the desert at Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 3,1.

Chrysostom is critical in *res. mort.* 7: many people imagine they are godlike and make a fuss about it. When later on J. is polemicizing against the Pelagians, he considers it downright mad to say a man is the same as God (*adv. Pelag. praef.* 2; cf. *epist.* 133,8,1). The alliteration in the present passage (*cum caro cupit*) is noted by Hritzu, p. 42.

illuc, unde angeli corruerunt, angelos iudicatura conscendere. The climax of the ch. is another commonplace. The same statement is found at *tract. in psalm.* 11 p. 438 l. 153 *ut unde angeli corruerunt, homines ascendant.* There too it is immediately preceded by citation of Mt. 11,12 (cf. p. 208,18f. above); if therefore this *Tractate* is by Origen, it has evidently been J.'s source in the present passage.

At the same time the idea which J. uses here had occurred on a number of occasions elsewhere. At *hom. in Ezech.* 13,2 p. 444,15 Origen had assured his audience that they would take the fallen angels' place: *audebo aliquid sacratius dicere: in locum angelorum qui ruerunt, tu ascensurus es*; cf. *hom. in Jos.* 1,6 p. 294,14 *locum Luciferi accipere merebor in coelis.* In Athanasius, *v. Anton.* 22 the demons had been said to hinder us from ascending to heaven ἵνα μὴ ὄθην ἐξέπεσον αὐτοὶ ἀνέλθωμεν ἡμεῖς. In particular Ambrose had made the virgin pass into heaven through chastity just as the angels fell from it through intemperance (*virg.* 1,8,53). J. himself says at *in Is.* 6,14,12 l. 14 that people ascend by humility whence Lucifer fell through pride; cf. Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra (= Evagrius Ponticus), *spir. mal.* 18. According to *Passio Pauli* 11 the demons know that human beings will ascend through grace whence they themselves have fallen through their pride.

On *angelos iudicatura* in the present passage Klostermann (1911), p. 194, compares 1 Cor. 6,3 *nescitis quoniam angelos iudicabimus?* The virgin had been told that she would judge angels at Athanasius, *Sermon on virginity* (Casey), p. 1043. J. does not refer to the text again. The allusion to it here produces a very effective polyptoton to round off the ch.

Chapter 41

The closing ch. of the *Libellus* describes the virgin's final reward. J. evokes her reception in heaven by Christ himself, by Mary and by a host of other saints. The impact of this very impressive scene is heightened by lavish citation of scripture: the tableau accordingly provides a magnificent climax to the work. J. then concludes the ch. with an exhortation to counter the temptations of worldliness by reflection on this future state.

41,1

egredere, quaeso, paulisper e corpore. Six years earlier Ambrose had concluded his *De excessu fratris Satyri* in the same way by saying that the mind should 'leave the body' (2,132). The idea is biblical; cf. 2 Cor. 5,8 *audemus ... magis peregrinari a corpore et praesentes esse ad deum*. Elsewhere in J. 'leaving the body' is a synonym for death: *epist.* 23,1,1; 39,3,1; cf. *TLL* V,2, 284,83f. and 1363,23ff. It is recommended as an ascetic exercise by Ambrose, *Isaac* 5,47 and 6,52. Virginity itself is a quitting of the body according to Gregory Nazianzen, *carm.* 1,2,34,176 ἡ παρθενεῖα δ' ἐκβάσις τοῦ σώματος; cf. Cassian, *inst.* 6,6. Leaving the body had been a prerequisite for discourse on God in Basil, *hom.* 15,1 σὺ δέ, εἰ βούλει περὶ θεοῦ λέγειν τι ἢ ἀκοῦειν, ἄφεξ τὸ σῶμα σεαυτοῦ. Origen had used the idea at *comm. ser. in Mt.* 139 p. 288,9 to give a fanciful interpretation of the opening of the graves in Mt. 27,53: *corpora ... videntur a seipsis exire*. On the present passage of the *Libellus* Simon, I, p. 171, rightly remarks that 'man wird es jedoch nicht wagen, dies als eine Aufforderung zur Ekstase zu erklären': it is clear from the foregoing that the idea was merely a commonplace.

praesentis laboris ante oculos tuos pinge mercedem. A similar exhortation had occurred in Ps.-Cyprian, *laud. mart.* 11 *ante oculos tibi quoque concurrant ... oblata ... praemia*. The treatise had ended as follows: *pro ... arbitrio mentis humanae ante oculos et aspectum divinum illud mihi et insigne concurrat: videor inquam mihi iam cernere ut ille verus nobilis numerus Christi sui gloriam iterque comitetur ...* (ib. 30). The same combination of 'toil' and 'reward' which J. employs here to conclude the *Libellus* had similarly occurred near the end of Cyprian's *De habitu virginum*: *si praemium pollicitationis attendas, minus est quod laboras* (21). J.'s own wording is imitated by (Ps.)-Caesarius of Arles, *epist. ad virg.* 1,5 p. 134,2 (*praesentis iniuriae futuram mercedem ante oculos pinge*). The

hyperbaton of the present passage is noted by Hritzu, p. 79. Though J.'s formulation is undoubtedly impressive, this injunction to the virgin to set the reward 'before her eyes' involves a slight but characteristic inconsistency with both the immediately antecedent command to 'step out of the body' (cf. previous n.) and the directly succeeding affirmation that 'eye has not seen it' (cf. next n.).

quam nec oculus vidit nec auris audivit nec in cor hominis ascendit. 1 Cor. 2,9 appealed strongly to J., who cites it fifteen times. Here however the text would appear to have been suggested by Tertullian, *spect.* 30 p. 29,23: J. had already imitated this ch. of the Tertullianic treatise at *epist.* 14,11 (cf. next n. and n. on *tunc Thecla* ... at 41,2 below). In the present passage there is a slight inconcinnity between *nec oculus vidit* and the *ante oculos tuos* which comes directly before it (cf. also previous n.).

qualis erit illa dies. Deléani, p. 68, affirms that J.'s *illa dies* has been inspired by Cyprian, *mortal.* 26 *amplectamur diem qui adsignat singulos domicilio suo*. It would seem however that the *illa dies* of the *Libellus* is in fact a case of self-imitation from the similar evocation of the Day of Judgment which concludes J.'s 14th letter: *veniet, veniet illa dies* (*epist.* 14,11,1). In both Hieronymian passages the phrase *illa dies* opens the description. Its occurrence in the earlier one would appear to have been suggested in turn by Tertullian's evocation of the same scene at *spect.* 30 p. 28,17 *ille ultimus et perpetuus iudicii dies* (J.'s debt to this ch. of the *De spectaculis* at *epist.* 14,11,2 is already noted by Hilberg ad loc.). The *qualis* of the *Libellus* would also seem to have come from the same Tertullianic text: *quale ... quale ... qualis ... ille ... dies* (*spect.* 30 p. 28,13).

cum tibi Maria, mater domini, choris occurret comitata virginels. According to Neumann, pp. 58f., and Duval (1974a), p. 65, n. 271, J. is copying Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,16f. in his description of the virgin's heavenly reception (41,1-3). Ambrose himself is dependent on Athanasius' treatment of the same theme in *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 64, ll. 11-35 (cf. Duval [1974a], pp. 48f.). Duval suggests that J. on the other hand was unfamiliar with Athanasius' *Letter* when he produced the *Libellus* (ib. p. 65 and n. 271). It would seem however that he has utilized both it and Ambrose's *De virginibus* in this ch. (cf. n. on *tunc et alius castitatis chorus* ... at 41,3 below). Again J. has improved on his models. Whereas Athanasius and Ambrose had dealt with the theme in general terms, J. makes it refer exclusively to Eustochium. Moreover while his predecessors had tucked the topic away in the middle of their respective works, J. turns it into a marvellously effective grand finale.

Mary had welcomed the deceased virgin at both Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,16 (*o quantis illa [sc. Maria] virginibus occurret*) and Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 64, l. 11 ('O combien de vierges recommandées pour émulation at 38,3 above. At *epist.* 39,7,1 J. makes Blesilla say she is with Mary in heaven. In the present passage *choris ... virginibus* would seem to have been suggested by *choros virginales* at Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,17; there the phrase is used with reference to Miriam in a context which J. imitates in the following clause (cf. next n.).¹ J. repeats his formulation here (*choris ... comitata virginibus*) twenty years later in *epist.* 108,31,2. On 'choirs of virgins' cf. further Wilpert, pp. 80ff.; Neumann, pp. 51ff.; *TLL* III, 1025,64f.

cum post Rubrum Mare et submersum cum suo exercitu Pharaonem tympanum tenens praecinet responsuris. Miriam with her timbrel had celebrated the virgin's arrival in heaven at Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,17 *tunc etiam Maria tympanum sumens choros virginales citabit cantantes domino, quod per mare saeculi sine saecularibus fluctibus transierunt.* In *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 64, l. 26 Athanasius had merely said that virginity's triumph recalled Miriam: 'Alors ensuite, comme autrefois, sur la mer, Mariham s'avança devant les femmes munie d'un tambourin, de même en sera-t-il dans le royaume des cieux: la virginité comme chef marchera en avant avec une grande assurance, et toutes formeront un seul choeur et une seule symphonie dans la foi ...'. In the present passage of the *Libellus* J. is evidently following Ambrose rather than Athanasius. However while both his predecessors had kept Miriam and Mary separate (cf. previous n.), J. boldly combines the two: in the *Libellus* the Lord's mother is described in terms borrowed from her Old Testament namesake (*Maria*). J.'s conflation of these two figures is appropriate, since Miriam was identified as a type of Mary; cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *virg.* 19. J. has no fewer than eight further references to the song of Miriam. At *epist.* 54,13,5 it is placed in the mouth of Eustochium (for this identification cf. Antin [1961a], pp. 1715f.). Ambrose himself applies it to the virgin at *exhort. virg.* 7,47.

Miriam's song celebrates the crossing of the Red Sea and the destruction of Pharaoh's army. Whereas Athanasius had barely referred to the circumstances ('sur la mer') and Ambrose had employed a rather frigid conceit (*per mare saeculi sine saecularibus fluctibus*), J.

¹ On the other hand Deléani, p. 68, asserts that J.'s *choris ... virginibus* has been inspired by Cyprian, *monit.* 26 *illuc apostolorum gloriosus chorus illic ... triumphans virginibus*. It must however be said that the Cyprianic chorus consists of apostles, not virgins; moreover this term is separated from *triumphans virginibus* by two lines of text.

typically introduces biblical detail that is very vivid and concrete; *post Rubrum Mare et submersum cum suo exercitu Pharaonem*. J. refers to the episode on nine further occasions. Sometimes the use he makes of it is largely picturesque: at *in Ioel prof.* l. 36 J. 'crossed the Red Sea' in his commentary on Hosea. Marcella is said to cross the Red Sea of this world at *in Gal. prof.* p. 307^A. The sea is baptism in *epist.* 69,6,4; 78,7,2; *adv. Iovin.* 1,11. At *tract. in psalm.* l p. 195 l. 91 Pharaoh is the Devil, his army demons and the sea baptism. Origen had identified Pharaoh with the Devil at *fr. in Ezech.* 30,25. Pharaoh is the Devil and Egypt the world according to Cyprian, *Fort.* 7; Gregory of Elvira, *in cant.* 2,25; Ps.-Origen (= Gregory of Elvira), *tract.* 7,3; 9,16. He was the ungodly and voluptuous temperament in Philo, *leg. all.* 3,212; cf. *ebr.* 111 (the boastful mind). Cf. further Wessel, pp. 376ff.

cantemus domino; gloriose enim magnificatus est. equum et ascensorem protegit in mare. Unlike Ambrose and Athanasius (cf. previous n.), J. characteristically inserts a direct quotation of scripture (Exod. 15,21; not 15,1, as Hilberg). Biblical citation in fact permeates the whole of this passage; in Ambrose and Athanasius on the other hand it is used very sparingly and reserved to the end. J. is highly partial to this verse of Exod., which he cites sixteen times elsewhere. According to Philo, *agric.* 83 the horses were passions and vices, while the rider was the mind that hates virtue; cf. *ebr.* 111.

41,2

tunc Thecla in tuos laeta volabit amplexus. J. now begins a very impressive sevenfold anaphora of *tunc* which runs right through his description of Eustochium's heavenly reception (41,2-4). A fourfold and twofold anaphora of the same word had occurred in the parallel descriptions at Tertullian, *spect.* 30 p. 29,6 and Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,17 respectively; for J.'s debt to these two passages in the present section of the *Libellus* cf. nn. on *quam nec oculus ...* and *cum tibi Maria ...* at 41,1 above. J. begins with Thecla: she had been mentioned by Ambrose in the immediately succeeding passage (*virg.* 2,3,19).²

² According to Delciani, p. 68, J.'s use of *laeta* and *amplexus* in this sentence is due to Cyprian, *moral.* 26 *ad horum conspectum et complexum venire quanta et illis et nobis in commune laetitia est.* The point may however be made that in Cyprian it is only the relatives of the ordinary Christian who do the greeting. A more likely source for J.'s combination of embraces and joy in the virgin's reception by the celebrities of heaven would seem to be Athanasius' depiction of exactly the same event in the aforementioned *Letter to virgins* (for J.'s indebtedness to this Athanasian description in the present ch. of the *Libellus* cf. n. on *tunc et alius caritatis chorus ...* at 41,3 below). In the Athanasian account one reads in adjacent lines: 'Comme elle (sc. Marie) les embrassera ... Quelle joie parmi les anges' (Lefon [1955], p. 64, l. 11).

Virgins talked a great deal about Thecla according to Gregory of Nyssa, v. *Macr.* 2³ (ἐκείνης Θεέκλης, ἧς πολὺς ἐν ταῖς παρθένοις ὁ λόγος). They had been told to copy her in Anon., *περὶ παρθενοίας* 1045. Isidore of Pelusium refers to her as τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν γυναικείων νικῶν καὶ τροπαίων ἢ πανεύφημος Θεέκλα, στήλη αἰώνιος Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 11, while according to Ps.-Athanasius, v. *Syncl.* 8 the name of Thecla in Jerusalem (*chron. a. Abr.* 2390). As in the present passage, Thecla regularly appears in distinguished company. She is mentioned together with Mary and Miriam (Ps.-Athanasius, *pat.* 7), with Mary and Agnes (Sulpicius Severus, *dial.* 2,13,5; Ps.-Ambrose, *laps. virg.* 10), with Agnes and Pelagia (Ambrose, *epist.* 2,7,36), with Susanna (Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 24,10; *carm.* 1,2,2,190) and with John, Peter, Paul, James, Stephen, Luke and Andrew (Gregory Nazianzen, *or.* 4,69). Epiphanius associates her with Moses and the daughters of Philip (*haer.* 78,16,7) and with Elijah and St. John (*ib.* 79,5,2). On the other hand J. notes at *vir. ill.* 7 that the 'Wanderings' of Paul and Thecla are apocryphal. As in the present passage of the *Libellus*, saints again embrace the deceased in Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 20 l. 552 *omne sanctorum agmen in tuis miscetur amplexibus*.

tunc et ipse sponsus occurret et dicet. Christ had met the virgin on her arrival in heaven at both Athanasius, *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 64, l. 14 ('Comme le Seigneur les recommandera à son père en les voyant!') and Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,16 (*quemadmodum eas ipse dominus commendabit patri*). As well as having Christ introduce the virgin to God, both had made Mary present her to Christ. J. abandons this progressive movement and prefers instead a string of distinct encounters which creates a very effective crescendo. Athanasius and Ambrose had also given Christ a short speech ('et dixit: "Toutes celles-ci furent et sont comme Marie qui est mienne ..."; *αὐτὴν ἰδὼν illud ei furent et sunt comme Marie qui est mienne ...*). J. on *repetens suum*: 'Pater sancte, istae sunt, quas custodivi tibi ...'. J. on the other hand predictably puts into his mouth a direct and very picturesque quotation of scripture (cf. next n.). Mention of the *sponsus* is particularly appropriate in this final ch., since in the opening one the bridegroom had led Eustochium into his chamber (1,5) and in the same middle of the work (26,2) he had come and knocked. J. follows Ambrose and Athanasius in placing Christ after Mary in the reception-scene.

³ For Macrina and Thecla cf. Albrecht (1984).

Christ again runs to meet us after death in *epist.* 39,3,2; cf. later Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 1,3 (where martyrs, prophets, apostles, angels and archangels also participate) and Hilary of Arles, *vita Honorat.* 141. 12. In the final ch. of Pelagius' *epist. ad Demetr.* (30) the virgin flies up to meet her spouse in company with her fellows. Similarly Ambrose finishes *inst. virg.* by petitioning Jesus to receive the virgin (17,114) *egredere itaque tu, domine Iesu, in die sponsalium tuorum, suscipe iam dudum devotam tibi spiritu ...*

surge, veni, proxima mea, speciosa mea, columba mea, quia ecce hiemps transit, pluvia abiit sibi. This charming text (Cant. 2,10f.) recurs eight times in J. At *epist.* 18B,4,3 the winter of temptation was meant (in Nilus of Ancyra, *ep.* 2,282 the reference is to incontinence). The expiring Paula heard Christ calling with this verse (*epist.* 108,28,3). It is also cited by Ambrose at *inst. virg.* 1,3. When Christ's bride reaches heaven at *adv. Pelag.* 3,13, J. makes him quote Cant. 4,7 to her instead: *tota pulchra es, amica mea ...*

tunc angeli mirabuntur et dicent. Cf. Athanasius, *Letter to virgin* (Lefort [1955]) p. 64, l. 12 ('Quelle joie parmi les anges en voyant l'image de leur pureté dans les corps des vierges!') and Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,17 (*quanta angelorum laetitia plaudentium, quod habitare mereatur in caelo quae caelestem vitam vixit in saeculo*). Again J. replaces Ambrose's rather insipid conceit with a biblical text that is put in the mouths of the angels (cf. next n.).

Already Methodius records the tradition that angels greet and escort the virgin: ἄμα ... τῷ καταλείψει τὸν κόσμον τὰς ψυχὰς λόγος ταῖς παρθένους ὑπαντῶντας ἀγγέλους μετὰ πολλῆς εὐφρομίας ... παραπέμπειν (*sympr.* 8,2,175). The scene is described in *Vita Melaniae iunioris* 70 χαίροντες δὲ οἱ ἅγιοι ἄγγελοι αὐτὴν προσεδέξαντο. Chrysostom assures his hearer at *hom. in Phil.* 12,2 that if he enters heaven victorious, the angels will pay him honour (αἰδεσθήσονται). Ambrose again describes (*epist.* 7,51,8) how the angels are glad to welcome a newcomer of distinction (*in ... sanctorum angelorum laetitia, qui ad se tantum virum transisse gratulabantur*), while they are also said to rejoice on our entry into heaven at Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 1,3. J. makes a band of angels meet the dead in *epist.* 23,3,1 and 39,3,2; cf. also Eucherius, *laud. her.* 23 and Ps.-Basil, *ad fil.* 20 l. 551. Examples of *angeli psychopompi* are given by Waszink (1947), p. 546, and Nock.

quae est ista prospiciens quasi diluculum, speciosa ut luna, electa ut sol? J. quotes Cant. 6,9 (= LXX 6,10) again only at *in Is.* 18,66,22 l. 46.

videbunt te filiae et laudabunt te reginae et concubinae te praedicabunt. J. paraphrases Cant. 6,8 (= LXX 6,9). This appealing

detail is absent from the description of the virgin's celestial welcome in Athanasius and Ambrose (cf. n. on *cum tibi Maria ...* at 41,1 above); J. of Cant. in this passage (pp. 209,13 – 210,1) in fact imparts a delightfully intimate and winsome tone to the conclusion of the work (cf. also pp. 210,19 – 211,4). It also balances the equally extensive citation of Cant. in the opening and central chs. (1 and 24–6).

J. cites Cant. 6,8 again in *epist.* 65,20,3, where (ib. 4) he identifies the 'queens' as those who have 'gone beyond the six days of the world' and yearn for the future kingdom, while the 'concubines' are people who already 'possess the circumcision of the eighth day, but have not yet reached marriage' (for J.'s meaning cf. Cola, II, pp. 237f., nn. 28f.). Methodius had made the concubines the souls of prophets after the flood, while the queens were the souls of those before it (*symp.* 7,4,159). Epiphanius makes the queens the generations up to Christ (*exp. fid.* 5,1) and the concubines heresies (ib. 8,4). Finally at *divers. quaest.* 55 Augustine thinks that the queens are souls which rule in intelligible and spiritual things, whereas the concubines receive the reward of things earthly.

J.'s quotation of the text at *epist.* 65,20,3 (*viderunt eam filiae et beatificant eam reginae et concubinae et laudant eam*) might seem to suggest that in the present passage of the *Libellus* an *et* should be inserted after *concubinae*; it is in fact found in some MSS.

41,3

tunc et alius castitatis chorus occurret: Sarra cum nuptis veniet. Sarah had also figured in Athanasius' account of the heavenly reception in *Letter to virgins* (Lefort [1955]) p. 64, l. 17 'O combien de femmes viendront à leur rencontre! Sara, Rebecca, Rachel, Lia, Suzanne, Elisabeth; et surtout les femmes qui veillèrent sur la décence du mariage'. Athanasius had inserted this list of married women because in the preceding section he had been at pains to show that marriage too is a blessed state. Ambrose on the other hand had left it out (cf. Duval [1974a], pp. 49f.). It would appear that J. has now taken over the first item in Athanasius' catalogue: Sarah thus becomes the leader of a group of married women who greet Eustochium.

The phrase *castitatis chorus* which J. employs here would also appear to have been inspired by this same passage of Athanasius: *castitatis* evidently echoes the 'décence' of the *Letter*, which also speaks shortly afterwards of a 'choeur' (p. 64, l. 30).⁴ In this connection

⁴ There is no warrant for the view of Deltani, p. 68, that J.'s wording is instead due to the *apostolorum ... chorus and triumphantis virgines* of Cyprian, *monit.* 26.

it may be noted that the Fathers were exercised by the problem of explaining how Sarah could have escaped defilement when Pharaoh took her as a concubine in the belief that she was Abraham's sister. J. himself has mentioned this episode just two chs. earlier: *Abraham uxorem periclitatur amittere* (39,4). At *quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 20,20 he argues that Sarah was not to blame: *corpus sanctarum mulierum non vis maculet, sed voluntas*; however he also attempts to uphold Sarah's chastity by referring to Esther's wait of a year. The latter explanation is adopted by Augustine at *quaest. hept.* 1,26; he deals more fully with the matter at *quaest. Dulc.* 7,1-4 (*qualiter satisfaciendum sit his qui dicunt Sarram stuprum non effugisse*). Eusebius of Emesa had dismissed the charge by reference to the similar story concerning Abimelech (*fr. Gen.* 12,17). Ambrose goes so far as to make Sarah's adventure a triumph of chastity (*spir.* 3,6,42); similarly Chrysostom says that God deliberately postponed Pharaoh's chastisement in order to demonstrate Sarah's virtue (*p. redit.* 2,1). Several passages speak of Sarah as a paragon of morality: Epiphanius, *anc.* 109,6; Ps.-Epiphanius, *num. myst.* 3; Chrysostom, *hom. in Is.* 6,1 4,3; Ps.-Chrysostom, *hom. in Gen.* 3,4. It is nonetheless worthy of note that, while Mary and Anna are the standard models for virgins and widows respectively, not Sarah but Susanna is regularly recommended for imitation by married women: Augustine, *serm.* 96,10; 196,2; 391,6 (the most concise formulation: *nuptae Susannam, viduae Annam, virgines Mariam cogitate*); Quodvultdeus, *catacl.* 6,22; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 6,7. In Athanasius Sarah had of course been grouped together with five others.

filia Phanuelis Anna cum viduis. To Sarah (cf. previous n.) J. adds Anna at the head of a band of widows. Anna had not figured in Athanasius or Ambrose: her inclusion is evidently J.'s own innovation. However it is perhaps possible that J. has taken a hint from Athanasius, who five lines after his mention of Sarah's group had remarked: 'Comme Marie les recommandera à sa mère!' (*Letter to virgins* [Lefort 1955] p. 64, l. 24). Mary's mother also of course bore the name Anna.

Anna is with Blesilla in heaven at *epist.* 39,7,2. The widow is told to imitate her example in *epist.* 79,11,3. J. also mentions her at *epist.* 7,6,2; 54,16,1; 54,18,2; 65,1,5; 123,1,2; 127,2,2; 130,4,2; *adv. Iovin.* 1,32; 2,15. Anna is the type and ideal of widowhood in the following passages: Augustine, *serm.* 96,10; 196,2; 391,6; Quodvultdeus, *catacl.* 6,22; Caesarius of Arles, *serm.* 6,7. Anna and Sarah will be with the reader on Judgment Day according to Arnobius Junior, *ad Greg.* 2 p. 387,18.

erunt ut in diversis gregibus, carnis et spiritus, matres tuae. The presence of Sarah and Anna among those who welcome Eustochium in heaven (cf. previous two nn.) serves a very important purpose: it now

enables J. to introduce the two women who had played the most significant role in Eustochium's upbringing. The first is her mother Paula. The second is her spiritual mentor Marcella (cf. *epist.* 127,5,2 *in Auius* [sc. *Marcellae*] *nutrita cubiculo Eustochium*). Both were widows: Paula had lost her husband recently,⁵ while Marcella had been widowed for the last quarter of a century.

In making Eustochium's spiritual and natural mothers part of the celestial reception J. would again seem to be following a cue from Athanasius. Just five lines after the passage dealing with Sarah Athanasius had continued: 'Comme les anges prieront pour les parents de celles-là parce que leurs filles marchèrent d'après l'image de leur pureté' (*Letter to virgins* [Lefort 1955] p. 64, l. 24). This sentence found a brief echo in Ambrose, *virg.* 2,2,16 *haec parentes redimat*. J. however exploits it to very good effect: while inclusion of Paula and Marcella gives a charmingly personal touch to the traditional theme of the entry into heaven, association with such august figures of the Bible as Sarah and Anna is at the same time extremely effective flattery of these two noble Roman ladies, on whose patronage J. depended. It is all the more telling inasmuch as it occurs at the very climax of the work.⁶

J. does not mention Paula and Marcella by name; instead they are introduced very strikingly and with great economy by means of the impressively polar antonomasia *carnis et spiritus matres tuae*: the genitive *carnis et spiritus* is evidently to be construed ἀνὸ κοινού with both *gregibus* and *matres*. J. is very fond of applying the antithesis 'flesh / spirit' to domestic relationships. He does so again at *epist.* 60,7,3; *in Os. prol.* l. 131; *tract. in Marc.* p. 320,4; *tract.* p. 505 l. 108. Elsewhere such usage is rare; for an example cf. *Apophthegmata patrum* p. 432^A ἔχων καὶ πατέρα τὸν αὐτὸν σαρκικὸν ἄμα καὶ πνευματικόν. On spiritual parenthood in general cf. Emonds, p. 52 (for additional examples of the pupil as offspring cf. Origen, *ser. in Ezech.* 5,8 and *exp. in Pr.* 5,18). Marcella is again called 'mother' in *epist.* 46,13,2; cf. 46,1,1 (*magistram*). Cf. also *epist.* 23,2,2 (*mater virginum* [sc. *Lea*]) and (e.g.) *Vita Melaniae iunioris* 58 (πνευματικὴν μητέρα); Chrysostom, *catech.* (Wenger) 4,1; Amphilochius of Iconium, *exerc.* 7 (in the last two passages the 'spiritual mother' is the church, while the final passage also makes the baptizing priest the father and adduces 1 Cor. 4,15; Gal. 4,19; Heb. 2,13).

laetabitur illa, quod genuit; exultabit ista, quod docuit. J.'s flattery of Paula and Marcella (cf. previous n.) is further enhanced by a biblical

⁵ Paula's husband had died in 381 according to Nautin (1972), pp. 217f.
⁶ J. thereby belies the affirmation he makes at the start of the treatise: *nullo in hoc libello adulatio* (2,2).

reminiscence; cf. Prov. 23,24f. (Vulg.; Sabatier, II, p. 333, does not provide an Old Latin version) *exultat gaudio pater iusti: qui sapientem genuit, laetabitur in eo. (25) gaudeat pater tuus et mater tua et exulet quae genuit te*. The echo has not been registered by previous commentators. The elegant isocolon of J.'s formulation is noted by both Harendza, p. 42, and Hritzu, p. 86. The theme of the mother's joy had occurred in the middle of the work (20,1 *nonne et laboris sui fruge laetabitur?*); it is now picked up at the end.

tunc vere super asinam dominus ascendet et caelestem ingredietur Hierusalem. J. now improves on Athanasius and Ambrose (cf. n. on *cum tibi Maria ...* at 41,1 above) by associating the virgin's entry into heaven with Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem. On *vere* cf. n. on *praecessit umbra, nunc veritas est* at 23,3. 'Truth' had been placed in heaven by Origen (*hom. in Jos.* 17,1 p. 400,18; *ib. Heb.* 8,5 *qui ... umbrae deserviunt caelestium*), while Ambrose (*off.* 1,48,238) locates the 'shadow' in the law, the 'image' in the Gospel and the 'truth' in heaven.

ecce ego et pueri, quos mihi dedit dominus. J. continues to intersperse his account with biblical citation. Here he introduces a piece of largely ornamental exegesis on *parvuli* in the preceding line. Is. 8,18 is put in Christ's mouth at Heb. 2,13. The 'children' of this verse are prophets born of God according to *in Is.* 3,8,18 l. 8 (in l. 38 J. is surprised that someone thinks them Isaiah's own sons); they are apostles at *in Eph.* 4,13 p. 501^D. J. quotes the text another half dozen times. In the present passage it is linked to Mt. 21,9 (*osanna ...*). The same combination occurs in Ps.-Basil, *Is.* 8,217; J. himself repeats it at *tract.* p. 551 l. 73 (cf. p. 550 l. 68).

palmas victoriae sublevantes consono ore cantabunt. Cf. Jn. 12,13 *acceperunt ramos palmarum et processerunt obviam ei et clamabant: 'osanna ...'*. The *parvuli* (l. 6) come from Mt. 21,15 *pueros clamantes in templo et dicentes: 'osanna ...'*.

osanna in excelsis; benedictus, qui venit in nomine domini, osanna in excelsis. J. cites Mt. 21,9 in this form again at *tract.* p. 550 l. 68; cf. *in Hab.* 2,9 l. 343 and *in psalm.* 117. At the beginning of the verse the Vulgate reads *osanna filio David* in place of *osanna in excelsis*.

41,4

tunc centum quadraginta quattuor milia. The style of this passage of the *Libellus* is conspicuously unadorned and paratactic: *tunc centum quadraginta quattuor milia in conspectu throni et seniorum tenebunt citharas et cantabunt canticum novum et nemo poterit scire canticum illud, nisi numerus definitus*. This stylistic feature is due only in part to the circumstance that here J. is paraphrasing Apoc. 14,1-3. The biblical

original runs as follows: *centum quadraginta quattuor milia habentes nomen eius et nomen patris eius scriptum in frontibus suis. (2) et audiui vocem de caelo tamquam vocem aquarum multarum et tamquam vocem tonitruum magni: et vocem quam audiui, sicut citharodorum citharizantium in citharis suis. (3) et cantabant quasi canticum novum ante sedem et ante quattuor animalia et seniores: et nemo poterat discere canticum nisi illa centum quadraginta quattuor milia, qui empti sunt de terra.* Though J. has remodelled his source quite substantially, no attempt at stylistic variation has been made. The solemn simplicity that results invests the conclusion of the work with a certain dignity.

hi sunt, qui se cum mulieribus non coinquinaverunt — virgines enim permanserunt —; hi sunt, qui secuntur agnum, quocumque vadit. J. now passes to direct citation of Apoc. 14,4. Souter (1912), p. 150, notes that the whole passage (ll. 15–16) should be printed as a quotation. For *permanserunt* (Vulg. *sunt*) cf. (e.g.) Cyprian, *testim.* 3,32 (*de bono virginitatis*); this reading fits J.'s stress on endurance in the next sentence. Cyprian had also cited the text in *hab. virg.* 4. It is in fact regularly adduced in treatises on virginity: the first half occurs at Methodius, *symp.* 1,5,26 and Augustine, *virg.* 27,27, while the second half is found in Ambrose, *inst. virg.* 17,113; Ps.-Sulpicius Severus, *epist.* 2,2; 2,11; Augustine, *virg.* 27,27 (*et passim*). J. applies the second part to virgins, widows and married women (*epist.* 77,12), to Paula (*epist.* 108,22,1), to the apostles (*c. Vigil.* 6) and to virgins (*in Is.* 1,1,18^b l. 16); he cites it eight times besides.

41,5

quotienscumque te vana saeculi delectarit ambitio. A warning against worldliness (and not the flesh) concludes the work.

ad paradysum mente transgredere. J. characteristically rounds off with two commonplaces and two quotations of scripture. The first commonplace is mental translocation to paradise. J. had already employed this notion at *epist.* 14,10,3 (*tu paradysum mente deambula: quotienscumque illuc cogitatione conscenderis, totiens in heremo non eris*; here he had been indebted to Tertullian, *mart.* 2,9 *quotiens eam [sc. viam, quae ad deum ducit] spiritu deambulaveris, totiens in carcere non eris.*); cf. also [Ps.-]Jerome, *epist.* 18 p. 57,125 (*in paradysum mente conscenders*).⁷ As in the present passage, the idea is combined with being what we shall be (cf. next n.) in J.'s translation of Theophilus at *epist.* 96,2,1 (*caelestibus misceamur choris, ut iam nunc illuc mente translati, ... simus quod futuri sumus*). It is again used in a

⁷ Asella in her cell enjoys the spaciousness of paradise at *epist.* 24,3,1.

translation of Theophilus at *epist.* 100,9,2.

The idea had already occurred in Cyprian, *zel.* 18 *paradisum cogita*. It is also found in Paulinus of Nola, *epist.* 13,24 (*non ... modica animis credentium voluptas est ... in paradiso iam animis deambulare*); cf. Ambrose, *loc.* 2,9,38 (*cui [sc. Jacob] liceret ... superna paradisi mentis vigore penetrare*) and Maximus of Turin 24,3 (*nihil ... detrimenti patitur in terris, cuius animus demoratur in caelis*). The audience had been enjoined to scale heaven by Cyril of Jerusalem, *catech.* 16,23 (*ἀνάβηθι μοι τῆ διανοίᾳ καὶ εἰς πρῶτον οὐρανὸν ... ὑπερανάβηθι τοῖς λογισμοῖς, εἰ δύνασαι, καὶ ἀνωτέρω*); cf. Chrysostom, *Thdr.* 1,11 (*διάβηθι τῷ λογισμῷ πρὸς τὰ ὑπὲρ τὸν οὐρανόν*); Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *h. rel.* 7 p. 1365^c. Finally the Apostle is said by Chrysostom, *catech.* (Wenger) 7,20 to have encouraged standing beside the Lord in thought. In the present passage of the *Libellus* there is an effective contrast between *paradisus* and the *mundus* of the previous line.

esse incipe, quod futura es. Deléani, p. 68, maintains that for this statement J. is indebted to the following passages of Cyprian: *servate quod esse coepistis, servate quod eritis* (*hab. virg.* 22); *hoc sis tantum quod esse coepisti* (*ad Donat.* 5); *renati imitemur quod futuri sumus* (*domin. orat.* 36). Only the last of these texts bears any resemblance to what J. actually says;⁸ moreover only its final section matches J.'s particular wording. However J.'s entire formulation finds a parallel in another passage of Cyprian: *quod futuri sumus, iam vos esse coepistis* (*hab. virg.* 22).

As usual, J. has streamlined his source and enhanced its rhetorical finesse. In particular the whole is now gracefully enclosed by two forms of the verb 'to be' that are linked by *parechesis* (*esse ... es*): J.'s sentence accordingly presents an instance of polyptotic *redditio*. The same idea is also found in several other writers; significantly however all their formulations are far less concise than that of the *Libellus*: Ps.-Cyprian (= Novatian), *puhic.* 7,3 (*virginitas quid aliud est quam futurae vitae gloriosa meditatio?*); Eusebius of Emesa, *serm.* 7,5 (*quod ergo ex promissione in regno caelorum reconditum est, hoc anticipans quorundam propositum habet et possidet*); Asterius of Ansedunum, *ad Renat.* 1. 265 (*his virtutibus enituntur quod futuri sunt esse, dum vivunt*); Cassian, *inst.* 6,6 (*quod deposita corruptela carnali habituros sanctos promittitur in futurum, hic iam in carne fragili possidentes [sc. virgines]*).

⁸ Phrasing almost identical to this Cyprianic passage is found in *Passio Montani et Lucii* 11,6 *imitemur iam hic esse quod futuri sumus*. The document is African and contemporary.

J. himself repeats the same idea in *epist.* 65,1,3 and *adv. Iovin.* 1,36 (*quod alii postea in caelis futuri sunt, hoc virgines in terra esse cooperunt*); cf. *reg. Pachom. praef.* 2 p. 5,5. As in the present passage, J. again puts it in the form of an injunction at *in Eph.* 5,29 p. 534^B (*iam nunc incipiamus esse quod nobis in caelestibus repromissum est*) and in *Gal.* 6,15 p. 437^A; cf. also *epist.* 96,2,1 (J.'s translation of Theophilus; *ib.* translocation to paradise, as here; cf. previous n.).

pone me sicut signaculum in corde tuo. J. again combines scripture with a striking formulation that has been borrowed from elsewhere (cf. previous n.). He does not quote this charming verse (*Cant.* 8,6) again. Ambrose on the other hand cites the text over a dozen times; he had already used it in *virg.* 1,8,46 and 1,8,48.

opere pariter ac mente. J. is unique in his fondness for the striking antithesis *opere / mente*. He uses it again at *epist.* 64,20,2; *Didym. spir.* 57 (on 1 Cor. 7,34 [*sancta et corpore et spiritu*]); *in Ier.* 1,73; *in Ezech.* 41,13 l. 1474; *in Mich.* 6,8 l. 245; *in Zach.* 1,2 l. 119; *in Math.* 5,29 l. 622; *in Eph.* 4,3 p. 495^C.

aqua multa non poterit extinguere caritatem et flumina non cooperient eam. Since the work has been marked throughout by lavish scriptural citation, it is fitting that a text of the Bible should form the climax. *Cant.* 8,7 deals with love (*caritatem*); accordingly it now aptly picks up the theme which had occupied both the opening and centre of the work (chs. 1 and 24–6), where the language of *Cant.* had likewise been used to express it. J. cites *Cant.* 8,7 on only three further occasions. In the biblical context it comes immediately after the verse just cited (p. 210,19ff.). Ambrose cites the two texts in conjunction at *inst. virg.* 17,113 and *in psalm.* 118 *serm.* 19,28,1.

INDEXES

INDEX OF LATIN WORDS

- a 287, 355f
abortium 110
Abraham 15
ac 56
ad 15; ad actum 352 n. 10; ad incesum
352 n. 10
admonere 347
admonitio 347
adolescere 56
adstrictus 197, 199
adulator 29
adolescencia 9, 285; flos -ae 140
adolescuntula 235
adversus 98
agapeta 119
agentes in rebus 262f.
agon 35
ait 16, 18
alienus 299
aliquantulum 239
altilis 263
alumnus 132
amare 142, 390f.
Ambacum 41f.
ambitio 129; delectat -o 70
amplexus 16f., 101, 400 n. 2;
spirit(u)alis 17
anachoreta 320
ancilla: Christi 217f.; dei 132, 218
anguste 196
anima 352; -ae venter 352
animus 352
ante-passiones 58
antichristus 377
anxie 77
aqua 73 n. 10
aequatus 394
argentum 127 n. 6
articulus: constrictus -o 295; conclusus
-o 295
artificium 193f.
aspera montium 66
astrum 38
atque 56, 210; -e utinam 56
auctor 264f.
audire 16
augere 264f.
auris: -em accommodare 319; declina
-em tuam 212; inclina -em tuam 212
auscultare 16

beatus 180
bonus 48; bene 273
breviter strictimque 262
bucinator 308

callidus 266
canere 16
cantare 16
capsaces 312
cancer 61, 66
carnalis 181; -e commercium 121
caro 36, 55f.; -es contusione mutatae
83; elaboratae -es 83; sarcina -is 227
castitas 34; -is chorus 403
castrare 287
castus 17; oculi -i 209
catellus 272
caupo 260
celeritas 158; -e rotas 158 n. 6
cellula 65
cena dubia 133
cervix 109 n. 10
cetera 78 n. 17
Cectura 182
Chaldaeus 15
chlamys 334
chorus 399 n. 1; castitatis 403; -i
virginales 399; -i virginei 399
Christianus 266; -us sum 292f.
Christus 143, 377; -i adultera 108, 110;
-i ancilla 217f.; de ecclesia -i rapere
41; -us deus noster 130; in -o filia
238; -um hospitem habere 226;

hospitium -i 227; prostituere membra
-i 51; renasci in -o 20f.
cibus 329 n. 6, 330 n. 14; -um capere
349 n. 5; lautior 287; moderatus 136;
-um sumere 349 n. 5
Ciceronianus 293
civitas: dei 242; meretrix 54 n. 6
clamare 16
clamitare 16
coenobium 320
coepi 295
cogitatio: -o crescit 37, 56; -o dicit 37,
58; -es necare 58; -o tacita subrepat
37, 251; -o venit et apponit 37; victus
300
collum 109 n. 10
coluber 290
comedere 329f.
concinere 16
condicio 283, 292
conditum merum 82
confoederatio 323
coniugium 129, 187
composita 202
conresurgere 20
conscientia 108; -ae ardor 293; -ae ignis
293; sufficit -a 112
conservus 238f.
consternare 364f.
consuere 158
contestari 68
continentia 34
continere 374
contra 98
contumelia 127 n. 6
convivium 226
copulare 182, 345
cor 111ff.; fores -is 240f.; -is ianuae
241; mundum 112; -is ostium (-a)
240f.; secundum -r domini 101
corpusculum 39, 246
corruptus 47
crassus 321
crescere 183; cogitatio -it 37, 56
crimen 80f.; in -e 80
crines 261
crux 353
cucullus 255
culpa 80f.; in -a 80
cum 147, 230, 373
cupere 391
Cupido 142
cur 113, 173f.
custodire 228

daemon 16
daemonium 16
de 261
decanus 324
defendere 378 n. 22
definire 16
dehabere 334
delectare (-at ambitio) 70
delicatus 301
deliciae 59, 195, 301
desertum 53 n. 5
desiderium: panis -i 85; -orum vir 85
deterrimus 320
detraho (nulli detrahas) 352 n. 10, 354
deus 45, 111ff., 224, 295; amicus -i 79;
ancilla -i 132; -o carus 94; Christus
-us noster 130; civitas -i 242; curus
-i 158; -o devotus 34; -us noster Iesus
129; -o nubere 129; -us pater 106;
socrus -i 5, 173; testimonium -i 94;
testis est -us 66; thesaurus -i 210
devorare 39
diabolus 242
dicere 16, 18, 295; cogitatio -it 37, 58
dies: illa 398; -es noctesque iungere 65
difficilis 391
diligere 142; -bus 52
dimittere 223f., 247 n. 4
discursus 74
dispensator 334
districtus 91
dolus 216
dominus 291, 295; -a 25; -a filia 238; -a
germana 239; mater -i 369; secundum
cor -i 101; testis est -us 66
durezza gentilis 157
durus 391; saxo -ior 100

ebdomadarius 64, 334
effari 16
egenu 304
egredi 344
egregius 201
eius 205f.
Eleazarus 180f.
electus 206
epulari 352
ergastulum 66
erigere 255
error 80f.; in campo -is 98
esca 39
esse 122, 248 n. 6, 330, 391, 407f.
et 194 n. 16, 364, 403
eunuchinus 255

- Eustochia 25; -ium 25
 ex obo 82
 exaggerare 264f.
 exaggerator 264f.
 exclamare 16
 exemplum 123, 304; accipe -um (-a)
 180
 exsus 60 n. 2
 exire 344
 exitus 151
 expectare 382
 exprimere 201
 exquirere 201
 extrinsecus 219f.
 exusta solis ardoribus 59
 Ezechiel 98
- fibrefactus 255
 facere 79 n. 18, 321
 facies 246, 255, 321; in -e 53
 fame temptare 88
 familia 190f.
 fastidia: conceptuum 383; sustinere 383
 femina 98
 femur 96 n. 12
 fenestram aperire 242
 ferculum 84
 fessus 60 n. 2
 festivus 113
 fides 360
 fieri 146
 filius: -a 238, 378; domina -a 238;
 hominis 382; in Christo -a 238
 flere 147
 flos 140; adolescentiæ 140
 fomenta ignium 72 n. 9
 fonticulus 197
 fores cordis 240f.
 fortior 181
 fortitudo 98
 fragilis 39
 fratruelis 52
 frons 261; adrita 270
 futura beatitudo 327
- gemere 147
 gentilis 300; dicitia 157; lingua 300
 germana 239; domina 239
 gloriari 244
 gloriatio 243f.
 gratia 332
 gravitas 115
 gremium 105f.
- grossus 321
- habere 295
 habitare 321
 Hierosolyma 287f.
 Hierusalem 287
 hoc 79 n. 18
 homicida sui 110
 homo 55, 109f., 129, 244, 382; -is filius
 382; suus 63
 honorare 171
 horridus (horor) 59
 hospitium: Christi 227; trinitatis 54
 hostis 36; callidus 266
- iaculum 141
 iam 32
 ieiunare 355
 ieiunium: cotidiana -a 139; lauda -is ora
 62; pallere ora -is 62
 Iesus 224; deus noster -us 129; testis est
 -us 66
 igitur 313
 ignis 192, fomenta -um 72 n. 9
 ille 156; -a dies 398
 imago (in -e) 143f.
 in 221, 246, 251f., 330 n. 14
 incedere 115
 incessus 115; ad -um 352 n. 10
 inconsultus 159
 inconsutus 159
 increpare 65
 incrementum 183
 indecens 212
 indumentum 19
 infelicitas 64
 inferus 294; in -o 296 n. 14
 inferre 16
 inferus: -i 296; ad -os 110; in
 profundum -i 54
 infringi 278
 infirmus 313
 inflare (-at superbia) 70
 ingeminare 16
 ingurgitare 113
 inimicus 29, 36, 263; blandus 29; -i
 Israel 79
 iniquitas 192
 illustrator 339
 immaculatus 94
 inopportune 395
 inpedicus: -e 208; -a lumina 209; -i
 oculi 208f.
 inquit 18

instar (ad -) 150 n. 6
integer 358; luna -a 358; -um relinquere 358
interesse 62
interficere 387; cogitatus 37, 58
interpretari 16
interrogare 16
intrinsecus 219
intumescere 27
intus inclusus 71
invenire 36 n. 5; quaere et -es 388; solus iustus -tus 79
invidia 172
ipse 344; -ad 186, 246, 252; -um 186
ira 357
iratus et rigidus 66
ire 342ff.
israhel 47; inimici -i 79
iter 115
iudex 128f.; tribunal -is 291f.
iungere -i 16f.; dies noctesque -ere 65
iustificare 374
iustitiam 323f.
iustus: Abel -us occiditur 387; solus -us inventus 79

labium: -is dissolutis 277; solutis -is 277
lacrima 64 n. 9
laetari 172
laetus 400 n. 2; gaudensque 67
languens 61
laudare 170f., 244
lautus: -ior cibus 287; -ior mensa 287
Lazarus 180f.
lectulus 141
lecythus 312
legere 16, 295
lepidus 113
lex 149f.
libellus 28f., 202
liber 28f.
liber 199 n. 2; -e proclamare 381
libertas 132
libido 77, 228; -um scomes 72 n. 9; -um pompa 140f.
lis 356
locus poenitentiae 295
loqui 16, 230, 330; res -itur 312
lucrosius 117
ludere 79, 109 n. 10, 228, 230, 276; metro 276
lugere 159, 161f. n. 13
lugubris 114

lumbus 95 n. 11, 97, 166
luna 357f.; integra 358
luxuria 77
lyricum carmen 275

maforte 117
maledictus 180
malitia 212
malus 212
mammona 300
manducare 78 n. 16
manus 166
margaritam 172; -a 172
maritus 129, 150 n. 8
martyr 372
masculus 150 n. 6
mater: catholica 107; domini 369
matrimonium 187
me 156
medicus: caelestis 74; spiritalis 73f.
memorare 16
mentiri 377 n. 19; -tus 108
merces 176
meridies 236
meritum 176
merx 176
meus 156, 224; mi 25
milia 79
miser 115
mitis 333
modus: istiusmodi 117; mirum in -um 23, 371; quomodo 87
molestiae 199 n. 3
momentum: modicum ad -um 239; per horarum -a 265
monacha 115
monasterium 320; pater -ii 318
monere 68
mori 248
mortificare 96
muliercula 128
multum 275
mundus 92, 408; iste 36; supra -um 32 n. 15; -i turbines 158
mutare: -ari 278; carnes contusione -tae 83; vestem 131

narrare 16
nasci 160ff., 277f., 321, 340 n. 3
nativus 278
natura 160f.
ne 277
nec 18, 136
necessarius 223

- necessitas* 156
negotium 193; *saecularium -orum cura* 225
nemo 329 n. 11
neque 18
nidor 263
nihil 390f.
nolle 128
non 22, 147, 277, 355
notrus 132; -a 132f.
nosse: *perfacile est* 309; *usu* 309
noster 200, 203; -a *provincia* 320
notabilis 115; -iter 115
notare 261
nubere 156; -i 156; *deo* 129; *mente* 48
nudare 233
nuditas 101f., 155
nudus 100f.
nullus 329 n. 11; -i *detrahas* 352 n. 10, 354; -a *est certa victoria* 39
nunc 180
nuntius 365f.
nutus 109 n. 10

obtestari 68
obvius 246; -iam 246
occasionem arripere 131
oculus 116 n. 25, 208f.
oeconomus 334
offerre 177
olla 41
olyra 82
omnis 98; *plena sunt -ia* 36
opertus 236
opus 202
opusculum 200f.
ordo 28, 259; -em *suum habere* 28
os 255; *lurida ieiunium -a* 62; *pallere -a ieiunium* 62
osculum 52

pallicium 306
pallium 148; *nigrum* 257
panis: *desiderium* 85; *sacramenti* 395
papa 200
peppus 263
paradisus 408; -i *patria* 160; *de -o virginitatis* 147
parens 318
parricida 110f.
parricidium 110f.
partus 106
parvus 56
pasci 352; *corvis ministrantibus* 311

passio 249
pater 132, 224, 318; *deus* 106; *monasterii* 318
paucus 205; *sufficient -a de plurimis* 86
pauper 304
pectusculum 39, 291
permanere 407
pertinere 364f.
perturbatio 249
pestis 119
phiale (potare in -is) 211
pietas 173
piger 119
pignus 193
pingere 353
plastica 376; -e 376
platea 232f.
plerique 108
pluma (in -is) 90f.
plus 246, 248
polluere 54
pompa: *libidinum* 140f.; *saeculi* 380; *sermonis* 39
ponere 53
post 288
praecinere 16
praemium 176
praepositus 323, 334
praesepe 332
prandium 263
presbyter 259
presbyteratus 259
presbyterium 259
pretium 176
prius 161
proclamare 16; *libere* 381
profanus 206
propheta 52, 284
prophetissa 368f.
propinquus 271
proponere 304, 362; -nam 33f.
psallere 16
publicus (in -um profere) 206
puer 119
pueritia 49
puella 61f.
pulcher 48
purgamentum 380
puritas 363 n. 4
purpure tenuis 116
purus 363 n. 4
pusillum 239; *quantulum* 239

questio 293, 297

- qualis 398
 quando 230
 -que 67, 299
 quercus 82
 quia 87, 174
 quid 147; ut quid 357
 quidquid 214f.
 quinquagesima 335
 quod 87, 161f. n. 13
 quoniam 87
 quot 105
- redire 342ff.
 reflectio 139
 referre 282, 316
 reficere 139
 refrigerium 351
 religiosus 248
 relinquere 194 n. 16; integrum 358
 reputare 16
 requies 162
 res 272 n. 10; agentes in -bus 262f.; -s
 loquitur 312; verbo (-is) ... -s 312
 respondere 16
 rete 193f.
 reverti 343; ad superos 295f.
 rex 22
 rixa 356
 rotare 261
 rubor 270
 ructare 137f.
 ructus 137ff.
 naere 105
 rugire 137f.
 rugitus 93, 137
 rupium praerupta (praeruptae -es) 66
 rusticitas 218
- sacramentum: epulae -i 395; panis -i
 395; scripturae 75f.
 sacrilegium 114
 saeculum: -i pompa 380; rudi adhuc -o
 75; sarcina -i 227
 sagina 89
 sagitta 141
 sagum 334
 sanctus 33f., 132, 215f.; quae -a sunt
 319
 sanguis 310
 sapiens 266
 sarcina: carnis 227; saeculi 227
 sartago 41
 satis 246, 248
 saturitas 89
- scribere 16
 scriptura 18; -ae sacramentum 75f.
 se 125
 securus 37, 46f.
 senex 263
 septimo mense 124 n. 3
 sermo 284; -o convenit 16; pompa -is
 30; propheticus 52
 serpens 290
 sexus 151
 si 214, 373
 signaculum 353
 simplex 94, 218; -iciter 208
 sinceris 164; -us 164
 singularitas 165 n. 16
 sinus 105f.
 situs 60
 sol: exusta -is ardoribus 59; -i testis 357
 solitudo 53; vasta 59
 sollicite providendum 88f.
 solus: aut -us aut primus 320; iustus
 inventus 79; tantum 291
 solvere: -i 213; -tis genibus 117; -tis
 labiis 277
 somnus 296
 soror 239, 378
 spado voluntarius 156
 spina 171
 spirit(u)alis: amplexus 17; chirurgicus
 74; Hippocrates 74; medicus 73f.
 sponsus 262, 401
 stacte 234
 stercus 380
 stilus 370f.
 strepitus 329f.
 strictus: -is dentibus 277; breviter
 -imque 262
 sub 271
 subtristis 114
 sufficere: -it conscientia 112; -ant pauca
 de plurimis 86
 summo studio ac labore 288
 superi 295f.; reverti ad -os 295f.
 suspicio 120
 suspiciosus 120
 suus 224; homo 63
- tacere 321
 talis 337
 tangere 231
 teloneum (de -o) 194 n. 17
 terere 353
 terra 171
 terribilis 218

- testis 296; -e 296; -is est deus 66; -is est dominus 66, 296; -is est Iesus 66; sol -is 357
 terrimus 320
 thestrum 233f.
 timor 132
 titulus 13
 tomus 368
 totus 218
 tranquillitas 65
 transferre 84 n. 1
 tristitia 115; -am simulare 258
 tumor 109
 tunc 191, 194, 400
 tunica 19, 158f.
 turpitude 378
 uas 53, 274 n. 15

 uber 106, 234
 umbilicus 98
 unio 164f.; -e fecundus 6, 164f.
 universitas 92
 univira 120
 unusquisque 332
 uterus 106
 uti 73
 uxor 195

 vae 54 n. 6
 vagire 27
 varietas 53
 venenum 68f.
 venter 78, 95 n. 11, 231, 270ff.; animae 352
 verberare 385
 verbum: dimidiata -a 277; -o (-is) ... re 312
 veredarius 132, 262
 versu prosaque 200
 vertere (in semet -sus) 46
 verus 217; -e 217, 406, Salomon 22
 vestigium 261, 321
 vestimentum 19
 vestis 19; -em mutare 131
 veteranus 267
 vicis (ad -em) 150 n. 6
 victoria (nulla est certa-a) 39
 videri 122
 vincere 197, 199
 vinculum 193f.
 vinam 68f.; concupiscentiae 85
 vir 98, 129, 150 n. 6; desideriorum 85
 virga 163f.
 virginalis 33, 333, 376; chori -es 399
 virginitas 34, 49, 184 n. 5; de paradiso -is 147; -em servare 205
 virgo 115, 163f., 184 n. 5, 213, 375; -o de -e 166
 virtus 98; catalogus -um 393; culmen -is 20; inter vitia atque -es fluctuare 56; spiritus -e 83
 viscera 106
 vita: aetas ... et -a 134; stadium -ae 34f.
 vitium: incentiva -orum 46; inter -a atque virtutes fluctuare 56; palma -orum 211
 vivere 91 n. 5, 273
 vocabulum 376
 volumen 202
 voluntas 156
 vox: erumpere in -em 16, 55; -x resonat 16
 vulgo 263
 vultus 255; adulterium -us 279

 zona pellicia-cingi 97

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

- ἀγνός 58
ἀδελφεός 52
ἀθηναγέρων 264
ἀντήρ 129
ἀνθρώπος 109 n. 11
ἀνιπτόποιος 253
ἀποστηθίζειν 350 n. 9
ἀφανίζειν 58
- γαστήρ 271f.
γέρων 263f.
γιγνώσκειν 251
γαμνός 155
- δείπνον 84
δεισμός 197
δείσσοινα 25
- ἐγκράτεια 175
ἐγκρατής 58
εἰκάν (ἐν -ι) 143f.
ἐνώμα 19
ἐρεύεσθαι 137f.
- ἡγεμῶν 93
- θεός: θεῶ Ἰησοῦ 129; μάρτυς ... ὁ θεός 67
67
θῆραι τῆς καρδίας 241
- ἱερός 216
ἰσάγγελος 31
- καθηγοούμενος 334
κακοζηλία 249
καλός 48
καμφάκης 312
κοιλία 95 n. 11
κόλαξ 131f.
κόλας 106
κουκουλλίον 255
- κείσσης 93
κύριος: -α 25; -α καὶ ἀδελφή 239;
μάρτυς ὁ -ος 66f.; -ε τίς 238
- λαθροφάγος 258
- μάρτυς: -ς ... ὁ θεός 67; -ς ὁ κύριος 66f.
μάχη 356
μετά 271
μηλωτή 148
μόνον 291
- οἰκονόμος 334; μέγας 334
ὄτι 174
ὀφθαλμός: ἀκόλαστοι -οί 209;
παρθένου -οί 209
- παπειδίον 263
παρθενία 175
παρθένος 213; -αι ὀφθαλμοί 209
πατήρ 93, 318
πέδη 197
ποιητής 93
κοπιῶν 263
πρεσβύτες 334, 364
πρόθεσις 34
προφητικὸς λόγος 52
προφήτης 368f.
- σκεῶς 211
- τέμνειν 368
τί οὖν; 173
τράπεζα 84
- ὑπό 271
ὑπογάστριος 271 n. 6
- χιτών 19

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS

- יְהוָה 192
יְהוָה (P'el) 244; (Hišp'ra'el with פ) 244
י 15
- יְהוָה 15
יְהוָה 15

INDEX OF PASSAGES: SCRIPTURE

O. T.

- Gen. 1,28: 154f.; 2,17: 151; 2,24: 21; 3: 155; 3,1: 266; 3,7: 155, 158; 3,14: 35; 3,16: 26, 148ff.; 199; 3,18: 35, 140, 156; 3,21: 147f.; 158; 4,1: 160; 4,8: 387; 7,2: 167; 11,9: 57; 11,31: 16; 12,1: 15; 18,1: 82; 18,4f.: 82; 19,17: 17; 19,33: 80; 19,38: 80; 28,20: 313; 29,20: 390ff.; 31,40: 392; 32,24: 96; 32,30: 96; 46,26: 96; 46,27: 96
- Exod. 1,14: 221; 5,1: 224; 5,7: 221; 5,16: 221; 12,11: 96f.; 12,46: 373; 15,1: 400; 15,21: 400; 20,5: 235; 23,26: 180; 25,22: 220; 32,6: 74, 77ff.; 272 n. 9; 34,7: 81; 34,14: 224, 235 n. 10
- Lev. 19,16f.: 354; 21,12: 344 n. 8
- Num. 12,1: 21; 12,3: 21; 14,3: 59
- Deut. 4,24: 235; 22,5: 254; 23,3: 81; 25,9: 167f.; 27,9: 325; 28,56: 261; 32,10: 59
- Jgs. 14,6: 100; 14,18: 100; 15,15: 100; 16,3: 100; 16,19: 101
- Ruth 1,20: 60
- 1 Reg. 3,11: 42; 12,5: 67; 12,6: 67; 13,14: 101; 16,7: 113, 361f.; 20,23: 67; 20,42: 67
- 2 Reg. 11,2: 102; 20,12: 246
- 3 Reg. 4,29: 370; 4,33: 103; 8,9: 220; 10,3: 22; 17,6: 311; 17,14: 312; 19,3f.: 60; 19,5: 82
- 4 Reg. 2,13: 148; 4,1: 185; 4,38ff.: 83; 6,23: 84; 18,14: 210; 18,15: 210; 20,13: 210
- 2 Paralip. 26,16: 206; 26,18: 206
- Est. 7,8: 192
- Job 1,1: 94; 1,8: 94; 1,21: 305, 342f.; 2,3: 94; 7,1: 42; 9,13: 63; 14,19: 107; 19,20: 61; 33,3: 94; 38,3: 96f.; 40,1: 94; 40,2: 96f.; 40,11: 94ff.
- Ps. 1,2: 346; 3,4: 244; 6,6: 293f.; 296; 6,7: 146; 23,4: 112; 26,13: 15f.; 33,3: 244; 36,28: 311; 38,7: 143; 43,9: 244; 44,2: 368; 370f.; 44,5: 21; 44,10f.: 52f.; 44,11: 212, 368; 44,11f.: 13ff.; 19ff.; 44,12: 173; 49,20: 354f.; 50,2: 103; 50,6: 102; 50,12: 112; 52,6: 254; 54,7: 327; 55,5: 55f.; 56,2: 291, 295; 62,7: 347; 67,9: 220; 72,1: 112; 72,26: 345; 79,2: 220; 81,1: 45; 81,6f.: 44f.; 81,7: 42; 83,7: 88; 90,5ff.: 37; 96,8: 305, 101,5f.; 144f.; 101,8: 146; 101,10: 147; 102,2ff.: 147; 102,9: 276; 103,2: 292; 103,20f.: 39ff.; 103,26: 290; 103,27: 40; 104,37: 180; 108,24: 145; 114,7: 162; 115,3-6: 386; 117,6: 55f.; 118,57 *incert.* LXX: 345; 118,62: 137; 118,83: 144; 118,140: 141f.; 119,5: 392; 123,7: 38; 127,3: 179f.; 130,1: 251; 131,11: 95; 136,8f.: 56ff.; 140,4: 212
- Prov. 3,3: 370; 3,12 (LXX): 388; 4,23: 236; 6,27f.: 121; 7,3: 370; 8,1: 103; 8,12: 103; 10,3: 311; 13,8: 299; 17,5: 358; 20,9: 112; 20,13: 354; 22,20: 77; 370; 23,24f.: 406; 30,19: 107
- Eccles. 1,14: 380; 2,17: 380; 3,5: 157f.; 10,4: 241f.
- Cant. 1,1 (LXX): 22; 1,2: 52; 1,3: 22f.; 67; 1,4: 13f.; 20, 22f.; 52f.; 1,5: 236; 1,6: 134, 235f.; 1,6f.: 236; 1,7: 236f.; 1,8: 48, 225; 1,12: 234; 1,13: 52; 2,1: 165; 2,5: 231, 392; 2,6: 165f.; 2,10f.: 402; 2,14: 107; 3,1: 143; 3,2: 232f.; 3,2f.: 233; 3,4: 227, 233; 4,7: 402; 4,12: 231ff.; 5,2: 52; 233f.; 240; 5,3: 233f.; 240; 5,4: 230f.; 233; 5,6: 233; 240; 5,7: 233f.; 5,8: 231; 233; 6,7: 235; 6,8: 227; 402f.; 6,9: 402; 7,12: 368; 8,5: 13f.; 23; 8,6: 409; 8,7: 409
- Is. 1,21: 54; 2,3: 344 n. 8; 3,16: 109, 115; 5,11: 276; 7,14: 188; 8,1: 368; 370f.; 8,3: 368; 8,3f.: 371; 8,18: 406; 9,6: 188; 11,1: 163ff.; 344; 11,8: 107; 13,21f.: 53; 148; 14,12: 42ff.; 14,13: 107; 14,13f.: 43f.; 26,18: 367; 369f.; 26,20: 239; 28,24: 172; 28,26: 172; 31,9: 179f.; 34,5: 35; 40,12: 384; 47,16: 52; 50,11: 192; 53,7: 385; 54,1: 356; 56,3-5: 180; 58,3f.: 357; 58,4: 356; 58,5: 356; 58,6: 356f.
- Jer. 1,17: 96f.; 2,15: 53; 2,16: 53f.; 2,32: 55; 3,3: 116; 4,7: 187; 9,21: 242; 13,23: 60; 13,26: 53; 15,17: 60; 16,2: 185; 17,14: 244; 27,16: 57; 29,22: 40; 50,17: 41; 51,13: 53

Lam. 1,20: 60; 3,24: 345; 3,27ff.: 339f., 345; 3,28: 60; 4,4: 187; 4,8: 61
 Ezek. 1,15ff.: 158; 1,28f.: 292; 4,16: 187; 10,9: 158 n. 5; 11,3: 41; 16,4: 98; 16,5: 98;
 16,25: 53f.; 16,39: 53; 24,3: 41; 28,13: 42f
 Dan. 1,5-16: 84; 1,8: 84; 2,34: 165f.; 6,10: 348; 9,23: 85; 10,3: 85; 10,11: 85; 10,19: 85
 Hos. 2,3: 53; 7,4: 141; 7,6: 141
 Am. 3,4: 137f.; 3,8: 137f.; 4,2: 40; 5,2: 47; 6,1ff.: 289; 8,13: 48
 Obad. 3f.: 107; 4: 43
 Nah. 1,6: 107; 3,5: 53
 Hab. 1,16: 41f.; 3,15: 220
 Zech. 9,14: 158; 9,16: 157f.

Apocr.

4 Esd. 9,12: 295
 Tob. 6,22: 80
 Judith 1,5: 41; 1,10: 41; 2,1: 41; 8,1: 192; 8,22: 79; 387; 15,11: 192; 16,26: 192
 Wisd. Sol. 7,27: 79
 Sirach 4,8: 212; 9,20: 267; 19,30: 332f.; 25,33: 189; 28,28: 354
 2 Macc. 7,3: 41

N. T.

Mt. 3,4: 97; 3,9: 157; 4,4: 352; 4,22: 194 n. 15; 5,3: 180; 304; 5,6: 304; 5,8: 112; 5,28:
 48; 5,46: 21; 6,2: 308; 6,2-4: 244f.; 6,5-15: 245; 6,6: 225; 239; 245; 6,16: 252; 258;
 6,16ff.: 114; 245; 6,19: 306; 6,21: 293; 6,24: 300; 303; 6,25: 300; 304f.; 6,25f.: 303;
 6,26: 303; 6,28ff.: 304; 6,32: 300; 6,33: 310f.; 7,6: 75; 7,7ff.: 395; 7,13: 233; 7,14:
 233; 7,15: 376; 8,20: 196; 8,21: 247 n. 4; 8,21f.: 194ff.; 8,22: 247 n. 4; 9,9: 194 n. 17;
 10,10: 168f.; 10,16: 225; 10,20: 318; 10,22: 204f.; 10,25: 190; 10,33: 295; 10,34: 42;
 10,37: 286; 11,12: 394ff.; 11,29: 21; 12,4: 206; 12,49: 367; 370; 12,50: 369; 13,7f.:
 156; 13,8: 126; 13,22: 300; 13,45: 75; 16,24: 194f.; 17,2: 292; 19,1-12: 341; 19,6: 21;
 19,11: 156; 19,12: 156; 176; 287; 19,27: 21; 20,16: 205; 21,2ff.: 220f.; 21,3: 223f.;
 21,9: 406; 21,13: 224; 21,15: 406; 22,14: 205; 22,30: 30f.; 156; 23,35: 387; 23,38: 225;
 24,17f.: 17f.; 24,19: 186; 24,35: 344; 25,1ff.: 49f.; 25,10ff.: 235; 25,33: 236f.; 25,35:
 227; 25,36: 308; 26,30: 332; 26,40: 388; 26,41: 36; 27,51: 225; 27,53: 397
 Mk. 1,6: 97; 1,13: 61; 2,14: 194 n. 17; 4,39: 65; 5,5: 65; 10,29: 286; 11,17: 224; 13,15f.:
 17f.; 14,72: 295
 Lk. 1,34: 366; 1,38: 218; 366; 1,43: 369; 2,9: 292; 2,12: 383; 2,36: 124 n. 3; 3,16: 169;
 5,27f.: 194 n. 17; 6,12: 137; 6,20: 180; 6,20f.: 304; 6,21: 305; 8,24: 65; 9,58: 196;
 9,59f.: 195f.; 9,62: 17f.; 10,2: 183; 10,4: 169 n. 19; 10,10: 233; 10,18: 42; 10,19: 35;
 10,39: 226; 10,40: 226; 10,41: 226; 11,5ff.: 395; 12,15: 314; 12,33: 306; 12,38: 95ff.;
 12,42: 190; 14,26: 286; 16,3: 302; 16,11: 299; 16,12: 299f.; 16,12f.: 302; 16,13: 300;
 16,19ff.: 308; 18,13: 65; 19,34: 223; 19,46: 224; 20,34: 30 n. 9; 20,35f.: 31; 21,36:
 198; 22,31: 42; 24,32: 141
 Jn. 1,47: 216f.; 2,16f.: 224; 3,5: 20; 4,35: 183; 5,39: 226; 5,44: 243f.; 8,44: 19f.; 10,34f.:
 44; 12,13: 406; 12,31: 36 n. 6; 14,30: 36; 16,2: 394; 19,23: 159; 20,28: 130
 Acts 1,13: 242; 2,30: 52; 3,6: 312; 5,6: 318; 5,9f.: 318; 5,11: 318; 7,3f.: 16; 8,20: 318;
 8,39: 291; 9,3: 292; 13,22: 101 n. 7; 16,25: 137
 Rom. 1,1: 46; 1,9: 67; 5,3: 393; 5,3f.: 392; 6,4: 370; 7,2: 129; 7,15: 58; 7,22: 56; 7,23f.:
 46f.; 8,12: 340; 8,18: 392f.; 8,35: 381; 8,35ff.: 393 n. 4; 8,38: 381; 8,39: 381; 9,5: 130;
 11,20: 33; 13,14: 359; 14,1: 269; 14,3: 355; 14,4: 355f.; 14,6: 356; 14,10: 292; 14,21:
 74
 1 Cor. 1,31: 244; 2,9: 398; 3,3: 45; 3,16: 207; 4,13: 380 n. 1; 4,15: 406; 5,12f.: 40; 6,3:
 396; 6,13: 88; 6,15: 51; 6,17: 21; 6,18: 71; 6,19: 51; 207; 224; 7: 175; 7,2: 54; 7,3: 198;
 7,5: 198; 7,7: 175; 7,8: 175; 7,9: 54; 269; 7,10: 149; 7,25: 170; 173f.; 176; 186; 7,26:

- 186; 7,27: 197; 7,28: 26, 198; 7,29: 179, 186; 7,32ff.: 196; 7,34: 49, 51, 361f., 409,
 7,38: 154, 162; 7,39: 132; 8,10: 279, 281; 8,13: 281; 9,5: 175; 9,19: 269, 9,24: 35;
 9,25: 35; 9,27: 46f.; 10,4: 58; 10,7: 79; 10,20: 279, 282; 11,3: 150, 11,6: 234, 11,14:
 257; 13,7: 390; 14,15: 147; 15,22: 189; 15,33: 270, 272
- 2 Cor. 2,11: 266; 4,7: 39, 289; 4,16: 56; 4,17: 388; 5,8: 397; 5,10: 292; 6,4f.: 46; 6,14f.:
 279, 282; 6,15: 281f.; 8,9: 385; 10,2ff.: 340; 10,17: 244; 11,2: 129, 150f., 267; 11,6:
 30; 11,14: 377 n. 20; 11,23: 392; 11,23ff.: 393; 12,2: 291; 12,4: 291; 12,7: 305; 12,10:
 181, 305
- Gal. 1,10: 218, 244; 1,18: 81; 2,20: 143; 3,27: 19; 3,28: 150 n. 6, 152; 4,19: 367, 406;
 4,26: 227; 5,17: 36, 39, 142; 5,24: 381; 5,26: 243; 6,1: 358; 6,4: 358; 6,14: 244
- Eph. 3,15: 190; 3,16: 56; 4,26: 357f.; 4,27: 241f.; 5,4: 212; 5,5: 310; 5,18: 74; 6,1: 135;
 6,9: 268; 6,12: 35; 6,14: 97; 6,15: 46; 6,16: 141; 6,18: 198
- Phil. 1,8: 67; 1,23: 134; 3,8: 380; 3,19: 88, 272 n. 8; 3,20: 155
- Col. 2,14f.: 371; 3,1: 20, 380; 3,5: 143f.; 3,10; 3,8: 212; 3,20: 135
- 1 Thess. 2,5: 67; 5,17: 198, 346
- 2 Thess. 3,10: 302
- 1 Tim. 2,11: 325; 3,4: 263; 4,1ff.: 178; 4,3: 113; 4,4: 282; 5,6: 68, 362; 5,11f.: 275; 5,13:
 269; 5,21: 205; 5,23: 72ff.; 6,5: 118; 6,7: 299, 305, 313; 6,8: 305, 313; 6,10: 300, 305,
 310, 313
- 2 Tim. 2,5: 387; 2,11: 380; 3,6f.: 258; 4,7f.: 393; 4,8: 35
- Tit. 1,11: 118; 1,15: 112f., 282
- Heb. 2,13: 406; 8,5: 406; 11,4: 387; 12,6: 388; 12,17: 295; 12,22: 227; 13,4: 28
- Jas. 2,23: 79; 2,25: 374; 4,15: 316; 5,2: 306
- 1 Pet. 1,13: 97; 5,8: 39f.
- 1 Jn. 3,8: 19f.
- Apoc. 3,20: 225, 239ff.; 4,2: 95; 12,5: 291; 12,9: 290; 14,1-3: 407; 14,4: 407; 17,1: 53,
 54 n. 6; 17,3: 53 n. 5; 17,15: 54 n. 6; 17,16: 53; 17,18: 54 n. 6; 18,10: 54 n. 6; 18,16: 54
 n. 6; 20,2: 290

INDEX OF PASSAGES: JEROME

In Abac. 3,10 L 746: 392

In Abd. 2 L 159: 107; 2 L 226: 107; 2 L 232: 107; 12 L 437: 56; 12 L 438: 265; 17 L 575: 262; 20 L 696: 312

In Agg. 1,1 L 16: 154; 1,1 L 20: 167; 1,1 L 21: 148, 155, 165; 1,1 L 39: 165; 1,2 L 171: 286; 1,6 L 260: 75; 2,16 L 552: 165

In Am. 2,6 L 188: 168; 2,6 L 190: 168; 2,6 L 201: 43, 107; 2,9 L 314: 336 n. 23; 2,13 L 441: 37; 2,13 L 485: 147f.; 2,13 L 487: 159; 3,3 ll. 56 and 63: 137f.; 3,3 L 106: 41; 3,3 L 110: 41; 3,12 L 325: 168; *ib.* 2 *praef.* l. 11: 16; L 22: 63; L 32: 55; 4,4 L 196: 76; 4,10 L 373: 143; 4,10 L 386: 143; 5,3 L 98: 165; 5,3 L 113: 165; 5,4 L 177: 251; 5,18 L 710: 239; 5,21 L 763: 379; 5,25 L 883: 377; 6,2 L 106: 253; 6,12 L 476: 220; 8,4 L 102: 132; 8,11 ll. 218 and 226: 48; 8,11 L 286: 48; 8,11 L 297: 311; 9,6 L 191: 368; 9,13 L 436: 75

Aug. epist. Dny. 27,3,1: 199; 27,3,6: 130

Chron. a. Abr. 2390: 309, 401; 2392: 1 n. 3; *epist.* p. 3,12: 284 n. 4; p. 3,19: 281

In Dan. prol. l. 37: 292; 1,3 L 51: 85; 2,31 L 408: 165; 6,10 L 302: 348; 7,4 L 471: 43; 9,23^f L 118: 85; 10,11^a L 689: 85; 11,14^b ll. 1055 and 1076: 251; 13,5^b L 717: 129

Didym. spir. praef. 2, 4 n. 15, 86 n. 1, 202, 218, 349 n. 6, 375 n. 16; 11: 167; 57: 167, 409

In eccles. 1,1 L 11: 22; 1,1 L 22: 17 n. 6; 1,1 L 24: 380; 3,2 L 13: 370; 3,5 L 87: 154; 3,8 L 131: 286; 3,8 L 144: 46; 3,16 L 258: 129; 4,2 L 37: 37, 66; 4,6 L 87: 167; 8,13 L 208: 143; 9,11 L 261: 299; 9,12 L 293: 258; 10,4 L 54: 241; 10,4 L 72: 55; 10,5 L 104: 265; 10,9 L 133: 157; 10,16 L 285: 164; 10,19 L 320: 132; 10,19 L 326: 327; 10,19 L 329: 132; 10,19 L 334: 132, 263; 12,1 L 7: 86; 12,4 L 182: 146; 12,6 L 272: 246; 12,9 L 298: 171

In Eph. prol. p. 439^A: 91, 158, p. 440^B: 2 n. 7, 30, 202 n. 7; 1,3 p. 445^B: 154; 1,3 p. 445^B: 293; 1,10 p. 454^B: 100; 2,1 p. 465^C: 251; 2,6 p. 469^A: 293; 2,10 p. 471^A: 381; 2,19 p. 476^B: 55, 219, *ib.* 2 *praef.* p. 477^A: 146; 3,5 p. 480^C: 103; 3,13 p. 485^B: 69; 3,13 p. 486^C: 393; 3,14 p. 487^B: 300; 4,2 p. 494^A: 253, 340; 4,3 p. 495^C: 409; 4,13 p. 501^B: 406; 4,13 p. 502^{A-B}: 39; 4,27 p. 511^C: 56, 239; 4,27 p. 512^A: 242; 4,28 p. 512^D: 300; 4,28 p. 513^A: 159; *ib.* 3 *praef.* p. 515^D: 43, 107; 4,31 p. 517^B: 138; 5,3 p. 519^C: 213; 5,3 p. 519^D: 129; 5,3 p. 520^A: 147; 5,5 p. 521^B: 55; 5,16 p. 527^B: 293; 5,18 p. 528^A: 13, 68; 5,20 p. 529^A: 198; 5,20 p. 529^B: 275; 5,22 p. 531^A: 151; 5,24 p. 532^A: 97; 5,28 p. 533^C: 152; 5,29 p. 534^B: 152, 409; 5,33 p. 537^A: 132; 6,1 p. 537^B: 135; 6,1 p. 539^B: 221; 6,12 p. 544^A: 242; 6,12 p. 547^B: 123; 6,12 p. 548^C: 294; 6,14 p. 550^C: 95; 6,16 p. 551^D: 141; 6,24 p. 554^C: 47

Epist.

1: 283 n. 1; 3,3: 66, 326; 10,3: 23; 14: 254; 15,2: 108

3,1,1: 190; 1,2: 84; 2,1: 372; 2,2: 317; 3,2: 268, 290, 303; 4,2: 59, 286; 4,3: 60; 4,4: 59, 61, 228f.; 5,1: 60 n. 2, 181; 5,3: 372

4,2,1: 239

5,1: 287; 2,3: 352, 388 n. 8

7,2,2: 300 n. 3; 3,1: 106; 6,2: 372, 404

8,1: 300 n. 3

10,1,1: 159; 2,3: 63; 3,2: 76

11,2: 218; 4: 378

12,3: 243

13,2: 357

14,1,1: 301; 1,3: 311; 2,1: 195 n. 18, 301; 2,2: 286; 2,3: 286; 3,2: 286; 3,3: 61; 3,4: 135; 4,1: 372; 6,1: 194 n. 17; 6,2: 46; 6,3: 71 with n. 6, 353; 7,1: 112 n. 16; 8,1: 259; 9,2: 51; 9,3: 225; 10,2: 227; 10,3: 60, 123, 193 n. 12, 195 n. 18, 304, 386 n. 7, 407; 10,4:

Epi^{st.} 14 (cont.)

- 301: 11: 398; 11,2: 218
 15,1: 13 n. 2; 1,1: 159, 231f., 352; 1,2: 76; 2,1: 373; 4,4: 248
 16,1: 13 n. 2
 17: 338 n. 1; 2,3: 64f., 256; 2,4: 300, 302; 3,1: 66
 18A,1,3: 98; 3,1: 16; 6,4: 16; 6,5: 98; 7,5: 100; 8,1: 22; 8,2: 16
 18B,4,3: 402
 20,2,1: 197; 5,1: 277; 6: 262, 319
 21,2,5: 382f.; 3,2: 199; 8,1: 16; 8,2: 57; 9: 263; 13,1: 98; 13,4: 276, 288; 13,6: 284;
 13,7f.: 281; 13,9: 275; 21,2: 16; 41,1: 319
 22,1: 121, 403, 409; 1,1: 6 n. 18, 7, 212, 238; 1,2: 28, 142, 228; 1,3: 15; 1,5: 52, 232,
 371, 401; 1f.: 11; 2,1: 18, 21, 109 n. 8, 123, 187, 243; 2,1f.: 5; 2,2: 8 n. 27, 74, 131,
 177, 201, 405 n. 6; 3: 121; 3,1: 42, 47, 69, 130; 3,2: 39, 3,3: 16, 47; 3,4: 58; 3-7: 324;
 4: 24, 121; 4,1: 7, 36; 4,2: 210; 4,3: 15, 47, 107; 4,4: 393; 5,2: 7, 35; 5,3: 7, 58; 6: 121;
 6,1: 68; 6,2: 56f.; 6,3: 27, 57, 233, 369; 6,3ff.: 34; 6,4: 16, 37, 68, 148; 6,5: 37, 324;
 6,6: 37, 53ff., 220, 237; 7: 10, 121f., 282 n. 23, 285, 296, 324, 338; 7,1: 147, 290, 335,
 340; 7,2: 49, 55, 66, 291, 331; 7,3: 147; 7,4: 147, 327; 8,1: 58, 114, 362; 8,1ff.: 34 n. 2,
 8,2: 9, 16, 34, 39, 55, 68; 8,4: 68, 125 n. 4, 172, 228, 272 n. 9, 330 n. 16; 8,4f.: 32 n.
 16; 8,5: 46f.; 8ff.: 140, 287, 394; 9,1: 84, 331; 9,2: 287; 9,3: 16, 38; 9,4: 42; 10,1:
 314f., 338; 10,1f.: 315f.; 11: 166f.; 11,1: 123, 301, 380; 11,2: 98, 208; 11,3: 15, 200,
 321; 11,4: 15; 12,1: 16; 12,2: 7, 15, 88, 388; 13: 52; 13,1: 7, 26, 34 n. 2, 115f., 119,
 123; 13,1f.: 111; 13,2: 108; 13,3: 33, 62, 91, 217 n. 3, 218, 273f., 282, 301 n. 4; 13,4:
 7; 13,5: 28, 134, 253, 321, 362, 376, 379; 14,2: 33, 47, 104, 134, 379; 15,1: 26, 33,
 134, 223, 226, 323, 379; 15,2: 21, 35, 123, 202, 247; 16,1: 25, 33, 69, 151 n. 9, 356;
 16,1f.: 34 n. 2; 16,2: 62; 16,3: 28, 125 n. 5, 130; 17,1: 62; 17,2: 64, 93, 321, 349, 356;
 17,2f.: 143; 17,3: 37, 39, 56, 143, 244; 17,5: 88; 18,1: 38, 137, 143, 145; 18,2: 27, 38,
 55, 134, 145; 18,3: 25ff., 129, 199 n. 1, 234; 19,1: 170, 177, 344; 19,2: 35, 126, 287;
 19,3: 7, 15, 19, 27, 39, 147, 161 n. 13; 19,3f.: 321; 19,4: 7, 39, 147, 278, 340 n. 3, 344;
 19,5: 5f., 152, 208; 19,6: 159; 19ff.: 10; 20,1: 2, 5, 25, 76, 129, 176 n. 13, 223, 406;
 20,2: 7, 186; 20,3: 21, 30, 91, 162; 20,3ff.: 5; 21,2: 155, 183, 305; 21,3: 27, 181, 187,
 190, 345; 21,5: 27, 129; 21,6: 26, 190f.; 21,7: 30, 152, 184ff.; 21,8: 6 n. 18, 27, 196,
 208, 227, 286; 21,8f.: 270; 21,9: 49, 362; 22,1: 26, 123, 199; 22,2: 26; 22,3: 4 n. 14,
 26, 28, 30, 123, 149 n. 3, 197, 204; 23,1: 5, 13, 26, 32, 123, 201; 23,2: 68, 219; 23,3:
 406; 24,1: 7, 113, 208, 274, 310, 361; 24,1f.: 28; 24,2: 131; 24,3: 135, 172, 193, 226f.,
 286; 24,4: 208; 24,6: 54f., 87, 223, 344; 24,6-26,4: 232f., 403, 409; 25,1: 15, 25, 52,
 135, 138, 233; 25,2: 21, 47, 128, 135; 25,3: 56, 234, 375; 25,4: 49, 52, 148; 25,5: 134,
 253; 25,6: 58, 225; 25f.: 7, 26; 26: 381; 26,1: 25, 378; 26,1f.: 24; 26,1ff.: 39; 26,2: 49,
 52, 135, 224f., 234, 401; 26,3: 240; 26,4: 58, 237; 27,3: 10 n. 42, 39, 114, 195 n. 19,
 248, 266, 321, 355; 27,4: 70, 219; 27,5: 33, 69, 123, 130, 134, 254; 27,6: 37, 117, 130,
 186, 227, 245f., 258, 355; 27,7: 321; 27,7f.: 321; 27,8: 161, 254; 28,1: 253, 309; 28,2:
 114, 119, 128, 134, 321, 379; 28,3: 26, 321f.; 28,4: 128, 309; 28,5: 132, 287; 28,6: 146,
 148, 261; 29,1: 10 n. 42, 245; 29,2: 27, 129, 134; 29,3: 33, 35, 87, 105, 124; 29,4: 54,
 128, 134, 274 n. 15, 333, 379; 29,5: 25, 78 n. 15, 111, 113 n. 17, 117, 269, 301 n. 4,
 29,6: 8 n. 27, 113, 128, 161 n. 12, 215, 281, 283, 336; 29,7: 6 n. 18, 16, 64, 112f., 265,
 274 n. 15, 293, 335; 29,8: 261; 30: 6, 10, 61, 67, 122, 372; 30,1: 60f., 68, 193, 261,
 263, 293; 30,2: 46, 60, 147, 251, 284; 30,3: 39, 60, 290; 30,4: 261, 292, 297, 305; 215,
 285, 294, 309; 30,6: 26, 284, 293; 31,1: 69, 314, 344; 31,2: 6 n. 18, 156, 305, 310,
 31,3: 15, 87, 90f., 300, 380; 31,3f.: 193, 270, 311; 31,4: 180, 300f., 303, 31,5: 313,
 342f.; 31f.: 314, 316; 32,1: 108, 248; 32,2: 26, 130, 248, 274 n. 13, 316; 32,3: 305;
 32,4: 305; 32,5: 86, 303, 316, 338, 344 n. 10; 33: 285 n. 7; 33,1: 86, 282, 315, 338,
 341; 33,2: 324; 33ff.: 61, 315; 34,1: 300; 34,2: 317; 34,3: 139f., 260, 327, 355; 34ff.: 9,
 316; 35,1: 122, 270; 35,2: 138, 318, 326; 35,3: 147, 321f., 330; 35,4: 73, 83, 318; 35,5:
 137, 334; 35,6: 302 n. 6, 318; 35,7: 59, 138, 303, 333; 35,8: 6 n. 18, 138, 148, 289,
 321; 36,1: 265 n. 7, 315f.; 36,2: 60, 86, 161 n. 11, 317, 345; 37,1: 91, 198, 350f., 353;

Epist. 22 (cont.)

- 37,2: 39, 137f, 322, 346f, 349, 37,3: 136, 139, 37,6: 135, 38,1: 27, 202, 246f, 362,
38,2: 49, 68, 113, 117, 196, 376; 38,3: 2, 25, 129, 164, 176, 226, 399; 38,4: 52, 38,4f:
24; 38,6: 21, 123, 133, 351; 38,7: 25, 41 n. 3, 91, 115, 117, 134, 213, 238f, 373; 39,1:
20, 227, 387; 39,2: 27, 87, 298; 39,2-4: 389; 39,3: 321, 372; 39,4: 35, 86, 103, 404;
39f.: 11; 40,1: 17, 123, 380; 40,2: 265; 40,3: 46, 226; 40,4: 35; 40,5: 44 n. 5, 177, 344;
41: 191 n. 11; 41,1: 21, 37, 123, 224, 400, 403, 406; 41,1-3: 398, 41,2: 398; 41,2-4:
400; 41,3: 27, 135, 172, 176, 388, 398, 400 n. 2; 41,5: 69f., 160, 227, 380
23,1,1: 397; 2,1: 37; 2,2: 137, 217, 245, 250, 405; 3,1: 388, 402; 3,3: 228; 4: 147, 168;
4,1: 68
24: 372; 1,1: 124; 2: 204; 3,1: 61, 139, 228, 339, 408 n. 7; 3,2: 253; 4,1: 135, 228, 302,
365 n. 8; 4,2: 64, 135, 139, 229, 245, 335; 4,3: 60; 5,1: 62; 5,2: 245, 332
25,4: 98
27,1,2: 218; 1,3: 197, 218, 263; 2,2: 11 n. 44, 267; 3,3: 265
28,5: 197
29,1,3: 289; 3,6: 102; 7,1: 336 n. 21
30,13,2: 395; 14,1: 49; 14,2: 46, 200
31,2,1: 98; 2,2: 28; 3,1: 300 n. 3; 3,3: 89, 217, 322
33,3: 263; 4,2: 98; 4,6: 98
34,4,1: 197
35,1,3: 352; 2,6: 94
36,1,3: 199; 1,4: 197; 2,4: 293; 5,1: 225; 11,1: 22; 15,5: 94; 16,6: 182
37,1,2: 98
38,1: 387; 2,2: 125, 290; 3,1: 97 n. 17, 253; 3,2: 359; 4,1: 125; 4,2: 90, 253; 4,3: 117,
253; 4,4: 253; 5,1: 193f., 286; 5,2: 114f., 216
39,1,2: 131; 1,3: 62, 138, 245; 1,5: 227; 2,2: 66; 2,6: 220; 2,7: 305; 3,1: 397; 3,2: 402;
3,4: 20; 3,6: 248; 4,8: 33, 344 n. 8; 5,1: 15, 138, 222; 5,2: 115, 286; 5,4: 66, 215; 5,5:
131; 6,1: 8, 286; 6,2: 115; 6,4: 66; 7,1: 125, 172f., 399; 7,2: 404
40,1,3: 74; 2,2: 132, 192, 255; 2,2f.: 11 n. 44; 2,3: 85, 309
42,1,4: 292; 2,1: 293
43,2,1: 128; 2,2: 359; 3,3: 55, 128
44,1: 253
44,2: 60, 135
45,2,1: 216; 2,2: 132, 262, 332; 3,1: 215, 250; 4,1: 25, 132, 215; 4,2: 33, 215; 5,1: 61,
356; 5,2: 62, 115, 134; 6,1: 25, 187; 6,3: 393
46,1,1: 405; 2,1: 15; 10,3: 246, 251; 10,4: 136, 355; 12,1: 225; 12,2: 128; 13,1: 115; 13,2:
405; 13,4: 392
47,1,1: 46, 251; 2,1: 85
48,3,2: 175, 225; 4,2: 226; 4,3: 289
49,3,1: 126, 171; 3,2: 115; 4,2: 153; 5,1: 153; 5,2: 19, 53; 6,1: 153; 7,1: 27; 7,2: 163; 8,2:
153, 378; 10,1: 21; 11,3: 124; 13,1: 197; 13,3: 197; 13,5: 218, 226; 14,4: 30; 14,8: 30;
14,13: 202; 15,6: 268; 17,6: 154; 18,2: 27, 197; 18,3: 28, 199; 19,4: 167; 20,3: 21, 300
n. 2; 21,1: 166, 232; 21,2: 98, 108; 21,3: 21, 152
50,1,3: 86 n. 1; 3,2: 140, 322; 3,3: 258; 4,1: 340; 4,2: 68; 4,4: 274 n. 13; 5,2: 309; 5,4:
26f., 153; 5,5: 153
51,1,5: 259; 1,6: 259; 4,7: 162, 197; 6,8: 143
52,2,2: 224; 3,2: 302; 4,1: 30, 58; 4,3: 9 n. 38, 200; 4,4: 319; 5,3: 132, 270; 5,4: 120, 270,
332; 5,6: 261, 322; 5,7: 262; 6,1: 119; 6,2: 132; 6,3: 263; 7,1: 138; 8,1: 270, 326; 8,2:
203; 9,1: 245, 253, 306; 9,3: 218, 226, 393; 10,2: 300, 385; 10,3: 154; 11,1: 128; 11,4:
68f., 73, 91; 12,1: 82, 136; 14,1: 354; 14,2: 319; 15,1: 209, 259; 15,2: 332; 16,3: 356;
17,1: 28; 17,1f.: 11 n. 44; 17,2: 259
53,1,3: 335 n. 20; 4,4: 98; 8,16: 98; 8,17: 281; 8,18: 192; 8,19: 47; 10,1: 290
54,2,1: 124; 2,2: 195 n. 19, 216, 223; 4,1: 123; 5,2: 216, 264, 266; 5,3: 108; 5,4: 259,
322; 6,1: 222, 238; 6,2: 62, 251; 6,3: 27, 124; 6,4: 98, 131, 226; 6,5: 44; 7,3: 125; 8,3:

Epist. 54 (cont.)

- 93; 9,1: 91, 93; 9,2: 69 n. 5, 161; 9,3: 71, 161f., 186, 340; 9,5: 93; 10,1: 61, 73; 10,2: 331; 10,3: 40; 10,4: 93, 331; 10,5: 62, 136, 139; 11,1: 350; 11,2: 76, 222; 12,2: 307; 13,1: 130, 132, 135, 276; 13,2: 131; 13,3: 308; 13,5: 399; 14,1: 22; 15,1: 111, 15,2: 268 n. 3; 16,1: 404; 16,2: 312; 16,3: 192; 18,2: 404; 18,3: 197
- 55,1,2: 47; 2,3: 77 n. 13, 140, 272 n. 9; 3,2: 381 n. 2; 4,4: 268 n. 3; 20: 34
- 57,1,1: 210; 1,2: 81; 5,1: 81; 8,2: 186; 11,1: 179; 12,4: 218, 372
- 58,1,1: 248, 251; 2,1: 131, 306; 2,2: 258, 306; 3,1: 15; 5,1: 269, 321; 5,2: 33; 5,3: 184f., 317, 339; 6,1: 128, 331; 6,2: 29, 138; 6,3: 128, 245; 7,1: 299, 307; 7,2: 122; 9,1: 238; 10,1: 4 nn. 12f., 199f.
- 60,1,1: 392; 3,4: 340; 5,2: 197; 7,3: 405; 8,1: 250; 8,2: 20; 9,2: 62, 255; 10,2: 245; 10,5: 251; 10,9: 138; 11,2: 139; 11,3: 132; 12,4: 73; 13,1: 124; 13,3: 326
- 61,2,5: 226; 3,4: 218, 264; 4,2: 165
- 62,2,1: 199
- 64,2,2: 88; 2,4: 361; 4,1: 286; 11,2: 146; 18,10: 98; 19,2: 20, 251; 19,3: 147; 20,2: 409; 21,3: 98; 22,3: 199
- 65,1,1: 238; 1,3: 152, 165, 368, 409; 1,5: 369, 404; 2,1: 23, 40, 238; 2,2: 165; 5,1: 137; 7: 368, 371; 7,3: 368; 8,2: 166; 10,3: 96; 10,4: 143, 190; 12,1: 392; 14,2: 144, 234; 14,5: 30; 15,3: 53, 227; 16,3: 15, 19; 16,4: 23; 16,5: 14; 17,1: 14; 18,1: 98; 19,4: 23, 239; 19,5: 55; 20,3: 227, 403; 20,4: 235, 403; 21,4: 157; 22,4: 238
- 66,1,2: 76; 2,1: 125f.; 2,2: 98; 3,2: 28, 33, 54, 123; 3,3: 124, 154, 170; 4,2: 251; 5,1: 130; 5,2: 63; 5,4: 200; 6,1: 253; 8,2: 372f.; 8,3: 265; 8,5: 166; 10,1: 143, 232; 10,2: 368, 371; 12,2: 71; 13,1: 123, 253, 382; 13,2: 114, 130
- 68,1,5: 98
- 69,2,1: 393; 2,4: 46; 2,6: 186; 4,2: 356; 4,3: 28, 154; 6,2: 98; 6,4: 400; 7,2: 98; 8,7: 260, 263, 287; 9,1: 72, 74, 79; 9,3: 132, 263
- 70,2,6: 190; 3,1: 200, 376 n. 18; 3,2: 226; 3,3: 336; 5,1: 199; 5,2: 200
- 71,1,4: 18, 28; 2,1: 205; 2,2: 15; 3,1: 148, 152; 3,3: 251; 4,2: 299; 6,2: 115
- 72,2,3: 66, 113; 4,2: 226
- 73,3,1: 75, 100
- 74,2,2: 22; 4,5: 106
- 75,1,2: 165; 1,3: 144; 2,2: 20, 37, 152; 3,1: 197; 5,1: 238
- 76,3,1: 192; 4,2: 22
- 77,1,1: 251; 2,1: 251; 2,2: 243, 251; 2,3: 217; 3,4: 120; 4,1: 46, 132, 253; 5,2: 52; 7,1: 72; 7,3: 222; 9,1: 251; 12: 407
- 78,2,3: 222; 3,3: 96; 7,1: 83; 7,2: 400; 18: 106; 26,3: 311; 27,1: 163; 29,2: 166; 35,2: 85; 39,1: 158; 42,2: 243
- 79,2,4: 253; 2,5: 94, 251; 4,2: 193; 4,3: 28, 136, 331; 7,2: 124, 393; 7,3: 134; 7,4: 356; 7,5: 47, 102; 7,6: 74, 282; 7,7: 62, 90, 196, 253; 7,8: 76; 8,1: 268; 9,1: 276; 9,2: 58, 138, 141; 9,3: 56; 9,4: 250; 9,5: 142, 220; 10,2: 28, 269; 11,3: 192, 238, 404
- 81,1,1: 66
- 82,1,1: 251; 6,1: 122; 7,2: 79; 9,3: 251
- 84,2,2: 199; 3,5: 68; 4,1: 206; 5,3: 271
- 85,3,2: 197; 6: 66
- 92,6,1: 134
- 96,2,1: 408f.
- 98,19,2: 144
- 99,2,1: 197; 2,2: 66
- 100,2,2: 144; 6,1: 34; 6,4: 258; 6,5: 83; 7,1: 84; 9,2: 408; 10,1: 388; 10,5: 197
- 106,2,3: 197; 67,3: 226
- 107,1,2: 163; 1,4: 135; 2,1: 238; 2,2: 255; 3,3: 97 n. 17; 4,1: 212, 276; 4,5: 134; 4,6: 277; 5,2: 222f.; 6,2: 232; 7,2: 22, 365, 392; 7,3: 234, 240; 8,2: 73; 8,3: 76, 276; 9,2: 135; 9,3: 62, 114, 134, 137, 267, 276, 348; 10,1: 130, 136, 302, 331; 10,2: 64, 82, 136; 10,3: 115, 335; 11,1: 48; 11,2: 55; 12,1: 307; 12,2: 166, 350; 12,3: 200; 13,1: 90; 13,2: 30,

Epist. 107 (cont.)

- 340f.; 13,3: 126, 222; 13,6: 217f.
 108,2,1: 206, 268; 2,2: 123; 3,1: 123; 3,4: 249, 251; 4,1: 123; 5,1: 131; 6,3: 218, 223, 286; 7,3: 130; 9,3: 66; 11,5: 81; 13,1: 44; 14,2: 317f.; 15,1: 66; 15,2: 251; 15,3: 65, 137; 15,4: 147, 255; 15,6: 66; 16,1: 308; 17,3: 82, 93, 113; 18,3: 218; 19,2: 56; 20,2: 138, 348; 20,5: 212f., 245 n. 2; 21,4: 354; 21,5: 66; 22,1: 407; 22,2: 255; 23,7: 30; 26,1: 350; 26,5: 253, 277; 28,1: 291; 28,2: 354; 28,3: 115, 402; 29,2: 228; 30,1: 66; 31,1: 372; 31,2: 15, 399; 32: 30; 33,3: 286; 34: 33
 109,2,3: 386
 112,2,5: 316; 3,2: 13
 117,1,2: 309; 2,1: 120, 238, 378; 2,2: 135; 3,3: 35; 4,1: 90, 173; 4,2: 120; 4,4: 112; 6,1: 128, 213; 6,2: 132, 253; 6,3: 25, 113, 128, 218; 6,4: 66, 93, 274; 7,1: 131, 290, 301; 7,2: 253; 7,3: 116, 253; 8,1: 301, 378; 9,1: 120; 10,1: 120; 11,1: 121; 12,2: 6, 23
 118,1,3: 30; 3,1: 314; 4,4: 18, 148; 4,5: 190; 5,5: 110; 5,6: 87; 7,2: 44, 100
 119,7,11: 372; 9,4: 393; 10,5: 393
 120 *praef.* 2: 200; 120 *praef.* 3: 30; 120 *praef.* 4: 275; 1,10: 388; 1,11: 90; 2,4: 313; 8,7: 107 n. 4; 9,1: 393; 9,7: 186; 9,10: 292; 10,14: 186; 11 *nir.*: 393; 12,7: 147; 12,8: 76
 121 *praef.* 3: 22; 121 *praef.* 4: 197; 1,8: 394f.; 2,10: 233; 3,4: 20; 4,4: 168; 4,5: 109; 6,13: 300; 6,14: 299; 7,6: 386; 8,18: 94; 8,21: 221; 10,23: 282; 11,1: 393
 122,1,1: 218; 1,13: 144; 3,2: 102; 3,3: 102; 3,14: 94; 4,5: 152
 123,1,2: 404; 3,3: 129; 4,1: 110; 4,2: 33, 116; 5,1: 154, 196; 5,3: 279; 6,3: 154; 8,3: 126; 9,1: 200; 10,1: 124, 238; 10,2: 131; 10,3: 125; 11,3: 227; 11,4: 167; 12,2: 154, 183, 185; 12,3: 180; 12,4: 179, 182f.; 13,2: 90; 13,3: 215; 13,4: 303, 311; 14,1: 112 n. 16; 14,4: 44, 314; 17,1: 238; 17,2: 9 n. 38, 172, 269, 356; 17,3: 13, 28
 124,7,1: 293
 125,1,2: 103; 3,1: 36; 5,1: 309; 6,2: 120, 215; 6,3: 119f., 253, 257; 7,1: 122, 128, 136, 139, 245; 7,3: 184; 7,4: 35; 7,5: 46f.; 7,6: 286; 8,1: 193; 11,1: 72, 138, 198; 11,5: 302; 12,1: 62, 284f.; 12,2: 163; 13,10: 318; 15,1: 128f.; 15,2: 318, 323; 16,1: 131; 16,3: 321; 16,4: 306; 17,1: 260, 361; 18,1: 218, 319, 352 n. 10, 354; 19,1: 354; 19,2: 149; 20,1: 21, 50, 117; 20,3: 312; 20,4: 224, 300; 20,5: 15, 371
 127,1,1: 213; 1,3: 30; 2,2: 404; 3,1: 211; 3,3: 132; 4,2: 73, 128, 135f., 306; 4,3: 135; 5,1: 9, 123, 339; 5,2: 9, 257, 405; 5,4: 166; 8,1: 120; 8,2: 115; 14: 30, 238
 128,2,1: 253; 2,3: 125; 3,1: 147; 3,2: 155, 168; 3,5: 35, 120, 131; 3,6: 267; 4,1: 135, 212; 4,2: 135, 350; 4,4: 269; 5,1: 307; 8,3: 125
 129,1,6: 21; 5,2: 226; 8: 30
 130,2,3: 52, 253, 267; 4,1: 130; 4,2: 97, 404; 4,3: 33; 4,4: 90, 255; 5,3: 372; 6,2: 268; 6,5: 213; 6,6: 248; 6,7: 33; 7,3: 275; 7,4: 35; 7,11: 28, 122f.; 7,12: 138, 143; 7,14: 20; 8,2: 148, 171; 8,3: 165, 190; 8,5: 107 n. 4; 9,1: 239, 353f.; 10,5: 30; 10,6: 161f., 173, 177; 11,1: 136; 11,2: 252; 11,3: 50; 12,1: 135; 12,2: 28; 13,1: 212f.; 14,1: 250; 14,6: 299; 14,8: 30; 15,1: 348; 15,3: 269; 15,4: 302; 17,3: 323; 18,1: 128; 18,2: 117; 18,3: 253; 19,1: 270; 19,3: 13; 19,30: 11 n. 44, 28; 19,4: 259; 19,5: 200; 19,6: 204, 222; 19,7: 30, 33, 190; 20: 138
 133,1,1: 43; 1,2: 197; 1,3: 197; 1,4: 250; 2,1: 199; 2,4: 250; 2,5: 103; 3,4: 160; 5,3: 73, 264; 5,4: 73; 8,1: 396; 9,5: 319; 11,2: 218; 11,6: 309; 12,3: 159; 13,1: 316
 134,1,2: 197
 140,1,2: 30; 11,2: 80
 143,1,2: 66
 145,3: 18; 4: 227
 147,3,6: 271; 4,2: 187; 5,2: 254; 6,2: 21, 253; 8,1: 255; 8,2: 261; 8,3: 260; 10,2: 207; 10,3: 211; 11,3: 110, 377
 [Ps.]-Jerome, *Epist.* 18: 319 n. 1; p. 55,38: 15; p. 56,80: 117; p. 56,88: 253; p. 56,89: 246, 260f.; p. 57,101: 115; p. 57,102ff.: 113; p. 57,105: 66; p. 57,125: 407f.; p. 57,134: 67, 229; p. 58,157: 146
 Ps.-Jerome, *Epist.* 42 p. 290^A: 195; p. 290^B: 119; p. 291^A: 120; p. 291^B: 119, 364, 366; p.

291^C: 216Ps-Jerome, *Epist.* 149 p. 206,8: 373Ps-Jerome (= Eutropius presbyter), *Epist.* 19 p. 205^B: 144*Epist. Pachom.* 3 p. 85,15: 340; 5 p. 90,4: 335; 5 p. 90,13: 147

In Ezech. 1,6 l. 234: 158; 1,8^B l. 320: 275; 1,12 l. 360: 17; 1,15 l. 492: 158; 3,7 l. 915: 270; 3,12 l. 964: 66; 3,22 l. 1101: 66; 4,8 l. 1378: 391; 4,9 l. 1401: 82; 4,9 l. 1450: 311; 4,16 l. 1532: 187; 7,17 l. 919: 255; 8,10 l. 205: 143; 8,15 l. 339: 242; 9,4 l. 526: 354; 11,2^A l. 903: 251; 11,2^B l. 937: 167; 11,2^B l. 939: 251; 11,2^B l. 944: 251; 12,10^B l. 1313: 87; 12,10^B l. 1335: 15; 57; 16,3^B l. 836: 102; 16,3^B l. 868: 234; 16,4 l. 889: 98; 16,4 l. 891: 95; 16,4 l. 894: 94; 16,4 l. 935: 159; 16,10^B l. 1160: 336 n. 23; 16,10^B l. 1166: 168; 16,10^B l. 1178: 144; 16,10^B l. 1182: 97; 16,10^B l. 1186: 96f.; 16,10^B l. 1189: 97; 16,12 l. 1272: 158; 16,15 ll. 1425f.: 41f.; 16,17 l. 1503: 143; *lib. 5 praef.* l. 12: 30; 16,28 l. 245: 15; 16,30 l. 317: 76; 16,32 l. 396: 54; 16,35 l. 458: 53; 18,5 l. 213: 393; 18,5 l. 341: 43; 18,5 l. 359: 395; 18,5 l. 383: 129; 18,5 l. 386: 308; 19,1 l. 772: 251; 21,8 l. 281: 361; 22,17 l. 638: 144; 23,11 l. 948: 15; 23,36 l. 1197: 270; *lib. 8 praef.* l. 15: 306; 25,1 l. 146: 268; 26,15 l. 615: 268; 26,15 l. 638: 39; 27,20 l. 1228: 37; 27,26^B l. 1352: 392; 28,1 l. 70: 43; 28,11 l. 232: 42; 28,11 l. 281: 158; 28,11 l. 302: 86; 28,11 l. 321: 293; 29,17 l. 944: 275 n. 17; 30,20 l. 1441: 275 n. 17; 31,1 l. 134: 43; 32,1 l. 564: 118; 36,16 l. 957: 227; 39,1 l. 1868: 46; 40,1 l. 193: 217; 40,5 l. 397: 146; 40,17 l. 641: 299; 40,25 l. 1010: 386; 40,44 l. 1129: 39; 40,44 l. 1159: 165; 41,13 l. 1474: 409; *lib. 13 praef.* l. 32: 238; l. 40: 227; 43,13 l. 806: 167; 44,6 l. 1321: 73; 44,17 l. 1570: 74; 44,17 l. 1574: 73; 44,22 l. 1912: 271; 46,8 l. 547: 17; 46,12 l. 643: 176; 46,12 l. 644: 177; 46,19 l. 847: 313; 47,1 l. 1047: 146; 47,6 l. 1195: 57; 47,19 l. 1469: 227; 48,16 l. 1725: 53; 48,23 l. 1890: 102

In Gal. prof. p. 307^A: 400; 1,4 p. 317^A: 81; 1,6 p. 319^B: 53; 1,8 p. 320^A: 199; 1,11 p. 322^B: 44; 2,10 p. 338^A: 299; 2,11 p. 341^C: 316; 3,1 p. 348^A: 55; 3,7 p. 352^C: 157; *lib. 2 praef.* p. 355^B: 135; 3,15 p. 364^C: 393; 4,6 p. 374^B: 318; 4,12 p. 379^B: 395; 4,15 p. 381^B: 368; 4,15 p. 382^B: 29; 4,17 p. 384^A: 246; 4,19 p. 385^A: 148; 4,19 p. 386^A: 369; 4,24 p. 390^B: 75; 4,27 p. 391^C: 129; 4,29 p. 392^C: 55; 5,2 p. 394^C: 393; 5,3 p. 396^B: 87; *lib. 3 praef.* p. 399^C: 284; p. 400^B: 280; 5,17 p. 411^B: 56; 5,19 p. 414^C: 76; 5,19 p. 415^B: 271; 5,19 p. 416^B: 249; 5,19 p. 417^B: 200; 5,19 p. 417^C: 281; 72; 5,19 p. 417^D: 13; 6,8; 72f.; 114; 5,19 p. 418^A: 79; 5,19 p. 418^B: 279; 5,22 p. 421^B: 58; 5,25 p. 422^B: 56; 5,26 p. 423^B: 243; 5,26 p. 424^A: 62; 149; 5,26 p. 424^C: 108; 5,26 p. 424^D: 108; 6,1 p. 425^B: 66; 6,1 p. 426^B: 39; 47 n. 1; 6,8 p. 431^C: 154; 6,15 p. 437^A: 409; 6,17 p. 438^A: 393; 6,18 p. 438^C: 393

In Hab. prof. l. 2: 42; l. 57: 84; 1,4 l. 72: 211; 1,6 l. 220: 15; 1,12 l. 361: 43; 1,15 l. 538: 40f.; 2,9 l. 343: 406; 2,9 l. 450: 146; 3,3 l. 172: 82; 3,6 l. 398: 227; 3,8 l. 514: 37; 3,10 l. 698: 166; 3,10 l. 750: 22; 3,14 l. 1051: 107; 3,14 l. 1075: 220f.; 3,17 l. 1222: 180

☞ For the next 5 entries cf. also Index of Passages: Ancient Authors, s.v. Origen

Hom. Orig. in cant. prof. p. 26,8: 23; 1,3 p. 32,25: 316; 1,6 p. 38,5: 288; 1,8 p. 40,2: 388

Hom. Orig. in Ezech. prof. p. 318,4: 1 n. 4; p. 318,11: 30; 1,13 p. 338,12: 88; 3,3 p.

351,16: 326; 3,3 p. 351,17: 29; 4,8 p. 370,17: 314; 6,5 p. 383,9: 318; 10,5 p. 423,7:

293; 13,1 p. 440,6: 42

Hom. Orig. in Ier. 9 p. 656^B: 239; 10 p. 662^C: 17f.; 10 pp. 662^B-663^A: 17 n. 7; 11 p.

675^C: 292

Hom. Orig. in Is. 3,1 p. 253,9: 287

Hom. Orig. in Luc. praef. p. 2,3: 316; 4 p. 23,16: 34; 6 p. 35,9: 251; 6 p. 35,30: 388; 7 p.

46,24: 316; 14 p. 83,15: 381; 23 p. 144,15: 262; 25 p. 150,7: 97 n. 17; 29 p. 169,7: 89;

37 p. 212,6: 372

In Ier. 1,10,1: 96f.; 1,26,3: 54; 1,62,2: 151; 1,72,1: 187; 1,73: 409; 1,100,3: 251; 2,7: 17;

2,34,2: 306; 2,73: 144; 2,81,2: 242; 2,95,2: 55; 2,96: 275 n. 17; 3,37,1: 290; 3,60,2:

198; 4,35,8: 251; 4,48,4: 185; 4,57,4: 260; 313; 5,2,8: 251; 5,3,2: 275 n. 17; 5,46,4: 57;

5,52,2: 27; 5,61,5: 27; 5,67,7: 141; 6,22,7: 27; 6,29,12: 39; 6,33,2: 251; 6,37,10: 224

Interpr. Iob praef. p. 75,5: 307; p. 75,6: 123; 250

- In Isrl. prof.* 1. 36: 400; 1,131. 410: 96; 1,131. 426: 356; 1,131. 427: 252; 1,191. 534: 66; 1,191. 550: 141; 3,411. 106: 211
- C. Joh.* 7: 162, 286; 8: 101; 22: 316; 32: 27; 33: 239; 36: 144; 37: 274 n. 13; 38: 74; 41: 259
- In Ion.* 2,4^a l. 152 D.: 35; 2,7 l. 280 D.: 147; 2,7 l. 285 D.: 377; 3,61. 209 D.: 218; 3,61. 211 D.: 200; 3,61. 227 D.: 289
- Adv. Iovian.* 1,1: 264; 1,3: 28, 91, 115, 124ff., 153f., 171; 1,4: 88; 1,5: 28, 33, 103, 105, 115, 174 n. 8, 181, 183, 186, 391; 1,7: 121, 154, 198; 1,8: 21, 53, 177f.; 1,9: 154; 1,10: 51, 279; 1,11: 144, 400; 1,12: 26f., 156, 161ff., 171, 177, 180, 186, 309; 1,13: 21, 26ff., 49, 110 n. 12, 176, 196, 198f., 303; 1,16: 152, 154f., 160, 162, 166f., 174 n. 8, 183; 1,19: 182; 1,20: 167, 219; 1,21: 144, 168; 1,22: 27, 179; 1,23: 100; 1,24: 103, 152, 154, 179; 1,25: 85, 183; 1,26: 27, 175; 1,27: 151, 163; 1,29: 23, 160; 1,30: 22, 52 n. 3, 234; 1,31: 232; 1,32: 55, 404; 1,33: 185; 1,34: 33, 51, 72, 177, 198; 1,35: 69; 1,36: 27, 177, 205, 409; 1,37: 27; 1,38: 381; 1,39: 152; 1,40: 30, 83, 178, 257, 262; 1,41: 27, 30, 48, 177, 383; 1,48: 134; 1,49: 110; 2,2: 279; 2,3: 42, 47; 2,4: 42f., 101, 144, 179; 2,6: 359, 376; 2,7: 64, 93; 2,8: 276; 2,9: 113; 2,11: 271, 321; 2,12: 139f.; 2,13: 82; 2,14: 261, 336f.; 2,15: 73, 84f., 88f., 145, 160, 183, 339, 404; 2,16: 376; 2,17: 356f.; 2,21: 62, 131, 253, 257, 261; 2,22: 53, 373; 2,36: 62, 114, 131, 261, 269, 313; 2,37: 132
- In Is.* 1,1,41. 27: 17; 1,1,6^a l. 15: 57; 1,1,15^a l. 9: 65; 1,1,18^b l. 16: 407; 1,1,18^b l. 17: 23; 1,1,21 l. 33: 54; 1,2,2^a l. 28: 56; 2,3,7 l. 21: 19; 2,3,12^a l. 17: 132; 2,3,16 l. 25: 109; 2,3,22 l. 3: 116; 2,3,22 l. 8: 234; 2,5,8 l. 18: 57; 2,5,11 l. 52: 58; 2,5,13 l. 19: 311; 2,5,20 l. 41: 167; 3,7,10 l. 47: 144; 3,8,1 l. 24: 368; 3,8,1 l. 30: 371; 3,8,1 ll. 42 and 50: 369; 3,8,1 l. 67: 368; 3,8,18 ll. 8 and 38: 406; 4,9,14 l. 38: 306; 4,10,1 l. 38: 129; 4,10,5 l. 33: 57; 4,11,1 l. 12: 163; 4,11,1 l. 13: 164; 4,11,1 l. 15: 165; 4,11,1 l. 28: 277; *lib.* 5 *proef.* 1. 37: 316, 341; 5,13,20^a l. 20: 55; 5,14,28 l. 14: 224; 5,21,5 l. 12: 211; *lib.* 6 *proef.* 1. 2: 316; 6,13,3^b l. 21: 55; 6,13,9 l. 7: 294; 6,13,17 l. 7: 57; 6,13,19 l. 22: 57; 6,13,19 l. 26: 15; 6,13,19 l. 30: 57; 6,13,19 l. 58: 55; 6,13,19 l. 60: 55; 6,13,19 l. 75: 55; 6,13,19 l. 88: 57; 6,13,19 l. 95: 148; 6,14,4^b l. 21: 361; 6,14,12 l. 14: 396; 6,14,13 l. 39: 43; 6,14,16 l. 15: 44; 6,14,20^a l. 21: 58; 6,16,1 l. 22: 81; 7,19,5 l. 49: 300; 7,19,18 l. 28: 67; 7,21,8 l. 22: 57; *lib.* 8 *proef.* 1. 11: 4; 8,26,14 l. 30: 61; 8,26,14 l. 33: 147; 8,26,17 ll. 12 and 31: 369; 8,26,20 l. 42: 239; 8,27,4 l. 41: 141; 9,28,1 l. 53: 118; 9,28,5 l. 76: 224; 9,28,16 l. 76: 279, 282; 9,28,23 l. 20: 172; 9,30,1 l. 57: 224; 9,30,23^a l. 37: 79; *lib.* 10 *proef.* 1. 8: 316; 11,37,26 l. 26: 43; 11,38,4 l. 36: 162; 11,38,10 l. 56: 159; 11,38,14 l. 11: 65, 147; 11,38,15^a l. 39: 294; 11,39,1 l. 25: 210; 11,39,1 l. 70: 210; 11,39,3 l. 48: 85; 11,40,1 l. 16: 232; 11,40,6 l. 34: 116; 12,42,5 l. 21: 92; 12,43,14 l. 20: 15; 12,43,16 l. 50: 148; *lib.* 13 *proef.* 1. 14: 123; 13,47,1 l. 39: 261; 13,48,12 l. 55: 57; 13,48,12 l. 56: 15; 13,48,20 l. 29: 57; 13,49,8 l. 29: 393; 13,49,14 l. 94: 53; 13,50,1 l. 41: 300; *lib.* 14 *proef.* 1. 14: 158; 14,51,12 l. 81: 56; 14,51,20 l. 31: 56; 14,52,2 l. 34: 178; 14,52,4 l. 77: 144; 14,53,12 l. 21: 223; 15,54,1 ll. 32 and 47: 129; 15,54,11 l. 23: 77; 15,56,4 l. 29: 395; 15,56,8 l. 36: 224; *lib.* 16 *proef.* 1. 5: 238; 16,57,7 ll. 21 and 25: 17; 16,58,2^a l. 71: 62; 16,58,2^a l. 74: 248; 16,58,2^a l. 94: 139; 16,58,2^a l. 95: 252; 16,58,4^a l. 23: 252; 16,58,9^b l. 54: 132; 16,58,13 l. 29: 141; 16,58,13 ll. 32f.: 18; 16,58,14 l. 61: 30; 17,60,5 l. 11: 226; 17,60,13 l. 33: 200; 17,60,21 l. 14: 16; 17,61,6 l. 33: 130; 17,62,4 l. 21: 368; 17,63,8 l. 40: 52; 17,63,17 l. 45: 224; 17,64,8 l. 62: 141; *lib.* 18 *proef.* 1. 1: 238; 1. 34: 271; 18,65,13 ll. 26 and 32: 311; 18,65,22^a l. 80: 180; 18,66,10 l. 14: 158; 18,66,15 l. 46: 37; 18,66,19^a l. 31: 37; 18,66,19^a l. 53: 23; 18,66,22 l. 44: 22; 18,66,22 l. 46: 402
- C. Lucif.* 5: 279, 300 n. 2; 8: 113; 11: 213 n. 2, 289; 13: 274 n. 13; 15: 63; 22: 75
- In Mal.* 3,1 l. 32: 13; 3,1 l. 37: 251; 3,131. 389: 74; 4,1 l. 54: 43; 4,4 l. 71: 144
- In Marth. prof.* 1. 20: 22; 1. 22: 231 n. 8; 1. 25: 219; 3,4 l. 245: 97; 3,9 l. 252: 157; 4,5 l. 340: 88; 5,29 l. 622: 409; 5,29 l. 627: 286; 6,14 l. 793: 44; 6,16 l. 801: 258; 6,24 l. 828: 300; 7,15 l. 948: 379; 9,17 l. 1353: 251; 10,10 l. 1597: 168; 10,37 l. 1797: 286; 11,12 l. 104: 394; 11,15 l. 128: 97 n. 17; 12,29 l. 468: 46; 12,36 l. 541: 213; 12,43 l. 595: 379; 12,44 l. 616: 226; 12,49 l. 647: 368; 13,20 l. 811: 28, 126; 13,45 l. 1026: 75; 14,31 l.

- 1370: 234, 393; 16,26 L 183: 386, 17,16 L 358: 265; 18,6 L 529: 251; 18,8 L 544: 286;
19,12 L 808: 156; 19,12 L 812: 379; 19,12 L 817: 205; 19,12 L 820: 21; 20,22 L 1063:
386; 21,1 L 1184: 221; 21,4 L 1205: 220; 21,6 L 1217: 220; 21,12 L 1352: 225; 21,13 L
1341: 132; 21,13 L 1354: 66; 22,30 L 1828: 156; 23,8 L 119: 318, 23,28 L 252: 313;
25,1 L 698: 49f.; 25,1 L 704: 48; 25,1 L 718: 50 n. 5; 25,1 L 725: 67; 25,10 L 778: 294;
25,33 L 935: 237; 25,33 L 939: 237; 26,25 L 1134: 251
- In Mich. praef.* L 12: 251; 1,3 L 113: 227; 2,9 L 315: 131; 2,9 L 316: 372; 2,9 L 325: 263;
2,11 L 479: 75; 2,11 L 520: 44; 3,1 L 53: 40; 3,9 L 294: 306; 4,1 L 205: 344 n. 8; 4,8 L
314: 148; 5,5 L 206: 393; 5,7 L 325: 141; 5,7 L 394: 124; 6,3 L 138: 221; 6,6 L 215:
386; 6,6 L 218: 386; 6,8 L 245: 409; 6,8 L 250: 21; 6,8 L 260: 46; 7,1 L 91: 129; 7,5 L
143: 100; 7,5 L 256: 100; 7,8 L 418: 210; 7,8 L 440: 57; 7,18 L 716: 221
- In Nah.* 1,6 L 178: 107; 1,6 L 182: 107 n. 4; 2,1 L 47: 95; 2,1 L 50f.: 97; 2,3 L 148: 328;
2,8 L 264: 22; 2,11 L 396: 41; 2,11 L 400: 41; 3,1 L 99: 249; 3,5 L 161 and 175: 53;
3,13 L 595: 221; 3,18 L 785: 148
- Nom. hebr. praef.* p. 1,2: 336 n. 23; p. 4,22: 15; p. 4,28: 182; p. 57,11: 15
- Orates. doctr.* 9: 319; 20: 50, 232; 25: 319; 26: 243; 27: 227, 243; 42: 387; 43: 109; 46:
91; 48: 137; 52: 85, 340
- In Oz. praef.* L 38: 22; L 82: 23; L 88: 22; L 131: 405; 1,21 L 106: 54; 2,1 L 18: 239; 2,2 L
54: 76; 2,6 L 143: 105; 2,13 L 285: 218; 7,13 L 354: 378; 8,1 L 71: 43; 107; 9,10 L 270:
378f.; 11,1 L 84: 182; 11,10 L 331: 137; 12,12 L 322: 182; 13,14 L 378: 164; 13,14 L
379: 6, 164; 13,14 L 380: 165; 14,2 L 106: 300; 14,5 L 149: 165; 14,10 L 223: 290
- Adv. Pelag. praef.* 1: 249, 300; 2: 396; 1,12: 46; 1,15: 280; 1,19: 39; 1,23: 250, 393; 1,27:
29; 1,35: 80f., 391; 1,39: 207; 2,1: 179; 2,3: 143; 2,5: 39; 2,11: 308, 2,13: 21, 249;
2,21: 82; 2,22: 210; 2,23: 46, 267; 2,24: 62, 132; 2,25: 35; 2,28: 185; 3,8: 313; 3,13:
35, 402; 3,14: 43
- Praef. Vulg. Dan.* p. 6,12: 285 n. 6; p. 8,35: 276; p. 10,60: 246; *Ench.* p. 4,5: 254; *euang.*
p. 1,7: 55; *Ezech.* p. 5,7: 246; *Ier.* p. 5,6: 185; *Iob* p. 72,3: 281; p. 73,8: 307; *Iudith* p.
214,1: 192; *Salom.* p. 5,3: 192
- In psalm.* 6: 141, 294; 81: 45; 103: 39f.; 115: 143; 117: 406; 136: 56ff
- Quaest. hebr. in gen.* p. 11,26: 45; p. 14,17: 246; p. 20,20: 404; p. 30,15: 81; p. 30,16:
80; p. 38,21: 234; p. 39,1: 182
- Reg. Pachom. praef.* 2 p. 5,5: 409; 2 p. 5,11: 334; 2 p. 5,12: 327; 2 p. 5,13: 323; 2 p. 6,1:
327; 5 p. 7,1: 334; 5 p. 7,6: 331; 6 p. 8,4: 334; 7 p. 15,1: 325; 20 p. 18,1: 332; 21 p.
18,4: 324; 22 p. 18,8: 324; 25 p. 19,6: 334; 31 p. 21,3: 328 n. 1; 39 p. 22,12: 323; 42 p.
23,14: 334; 45 p. 24,10: 331; 60 p. 32,7: 319; 88 p. 39,4: 334; 122 p. 46,4: 332; 122 p.
46,5: 350; 138 p. 49,9: 332; 143 p. 51,10: 134; 157 p. 57,16: 323
- Adv. Rufin.* 1,11: 295; 1,16: 310; 1,17: 264, 329 n. 12; 1,23: 28; 1,25: 144; 1,29: 152;
1,30: 3 n. 11, 28; 1,31: 283, 285 n. 5; 1,31f.: 296; 2,11: 342 n. 6, 344 n. 9; 2,23: 316;
3,6: 264; 3,9: 66; 3,14: 358; 3,27: 199
- Sit. et nom.* p. 41 L 5: 57; p. 43 L 9: 79
- In Soph. praef.* L 6: 192; 1,2 L 155: 44; 1,11 L 451: 87; 1,11 L 504: 250; 1,11 L 509: 150;
1,15 L 660: 310 n. 3; 1,15 L 674: 310; 2,12 L 523 and 526: 22f.; 2,12 L 633: 107 n. 4;
3,1 L 97: 300; 3,10 L 362: 22; 3,14 L 468: 309
- In Tr.* 1,1 p. 557^c: 129; 1,2 p. 561^a: 388; 1,6 p. 564^b: 199; 1,7 p. 566^b: 277, 394; 1,7 p.
567^a: 93, 272 n. 9; 1,8 p. 568^b: 318; 1,8 p. 568^c: 198; 1,15 p. 576^a: 282; 1,15 p. 576^b:
282; 2,3 p. 580^b: 332; 2,3 p. 581^a: 72; 2,3 p. 581^c: 151, 250; 2,6 p. 583^a: 47; 2,9 p.
585^b: 129; 2,15 p. 590^a: 318; 3,9 p. 594^c: 138; 3,9 p. 595^b: 277
- Tract.* p. 504 L 52: 74; p. 505 L 78: 193; p. 505 L 83: 372; p. 505 L 93: 247; p. 505 L
108: 405; p. 510 L 103: 294; p. 514 L 238: 316; p. 514 L 258: 251; p. 517 L 24: 339; p.
521 L 143: 166; p. 536 L 16: 373; p. 540 L 105: 96; p. 540 L 112: 97; p. 540 L 121:
198; p. 541 L 130: 153; p. 545 L 21: 373; p. 550 L 68: 406; p. 551 L 73: 406; p. 551 L
79: 157 n. 3; p. 554 L 59: 355; p. 555 L 92: 318
- Tract. in Is.* p. 97,4: 74; p. 109,3: 313
- Tract. in Marc.* p. 320,4: 405; p. 321,26: 339; p. 323,10: 246; p. 329,2: 22; p. 332,30:

193; p. 338,11: 63; p. 343,13: 251; p. 344,15: 251; p. 357,12: 378; p. 361,27: 193; p. 366,29: 67; p. 368,9: 63

Tract. in psalm

I p. 5 L 83: 198, 347 n. 3; p. 6 L 92: 21; p. 18 L 234: 385; p. 22 L 100: 22 n. 13; p. 23 L 115: 251; p. 34 L 117: 15; p. 38 L 110: 166; p. 52 L 82: 220f.; p. 53 L 111: 58; p. 54 L 149: 239; p. 54 L 153: 227; p. 55 L 17: 311; p. 58 L 117: 44; p. 61 L 193: 158; p. 69 L 156: 39; p. 71 L 205: 57; p. 74 L 1: 385; p. 74 L 29: 218; p. 75 L 39: 251; p. 77 L 44: 75; p. 78 L 89: 221; p. 78 L 95: 221; p. 80 L 142: 88; p. 80 L 160: 239; p. 86 L 109: 44; p. 87 L 144: 42, 44; p. 87 L 149: 42; p. 90 L 24: 43; p. 96 L 27: 300; p. 96 II, 31f.: 251; p. 99 L 124: 35; p. 100 L 144: 35; p. 100 L 154: 21; p. 107 L 141: 226; p. 108 L 192: 368; p. 114 L 154: 23; p. 116 L 220: 39; p. 116 L 224: 39; p. 117 L 238: 239; p. 117 L 254: 370; p. 126 L 231: 246; p. 130 II, 93f.: 251; p. 130 L 118: 289; p. 131 L 121: 39; p. 134 L 44: 137; p. 135 II, 66 and 68: 251; p. 144 L 69: 129; p. 147 L 175: 46; p. 148 L 182: 90; p. 148 L 207: 112; p. 155 L 164: 368; p. 164 L 67: 158; p. 165 L 114: 251; p. 170 L 100: 220; p. 175 L 215: 186; p. 178 L 29: 145; p. 185 L 116: 66; p. 185 L 119: 43; p. 186 II, 145f.: 40ff.; p. 187 L 177: 251; p. 187 L 186: 260; p. 190 L 34: 198; p. 192 L 15: 294; p. 192 L 20: 296; p. 193 L 35: 268; p. 193 L 40: 46f.; p. 195 L 91: 400; p. 200 II, 137f.: 144; p. 200 L 142: 140; p. 200 L 145: 140; p. 200 L 149: 55, 58; p. 201 L 174: 287; p. 203 L 70: 251; p. 205 L 136: 81; p. 206 L 157: 251; p. 218 L 280: 62; p. 220 L 340: 159; p. 232 L 28: 61; p. 234 L 101: 251; p. 235 L 16: 137; p. 238 L 100: 37; p. 239 L 134: 58; p. 242 L 56: 45; p. 242 L 60: 44; p. 243 L 91: 386; p. 243 L 95: 186; p. 245 L 164: 30, 372; p. 248 L 75: 44; p. 249 L 97: 46; p. 249 L 102: 47; p. 250 L 114: 356; p. 252 L 174: 43; p. 252 L 175: 47; p. 252 L 185: 333f.; p. 252 L 187: 358; p. 257 L 321: 348; p. 261 L 1: 21; p. 263 L 63: 75; p. 264 L 105: 352; p. 265 L 124: 182; p. 267 L 181: 75; p. 274 L 54: 388; p. 275 L 6: 93; p. 277 L 45: 67; p. 288 L 151: 308; p. 289 L 180: 138 n. 5; p. 291 L 260: 47; p. 293 L 11: 44; p. 295 L 6: 57; p. 298 L 74: 89; p. 298 L 81: 57; p. 298 L 86: 58; p. 302 L 47: 276; p. 303 L 71: 46; p. 306 L 134: 56, 58; p. 306 L 135: 57; p. 307 L 167: 308; p. 313 L 71: 382; p. 319 L 190: 303; p. 320 L 209: 385; p. 320 L 229: 118; p. 326 L 100: 303; p. 326 L 108: 306; p. 328 L 166: 129; p. 334 L 160: 311; p. 350 L 63: 146

II p. 358 L 85: 96; p. 370 L 182: 193; p. 387 L 67: 57; p. 393 L 106: 35; p. 393 L 117: 35; p. 394 L 14: 165; p. 410 L 163: 382; p. 416 L 82: 246; p. 423 L 119: 73; p. 429 L 156: 37; p. 433 L 114: 373; p. 433 L 118: 167; p. 438 L 151: 395; p. 438 L 153: 396; p. 440 L 7: 166; p. 445 L 164: 279; p. 446 L 186: 386

Victoria Poetov. in apoc. praef.: 316; 11,5: 251; 20,1: 126; 20,1f.: 49

C. Figul. I: 115; 2: 27; 6: 407; 8: 199; 9: 360; 11: 131; 13: 62; 14: 193; 16: 27, 35; 18: 27
Virg. Mar. tit.: 197; 2: 30, 108; 6: 87; 13: 87; 14: 100, 239; 15: 86, 246; 17: 199; 18: 382; 19: 153, 170; 20: 21, 27, 48, 117, 148, 151ff.; 161, 179, 196, 198, 209, 252, 359; 21: 27, 105, 173, 176f.; 181, 183, 186, 258ff.; 362 n. 2; 22: 30

Vir. ill. praef.: 218; 5: 393; 7: 401; 8: 336 n. 23; 11: 336; 53: 4, 199; 67: 200; 70: 151 n. 10; 86: 381 n. 2; 91: 8; 105: 164 n. 15; 109: 86 n. 1; 117: 86 n. 1, 303; 125: 86 n. 1; 128: 86 n. 1; 129: 175 n. 10; 132: 86 n. 1; 133: 86 n. 1; 134: 13, 78 n. 15, 86 n. 1, 229 n. 5; 135: 13, 197, 257

Vita Hilari. 3,2: 43; 3,3: 55; 3,7: 290; 4,2: 255; 5,3: 82; 32,3: 255

Vita Malchi. I: 316; 6: 371f.

Vita Pauli. 283 n. 1; I: 339; 2: 266; 6: 206; 8: 54 n. 6; 12: 147; 17: 130

In Zach. prol. I 11: 381; 1,2 L 119: 409; 1,18 L 492: 249; 3,6 L 157: 30; 4,1 L 10: 290; 4,8 L 183: 307; 5,5 L 113: 251; 5,9 L 209: 57; 6,1 L 104: 23; 7,1 L 81: 356; 7,8 L 217: 54; 8,1 L 23: 54; 8,4 L 88: 232; 8,6 L 168: 307; 8,11 L 321: 379; 8,23 L 649: 50; 9,5 L 158: 234; 10,8 L 271: 43; 10,11 L 366: 244; *lib. 3 praef.* L 24: 270; 11,3 L 72: 187; 11,8 L 194: 92; 12,1 L 40: 92; 13,3 L 77: 45; 14,10 L 358: 154; 14,10 L 416: 118; 14,13 L 546: 53; 14,15 L 573: 220; 14,15 L 579: 49; 14,15 L 583: 180; 14,16 L 686: 144

INDEX OF PASSAGES: ANCIENT AUTHORS

Acta Archelai, 37,11: 360

Acta Felicis et Fortunati, 3: 293

Acta Joannis, 112: 129

Acta Maximi, 2: 293

Acta Pauli et Theclae, 5: 207

Acta Petri, 5: 129

Acta Thomae A., 60: 129

ALCIMUS AVITUS, *Carm.* 6,576: 296

AMBROSE, *Abr.* 1,2,4: 15; 1,4,23: 15; 1,4,24: 80; 1,4,26: 27; 1,5,38: 206; 1,6,56: 80; 1,6,58: 75; 1,7,65: 27; 2,5,22: 138; 2,9,65: 222; 2,11,80: 167; *Apol. Dav.* 1,4,16: 100; 1,10,51: 102; 1,12,59: 23; *Bon. mort.* 5,21: 352; 7,27: 209; 9,41: 332; *Coen. et Ab.* 1,4,14: 117; 1,5,16: 88; 1,5,17: 387; 2,6,19: 352; *Epist.* 1,4,16: 96; 2,7,26: 102; 2,7,36: 401; 4,15,2: 161; 254; 4,15,4: 254 n. 11; 4,15,6: 261; 4,15,7: 257; 261; 5,18,12: 182; 6,31,12: 267; 7,51,8: 402; 7,52,4: 234; 7,52,6: 22; 8,55: 239; 8,55,7: 352; 8,56,6: 51; 8,56,8: 309; 8,56,11: 108; 8,56,12: 361; 8,56,16: 128; 363; 8,57,19: 30; 9,62,22: 101; 10,73,12: 117; 10,77,11: 37f.; *Epist. extra coll.* 1,22: 64; 106; 6,1: 115; 12,2: 28; 14,11: 216; 14,26: 77 n. 13; 14,28: 82; 14,29: 192; 14,30: 83; 14,35: 173; 14,36: 212; 14,38: 158; 196; 14,40: 54; 14,57: 22; 14,67: 66; 14,72: 34; 14,75: 82; 14,82: 335; 14,97: 395; 15,3: 153; 161; 189; *Exc. Ser.* 1,67: 267; 2,132: 397; *Enchir. virg.* 1,7: 171; 3,17: 173; 180; 3,18: 156; 4,19: 30f.; 4,22: 175; 4,26: 188; 5,29: 232; 6,34: 20; 6,35: 161; 6,40: 345; 7,47: 399; 9,56: 236; 9,57: 134; 213; 9,58: 143; 147; 213; 10,66: 236; 10,67: 236; 10,68: 209; 10,70: 213; 10,71: 213; 364; 11,75: 147; 13,86: 213; 14,91: 35; *Fid.* 2,13,119: 375; 3,1,4: 148; 3,10,71: 167f.; 5,19,238: 44; *Fig. sac.* 2,6: 286; 5,27: 182; *Hel.* 1,1: 88; 3,4: 94; 3,5: 352; 4,7: 89; 5,10: 75; 77; 79; 6,18: 83; 8,22: 94; 8,25: 394; 9,30: 192; 10,34: 356; 10,35: 333; 10,35f.: 258; 12,41: 113; 12,43: 394; 14,51: 69; 15,54: 276; *Hec.* 1,8,30: 119; 1,8,31: 71; 3,5,23: 34; 3,15,64: 103 n. 11; 3,17,72: 114; 5,3,9: 161; 5,18,60: 164; 5,19,63: 140; 5,22,76: 146; 5,24,91: 226; 6,2,5: 83; 6,6,36: 161; *Inc.* 2,5,25: 182; 2,6,29: 71; 2,7,30: 96; 2,9,38: 209; 408; 2,12,56: 148; *Incar.* 7,62: 153; *Inst. virg.* 1,3: 402; 1,5: 22; 2,14: 153; 4,30: 161; 5,36: 160; 6,45: 180; 9,58: 213; 232; 9,59: 163f.; 213; 9,60: 213; 9,60f.: 232; 9,61: 213; 9,62: 213; 10,66: 213; 13,82: 213; 15,93: 213; 16,97: 22; 17,104: 31; 17,111: 227; 232; 17,113: 236; 407; 409; 17,114: 402; *Job* 3,4,11: 352; 4,4,15: 22; *Joseph* 4,19: 141; 352; 6,35: 192; *Isa.* 4,11: 352; 4,16: 237; 5,47: 397; 6,51: 241; 6,52: 148; 397; 6,53: 371; *In Luc. protyf.* 6: 388; 2,20: 216; 2,24: 163; 2,28: 152; 189; 2,86: 21; 2,92: 374; 3,18: 190; 3,24: 167; 4,2: 148; 4,53: 81; 7,57: 168; 7,113: 352; 7,171: 106; 7,246: 299; 8,75: 173; 8,79: 132; 10,11: 71; 10,63: 382; 10,141: 157; *Agar* 7,35: 23; *Nab.* 5,21: 156 n. 2; 5,23: 156 n. 2; *Noe* 7,16: 219; 12,39: 167; 14,49: 379; 15,53: 352; 15,54: 109; *Obit. Theod.* 47: 189; *Obit. Valer.* 38: 216; 40: 216; 52: 216; 64: 216; *Off.* 1,9,29: 29; 1,14,52: 319; 1,18,69: 363f.; 1,18,71: 332; 1,18,76: 212; 1,18,78: 374; 1,19,83: 245; 1,20,87f.: 259; 1,20,88: 229f.; 1,25,117: 375; 1,25,120: 96; 1,30,159: 153; 1,31,163: 352; 1,42,218: 218f.; 1,48,238: 406; 2,1,2: 308; 2,10,52: 22; 3,14,86: 84; 3,21,123: 192; *Parad.* 1,13,61: 46; 1,14,76: 72; 1,16,91: 63; 2,8,67: 64; 2,8,72: 106; 2,9,84: 308; 2,11,106: 57f.; *Parad.* 2,9: 42; 3,16: 96; 3,18: 352; *Parr.* 4,19: 163; 4,22: 167; 5,27: 106; *In psalm.* 1,9,4: 325; 1,24,4: 66; 1,30,2: 156 n. 2; 1,45,1: 22; 35,9,2: 352; 35,11,1: 43; 36,77,1: 43; 37,10,3: 182; 37,33,2: 94; 98; 37,33,3: 95; 38,23,1: 143; 43,1,2: 71; 43,17,3: 96; 43,75,1: 55; 43,75,2: 55; 48,26,2: 81; *118 serm.* 1,11,1f.: 37f.; *118 serm.* 2,9,4: 242; *118 serm.* 2,15,1: 237; *118 serm.* 2,23,2: 74; *118 serm.* 2,27,2: 210; *118 serm.* 2,33,3: 38; *118 serm.* 3,34,1: 43; *118 serm.* 5,39,2: 226; *118 serm.* 6,13,3: 352; *118 serm.* 7,7,2: 352; *118 serm.* 7,8,2: 43; *118 serm.* 7,26,1: 22; *118 serm.* 7,29,2: 352; *118 serm.* 7,31,3: 140; *118 serm.* 7,32,2: 137; *118 serm.* 8,3: 225; *118 serm.* 8,34,3: 58; *118 serm.* 8,59,2:

241; 118 *serm.* 11,13,1: 144; 118 *serm.* 11,24,2: 71; 118 *serm.* 11,25,3: 81; 118 *serm.* 12,9,1: 115; 118 *serm.* 12,33: 138, 352; 118 *serm.* 14,9,2: 242; 118 *serm.* 14,24,2f.: 156 n. 2; 118 *serm.* 14,26,4: 156 n. 2; 118 *serm.* 15,11,4: 268; 118 *serm.* 15,18,3: 100; 118 *serm.* 15,28,3: 395; 118 *serm.* 16,11,2: 79; 118 *serm.* 16,14,1: 31; 118 *serm.* 16,21,2: 23; 118 *serm.* 17,23: 388; 118 *serm.* 18,5,3: 387; 118 *serm.* 18,19,2: 141; 118 *serm.* 18,33,2: 20; 118 *serm.* 19,18,1: 137; 118 *serm.* 19,19,1: 267; 118 *serm.* 19,24,2f.: 182; 118 *serm.* 19,28,1: 409; 118 *serm.* 19,39,2: 242; 118 *serm.* 20,17,2: 250, 268; 118 *serm.* 20,47: 372; *Socr.* 1,3,10: 218; 6,3,13f.: 239; *Spir.* 2,5,38: 163; 3,6,42: 404; *Tob.* 5,16: 148; 7,26: 132; *Vid.* 1,1: 125, 200; 1,2: 132; 2,13: 216; 4,22: 267; 4,23: 149; 6,34: 216; 6,35: 37, 147, 388, 7,40: 72; 12,72: 173; 13,75: 156; 13,80: 186; 14,82: 175, 186; 14,84: 34; 14,85: 267; 14,87: 216; *Virg.* 1,1,4: 190f.; 1,3,10: 216; 1,3,11: 30, 32 n. 12, 190f., 396; 1,3,12: 153, 184; 1,3,13: 190f.; 1,4,19: 123; 1,5,23: 173, 176, 196, 1,6,24: 199; 1,6,25: 27; 1,6,28: 161, 200, 279; 1,6,29: 130; 1,6,30: 209 n. 6; 1,7,34: 153; 1,7,35: 154, 170; 1,7,36: 14, 52; 1,7,37: 173; 1,8,45: 171, 232; 1,8,46: 227, 409; 1,8,48: 409; 1,8,51: 37, 216; 1,8,52: 31, 129; 1,8,52f.: 32; 1,8,53: 74, 79, 396; 1,9,54: 199; 1,9,56: 117 n. 27; 1,10,57: 153; 1,10,58: 223; 1,10,60: 126, 302; 1,10,61: 14; 1,11,65: 172, 2,1,4: 28; 2,2,6: 363; 2,2,7: 363 n. 3; 2,2,7f.: 200; 2,2,9: 135; 2,2,11: 364ff.; 2,2,16: 399, 401, 405; 2,2,16f.: 398; 2,2,17: 32, 399f., 402; 2,2,18: 207; 2,3,19: 209, 363, 400; 2,3,21: 153; 2,4,25: 279; 2,4,27: 216; 2,6,39: 216; 2,6,42: 22; 3,1,1: 216; 3,2,5: 71ff.; 3,2,5ff.: 68; 3,3,9: 128; 3,3,11: 325; 3,3,13: 326, 333; 3,4,15: 138f., 147; 3,4,16: 267; 3,4,17: 171; 3,4,18: 349f.; 3,4,18f.: 350 n. 8; 3,4,19: 146f., 350 n. 8; 3,5,21: 146; 3,6,31: 216; 3,7,32: 216; *Virgini* 2,8: 153; 4,20: 367; 6,27: 30; 6,29: 156, 205; 6,31: 154; 6,32: 198, 205; 8,45: 143; 8,46: 232, 259; 8,47: 267; 8,48: 234; 10,55: 240; 10,57: 234, 240; 10,58: 240; 11,60: 231 n. 8, 239f.; 11,67: 240; 12,68: 130; 12,69: 232; 12,70: 240; 12,72: 240; 12,75: 233, 240; 12,76: 234; 13,77: 227; 13,78: 227; 13,79: 231 n. 8, 233; 13,79ff.: 238, 242; 13,80: 232f.; 13,81: 212, 233, 242; 13,82: 380; 13,84: 233; 14,91: 182, 233; 14,92: 233f.; 15,95: 233; 16,98: 233; 17,108ff.: 32 n. 15; 17,110: 352; 19,127: 387

[PS.]-AMBROSE, *Apol. Dav.* II 3,16: 100f.; II 3,18: 75, 79; II 8,43: 163

PS.-AMBROSE, *Epist.* 1,3: 17; *Ad virg. dev.* I p. 579^c: 14; 2 p. 582^b: 48; 3 p. 583^b: 25; 3 p. 584^a: 302

PS.-AMBROSE (= NICETA OF REMESIANA), *Laps. virg.* 5: 122; 6: 207; 10: 401; 11: 401; 15: 172; 17: 205; 19: 14, 173; 21: 269; 24: 196; 28: 14; 35: 208, 254f.; 36: 47; 39: 211; 40: 256; 41: 79; 46: 146, 49; 294; 51: 294

AMBROSIASTER (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Augustine), *In 1 Cor.* 3,2,1: 73; 7,26,1: 149; 7,28,2: 27; 7,34,2: 34; 9,29: 73; 10,24: 73; *In 2 Cor.* 13,12: 142; *In Rom.* 3,26,1: 296 n. 14; 6,19,2: 73; 9,33,3: 165; *In 2 Tim.* 3,7,1: 258, 378

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, 28,4,34: 263

AMMON OF EGYPT, *Ep.* 23: 31

AMMONAS, *Ep.* 1 p. 433: 339; *Opusc.* 2,2: 252

AMMONIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, *1 Petr.* 3,19-20: 294

AMPHILOCHIUS OF ICONIUM, *Exerc.* 5: 106; 7: 405f.; *Hom.* 1,4: 188; 2,1: 31, 149, 170f.; 4,4: 162; *Mesopot.* p. 125: 83

ANON., *De decem virg.* p. 37: 50; *Περὶ καρβευίας* (Amand-Moons) 4: 154; 37: 247; 58: 180; 60: 142; 100: 401; 106: 14

ANTIPATER OF BOSTRA, *Annunt.* 3: 189; 4: 365; 11: 370

Apocalypse of Peter A (Preuschen), 6ff. (p. 84, 19ff.): 292

APONIUS, 10,11: 98

Apophthegmata Patrum, p. 108^a: 145; p. 136^b: 332; p. 153^a: 48; p. 160^c: 61; p. 169^c: 338; p. 173^a: 338; p. 213^b: 338; p. 429^c: 356; p. 432^a: 405; p. 436^a: 317; 23 (Nau [1907], p. 58): 338f.; 28 (Nau [1907], p. 60): 318; 30 (Nau [1907], p. 62): 317; 63 (Nau [1907], p. 393): 48; 74 (Nau [1907], p. 397): 317; 142 (Nau [1908], p. 49): 222; 146 (Nau [1908], p. 50): 139; 162 (Nau [1908], p. 53): 331; 163ff. (Nau [1908], pp. 53ff.): 62, 211 (Nau [1908], p. 282); 395; 222 (Nau [1909], p. 359); 350; 242 (Nau [1909], p.

- 363); 64: 290 (Nau [1909], p. 376); 323; 292 (Nau [1909], p. 377); 323; 314 (Nau [1912], p. 207); 64; 385 (Nau [1913], p. 143); 350
Apostolic Constitutions, 1,6,4: 280; 2,13,2: 294; 2,57,8: 325; 3,6,4: 269f.; 5,20,16: 192; 8,9,8: 92
- APULEIUS, *Apol.* 76,2: 108; 76,5: 116 n. 25
- AQUILA ROMANUS, *Rhet.* 14 p. 26,14: 371
- ARNOBIUS THE ELDER, *Nat.* 1,59: 30; 3,2: 92; 6,24: 36
- ARNOBIUS THE YOUNGER, *Ad Greg.* 2 p. 387,18: 404; 5 p. 391,25: 94; 8 p. 397,22: 73; 14 p. 408,9: 89; 18 p. 422,10: 218; 19 p. 424,1: 106; 19 p. 427,9: 73; 20 p. 428,6: 14; *In psalm.* 105 l. 107: 132; 117 l. 62: 165; 136 l. 51: 58; 136 l. 56: 56; 140 l. 18: 132
- ASTERIUS OF AMASEA, *Hom.* 6,2,1: 210; 6,2,2: 172
- ASTERIUS OF ANSEDUNUM, *Ad Roman.* l. 111: 339; l. 191: 67; l. 256: 61; l. 268: 408f.; l. 298: 309; l. 423: 258; l. 432: 258; l. 516: 120; l. 548: 161; l. 558: 263; l. 563: 119; l. 564: 119f.; l. 570: 132; l. 583: 120
- ASTERIUS THE SOPHIST, *Hom.* (Richard) 5,16: 311; 7,19: 92; 12,5: 226; 16,13: 396; 21,10: 144; 25,5: 66; 25,15: 43
- ATHANASIUS, *Apol. Const.* 33: 25; 31; *Ep. Marcell.* 6: 14 n. 4; *Fr.* (Lefort [1955]) p. 86,16: 247; *Fr. Lc.* p. 1393^b: 31; 190; p. 1396^a: 395; p. 1396^b: 48; *Letter to virgin* (Lebon) p. 190,25: 52f.; p. 190,30: 51; p. 191,8: 333; p. 191,18: 14; p. 191,23: 235; p. 192,3: 193; p. 192,5: 64; p. 193,14: 325; p. 196,1: 333; p. 198,2: 207; p. 198,20: 121; p. 198,29: 235; p. 199,18: 176; p. 199,32: 54; p. 202,25: 232; p. 203,7: 134; 232; p. 203,8: 227; p. 203,11: 22; *Letter to virgin* (Lefort [1955]) p. 56,5: 31; p. 56,8: 369; p. 56,12: 369; p. 58,11: 184f.; p. 58,15: 185; p. 58,18: 185f.; 190; p. 59,26: 363; p. 60,24: 223; p. 61,34: 363; p. 61,36f.: 364 n. 6; p. 62,1: 364; p. 62,2: 364 n. 6; p. 62,3: 365; p. 62,4: 363; p. 62,6: 366; p. 62,10: 362f.; p. 62,17: 173; p. 62,25: 176f.; p. 62,31: 176; p. 63,7: 177; p. 63,8: 31; p. 63,16: 176; p. 63,25: 177; p. 64,11: 399f.; p. 64,11-38: 398; p. 64,12: 402; p. 64,14: 401; p. 64,17: 403; p. 64,24: 404f.; p. 64,26: 399; p. 64,30: 403; p. 65,20: 360f.; p. 65,23: 361; p. 66,13: 127 n. 6; p. 66,18: 126; p. 69,8: 127; p. 69,25: 229f.; p. 69,32: 231; p. 70,25: 31; p. 71,11: 359; p. 71,30: 361; p. 71,31: 362; p. 71,33: 359; 362; p. 71,35: 360; p. 72,5: 363; p. 76,13: 363; *Sermon on virginity* (Casey) p. 1035: 235; pp. 1042f.: 22; p. 1043: 52; 396; p. 1044: 183; p. 1045: 175; 401; v. *Anton.* 3: 287; 5: 62; 94; 7: 61; 139; 338; 22: 396; 47: 372; 58: 357; 65: 21; *Fig.* 2: 196; 5: 43; 6: 89; 9: 75; 213; 10: 31; 11: 116f.; 207; 253; 12: 73; 303; 20: 137; 22: 135f.; 23: 325; 24: 31; 207; 388; 390 n. 3
- PS.-ATHANASIUS, *Doct. mon.* p. 1424^c: 372; p. 1425^b: 126; *Exhort.* 1: 389; *Par.* 7: 339; 401; 8: 312; *Synag.* 2,16: 355; 4,5: 245; 4,6: 255; 4,8: 257; 5,1: 64; 5,4: 257; 5,5: 260; *V. Syncl.* 8: 401; 20: 373; 23: 126; 24: 212; 25: 135; 26: 94; 29: 271 n. 6; 49: 271 n. 6; 53: 82; 139; 355; 69: 395; 75: 31; 100: 140
- AUGUSTINE, *C. acad.* 1,1,2: 36; *C. Adim.* 12: 75; 13: 235; *C. adv. leg.* 1,21,45: 374; *Agon.* 22,24: 188; *Bapt.* 5,17,23: 70; 6,33,63: 105; *Beat. vir.* 2: 147; 8: 352; *Bon. contig.* 23,30: 269; *Bon. viduit.* 8,11: 34; 172; 10,13: 33; 110; 13,16: 120; 14,18: 172; 15,19: 375; 16,20: 363; 20,25: 140; 21,26: 142; 298; 22,27: 112; *Civ.* 11,15 p. 482,20: 42; 14,5 p. 12,10: 249; 14,8 p. 16,30: 249; 14,17 p. 39,16: 155; 14,21 p. 45,6: 155; 14,21 p. 45,20: 154; 15,5 p. 65,18: 142; 15,16 p. 93,16: 197; 15,26 p. 116,10: 126; 16,2 p. 123,2: 75; 16,34 p. 179,11: 181; 16,34 p. 179,16: 181; 16,34 p. 180,13: 181f.; 18,43 p. 321,28: 259; 19,24 p. 400,28: 210; 20,23 p. 465,6: 259; 21,15 p. 518,11: 382; 22,29 p. 626,6: 259; *Conf.* 1,17,27: 3 n. 11; 1,20,31: 92; 3,8,16: 92; 3,11,20: 147; 4,5,10: 147; 6,3,4: 107; 6,7,12: 379; 8,3,7: 36; 9,6,14: 257; 9,13,37: 107; 10,14,22: 249; 10,42,67: 65; *Cons. evang.* 2,3,6: 382; *Contin.* 2,5: 142; 7,17: 98; *C. Creat.* 2,13,16: 226; 3,63,69: 107; 4,56,67: 106; *Cur. mor.* 12,15: 218; 291; *Discip.* 2,2: 76; 3,3: 106; 10,11: 65; *Divers. quæst.* 55: 403; 58,2: 374; *Doct. christ.* 1,35: 106; 3,62: 157; 3,63: 179; 3,72: 142; 4,48: 259; 4,50: 289; 4,84: 209; 4,104: 90; 4,128: 200; 4,129: 200; 4,132: 30; 200; *De diab. anim.* 1: 106; 3: 147; *Enchir.* 9,30: 70; 39,12: 106; 87,23: 259; *Epist.* 34,3: 106; 36,9: 139; 36,27: 139; 36,31: 139; 50: 310; 54,9:

- 139, 55,17: 226; 69,1: 106f.; 91,1: 62; 92 (*simulus*): 25; 92,6: 238; 93,28: 236; 93,40: 250; 95,2: 213; 105,13: 107; 111,1: 147; 111,4: 226; 126 (*simulus*): 25; 126,2: 259; 131: 238; 140,10: 382; 140,12: 382; 140,77: 70; 140,79: 112; 145,4: 71; 150: 151 n. 11, 172, 238, 268; 151,11: 106; 153,7: 147; 155,4: 70; 170,10: 107; 185,3: 86; 185,12: 106f.; 185,23: 106; 185,30: 106; 185,32: 107; 185,36: 107; 185,44: 107; 185,46: 107; 188 (*simulus*): 25; 188,1: 17; 238; 188,9: 65; 197,5: 259; 208 (*simulus*): 25; 208,7: 238; 211,10: 209, 246; 211,14: 33; 142, 218; 211,15: 269, 323; 212: 33; 238,21: 382; 243,4: 106; 262,9: 131; 266,2: 238; *Epist. Dryj.* 6,8,1ff.: 160; 11,5,4: 250; 11,15,3: 292; 12,12,1: 250; *C. apst. fund.* 23: 106; *In epist. Ioh.* 1,13: 165; 10,8: 132; *In evang. Ioh.* 1,15: 70; 3,19: 226; 6,19: 374; 9,15: 165; 10,2: 226; 13,12: 184 n. 5; 13,14: 49; 13,15: 373; 15,1: 352; 17,15: 226; 25,6: 264f. n. 5; 39,2: 105; 80,3: 226; 86,1: 56; *C. Faust.* 5,4: 382; 12,39: 336; 12,47: 106; 13,16: 106; 15,3: 106; 16,1: 172; 20,15: 375; 22,56; 182; 32,12: 226; *In Gal.* 40,7: 182; *Gen. ad lit.* 9,6 p. 274,17: 183f.; *Gen. c. Manich.* 2,9,12: 352; *Gen. Pelag.* 35,66: 259; *Grat.* 21,42: 226; *Haer.* 68: 257; *C. Julian.* 2,10,33: 259; 2,10,36: 259; 4,8,48: 49; 4,8,50: 49; 5,1,1: 70; 6,19,60: 226; 6,21,67: 107; *C. Julian. op. imperf.* 2,77: 226; 2,142: 390; 3,67: 226; 4,120: 107; 4,122: 154; *Lib. arb.* 1,78: 70; *Mor. eccl.* 1,2: 379; 30,64: 106; 31,65 - 35,80: 247 n. 5; 31,67: 324ff.; 334; 31,68: 302; 33,70: 139, 302, 321; 34,75: 247; *Nat. et grat.* 21,23: 105; 65,78: 259; *Nupt. et conc.* 1,15,17: 109; *Op. monach.* 1,2: 335; 29,37: 335; 31,39: 257; *Ord.* 1,8,23: 119; *C. Parmen.* 2,7,13: 65; 2,10,20: 65; *Pecc. mer.* 2,10,12: 374; *Pecc. orig.* 40,45: 188f.; *C. Pelag.* 1,10,17: 142; *C. Petil.* 2,104,239: 226; 3,5,6: 107; 3,9,10: 106; *In psalm.* 1,4: 70; 7,14: 381; 10,8: 106; 16,13: 75; 17,43: 70; 21, *enarr.* 2,1: 147; 26, *enarr.* 2,14: 147; 32, *serm.* 2,29: 226; 33, *serm.* 2,5: 220; 36, *serm.* 2,4: 296 n. 14; 37,2: 147; 38,3: 105; 38,14: 65; 38,20: 147; 39,8: 106; 44,25: 19; 44,26: 23; 48, *serm.* 2,4: 65; 48, *serm.* 2,8: 296 n. 14; 49,27: 105; 50,11: 147; 51,14: 226; 52,6: 382; 69,3: 65; 70, *serm.* 1,6: 71; 71,1: 22; 71,17: 22; 73,24: 70; 75,16: 18, 33, 48; 83,4: 18, 110; 85,3: 70; 85,7: 229f.; 88, *serm.* 2,14: 106; 90, *serm.* 2,9: 48, 375; 90, *serm.* 2,13: 392; 94,4: 294; 98,14: 165; 99,13: 33, 48, 269; 103, *serm.* 3,5: 106; 110,9: 17; 118, *serm.* 23,7: 388; 122,5: 17; 122,12: 139; 126,2: 22; 127,9: 147; 128,9: 65; 145,16: 106; 146,7: 65; 147,11: 112; 148,9: 28; 148,16: 65; *Quaest. Dulc.* 7,1-4: 404; *Quaest. hept.* 1,26: 259, 404; 1,88: 392; 2,80: 109; 2,158: 235 n. 10; 4,48: 83; *Retract.* 2,71,1: 259; *C. Secundin.* 23: 374; *Serm.* 2,6: 75; 2,7: 75; 8,17: 222; 9,20f.: 274; 14,4: 226; 14,6: 139; 14,8: 36; 14,9: 382; 16,2: 37; 19,2: 65; 20A *tit.* 295; 22,9: 106; 22,10: 106; 29,2: 294; 32,20: 308 n. 1; 45,6: 165; 46,36: 236; 46,37: 237; 50,2: 70; 51,3 *RBen* 91, 1981 p. 25,101: 188; 53A,2 *coll. Morin* p. 627,30: 70; 56,14 *RBen* 68, 1958 p. 36,277: 106; 57,2 p. 415,27 (Verbraken): 106; 72A,8: 367 n. 13; 77,11: 70; 80,7: 347 n. 3; 93,1: 50; 96,10: 404; 101,7 *RBen* 42, 1930 p. 311,175: 169; p. 312,178: 257; 103,3: 226; 112A,5 *coll. Morin* p. 258,19: 65; 113A,3: 296 n. 14; 113B,3 *coll. Morin* p. 290,13: 65; 119,5: 382; 122,3: 96 n. 14; 130,3: 392; 136,2: 65; 136,3: 84; 146,2: 237; 155,3: 226; 161,12: 216; 163B,5 *coll. Morin* p. 217,17: 112; 184,2: 216; 186,2: 382; 188,4: 166; 189,4: 221; 190,3: 221; 191,1: 382; 191,4: 17; 194,3: 382; 196,2: 363, 404; 216,7: 106; 216,8: 106; 251,3: 226; 254,4 *RBen* 79, 1969 p. 65,55: 147; p. 66,57: 147; p. 66,63: 147; 299C,3 *coll. Morin* p. 524,24: 388; 301,4: 226; 308,5: 297; 335I,5 *RBen* 62, 1952 p. 107,86: 226; 335K,5 *RBen* 59, 1949 p. 73,3: 200; 342,5: 382; 348,1: 70; 351,5: 17; 352,6: 83, 222; 352,7: 226; 353,1: 70; 354,9: 33; 356,7: 112; 359,4: 106; 359,6: 106; 362,11: 139; 385,7: 139; 391,6: 363, 404; *Serm. REAug* 40, 1994 p. 183,296: 17; *Trin.* 4,17,23: 92; 14,8,11: 28; *Unif. cred.* 1,2: 147; 2,4: 147; 3,5: 77; 17,35: 106; *Vera relig.* 44: 92; 117: 36; 197: 34; *Vrg.* 2,2: 166; 5,5: 205, 367; 7,7: 205; 10,10: 171; 13,12: 31; 34,1: 13,13: 173; 186; 14,14: 173; 15,15: 198; 16,16: 197; 18,18: 154; 22,22: 196; 23,23: 156; 24,24: 180; 27,27: 407; 34,34: 33; 38,39: 161f.; 369 n. 14; 41,42: 212; 47,47: 33; 49,49: 205; 53,54: 205, 333
- PS - AUGUSTINE, *C. Fulg.* p. 220,22: 107; *Reg.* II 3: 335; 4: 372; 7: 328 n. 2; *Reg.* III 7,1: 323; *Serm. cod. Quelf. app.* 4,7 p. 185,130: 305; *Sobr.* I p. 1105: 29; I pp. 1106f.: 69; 2 p. 1108: 93, 138, 212, 253, 302; 2 p. 1109: 115, 128, 218, 246, 250, 276, 298; 3

- p. 1110: 72, 255; *Vit. Christ.* 7: 79f.; 13: 86
- PS.-AUGUSTINE (= AMBROSIASTER), *Quaest. test.* 2,6: 40, 46,3: 94, 127,18: 378;
Quaest. test. app. ver. 2,1: 83, 2,3: 66, 40: 188
- AURELIAN, *Reg. mon.* 49: 328 n. 2; *Reg. virg.* 32: 328 n. 2
- AURELIUS OF CARTHAGE, *Epist.* 2 (p. 157,31 Munier): 259, 4 (p. 169,14 Munier):
 259
- BACHIARIUS, *Epist.* 1 p. 293,7: 219; 1 p. 294,26: 25; 2 p. 298,5: 367; 2 p. 298,20: 219
 2 p. 300,3: 85; *Repor. laps.* 21: 173
- BASIL OF ANCYRA, *Virg.* 1: 5 n. 17, 26; 2: 117, 124, 396, 4: 398; 7: 93, 95; 8: 72; 9:
 145; 10: 140; 11: 91; 12: 73; 13: 48, 116; 16: 209; 19: 54, 135f., 149, 197; 20: 279, 22:
 134; 23: 124, 149, 151, 196; 25: 15; 26: 52; 27: 278; 28: 376; 41: 207; 43: 48, 119, 48:
 121; 51: 31, 191; 52: 143; 53: 44, 218; 54: 154f., 160, 181, 183; 55: 173, 56: 173, 177,
 186, 196, 198; 57: 156; 58ff.: 180; 59: 47, 162; 60: 42; 68: 31
- BASIL OF CAESAREA (cf. also s.v. Rufinus of Aquileia), *Ascet.* 1,1f.: 51; 1,2: 31; 1,3:
 323, 334; 1,4: 73, 348; 1,5: 334; 2,2: 323; *Ascet. dicit.* 1: 302, 328; 2: 69; *Aug. e. Julian.*
 1,5,17: 375f.; *Ep.* 2,2: 27, 197; 2,6: 332; 22,3: 140, 42,4: 48, 44,1: 42, 350, 45,1: 68,
 131, 144f.; 45,2: 47, 46,2: 173; 46,3: 54, 207; 127: 107; 173: 205; 188,2: 110, 199,18:
 26, 206 n. 2; 199,20: 375; 288: 41; *Hex.* 9,1: 83; 9,2: 271; *Hom.* 1,4: 89; 1,5: 75; 1,6:
 83, 94; 1,9: 131, 333; 2,5: 94; 2,6: 100f.; 2,8: 311; 3,8: 271; 5,3: 348; 5,4: 137, 347,
 6,7: 298f.; 7,8: 91; 9,7: 87 n. 3; 10,7: 92; 12,13: 395; 12,16: 268; 13,1: 106 n. 3; 13,3:
 38; 13,5: 313; 13,8: 389; 15,1: 397; 18,8: 389; 19,1: 372; 20,1: 132; 21,9: 192; *Inst.*
ascet. 3: 189; *Leg. lib. gent.* 4 B.: 148; 9 B.: 271; *Ad mon.* 1.8: 328 n. 4; *Hom. in Ps.*
 32,1: 242; 32,5: 268; 33,7: 393; 33,8: 386; 44,5: 96; 44,10: 20, 59,4: 81, 61,4: 129,
Reg. br. 75: 360; 262: 385; *Reg. fus.* 13: 332; 17,2: 134; 19,2: 331; 20,3: 313; 22,3:
 246; *Remot.* 4: 91, 252, 358; 5: 135; 6: 34, 88, 140, 258; 7: 74, 79, 8: 251f.; 9: 205,
 302, 395
- PS.-BASIL OF CAESAREA, *Cons.* p. 1690^B: 387; p. 1690^B: 387; p. 1695^A: 210; p.
 1696^C: 210; p. 1696^B: 101 n. 5; *Const. praef.* 2: 177, 197; 1,3: 143; 1,4: 72; 1,5: 100;
 6,4: 145; *Contab.* 6: 261; 11: 119; *Ad fil.* 11,30: 35; 71,197: 142; 71,202: 259 n. 2; 7
 1,207: 177; 71,219: 48; 91,265: 299; 91,281: 360; 121,380: 56; 141,426: 71; 151,
 432: 355; 171,465: 277; 191,540: 294; 201,551: 402; 201,582: 401; 201,554: 37; 20
 1,562: 67; *Is.* 1,31: 93, 271; 5,156: 72; 5,157: 276; 5,165: 311; 5,170: 260; 6,186: 141;
 7,193: 15; 8,208: 369; 8,217: 406; 12,251: 168; 13,272: 56f.; 210; 13,274: 55; 13,276:
 55; 14,278: 44; 15,297: 98; *Jey.* 2: 184, 356; *Poen. mon.* 28: 328 n. 2; *Hom. in Ps.* 28,1:
 88; *Strict. hom.* (Smets-Van Esbroeck) 2,15: 271
- PS.-BASIL OF CAESAREA (= EUSEBIUS OF EMESA), *Poenit.* 4: 64
- PS.-BASIL OF CAESAREA (= PROCLUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE), *Aegr.* p. 1716^B:
 159
- BASIL OF SELEUCIA, *Or.* 14 p. 188^B: 124; *I. Theol.* 1 p. 485^A: 31
- BENEDICT, *Reg.* 1,3: 338; 1,6: 321; 1,8: 320; 2,14: 47; 4,50: 57; 4,61: 323; 4,62: 215;
 35 *dir.*: 327; 38,1: 328 n. 2; 38,5: 328 n. 2; 48,22: 335; 63,12: 132
- CAESARIUS OF ARLES, *Epist. ad Ruric.* 1,37: 316; *Epist. ad virg.* 2,1,1: 29; 2,3,7:
 245; 2,3,11: 76; 2,3,14: 135f.; 2,3,21: 112; 2,3,34: 208; 2,5,8f.: 207; 2,6,13f.: 18,
 2,6,23: 319; 2,7,1: 302; 2,8,16: 124; 2,10,12: 124; *Reg. mon.* p. 190,25: 328 n. 2; *Reg.*
virg. 18,1: 323; 18,2: 328 n. 2; 19,1: 335; 23,2: 209; 23,3: 208; 36,2: 134; *Serm.* 1,12:
 109f.; 5,3: 352; 5,4: 39; 5,5: 74; 6,7: 48; 126,363,404; 6,8: 269; 7,2: 160; 10,2: 382;
 11,2: 265 n. 7; 13,3: 325; 19,3: 325; 20,2: 215; 20,3: 90f.; 21,7: 139; 23,1: 390; 23,2:
 31; 26,4: 241; 37,6: 86; 41,1: 372; 42,1: 160; 42,4: 73; 43,9: 74; 44,2: 109f.; 45,1: 142;
 46,2: 140; 46,3: 394; 46,4: 124; 48,3: 86; 50,3: 325; 51,4: 109f.; 52,4: 110; 52,5: 56;
 54,1: 68; 54,6: 319; 55,4: 325; 57,1: 74; 57,4: 382; 58,5: 160; 59,7: 74; 66,1: 68; 68,2:
 294; 69,4: 49; 70,1: 124; 73,5: 68; 319; 78,3: 160; 81,3: 19; 81,4: 15; 88,4: 241; 90,5:
 71; 95,2: 20; 22; 95,4: 241; 96,4: 167; 100,1: 74; 100,12: 222; 100,5: 106; 113,4: 86;
 119,2: 75; 119,3: 71; 124,1: 311; 136,1: 40; 136,4: 40; 151,2: 160; 158,3: 33; 49; 51;
 156,4: 50; 160,2: 241; 160,5: 37; 169,6: 166; 182,1: 73f.; 187,3: 227; 189,4: 68; 198,4:

- 140; 198,5: 139; 200,4: 110; 200,5: 106; 201,1: 140; 201,2: 68; 208,1: 389; 209,4: 68; 214,1: 372; 215,2: 372; 227,1: 241; 237,4: 33
- (PS) CAESARIUS OF ARLES, *Epist. ad virg.* I,1 p. 130,18: 32; I,5 p. 133,28: 132; I,5 p. 134,2: 397; 3,1,3: 238; 3,2,1: 378; 3,5,2: 366; 3,5,4: 135
- CALPURNIUS SICULUS, *Ecl.* 5,92: 277
- Canones Hippolyti*, 78,28: 354; 79,9: 137
- CAPER, *Gramm.* VII 102,7: 25
- CASSIAN, *Concl. praef.* 3: 239; 1,14,7: 249; 1,17,1: 58; 2,17,1f.: 139; 2,22,1f.: 140; 2,23,1: 145; 2,23,2: 139; 3,1,3: 67; 3,6,2: 15; 3,10,5: 222; 5,4,2: 88, 94; 5,7,2: 44; 5,10,1: 93; 5,11,7: 358; 5,12,3: 64; 139; 5,12,4: 41 n. 2; 8,8,1ff.: 43; 10,34: 218; 12,2,5: 51; 12,11,5: 145; 14,8,1: 77; 14,10,2: 219; 14,10,4: 350; 17,19,1f.: 154; 17,30,3: 29; 18,4,2: 319f.; 18,6,1: 339; 18,6,2: 320, 339; 18,6,4: 340; 18,7,1: 320; 18,7,3: 320f.; 18,7,4: 320, 323; 18,7,5: 321; 18,7,8: 320; 18,10: 320; 18,15,4: 320; 19,8,4: 340; 20,7,1: 293; 20,8,10: 139; 21,4,2: 183 n. 3; 21,9,1: 140; 21,23,2: 335; 21,28,3: 222; 22,6,2: 74; 22,6,5: 145; 22,6,7: 144; 22,6,9: 49; 22,10,1: 88; 24,21,3: 83; 24,26,12f.: 395; 24,26,14: 323; *Inst.* 1,1,2: 339; 1,2,3: 255; 1,3: 255; 1,10: 255; 1,11,2: 98; 1,11,3: 83; 144; 1,12,13: 83; 2,4: 324; 2,5,2: 139; 2,5,5: 324; 2,6: 324; 2,7: 324; 2,10,1: 326f.; 2,13,3: 333; 3,2: 335; 3,3,8: 348 n. 4; 3,6: 103; 4,6: 334; 4,17: 325, 328; 4,18: 334; 4,19,1: 327f.; 4,22: 328; 4,36,2: 18; 4,39,2: 252; 5,5,2: 139f.; 331; 5,6: 93; 137; 5,9: 140; 5,11,1: 69; 5,21,1: 71; 5,21,5: 227; 5,24: 139; 5,26: 139; 5,34: 75; 6: 62; 6,4,1: 183 n. 3; 6,4,1f.: 58; 6,6: 31; 397; 409; 6,13,2: 57; 6,14: 26; 7: 298; 10,1: 37; 10,7,1: 31f.; 10,20: 334; 11,4: 249; 11,9: 249; 12,13: 312; 12,19: 164; 12,20: 74; 12,27,3: 326; *C. Nest.* 7,3,1: 312; 7,24,2: 384 n. 6; 7,24,3: 381 n. 2; 7,26,1: 29, 384
- CASSIODORUS, *Inst.* 1,17,1: 336; *In psalm. praef.* 1: 119: 76
- CELSUS, 4,13,6: 139
- CHARISIUS, *Gramm.* p. 102,1: 164; p. 222,9: 343
- CHROMATIUS, *In Matth.* 2,5: 188; 7,2: 190; 9,2: 97 n. 20; 11,4: 167; 32,1: 311; 42,6: 158; 51A,1: 382; 54A,5: 148; 54A,10: 373f.; 55,2: 105; *Serm.* 2,5: 373; 9,6: 106; 24,2: 363; 28,1: 34; 35,1: 209; 40,1: 241
- CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom. in Ac.* 5,4: 209; 44,4: 392; *Anno* 2,5: 348; *Anom.* 12,5: 209; *Catech.* 1,1 (PG 49, p. 224): 105f.; *Catech.* (Wenger) 4,1: 405; 4,26: 333; 5,3: 72; 5,25: 209; 7,5: 74; 7,9: 74; 7,20: 408; 8,8: 15; *Hom. in Col.* 10,5: 155; 12,6: 77; *Comp.* 3: 67; *Composit.* 1,3: 209; 1,8: 381; 1,9: 393; *Hom. in I Cor.* 3,4: 69; 12,6: 153; 19,2: 198; *Hom. in I Cor.* 7,2 1: 213; 4: 209; *Hom. in 2 Cor.* 5,3: 209; 6,4: 313; 7,6: 209; 9,3: 388; 15,4: 209; 17,3: 308; 19,3: 308; 20,3: 313; *Hom. in 2 Cor.* 4,13 1,7: 298; 1,9: 256; 3,6: 393; *Hom. in 2 Cor.* 11,1 1: 209; *Educ. lib.* 28: 212; 35: 276; *Ep.* 2,7: 176; 3,2: 25; 3,8: 393; 39: 25; 207: 393; *Hom. in Eph.* 13,3: 90, 253, 256, 302, 331; 13,4: 189, 209; 14,1: 358; 14,3: 213; 14,4: 52, 207; 20,2: 209; 20,7: 130, 276; 24,5: 294; *Entrap.* 1,1: 106; 2,15: 19; 17,1: 2,17: 209; *Fem. reg. (titulus)*: 13; 1: 225; 2: 124; 4: 54; 7: 22 n. 14; 9: 32; 22,1, 230, 10: 270; 12: 14; *Comm. in Gal.* 5,6: 209; *Hom. in Gen.* 2,3: 376f.; 11,6: 393; 18,4: 31, 181; 23,6: 382; 44,4: 80f.; 45,2: 388; 54,5: 313f.; 55,3: 393; 56,1: 209; *Serm. in Gen.* 7,4: 377; *Hom. in Heb.* 3,6: 149; 20,3: 222; 24,1: 84; 28,7: 49; *Hom.* (Bickersteth) 6: 385; *Hom. div.* 3,1: 155, 388; 4,1: 34; 5,2: 69; 5,3: 63, 69, 256; 6,2: 209; 7,1: 69; 7,2: 75; 8,4: 43, 385; *Hom. suppl.* 4 p. 444: 46; *Is. interp.* 2,3: 106; 3,8: 116, 332; *Hom. in Is.* 6,1 1,1: 191 n. 10; 1,5: 293; 3,3: 44; 4,1: 65, 352; 4,3: 404; 4,4: 34; *Hom. in Jo.* 1,3: 75; 28,3: 130; 32,3: 307; 45,1: 140; 53,3: 385; 60,5: 209; 61,4: 103f.; 88,3: 76; *Aud. et gent.* 3: 385; *Laud.* 4: 305; *Laud. Mar.* 6: 130, 209; 7: 228; *Laz.* 1,8f.: 348; 6,8: 208; 7,5: 233; *Hom. in Mt.* 8,4: 189, 372; 8,5: 372; 10,6: 209; 17,4: 209; 18,5: 209; 20,2: 130; 23,10: 74; 36,3: 209; 41,4: 209; 42,2: 192; 44,5: 140; 47,4: 50, 171; 49,5: 261f.; 307; 50,4: 307f.; 69,3: 341; 77,5: 20; 77,6: 356; 78,1: 50, 176, 179; 78,2: 177; 83,2: 360; 84,4: 209; *Nativ.* 2: 188; *Oppugn.* 2,3: 134, 257; 2,6: 257, 321; *P. redit.* 2,1: 388, 404; *Pan. Bab.* 2,1: 270 n. 4; *Pan. Bern.* 2: 313; 3: 162; 4: 209; *Pan. Pelag. Ant.* 3: 130; *Pan. Phoc.* 2: 106; *Pauch.* 2: 160; *Pecc.* 4: 112; *Hom. in Phil.* 2,3: 374f.; 4,1: 393; 10,5: 130, 308; 12,1: 234; 12,2: 35, 402; 12,3: 184; *Poem.* 3,3: 71.

- 179, 298; 4,3: 49; 5,1: 66; 6,2: 144, 209; *Exp. in Ps.* 9,1: 294; 44,7: 188; 44,11: 209; 44,12: 374; 45,3: 69; 109,6: 69; 110,5: 352; 110,6: 209; 115,5: 135; 139,1: 69; 140,2: 372; 140,4: 314; 144,4: 40; 147,4: 69; *Hom. in Ps.* 48,17 1A: 307; 1,8: 130; 2,2: 130; 307; *Hom. in Ps.* 113,1-3 (Haidacher) p. 355,16: 75f.; *Res. mor.* 7: 396; *Hom. in Rom.* 31,1: 130; 31,3: 163; *Hom. in Rom.* 12,20 4: 130, 209; *Sac.* 6,13: 132; *Sol.* 6,1: 106; 408; 1,18: 132; 2,2: 102; *Theatr.* 4: 47, 207; *Hom. in 1 Thess.* 6,4: 230; *Hom. in 2 Thess.* 1,2: 94, 341f.; *Hom. in 1 Tim.* 2,3: 159, 308; 8,2: 116f.; 8,3: 109f.; 117, 9,1: 325; 14,3ff.: 323; 14,4: 331; 14,6: 76; *Hom. in 2 Tim.* 7,4: 131; 10,5: 395; *Hom. in Tit.* 2,2: 209; *Virg.* 1,1: 374; 1-8: 375; 2,2: 173; 3: 374; 5,1: 374; 6,1: 134; 9,3: 178; 10,1: 154; 11,1: 190; 14,4: 181; 15,2: 160; 19,1: 181; 26: 54; 39,1: 198; 41,1: 197; 41,5f.: 173; 41,6: 174f.; 42,3: 186; 47,5: 197; 49,2: 186; 57,6: 27; 63,3: 333; 74,1: 196; 77: 49; 79,1: 183; 79,2: 83; 191 n. 10
- PS-CHRYSOSTOM. *Ador.* 2 p. 752: 69; *Annunt.* p. 756: 364; p. 760: 107 n. 4; *Annunt. et Ar.* p. 766: 188, 371; *Ascet. faciet.* p. 1056: 56; p. 1057: 121; *Annunt. Chr.* 2 p. 730: 188; *Coac.* 4: 84; *Elem.* 1 p. 1061: 176f.; 1 p. 1062: 160, 190; *Hom. in Gen.* 3,4: 404; *Hebr. jej.* p. 703: 189; *Hom.* 1 p. 12: 363; 1 p. 14: 147; 2 p. 15: 184; 10 p. 40: 110; 226; *Hom. in Jo.* 1,1 2: 280; *Hom. in Jo.* 7,15 3: 226; *Hom. in Job* 3,3: 305; *Jud.* p. 1076: 184; *Hom. in Lc.* 2,1 1: 41 n. 2; *Méret.* 1,1: 166; *Hom. in Afr.* 26,39 p. 755: 226; *Nat. Chr.* 1 p. 738: 188; 2 p. 765: 166; *Op. imperf. in Matth.* 1 p. 613: 13; 1 p. 618: 374; 1 p. 627: 210; 3 p. 648: 97; 11 p. 691: 207; 17 p. 728: 75; 19 p. 739: 377; 21 p. 748: 74; 42 p. 870: 31; 44 p. 880: 258; 46 p. 895: 74; 48 p. 905: 256; 49 p. 908: 106; 49 p. 913: 210; 52 p. 929: 48f., 51, 124; *Passch.* 4 p. 731: 373; 6,3: 96; *Patr. et Paul.* 1: 69; *Poenit.* 1,1: 145; 1,4: 145; 2,3: 145; *Præcura.* 1,1: 189; 2 p. 491: 97; *Proc.* p. 923: 159; 2 p. 779: 67; *Prodig.* 1,3: 166; *Hom. in Ps.* 50 2,7: 102; 3,6: 102; *Hom. in Ps.* 76,4 2: 184; *Hom. in Ps.* 83 1: 20; 2: 226; *Hom. in Ps.* 103,5: 40, 42; *Psalm.* 6: 119f.; *Puer.* 2: 271 n. 6; *Rach.* p. 700: 182, 189; *Sal. Hierosol.* 1: 90; *Samarit.* 1,2: 189; *Serm. jej.* 1 p. 787: 94; 1 p. 790: 94; *Synops.* p. 319: 80; *Theol.* p. 745: 372; p. 748: 16; *Theoph.* 1 p. 805: 66; *Villic.* p. 788: 132; *Virg. corrupt.* p. 741: 207; p. 743: 180, 188; p. 744: 48; *Virg. parab.* 1: 50; *Virg. spei* p. 774: 184
- PS-CHRYSOSTOM (= HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM). *Hom. in Ps.* 86,4: 374; 90,1: 37
- PS-CHRYSOSTOM (= SEVERIAN OF GABALA) *Hom. in Ps.* 95,1 6: 375
- CICERO, *Att.* 12,28,2: 112; *Catil.* 2,11: 71 nn. 6f.; 4,19: 264f.; *Fam.* 5,8,2: 119; *Fin.* 1,8: 289 n. 10; *Lael.* 74: 223; *Manif.* 30f.: 296; *Off.* 1,150: 260; *Orat.* 33: 390f.; *De orat.* 2,363: 288; 3,101: 330; *P. red. in sen.* 16: 261; *Tim.* 6: 92; *Tusc.* 1,30: 159; *Verr.* 11 4,23: 199 n. 2
- CIL, II 391: 273; IX 4693: 132
- CLEDONIUS, *Gramm.* V 57,11: 343
- CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA. *Psalm.* 2,1,11,1: 140; 2,6,49,1: 212; 2,7,60,1: 325f.; 2,8,61,1: 260; 2,9,77,2: 90; 2,10,90,1: 271; 2,10,100,3: 30; 2,11,117,1: 253; 2,11,117,2: 257; 3,1,3,3: 209; 3,2,12,3: 209; 3,7,38,1: 82; 3,11,72,2: 109; 3,11,73,4: 333; *Q. d. s.* 25,5: 71; *Str.* 1,5,30,2: 271; 1,21,127,1: 41 n. 2; 2,1,3,3: 172; 3,6,53,1: 174; 3,15,98,1: 180; 4,19,118,4f.: 192; 7,7,40: 346 n. 2; 7,7,49,4: 137
- CLEMENT OF ROME, *Ad Cor.* 2,5: 164; 55,4: 192; 55,6: 192
- PS-CLEMENT OF ROME, *Ep. ad virg.* 1,6: 183; 2,9ff.: 100
- 2 CLEMENT, 8,3: 294 n. 12
- Codex Iustinianus*, 1,3,32 pr. (n. 472): 128
- Codex Theodosianus*, 16,2,20: 132, 258; 16,2,27,1: 254; 16,5,9 pr.: 115 n. 24
- Collectio Ariana*, *Hom.* 11,3: 221; *C. Ind.* 1,3: 374; *Serm.* 1,4: 382; 10,2: 382
- Collectio Avellana*, 2,69: 79; 2,103: 51; 25,3: 216; 27,2: 216; 40,2: 259
- COMMODIAN, *Apal.* 389: 73; *Instr.* 2,15,3: 109; 2,18,11: 68; 2,21,13: 65
- Communitioes Sanctorum Patrum*, 1,4: 388; 2,4 (= *Plac. Patrum* 3,10): 38; 2,7: 74
- Consultationes Zacchaet et Apollonii*, 1,17 p. 20,3: 79; 3,3 p. 102,7: 321; 3,3 p. 102,9:

334; 3,3 p. 102,17; 65; 3,3 p. 102,26; 60; 3,4 p. 104,1; 82; 3,5 p. 105,31; 171; 3,5 p. 106,1; 154; 3,5 p. 106,6; 158; 3,5 p. 106,7; 155; 3,5 p. 106,9; 158; 3,5 p. 106,13; 156; 3,5 p. 106,23; 176; 3,6 p. 107,11; 31; 3,9 p. 116,19; 83

Council of Ancyra (a. 314), 21: 110

Council of Carthage (a. 345/348), p. 3 l. 11: 106; p. 5 l. 67: 120

Council of Elvira, 5: 27; 15: 140

Council of Gangra, 3: 269; 13: 254; 17: 254

Council of Saragossa (a. 380), 4: 257

Council of Toledo (a. 400), 1: 259

Council of Valence (a. 374), 4: 259

Council of Vannes, 4: 26

CYPRIAN, *Demetr.* 10: 70; 19: 158; *Domin. orat.* 21: 311; 31: 241; 36: 408; *Ad Donat.*

3: 70; 5: 408; 6: 158; 15: 138, 228ff.; *Eloem.* 9: 301; 11: 311; 17: 311f.; *Epist.* 4,1,1: 120; 4,3,2: 236; 4,4,1: 110; 120; 6,2,1: 387; 6,4: 52; 10,2,1: 297; 10,4,4: 297; 13,2,1: 204 n. 1; 16,4,2: 105; 21,3,2: 66; 31,3: 67; 33,2,1: 66; 37,3,1: 52; 38,1,2: 94; 39,5,2: 259; 45,4,1: 259; 52,2,5: 111 n. 13; 55,17,3: 294; 55,29,2: 294; 58,5,1: 387; 58,6,3: 92; 63,3: 75; 63,16,1: 268f.; 66,7,3: 297; 69,4,1: 373; 72,1,3: 73; 73,4,2: 119; 74,11,3: 373; 75,15,2: 373; 76,2,4: 60; 386 n. 7; 76,4,1: 386; *Fort.* 6: 381; 7: 18; 400; 8: 205; 9: 393; 10: 56; 11: 387; 12: 386; 13: 393; *Hab. virg.* 3: 122f.; 200; 4: 156; 407; 5: 51; 131; 196; 244; 6: 213; 244; 7: 273; 9: 115f.; 10: 250; 312; 11: 113 n. 17; 273; 276; 12: 53 nn. 4f.; 54 n. 6; 13: 109; 15: 239; 278; 376; 18: 34; 49 n. 4; 72 n. 9; 128; 212; 19: 208; 20: 107f.; 110; 21: 128; 233; 397; 22: 31; 148ff.; 199; 204; 213; 408; 23: 156; 176; 181; 23f.; 200; 24: 213; *Idol.* 9: 316; 11: 373; *Laps.* 2: 105; 6: 51; 11: 71; *Mortal.* 2: 158; 3: 158; 4: 70; 26: 160; 398ff.; 403f. n. 4; *Patent.* 389; 10: 387; 18: 314; 20: 125; 21: 158; *Sent. episc.* 26: 105; *Testim.* 1,20: 182; 2,1: 393; 2,6: 44; 2,7 *nr.* 339; 2,19: 167f.; 2,28: 393; 3,1: 311; 356; 393; 3,3: 393; 3,6: 233; 305; 393; 3,10: 56; 3,11: 18; 88; 186; 196; 244; 303; 3,15: 387; 3,16: 205; 386; 394; 3,17: 393; 3,18: 381; 3,21: 355; 3,32: 148f.; 156; 175; 196; 407; 3,36: 53 n. 4; 3,55: 244; 3,56: 361; 3,60: 79; 3,61: 305; 310; 312f.; 3,64: 39; 3,66: 388; 3,70: 135; 3,74: 68; 275; 3,95: 270; 3,100: 318; 3,107: 354; 3,114: 294; 3,117: 36; *Unit. eccl.* 3: 41; 376f.; 8: 373; 14: 373; 16: 70; 23: 105; *Zel.* 2: 276; 6: 70; 9: 70f.; 12: 377; 16: 138; 17: 83; 18: 408

PS.-CYPRIAN, *Adv. Iud.* 5,4: 75; *Laud. mart.* 10: 389; 11: 397; 14: 158; 297; 17: 130; 18: 387; 21: 265; 25: 297; 30: 397; *Singul. cler.* 2: 121; 6: 196; 7: 120; 258; 9: 340; 10: 276; 17: 132; 18: 34; 26: 276; 312; 39: 31; 40: 151f.; 44: 34; *Tract.* 5: 158; 17: 372; 21: 49

PS.-CYPRIAN (= NOVATIAN), *Pudic.* 2,3: 5 n. 17; 26; 4,3: 125; 7,2: 31; 177; 7,3: 149; 151; 408; 7,3f.: 151 n. 12; 7,4: 151; 10,1: 140; 11,2: 71; 11,3: 70; 12,3: 51; 12,5: 130; 14,4: 87

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, *Ador.* 14 p. 916^a: 157; *Glaph. Gen.* 4 p. 201^a: 182; 4 p. 212^a: 182; 4 p. 220^a: 182; 4 p. 220^aff.: 182; 5 p. 232^a: 182; 6 p. 296^a: 182; 6 p. 329^a: 182; *Hom. pasch.* 1,4: 94; 12,2: 92; 17,3: 369; 27,3: 305

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *Catech.* 4,24: 31; 34; 4,25: 33; 171; 6,38: 31; 12,5: 160; 12,15: 188; 12,34: 31; 13,34: 389; 13,36: 353; 15,23: 31; 16,23: 408; *Ep. Const.* 1: 28

DAMASUS, *Carm.* 37,8: 207

Didascalia Apostolorum, 3,2: 280; 3,7-16: 280; 4,21: 73; 55,4: 73; 56,10: 73; 56,13: 73; 60,15: 168

DIDYMUS, *Pr.* 1,8: 106; *Pr.* 33,3: 244; 50,6: 102; 67,32: 20; 88,49: 45; *Zach.* 3,217: 158; 13,3: 45

DIOMEDES, *Gramm.* 1,310,16: 163

DONATUS, *Gramm. mol.* 2,5 p. 619,13: 320; 2,5 p. 620,3: 25; 2,12 p. 635,1: 343; 2,14 p. 645,16f.: 156 n. 1; 3,6 p. 672,8: 85; *Gramm. min.* 3: 186; 4: 343; *Ter. Andr.* 506,3: 329 n. 11; *Ter. Eun.* 167,2: 201; 236,4f.: 309f.; 251,1: 215; *Ter. Phorm.* 254,1: 25

EPIPHANIUS LATINUS, *In euang.* 7 p. 6,10: 182; 15 p. 10,20: 73; 19 p. 20,14: 395; 19 p. 22,19: 299; 21 p. 29,5: 71; 29 p. 51,8: 234; 34 p. 70,16: 31; 36 p. 76,23: 50; 37 p.

- 84,19: 159; 38 p. 86,24: 31; 42 p. 97,17: 126; 42 p. 100,1: 241; 42 p. 101,5: 312; 51 p. 128,21: 312; 56 p. 152,5: 294; 59 p. 162,13: 176; 59 p. 162,14: 31
- EPIPHANIUS OF SALAMIS, *Anc.* 40,5: 165; 98,8: 184; 102,3: 168; 102,4: 212; 109,6: 404; *Exp. fid.* 5,1: 403; 8,4: 403; 13,8: 256; 23,3: 257; 23,5: 61; 23,6: 255ff.; *Haer.* 43,2,3: 92; 48,8,8: 178; 58,4,8: 184; 61,4,3: 373; 63,3,8: 75; 63,4,5: 184; 64,4,8: 162; 64,20,2: 148; 64,57,1: 58; 75,8,2: 106 n. 2; 76,54,14: 30; 77,21,2: 30; 78,10,11: 189; 78,16,5: 369; 78,16,7: 401; 78,18,5: 188; 79,5,2: 184; 401; 79,6,2: 369; 80,6,5: 106; 80,6,6: 255, 257
- PS.-EPIPHANIUS OF SALAMIS, *Hom.* 1 p. 432^C: 280; 2 p. 452^C: 374; 2 p. 461^A: 65 n. 12; 4 p. 480^A: 385; 4 p. 485^A: 126; 5 p. 488^A: 30; 5 p. 489^A: 371; 5 p. 492^A: 165; 5 p. 501^A: 189; *Num. myst.* 3: 404; *V. proph.* 10 p. 404^A: 85
- Epistulae*, ed. Caspari, 7 p. 171: 158; 7 p. 175: 306f.; 7 p. 177: 348
- Epistulae Migne suppl.*, 1,1701: 65, 325; 1,1703: 124; 1,1704: 293
- EUCHERIUS, *Epist. ad Val.* p. 726^C: 158; *Form. praef.*: 77; 2 p. 11,5: 144; 4 p. 22,15: 180; 6 p. 36,8: 166; 6 p. 36,22: 94; 6 p. 37,1: 95; 7 p. 43,4: 141; 7 p. 47,11: 75; 9 p. 51,20: 374; 9 p. 56,1: 242; 10 p. 61,4 and 20: 126; 10 p. 62,4: 126; *Instr. 1 praef.* p. 65,9: 29; 1 p. 75,9: 75, 179; 1 p. 102,26: 58; *Laud. her.* 23: 402
- EUGRAPHIUS, *Ter. Eun.* 232: 214; 244: 214
- EUNAPIUS, *VS* p. 472,37: 257
- (PS.)-EUSEBIUS OF ALEXANDRIA, *Serm.* 1 p. 317^B: 67; 1 p. 320^A: 356; 1 p. 321^A: 47; 1 p. 321^C: 355; 3 p. 329^A: 188, 190; 3 p. 332^A: 44; 4 p. 336^B: 359; 10 p. 368^C: 163; 14 p. 528^B: 360; 21 p. 437^B: 302; 22 p. 460^{A-B}: 256f.
- EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA (cf. also s.v. Rufinus of Aquileia), *D. e.* 1,9: 181; *Ecl.* 4,5: 369; *H. e.* 3,28,5: 271; 5,28,12: 297; 7,25,3: 271f.; *A.* 7,18: 41 n. 2; 8,7: 41 n. 2; 13,21: 55; *P. e.* 8,11,1ff.: 336f.; 8,12,1ff.: 336; 11,5,2: 289f.; *Ps.* 21,17: 52; 45,2: 52, 220; 59,8: 81; 64,10: 52; 65,14: 381; 66,2: 154; 81,4: 42; 90,3: 381; 126,8: 57f.; *Qu. Steph.* 8,3: 102; 9,1: 81
- EUSEBIUS OF EMESA (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Basil of Caesarea), *Fr. Gal.* 4,4: 189 n. 3; *Fr. Gen.* 3,1: 88; 9,23: 75; 12,17: 404; 32,25: 96; *Serm.* 6,3: 27, 31; 6,4: 27; 6,5: 149, 151, 189; 6,6: 31, 154, 170; 6,8: 191; 6,9: 72, 93f.; 6,12: 268 n. 2; 6,13: 120; 6,16: 149, 163; 6,17: 170; 7,5: 31, 408; 7,11: 124; 7,13: 31, 268 n. 2, 352; 7,14: 35 n. 3; 7,15: 27, 124; 7,18: 151; 7,21: 207; 7,26: 235; 7,27: 211; 7,28: 235; 8,1: 352; 8,10: 352; 13,27: 188; 15,17: 395; 26,20: 73
- (PS.)-EUSEBIUS GALLICANUS, *Hom.* 1,8: 367f.; 18,2: 296; 38,2: 71; 39,4: 48f.
- EUTROPIUS PRESBYTER (cf. Index of Passages: Jerome, s.v. Ps.-Jerome)
- EVAGRIUS OF ANTIOCH, *Vita Anton.* 55 p. 921: 357
- EVAGRIUS GALLICUS, *Ahere.* p. 18,3: 164; p. 35,6: 374; p. 52,4: 226
- EVAGRIUS PONTICUS (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Nilus of Ancyra), *Serm. mon.* 11: 94 n. 7; 45: 57; 46: 146; *Serm. virg.* 48: 276; 52: 390 n. 3; 55: 209; *Vit. cog.* 1: 58
- EVODIUS, *Fid.* 45: 105
- FAUSTINUS, *Trin. praef.*: 29, 352; 7,2: 44
- FAUSTUS OF RIEZ, *Epist.* 7 p. 202,12: 132
- FERRANDUS, *Epist.* 7,1: 140
- FERREOLUS, *Reg.* 26: 335; 32: 260
- FILASTER, 61,2f.: 375; 61,3: 378 n. 22; 81: 257; 110,9: 183 n. 3, 185 n. 7
- FRONTO, p. 141,22: 264 n. 5; p. 150,13: 164
- FRUCTUOSUS OF BRAGA, *Reg. monarch.* 5: 330 n. 15
- FULGENTIUS, *Alysh.* 2,2: 98
- GAUDENTIUS, *Serm. praef.* 50: 87; 1,18: 222; 2,22f.: 97; 4,18: 333; 5,5: 51; 5,9: 169; 7,23: 222; 8,12: 162; 8,17: 276; 8,18: 353; 8,25: 158 n. 6; 8,30: 74; 8,36: 94; 13,29: 141; 13,34: 305; 16,3: 295; 18,26: 50; 19,1: 239; 19,4: 382; 19,26: 259; 19,35: 166; 19,37: 396; 21,13: 245
- Gelastian Sacramentary*, 790: 50

GELASIUS, *Epist. frag.* (Theil) 10: 259

Gloss. 1300 (cod. Leid. 191): 132; II 169,24 marg.: 320; II 567,23: 394; V 412,54: 320; V 414,7: 132

Gramm. Suppl. 153,30: 343

GREGORY OF ELVIRA (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Origen), *De arca* 4: 374; 5: 79; *In cont.* 1,24:

20; 2,20: 237; 2,25: 400; 2,31: 106; 4,20: 182; 5,4: 73; *Fid.* 41: 34: 164; 81: 118: 382

GREGORY NAZIANZEN (cf. also s.v. Rufinus of Aquileia), *Carm.* 1,1,2,48: 396;

1,1,3,4: 396; 1,1,10,5C: 395; 1,1,11,9: 395; 1,1,16,22: 83; 1,1,17,48: 210; 1,2,1,117ff.:

181; 1,2,1,127: 181; 1,2,1,188: 154; 1,2,1,189ff.: 187f.; 1,2,1,197ff.: 190; 1,2,1,198:

164; 1,2,1,200: 189; 1,2,1,209f.: 191; 1,2,1,210: 396; 1,2,1,222: 170 n. 2; 1,2,1,234:

197; 1,2,1,235: 163; 1,2,1,290f.: 303; 1,2,1,338ff.: 170 n. 2; 1,2,1,385f.: 170;

1,2,1,624ff.: 26; 1,2,1,658: 19; 1,2,1,682f.: 360; 1,2,1,687: 172 n. 7; 1,2,1,689f.: 170 n.

2; 1,2,1,697: 171 n. 6; 1,2,2,51ff.: 17f.; 1,2,2,73: 207; 1,2,2,77: 212; 1,2,2,81f.: 333;

1,2,2,85: 130; 1,2,2,100: 120; 1,2,2,105: 235; 1,2,2,172ff.: 311; 1,2,2,179: 210;

1,2,2,190: 401; 1,2,2,211ff.: 88; 1,2,2,370: 267; 1,2,3: 18 n. 8; 1,2,3,6: 31; 1,2,3,25:

170; 1,2,3,27f.: 179; 1,2,3,29ff.: 190; 1,2,3,33f.: 18; 1,2,3,48: 360; 1,2,3,50: 19;

1,2,3,55: 134; 1,2,3,68: 235; 1,2,3,72: 267; 1,2,3,76: 27; 1,2,3,81f.: 88; 1,2,3,85f.: 311;

1,2,3,96: 180; 1,2,6,22f.: 360; 1,2,6,29: 235; 1,2,6,58f.: 18; 1,2,7,3f.: 31; 1,2,9,48: 362;

1,2,10,496ff.: 313; 1,2,10,530: 312; 1,2,10,892: 31; 1,2,10,923f.: 191; 1,2,14,92: 395f.;

1,2,29,7: 116; 1,2,29,45: 47; 1,2,33,222: 396; 1,2,34,176: 397; 2,1,1,8: 210; 2,1,1,16:

395; 2,1,1,66f.: 93; 2,1,34,101f.: 207; 2,1,38,35: 171; 2,1,44,25: 257; 2,1,44,27f.: 257;

2,1,44,35f.: 31; 2,1,45,222: 163 n. 14; 2,1,50,23f.: 17; 2,2(epit.),61,3: 163 n. 14;

2,2(epit.),74,2: 163 n. 14; 2,2(epit.),91,1: 163 n. 14; 2,2(epit.),100,1f.: 38;

2,2(epigr.),11,5: 19; 2,2(epigr.),16,11f.: 120; 2,2(epigr.),17,2: 31; 2,2(epigr.),22,2f.:

360; *Ep.* 120: 222; 147: 92; 183: 171; *Or.* 1,3: 222; 1,5: 395; 2,7: 67; 2,22: 396; 2,73:

396; 2,93f.: 207; 3,1: 396; 4,69: 401; 4,71: 253; 5,3: 41 n. 2; 6,2: 65; 168; 257; 333;

340; 7,22f.: 396; 14,8: 376 n. 17; 14,16: 306; 14,17: 271; 16,7: 294; 17,9: 396; 18,17:

374; 18,23: 252; 19,14: 155; 19,16: 163 n. 14; 20,3: 207; 24,9: 232; 24,10: 210; 401;

25,2: 396; 25,12: 210; 26,2: 390; 26,11: 209; 26,12: 312; 27,3: 271; 27,9: 38; 28,12:

42; 30,14: 395; 30,21: 395; 32,9: 40; 33,10: 130; 33,15: 396; 37,10: 31; 48; 154; 170;

37,11: 341; 37,16: 341; 38,1: 367; 38,2: 208; 38,2: 39,13: 382; 39,17: 396; 40,26: 31;

40,40: 96; 40,45: 395; 41,12: 242; 43,47: 279; 43,62: 31; 43,63: 63; 44,15: 222; 45,15:

57; 45,18: 96; 45,19: 167

(PS.)-GREGORY NAZIANZEN, *Carm.* 1,2,32,105f.: 72

GREGORY OF NYSSA, *Bapt. Chr.* p. 589^A: 165; *Beat.* 4 p. 1244^B: 271; 5 p. 1249^B:

396; 6 p. 1272^B: 38; *Hom. in Cant.* 2 p. 804^C: 237; 4 p. 840^C: 165; 5 p. 881^A: 43; 7 p.

917^B: 15; 10 p. 980^B: 38; 11 p. 1005^C: 167f.; 12 p. 1029^B: 234; 14 p. 1081^A: 43;

Castig. p. 316^B: 192; *Hom. in Eccl.* 3 p. 660^B: 80; 7 p. 716^B: 157f.; *Ep.* 2,17: 56; *Eum.*

2,438: 55; *Hom. opif.* 13: 41 n. 2; *Instit.* p. 52,19: 244; p. 83,13f.: 50; *Laud. Bas.* p.

808^B: 38; p. 812^A: 219; *Marr.* 2 p. 768^C: 305; 2 p. 769^A: 163 n. 14; 3 p. 777^B: 210; 3 p.

785^B: 210; *Metec.* p. 856^C: 219; *Morr.* p. 528^B: 130; *Or. dom.* 5 p. 1180^A: 396; *Pausp.* 1

p. 456^A: 360; *Placill.* p. 881^A: 210; *Ps.* 6 p. 612^B: 61; 6 p. 613^A: 294; *Pss. tit.* B 10:

318; B 12: 271; *Res.* 3 p. 677^B: 56; *Spir.* p. 697^C: 242; *V. Ephr.* p. 821^A: 122; p. 845^B:

38; *V. Macr.* 2: 401; 7: 268; 11: 269; *Virg. praef.* 1: 26; 1: 376; 396; 2,1: 165 n. 17;

2,2: 190; 367; 2,3: 29; 4,5: 271; 6,1: 184; 7,1: 153; 177f.; 12,4: 160; 13: 31; 18,4: 197;

19: 399

GREGORY THAUMATURGUS, *Pan. Or.* 1,2: 29; 9,120: 249

PS.-GREGORY THAUMATURGUS, *Annunt.* 1 p. 1152^B: 219; 2 p. 1157^A: 365; 2 p.

1157^B: 31; 2 p. 1168^B: 43; 3 p. 1173^B: 219; 3 p. 1177^A: 188; *Sanct.* p. 1197^A: 29; p.

1199^A: 135f.

HERMAS, *Sim.* 9,12,4: 157 n. 4; 9,15,4: 157 n. 4; *Vis.* 4,2,1: 23

HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Chrysostom), *In lev.* 7,8 p. 859^B: 144;

Serm. (Aubineau [1978]) 6,2f.: 366f.; 8,1: 373; 8,8: 395; 9,24: 382; 12,10: 149; 13,7:

393

- PS.-HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM, *Serm.* (Aubineau [1978]) 16,29: 188, 21,1: 29
- HILARY OF ARLES, *Vita Honorat.* 14,1: 12: 402
- HILARY OF POITIERS, *Coll. antior.* p. 119,3: 259; p. 119,13: 259; p. 181,14: 128; *In*
 33,8: 157; *Myrr.* 1,13: 373; *In psalm.* 1,12: 346 n. 2; 2,46: 395; 2,47: 396; 14,8: 373;
 65,24: 381; 66,2: 154; 67,16: 164; 67,21: 52; 67,32: 52; 68,30: 52; 118,4: 52; 118
 p. 422,2: 140; 118 caph 4 p. 452,20: 144; 118 lamed 7 p. 460,27: 52; 118 phe 3 p.
 507,25: 66; 118 zade 3 p. 516,18: 224; 119,8: 52; 119,19: 94; 119,21: 20; 120,16: 52;
 122,7: 52; 127,7: 388; 128,8: 109; 136,14: 56; 58; 137,1: 294; 138,4: 388; 139,16: 385;
 80: 66; *Trin.* 1,33: 395; 2,24: 381; 2,25: 384, 386, 395; 3,16: 382; 5,20: 28; 6,40: 28;
 7,4: 106; 9,4: 395; 10,7: 395; 10,15: 382; 12,48: 382
- PS.-HILARY OF POITIERS, *Epist. ad fil.* 5,2: 116
- HIPPOLYTUS, *Haer.* 10,32: 92
- Historia Augusta, Heliog.* 4,3f.: 34 n. 2; *Quint. tyr.* 2,2: 34 n. 2; 4,4: 34 n. 2; 12,7: 34 n.
 2; 14,4f.: 34 n. 2; 15,8: 34 n. 2
- Historia Monachorum* (cf. also s.v. Rufinus of Aquileia), 1,17: 61; 1,20: 372; 2,8: 350 n.
 9; 2,9: 38; 8,50: 350 n. 9; 8,59: 256; 10,7: 350 n. 9; 20,3: 94 n. 7; 145
- HOMER, *Il.* 16,235: 253
- Homiliae Clementinae*, 4,13,3: 92; 4,19,3: 280; 4,21,2: 110; 10,5,4: 92; 17,8,9: 92
- HORACE, *Carm.* 4,3,22: 246; *Sat.* 1,3,68f.: 249f.; 1,4,34: 309; 1,6,66f.: 249f.; 1,10,30:
 309
- HYPERECHIUS, *Mon.* 16: 38
- IGNATIUS, *Epst.* 7,2: 74; *Polye.* 4,3: 268
- PS.-IGNATIUS, *Ant.* 10: 268; *Her.* 1: 138; *Philad.* 4: 174, 183, 185 n. 7; *Polye.* 3: 35
- INNOCENT, *Epist.* 2,14,16: 26; 28,3: 36
- Inscr. Christ. Diehl*, 900: 273 n. 12; 1137a (a. 52f.): 132; 2584: 132; 3977c: 218; 4682: 132
- Inscr. Christ. Rossi*, II 6,7,8: 26, 129
- Inscr. Dessau*, 8542: 132
- Inscr. Orelli-Henzen*, 4806: 273; 4807: 273
- IRENAEUS, 3,7,1 (SC 211): 393; 3,7,2: 393; 3,16,3: 382; 3,16,7: 382; 3,17,1: 382;
 3,18,3: 382; 3,19,1: 382; 3,21,7: 165; 3,22,4: 188; 4,20,12 (SC 100**): 22; 4,21,3: 182;
 4,28,3: 393; 4,29,1: 393; 4,31,2: 80; 4,34,1: 226; 4,37,7: 395; 5,7,1 (SC 153): 393;
 5,13,3: 393; 5,19,1: 188; 5,20,2: 106; 5,21,2: 88; 5,25,3: 393
- ISAIAH, ABBA, *Or.* 8,7: 325; 8,16ff.: 332; 10,17: 326; 11,52: 321
- ISIDORE OF PELUSIUM, *Ep.* 1,87: 401; 1,220: 257; 1,446: 356; 4,181: 75
- ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, *Ecol. off.* 2,16,1: 339; 2,16,2: 320; 2,16,3: 339 n. 2; 2,16,9:
 320f.; 2,16,9f.: 321; 2,16,13: 334; 2,16,14: 325, 328; 2,16,17: 115 n. 23; *Orig.* 7,13,2:
 320; 7,13,3: 320; 20,3,2: 69 n. 3; *Reg. monach. praef.* 1: 291; 9,2: 328 n. 5; 9,3: 291;
 9,7: 334; 11,3: 331f.; *Serm.* 3,8,2: 229; *Synon.* 1,26: 159 n. 7; 1,51: 294 n. 12; 2,14: 93
 n. 6; 2,15: 72 nn. 8f.
- JOSEPHUS, *Bj* 2,8,2-13: 336
- JULIAN OF ECLANUM, *Aug. c. Julian. op. imperf.* 4,122: 154; *In ioel* 2,4: 289; *In Or.*
 1,8: 291
- JULIAN OF ECLANUM (= THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA), *Epist. In psalm.* 50,6^a:
 102; 81,1^b: 45 n. 6; 88: 226; 103,21: 40; 118,83: 144; 147,19: 265 n. 7; *In psalm.* 6,6:
 294 n. 11; 33,3^a: 244
- PS.-JULIAN OF ECLANUM, *Lab. fid.* II p. 1734 (PL 45): 154
- JULIANUS POMERIUS, 3,17,1: 265
- JULIUS AFRICANUS, *Ep. Or.* 1: 238
- JUSTIN MARTYR, *I Apol.* 8: 92; *Dial.* 7,3: 92; 16,4: 92; 56,1: 92; 60,2: 92; 70,1: 165;
 100,5: 188; 117,5: 92; 134,3: 182

JUVENAL, 6,379ff.: 275; 6,434ff.: 275; 13,242: 270

JUVENCUS, 4,112: 36

LACTANTIUS, *Epist.* 33,6: 94; *Inst.* 1,2,2: 265 n. 7; 1,16,6: 36; 1,20,10: 209; 3,8,6: 272 n. 7; 4,2,2: 288; 4,7,1: 94; 5,1,23: 4; 5,1,24: 200; 5,3,23: 376; 5,8,5: 92; 5,13,15: 312; 5,15,3: 239; 6,4,14: 388; 6,14,7: 249; 6,20,3: 71; 6,23,26: 48; 6,25,13: 94; 7,22,16: 295f.; 7,24,3: 94; *Inst.* 1,6: 36; 10,53: 92; 17,5: 94; *Mort. pers.* 23,4: 36; *Opif.* 10,24: 320

LAWRENCE OF NOVAE, *Poem.* p. 91^C: 148; p. 96^C: 360

LEO THE GREAT, *Epist.* 167,15: 26; *Serm.* 23,1: 92; 42,2: 312; 58,4: 36

(PS)-LEO THE GREAT, *Serm. app.* 3,3: 158; 11,3: 158; 15,2: 365f.

Letter to Diognetus, 12,8: 188

LIVY, 37,24,6: 139

LUCAN, 3,81f.: 246; 7,559: 72; 9,382: 59

LUCIFER OF CAGLIARI, *Athos*, 2,34 l. 41: 94; *Morimod.* 3 l. 77: 158; *Non parat.* 18 l. 38: 265

LUCILIUS, 652: 206

LUCRETIUS, 1,402ff.: 87 n. 2; 5,30f.: 265; 5,226f.: 159

MACARIUS OF EGYPT, *Ad fil. dei* 4f.: 37

(PS)-MACARIUS OF EGYPT, *Ep.* p. 417^A: 207; *Hom. typ. I* (Berthold) 7,2: 160; 7,6,9: 48; 9,3,8: 221; 11,2,2: 222; 15,2,1: 286; 17,2,1: 252; 21,1,3: 252; 23,1,4: 352; 33,2,4: 252; 40,3,3: 294; 48,4,12: 388; 50,4,11: 287; 53,4,5: 241; 54,1,2: 287; 54,4,5: 287; 56,1,2: 252; 56,1,3: 395; 60,3,2: 388; 61,2,1: 182; 62,1ff.: 333; 63,16: 73; 62,19: 303; *Hom. typ. II* (Dörries-Klostermann-Kroeger) 15,43: 92; 23,2: 221; 25,6: 222; 41,3: 252; 45,1: 287; *Hom. typ. III* (Klostermann-Berthold) 16,4: 241; 28,1 (M): 189; 28,2 (CR): 367, 369

MARIUS VICTORINUS, *Adv. Arius* 1,18: 130; *In Eph.* 6,14: 98

PS-MARIUS VICTORINUS, *Phys.* 16: 188

MARK THE HERMIT, *Opusc.* 4 p. 1009^C: 381; 5,7: 124

MARTIAL, 1,15,12: 273; 3,84,1f.: 278 n. 21

MARTIN OF BRAGA, *Sent. patr.* 17: 356

MAXIMUS OF TURIN, 2,1: 311; 2,2: 242; 7,2: 34; 14,1: 296; 22a,3: 296 n. 14; 24,3: 408; 26,2: 34; 36,3: 394; 37,2: 55; 39,4: 296; 42,5: 219; 45,1: 395; 50,3: 139; 50a,2: 93; 53,3: 296 n. 14; 66,3: 140; 81,3: 396; 88,6: 164; 90,1: 382; 107,1: 80; 108: 164; 110,1: 158

MELITO OF SARDIS, *New fr.* (Hall) II,6: 381

METHODIUS, *Symp.* 1,4,22: 183 n. 4; 185; 1,4,23: 190; 1,5,26: 407; 3,12,83: 174;

3,13,85: 173; 4,6,106: 55; 5,8,131: 171; 6,3,139: 279; 7,3,156: 372; 7,4,158f.: 369;

7,4,159: 403; 8,2,175: 31; 402; 8,8,191: 367; 8,11,198: 124

MINUCIUS FELIX, 18,11: 316; 30,2: 111 n. 13; 38,1: 278

De Miraculis S. Stephani Protomartyris, 2,4,1: 105

NEMESIUS, *Nat. hom.* I p. 533^B: 67

NICETA OF REMESIANA (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Ambrose), *Psalms*, 13 l. 40: 327; *Vigil.* 3 l. 12: 65; 9 l. 15: 241; *Virg. laps.* p. 132,3: 106

NILUS OF ANCYRA, *Aib.* p. 708^B: 61; *Ep.* 1,31: 137; 1,84: 374; 1,179: 314; 1,181: 31; 183 n. 3; 1,232: 372; 1,241: 148; 2,37: 138; 2,49: 372; 2,52: 222; 2,57: 372; 2,61: 303; 2,66: 287 n. 9; 2,68: 232; 2,73: 280; 2,81: 221; 2,98: 159; 2,135: 302; 2,141: 289; 2,160: 331; 2,167: 98; 2,177: 299; 2,198: 138; 2,199: 148; 2,244: 93; 271 n. 6; 2,266: 312; 2,282: 402; 2,294: 325; 2,303: 65; 3,12: 34; 3,33a: 93; 271 n. 6; 3,46: 355; 3,101: 302; 3,127: 137; 3,129: 65; 3,134: 333; 3,137: 159; 3,156: 222; 3,238: 139; 3,243: 65; 3,254: 182; 3,288: 65; 3,290: 287 n. 9; 3,298: 49; 3,324: 65; 4,1: 267; 280; 4,14: 389; 4,19: 290; 4,41: 333; *Exerc.* I: 271 n. 6; 58; 271 n. 6; 73: 50; *Magn.* 65: 140; 271 n. 6; *Proent.* 8: 57

PS-NILUS OF ANCYRA, *Narr.* 1,3: 286 n. 8; 3,4: 331 n. 18; 3,7: 64; 3,12f.: 93; 3,13: 271 n. 6; *Perur.* 9,3: 50; 11,20: 83

- PS-NILUS OF ANCYRA (= EVAGRIUS PONTICUS), *Mat. cog.* 11: 65, *Spir. mat.* 1: 140; 4: 116; 18: 396; *Vir.* 2: 93
- NONIUS MARCELLUS, p. 49,27: 332; p. 423,27: 119
- NOVATIAN (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Cyprian), *Trin.* 9,4: 96; 9,6: 165; 28,7: 369
- OPTATUS OF MILEVIS, 4,2 p. 104,1: 106; 4,5 p. 107,5: 106
- ORIBASIIUS, *Exp.* 1,13,4: 141; 2,111: 291; *Syn.* 1,6,4: 145; 1,7,4 Aa: 291; 6,21,11: 290
- ORIENTIUS, *Comm.* 1,341: 250; 1,355: 232; 1,359ff.: 100 n. 3; 1,401: 65; 1,427: 260; 1,428: 261; 1,555: 130; 1,561f.: 305; 1,617f.: 357; 2,13: 249 n. 10; 2,52: 69; 2,325f.: 357
- ORIGEN (cf. also s.v. Rufinus of Aquileia and Index of Passages: Jerome), *Cont. pag.* 1 p. 66,29: 142; p. 71,7: 45; p. 72,11: 141; p. 73,30: 392; p. 84,3: 22; 1 p. 89,10: 52 n. 3; 1 p. 90,26: 52; 1 p. 108,22: 23; 1 p. 110,7: 53; 2 p. 114,3: 14; 2 p. 114,22: 20; 2 p. 118,16: 197; 2 p. 118,18: 22; 2 p. 118,23: 22; 2 p. 118,29: 22; 2 p. 119,17: 22; 2 p. 125,9: 23; 2 p. 136,13: 236; 2 p. 136,17: 235; 2 p. 142,6: 237; 2 p. 145,11: 237; 2 p. 153,10: 220f.; 2 p. 155,10: 190; 3 p. 189,6: 146 n. 1; 3 p. 186,16: 141; 3 p. 195,22: 167; 3 p. 240,5: 289; 3 p. 240,26: 56; *Hom. in Cant.* 1,2 p. 31,2: 123; 1,2 p. 31,6f.: 142; 1,2 p. 31,11: 344; 1,2 p. 31,19: 17; 166f.; 1,5 p. 35,1: 235; 1,6 p. 36,3: 20; 1,6 p. 36,15: 23; 1,6 p. 36,20: 22; 1,6 p. 36,25: 22; 1,6 p. 37,16: 22; 1,8 p. 40,7: 236; 1,8 p. 40,9: 235; 1,9 p. 40,22: 237; 2,6 p. 49,25: 251; 2,12 p. 57,25: 242; 2,12 p. 58,2: 267; 2,12 p. 58,5: 38; *Schol. in Cant.* 1,1: 52; 1,3: 53; 1,7: 237; 7,1: 94 n. 8; 8,6: 390; *Col.* 2,65: 393; 3,47: 393; 4,1: 216; 4,45: 80f.; 5,1: 216; 5,17: 393; 6,1: 216; 7,1: 216; 7,22: 57; 8,76: 216; *Comm. in I Cor.* 26: 110; 29: 153; 160; 34: 198; 38: 154; 37: 51; 37b; 39: 176; 186; 42: 176; 74: 129; *Ep.* 2,3: 238; *Comm. in Eph.* 20: 242; 34: 97; *Hom. in Ex.* 1,5 p. 151,9: 222; 2,1 p. 155,25: 160; 3,3 p. 167,3: 222; 6,5 p. 196,21-44: 8,2 p. 220,17: 44; 8,2 p. 220,19: 44; 8,5 p. 229,16: 235; 8,6 p. 231,3: 19; 8,6 p. 233,3: 19; 8,6 p. 233,5: 19; 9,4 p. 242,17: 219; 10,3 p. 248,10: 369; 12,3 p. 265,5: 167; 13,3 p. 272,27: 325; 13,5 p. 277,4: 168; *Sol. in Ex.* 12,46: 373; *Hom. in Ezech.* 1,2 p. 323,20: 95; 1,3 p. 323,22: 95; 1,3 p. 326,8: 43; 2,5 p. 347,5: 100; 3,3 p. 380,19f.: 133; 4,5 p. 366,12: 85; 5,1 p. 371,23: 100; 6,3 p. 380,26: 19; 6,4 p. 381,24: 98; 6,4 p. 382,5: 94; 6,4 p. 382,11: 98f.; 6,4 p. 382,12: 95; 7,3 p. 393,13: 266; 8,3 p. 404,21: 129; 8,3 p. 404,28: 268; 8,3 p. 405,8: 129; 9,1 p. 406,3: 165 n. 16; 9,2 p. 409,19: 146; 12,1 p. 433,14: 100; 13,1 p. 440,9: 43; 13,1 p. 441,25: 43; 13,2 p. 444,15: 396; 13,4 p. 449,14: 38; *Sol. in Ezech.* 1,3: 15; 1,26: 94 n. 8; 4,9: 167; 4,16: 187; 5,8: 405; 7,10: 165; 14,16: 85; 16,25: 53; 17,12: 187; *Fr. in Ezech.* 30,25: 400; *Hom. in Gen.* 2,6 p. 36,21: 76f.; 5,3 p. 60,19: 81; 5,3 p. 61,5: 79; 5,4 p. 62,2: 80; 5,5 p. 63,7: 81; 6,3 p. 69,1: 129; 8,1 p. 77,17: 76; 8,3 p. 79,27: 142; 8,7 p. 82,5: 167; 8,7 p. 82,26: 142; 10,4 p. 98,4: 129; 10,4 p. 98,9: 48; 11,1: 181; 12,5 p. 111,13: 126; 15,1 p. 127,10: 289; 16,2 p. 137,15: 222; 16,3 p. 139,14: 311; *Sol. in Gen.* 9,20: 75; 32,24: 96; ap. *Gloss. Anst.* etc. II (Pitra [1852], III, p. 395): 192; *Hom. in Is.* 2,2 p. 252,26: 240; 5,2 p. 264,26: 146; 5,3 p. 266,25: 87; 5,3 p. 267,5: 222; 6,1 p. 270,7: 372; 8,2 p. 287,9: 268; *Hom. in Jer.* 2,4 p. 294,9 (GCS 33): 87; 2,6 pp. 295,20 and 296,7: 388; 2,7 p. 296,24: 251; 3,1 p. 305,9: 87; 4 p. 616^A (PL 25 [1845]): 244; 5 p. 629^A: 87; 6 p. 636^C: 19; 6 pp. 636^C: 637^A: 14; 19f.; 7 p. 642^A: 23; 9 p. 655^A: 33; 11 p. 673^B: 305; 13 p. 684^C: 123; 14 p. 690^C: 157 n. 3; 5,7 (GCS 6): 57; 5,16: 40; 14,14: 372; 19,13: 242; 20,7: 185; *Fr. in Jer.* 25: 249; 26: 56ff.; 28: 40; 48: 187; 58: 41 n. 2; *Sol. in Jer.* 11,10: 19; *Jo.* 1,23,147: 165; 4,2: 289; 6,49,255: 369; 10,23,133: 224; 10,23,137: 225; 10,24,142: 225; 10,34,221: 224; 13,2,8: 145; 13,33,210: 83; 32,7: 168; *Enarr. in Job.* 40,11: 94f.; *Hom. in Jos.* 1,6 p. 294,14: 396; 1,7 p. 295,23: 222; 3,4 p. 304,27: 374; 4,1 p. 309,10: 222; 4,4 p. 312,15: 222; 5,2 p. 316,16: 71; 5,2 p. 316,17: 149; 5,2 p. 316,20: 36; 6,3 p. 325,13: 168; 15,3 p. 384,13: 43; 15,3 p. 387,1: 57; 15,3 p. 387,3: 57; 15,3 p. 387,5: 58; 17,1 p. 400,18: 406; 21,2 p. 430,5: 75; 22,5 p. 437,15: 208; *Sol. in Jos.* 2,1: 374; *Hom. in Jud.* 5,4 p. 494,11: 224; 7,2 p. 507,21: 36; *Fr. in Lam.* 23: 167f.; 95: 55; 96: 55; *Hom. in Lc.* 6 p. 37,5: 123; 8 p. 47,7: 189; 11 p. 66,24: 154; 15 p. 93,14: 123; 17 p. 107,17: 58; 20 p. 124,10: 123; 22 p. 135,17: 15; 25 p. 149,17: 140; 29 p. 171,15: 396; 37 p. 210,15:

- 220; 37 p. 211,10; 221; 37 p. 212,6; 220; 38 p. 214,24; 268; *Fr. in Lc.* 21a: 189; 21b: 189; 28: 370; 95: 88; 96: 88; 124; 271; 151; 225; 161a: 233; 195: 97; 256: 141; *Schol. in Lc.* 1,27: 188; 1,46: 369; 3,8: 157; *Hom. in Lev.* 1,5 p. 288,2; 49; 1,5 p. 288,9-49; 1,5 p. 288,12: 51; 2,4 p. 297,23; 144; 3,8 p. 313,1 and 7: 299; 3,8 p. 313,8: 299; 4,4 p. 320,7: 395; 4,10 p. 330,28: 144; 5,5 p. 343,19; 141; 5,5 p. 344,8: 77; 6,2 p. 362,15: 148; 9,2 p. 420,31: 97; 9,8 p. 432,26: 192; 10,2 p. 445,9: 93; 11,1 p. 447,12: 216; 12,7 p. 466,24 and 28: 370; *Marr.* 18: 42; *Comm. in Mt.* 10,8 p. 9,21: 75; 10,17 p. 22,1: 152; 189; 12,4 p. 75,15: 224; 12,22 p. 119,19: 87; 12,35 p. 149,27: 87; 13,29 p. 260,23: 381; 14,17 p. 326,31: 381; 15,4 p. 357,19: 156; 15,5 p. 360,12: 85; 16,15 p. 523,28: 221; 16,16 p. 526,30: 220; 16,17 p. 534,13; 220; 16,19 p. 540,11: 87; 16,23 p. 555,18: 224; 16,29 p. 572,1: 153; 16,29 p. 574,4: 45; 17,19 p. 638,29: 45; 17,33 p. 692,17: 21; *Fr. in Mt.* 35: 182; 39: 19; 97: 62: 88; 281: 367; 308: 75; 407: 221; *Comm. ser. in Mt.* 1 p. 1,19: 224; 4 p. 8,27: 381; 10 p. 18,9: 258; 14 p. 27,7: 395; 24 p. 40,16: 122; 28 p. 54,8: 225; 28 p. 54,9: 107 n. 4; 43 p. 87,2: 369; 44 p. 89,5: 93; 46 p. 93,29: 153; 48 p. 99,9: 153; 50 p. 111,24: 73; 61 p. 139,28: 190; 71 p. 168,8: 75; 77 p. 181,8: 87; 135 p. 281,2: 224; 139 p. 288,9: 397; *Hom. in Num.* 2,1 p. 10,19: 333; 6,3 p. 33,18: 153; 9,6 p. 62,23: 289; 9,7 p. 64,11: 77; 9,7 p. 64,18: 224; 11,4 p. 84,20: 224; 20,2 p. 190,1: 58; 20,2 p. 190,4: 57; 20,2 p. 190,7: 56; 23,3 p. 215,11: 198; 23,11 p. 221,24: 160; 26,2 p. 245,19: 381; 26,3 p. 248,17: 153; 27,4 p. 260,28: 222; 27,4 p. 261,8: 160; 27,4 p. 261,9: 162; 27,7 p. 265,23: 47; 27,12 p. 276,3: 242; 27,12 p. 279,14: 222; *Gr.* 12,2: 346; 348 n. 4; 13,2: 192; 16,3: 192; 17,2: 209; 23,4: 198; 30,3: 141; *Pasch.* 35: 95; 36: 96f.; 37: 167; 43: 43; *Exp. in Pr.* 2,17: 43; 5,18: 405; 5,20: 58; 6,19: 141; 21,19: 144; 25,6: 43; *Princ.* 1,5,4: 42f.; 1,5,5: 94; 3,2,4: 192; 3,4,2: 39; 4,2,4: 77; 4,3,9: 43; *Ps.* 18,6: 371; 44,11: 14f.; 81,1: 45; 90,5: 37; 103,19: 40; 108,23: 145; 118,83: 144; 118,172: 289; *In psalm.* 36 *hom.* 5,7: 36; 37 *hom.* 1,6: 94f.; *Sol. in Ps.* p. 1076^A: 167; 1,2: 346; 2,11: 132; 4,3: 45; 6,7: 146; 16,15: 352; 20,4: 75; 45,10: 53; 90,6: 37; 101,10: 276; 118,108: 176; 136,9: 57; *Hom. in I Reg.* 6: 167f.; 15: 212; *Fr. in Reg.* 22: 85; *Comm. in Rom.* 1,1 p. 839^B: 174; 1,9 p. 854^B: 88; 1,18 p. 866^B: 17; 1,19 p. 869^C: 224; 2,13 p. 913^B: 56; 2,14 p. 922^B: 102; 3,1 p. 925^C: 44; 4,6 p. 983^C: 367; 5,9 p. 1047^B: 160; 5,10 p. 1052^C: 42f.; 5,10 p. 1053^B: 381; 5,10 p. 1054^B: 43; 6,1 p. 1056^B: 142; 7,4 p. 1108^B: 392; 7,11 p. 1132^C: 388; 7,17 p. 1147^C: 85; 8,2 p. 1161^B: 224; 8,10 p. 1189^C: 49; 9,1 p. 1205^B: 51; 9,11 p. 1220^A: 393; 10,3 p. 1254^B: 93; 10,5 p. 1255^B: 205; 10,14 p. 1274^C: 220; 10,14 p. 1275^B: 176f.
- PS.-ORIGEN, *Hom. in Matth.* 1,4 p. 243,13: 189
- PS.-ORIGEN (= GREGORY OF ELVIRA), *Tract.* 2,17: 262; 4,29: 73; 5,1: 77; 6,36: 164; 7,3: 400; 7,5: 222; 9,8: 164; 9,16: 400; 11,27: 158; 12,22: 374; 14,24: 83; 15,29: 73; 19,14: 73
- OVID, *Art.* 1,516: 260; *Epist.* 5,103f.: 47 n. 2; *Fast.* 4,311: 112 n. 16
- PACIAN, *Paraen.* 6,3: 207; 8,2: 108 n. 7; 9,4: 60; 12,1: 294; 12,2: 119
- PS.-PACIAN, *Sim. corr.* p. 109,13: 73
- PALLADIUS, *H. Laus.* 1: 317f.; 2: 145; 7: 317; 8 M.: 239; 10: 317; 11: 350 n. 9; 18: 350 n. 9; 32: 328; 350 n. 9; 34: 254; 37: 350 n. 9; 42: 290; 43: 144; 45: 61; 46: 318; 86 M.: 61; 119 M.: 123f.; *Hist. mon.* 119: 328 n. 3; *V. Chrysa.* 12: 86; 314; 394
- PAPINIAN, *Dig.* 35,2,9,1: 109
- PASCHASIU OF DUME, *Verba patr.* 1,4: 139; 11,3: 134
- Pascho Bartholomaei*, 4 p. 136,12: 88; 4 p. 136,14: 189
- Pascho Caeciliae*, 28: 292
- Pascho Montani et Lucii*, 11,6: 408 n. 8
- Pascho Pauli*, 11: 396
- Pascho Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, 5,5: 25
- Pascho Petri*, 15 p. 38,7: 265 n. 7
- Pascho Petri et Pauli longior*, 37: 92
- Pascho Pontiani*, 2: 292; 3: 293
- Pascho Quirini*, 2: 293

Pastio Saturnini, Dativi etc., 5,1: 292; 5,2: 293

Pastio Symphoriani, 4: 292; 7: 293

PATRICK, *Epist.* 7: 218

PAULINUS OF MILAN, *Adv. Coel.* 3: 105; *Vita Ambr.* 1: 29, 259, 262, 41, 58

PAULINUS OF NOLA, *Carm.* 9,1: 210; 9,7: 210; 25,85f.: 117; 25,173f.: 129, 232, 26,255: 210; 28,26f.: 192; 31,533f.: 64; 31,543f.: 64; *Epist.* 5,6: 193; 6,2: 66; 12,2: 157; 12,7: 130; 13,11: 309; 13,14: 309; 13,24: 408; 13,26: 395; 15,4: 139, 145; 16,7: 55, 148; 17,1: 131; 18,8: 64; 20,4: 210; 20,6: 226; 22,2: 245, 253, 255, 334; 23,7: 83; 23,9: 223; 23,11: 100; 23,17: 71; 23,19: 41 n. 2; 23,24: 64; 23,31: 395; 23,35: 64; 23,37: 64; 23,42: 392; 24,8: 96, 395; 25,5: 395; 25*,2: 294; 25*,3: 296 n. 14, 26,3: 352; 29,3: 74; 29,13: 139, 334; 31,1: 66; 32,5: 105; 34,6: 395; 39,1: 126; 39,6: 249; 40,7: 66; 40,11: 294, 299; 44,3: 56ff.; 45,4: 74; 46,3: 241; 49,10: 374

PS.-PAULINUS OF NOLA, *Carm. app.* 1,44: 388; *Epist. app.* 1,2: 378; 1,3: 216, 393, 2,14: 138; 2,15f.: 352 n. 10; 2,16: 354; 2,17: 270; 2,21: 250; 2,22: 355f.; 2,30: 21; 2,32: 35

PAULINUS OF PELLA, *Ench.* 167: 80

PAULINUS OF PERIGUEUX, *Mart.* 1,108: 130; 1,320: 290; 2,42: 129; 2,489f.: 291; 2,494: 291; 2,521: 291; 3,94: 130; 4,100: 290; 4,389: 130; 5,84: 227; 5,85: 241; 5,445: 119; 6,263f.: 318

PELAGIUS, *In Col.* 3,5 p. 464,20: 85; *Epist. ad Demetr.* 1: 140, 204; 5: 79, 142 n. 4, 213; 9: 156, 177, 205, 213; 10: 233; 12: 196; 16: 213; 18: 83, 139; 19: 21, 275, 334; 20: 252, 321; 21: 29, 219; 22: 135, 250; 23: 139, 352; 25: 34, 37, 27; 234; 28: 318, 30; 402

Peregrinatio Aetheriae, 10,2: 129; 17,1: 129; 18,1: 129; 19,2: 129; 19,19: 129; 23,8: 129; 23,9: 129; 24,10: 326f.; 34: 326f.; 36,3: 326f.

PERSIUS, 1,104f.: 277

PETER CHRYSOLOGUS, *Serm.* 8,3: 94; 70,11: 319; 73,3: 106; 99,5: 188; 143,3: 241; 158,1: 382; 175,6: 124

PETER DAMIAN, *Epist.* 2,13,76: 273

PHILIP, *In Job rec. brev.* 38 p. 1460^A: 97; 40 p. 1464^B: 95; *In Job rec. long.* 4 p. 627^B: 388; 9 p. 639^C: 63; 14 p. 650^B: 158; 24 p. 684^B: 43; 29 p. 699^A: 141; 38 p. 745^B: 97; 38 p. 755^B: 106; 39 p. 777^A: 63; 39 p. 780^B: 41; 40 p. 782^B: 94f.; 40 p. 789^A: 218; 40 p. 789^B: 106; 41 p. 796^C: 43; 42 p. 799^B: 395

PHILO, *Abr.* 9: 92; 58: 92; 236: 249 n. 9; *Agric.* 83: 400; 88: 222; *Cher.* 93: 271; *Conf. ling.* 90: 249 n. 9; 144: 92; *Congr.* 80: 271; *Decal.* 105: 93; *Det. pot. ins.* 157: 271; *Ebr.* 111: 400; *Fug.* 35: 271; 177: 93; *Jos.* 79: 249 n. 9; *Leg. all.* 3,212: 400; *Leg. Gog.* 293: 93; *Migr. Abr.* 2: 15; 12: 122; 219: 249 n. 9; *Omn. prob. lib.* 75-91: 336; *Praem. poen.* 24: 93; 32: 93; 41: 93; 71: 249 n. 9; *Quaest. in Ex.* 1,19: 97 n. 21; 2,19: 180 n. 1; *Quaest. in Gen.* 2,12: 167; 4,56: 80; *Rev. div. her.* 97: 15; 236: 93; *Sober.* 12: 182 n. 2; 209 n. 4; *Som.* 1,93: 93; 1,123: 91; 1,126: 314; 2,59: 260 n. 3; *Spec. leg.* 1,192: 93 n. 6; 2,6: 93; 2,20: 90 n. 3; 2,30: 249 n. 9; 2,256: 93; 3,109: 109 n. 11; 3,178: 93; *Vit.* 34: 93; 64: 93; 77: 93; 179: 93; *Vit. const.* 90: 93

PLATO, *Resp.* 519b: 140; *Soph.* 252c: 71; *Tim.* 28c: 92

PLAUTUS, *Cas.* 897: 119 n. 1

PLINY THE ELDER, *Nat.* 7,40: 110; 34,35: 376

PLINY THE YOUNGER, *Paneg.* 15,4: 139

POMPEIUS, *Gramm.* V 157,25: 355; V 225,13: 342; V 225,21: 342 n. 7; V 225,34: 342 n. 7

PONTIUS, *Vita Cypr.* 3,3: 259; 12,6: 294; 12,9: 296

PORPHYRION, *Hor. carm.* 1,18,12f.: 206

POSSIDIUS, *Vita Aug.* 18,5: 105

PRISCILLIAN, *Tract.* 4,79: 381 n. 2; 6,104: 381 n. 2; 6,110: 164

PROBUS, *App. gramm.* IV 199,10: 148

PROCLUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Basil of Caesarea), *Hom.* 2,1: 289;

- 3,4: 189; 4,9: 31; 4,14: 189; *Or.* 4,2: 75; 6,11: 367; 6,17: 219
PROSPER OF AQUITAINE, *In psalm.* 136,8: 58
Protevangelium Jacobi, 1,2: 180 n. 1; 3,1: 180 n. 1
PRUDENTIUS, *Cath. praef.* 11: 119; 6,151E: 347; 7,16ff.: 140; *Ham.* 316ff.: 276; 328f.: 90; *Perist.* 4,18: 200; 10,226: 213; 13,7ff.: 200; *Psych. praef.* 64ff.: 17; 183f.: 117
QUINTILIAN, *Decl.* 329,8: 264 n. 5; *Inst.* 6,4,9: 108 n. 5; 8 *prooem.* 27: 108 n. 5; 8,5,2: 89; 9,2,29f.: 111; 9,3,45: 329 n. 9; 10,1,32: 335 n. 20; 11,1,17: 112
PS.-QUINTILIAN, *Decl.* 12,23: 274 n. 13; 19,7: 108 n. 5
QUODVULTDEUS, *Cont. nov.* 4,9: 34; 10,9: 119; *Cantab.* 5,2: 163; 6,22: 363, 404; *Hoer.* 5,6: 382; 5,15: 188; 6,19: 226; *C. Iud. pag. Ar.* 10,1: 382; 12,4: 165; *Prom.* 2,34,74: 165; *Symb.* 1,1,3: 106; 2,4,4: 163f.; 2,4,6: 164; 2,4,25: 188; 3,13,1: 106; 3,13,2: 107
Regula Macarii, 3: 252; 18: 328 n. 2
Regula Magistri, *Them. or. dom.* 69: 65; *Them. psalm.* 24: 57; 1,6: 320f.; 1,8: 320; 1,21: 322; 3,56: 57; 7,25: 320; 10,68: 252; 11,27: 323; 18,2: 327; *nr.* 23: 327; 27,36: 335; *nr.* 28: 139; 28,26: 331; 28,38: 335; *nr.* 70: 335; 90,4: 139
Regula Patrum I rec. E. 2,41E: 328 n. 2
Regula Patrum II, 7: 328 n. 2
Regula Patrum III, 7: 328 n. 2
Regula Tarnatensis, 8,7: 319; 8,8: 328 n. 2; 9,5: 335; 17,4: 333; 18,5: 209; 19,5: 245 n. 2; 23,8: 269
Rhetorica ad Herennium, 4,25,35: 298 n. 1; 4,28,38: 142, 170, 329 n. 7, 391
RUFINUS OF AQUILEIA (cf. also s.s.vv. Basil of Caesarea, Eusebius of Caesarea, *Historia Monachorum*, Origen, *Sentences of Sextus*), *Adamant.* 1,9: 73; 1,22: 73; *Apol. adv. Hier.* 1,5: 271; 1,8: 271; 1,34: 312; 2,5: 11 n. 45, 13, 28, 64, 254, 259, 272; 2,6: 28; 2,6f.: 283; 2,7: 289; 2,7f.: 280, 291; 2,9: 289; 2,11: 331; 2,13: 5, 28, 173; 2,15: 317; 2,46: 173, 291; *Basil. hom. praef.* 372; 2,6: 66; 3,1: 278; 3,5: 295; 3,7: 298f.; 7 p. 1786^c: 31, 333; 7 p. 1786^b: 134; 7 p. 1789^b: 293; *Clement.* 2,1,6f.: 350; 3,13,1: 112; 4,36,1: 92; 6,1,4: 140; 10,46,2: 112; *Greg. Naz. orat.* 7,2,3: 333; *Hist.* 5,1,34: 293; 11,4: 317; 11,8: 317; *Hist. mon. praef.* 317; 3: 328 n. 1; 19: 292; 21: 317; 28: 317; *Orig. in cont. praef.* p. 73,30: 390; p. 74,4: 390; 2 p. 128,13: 60; 2 p. 141,17: 48; 3 p. 236,20: 360; *Orig. in gen.* 10,1 p. 93,5: 56; 10,3 p. 96,7: 352; 13,3 p. 117,8: 73; *Orig. in los. praef.* p. 287,14: 29; 1,1 p. 288,7: 79; 3,1 p. 300,20: 35; 12,2 p. 368,19: 56; 15,3 p. 387,7: 58; 15,6 p. 391,4: 35; *Orig. in lev.* 16,5 p. 500,16: 352; *Orig. in num.* 2,2 p. 12,26: 190; 4,3 p. 23,4: 206; 5,3 p. 29,9: 352; 9,7 p. 64,8: 352; 25,6 p. 241,22: 58; *Orig. in psalm.* 36 hom. 3,10: 311; 4,3: 352; *Orig. in psalm.* 38 hom. 1,7: 293; *Orig. in Rom.* 3,2 p. 932^b: 35; 7,6 p. 1118^b: 35; *Sent. Sext.* 230b: 156; 428: 272 n. 7; *Symb.* 8: 205
RURICIUS, *Epist.* 2,15: 378
SACERDOS, *Gramm.* VI 434,10: 343
SALLUST, *Cant.* 1,1: 87; 54,6: 122 n. 1; *Aug.* 19,6: 59
SALVIAN, *Ecc.* 2,30: 50; *Epist.* 4,2: 238; 4,13: 25
Schol. Cic. Gram. A. p. 344,19: 264 n. 5
Schol. Stat. Theb., 3,22: 119 n. 2
Schol. Verg. Bern. georg., 1,27: 265 n. 6
SCRIBONIUS LARGUS, 224: 164
SENECA THE YOUNGER, *Dial.* 3,19,4: 394; 10,17,6: 70; *Epist.* 16,1: 205; 45,7: 29; 47: 268; 47,2: 269; 47,15: 269; 51,6: 147 n. 2; 88,8: 48 n. 3; 93,4: 63 n. 6; 99,16: 253; *Herc. f.* 48: 296 n. 13; 318: 296 n. 13; 568: 296 n. 13; *Oed.* 573: 296 n. 13; *Phaedr.* 626: 296 n. 13
Sentences of Sextus (cf. also s.v. Rufinus of Aquileia), 64: 122; 108a: 93; 240: 93; 413: 352; 428: 271; 510: 93; 588: 271
Sententiae Niceni Synodi, 38 p. 53 (Haase): 48
SERAPION OF THMUIS, *Ep. mon.* 11: 339

Sermoes, ed. Caspari, p. 185,8: 395

SEVERIAN OF GABALA (cf. also s.v. Ps.-Chrysostom), *Croc.* p. 906: 149, *Serp.* 10: 226

SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, *Epist.* 1,7,7: 112

SIRICIUS, *Epist.* 1,6,7: 115; 1,7,9: 121; 1,9,13: 259; 10,1,4: 26

SOZOMEN, *H. e.* 1,12: 339; 3,14: 328

STATUTA ECCLESIAE ANTIQUA, p. 167,12: 280; p. 171,76: 260

SUETONIUS, *Nero* 47,1: 394

SULPICIUS SEVERUS, *Chron.* 1,2,6: 94; 1,6,7: 80; 1,25,2: 94; 1,43,2: 59; 2,28,3: 119; 2,48,3: 110; *Dial.* 1,6,1: 295; 1,8,2: 259; 1,8,4: 28; 1,8,4ff.: 11 n. 44; 1,8,5: 322; 1,8,6: 298; 1,9,1: 259; 1,9,2: 120; 1,9,5: 1 n. 4; 1,10,1: 323; 1,10,2: 339 n. 2; 1,11,2: 62; 1,13,2: 59; 1,17,1: 339; 1,17,8: 323; 1,19,1: 323; 1,20,3: 129; 1,21,1: 215; 2,19; 1,21,4: 260; 2,62; 2,65; 1,21,5: 265; 2,3,2: 257; 2,6,3: 64; 2,7,5: 226; 2,13,5: 401; *Epist.* 1,14: 66; *Mart. praef.* 6: 13; 10,7: 73; 16,2: 63; 16,4: 63; 19,5: 86

PS.-SULPICIUS SEVERUS, *Epist.* 1,3: 402; 2,1: 25; 2,2: 180; 371; 407; 2,3: 152; 166; 2,4: 124; 173; 2,8: 160; 196; 212; 2,10: 212f.; 2,11: 407; 2,12: 34; 213; 2,14: 14; 333; 2,16: 129; 243; 250; 2,17: 122; 2,18: 72f.; 351; 2,19: 34; 110; 204; 235; 5: 239

TACITUS, *Ann.* 13,45,3: 135

TATIAN, *Orat.* 6: 292; 25: 292; 29: 290

TERENCE, *Ad.* 866: 218; 968: 269; *Eur.* 46: 343; 49: 343; 236: 309f.; 249f.: 213; 251f.: 213ff.; 284: 274 n. 13; 732: 93; *How.* 373: 326; *Heu.* 461: 273

TERTULLIAN, *Anim.* 9,4: 66f.; 27,6: 62 n. 3; 37,2: 109; *Apol.* 23,13: 292; 40,15: 144; 46,18: 280; 47,12: 292; *Bapt.* 12,2: 66; 20,4: 88; *Car.* 31: 12: 112; 41,3: 381; 41,12: 383; 41,13: 384; 17 l. 37: 189; 20 l. 23: 103; 20 l. 55: 166; 21 l. 32: 165; 23 l. 29: 108; *Casiv.* 3 l. 54: 154; 4 l. 14: 198; 6 l. 4: 181; 6 l. 14: 181; 6 l. 19: 183; 9 l. 3: 196; 9 l. 35: 124; 10 l. 16: 198; 10 l. 47: 131; 11 l. 12: 120; 13 ll. 6, 8, 9 and 25: 120; 13 l. 36: 129; 13 l. 41: 155; *Coron.* 3,4: 352ff.; 10,7: 279; 282; *Cult. fem.* 1,1 l. 5: 378; 1,1 l. 13: 148f.; 151; 1,1 l. 19: 151; 1,4 l. 12: 218; 1,6 l. 7: 77; 2,1 l. 2: 218; 238; 378; 2,2 l. 39: 252; 2,2 l. 43: 376; 2,3 l. 4: 218; 2,3 l. 23: 116; 2,5 l. 4: 245; 2,5 l. 8: 376; 2,5 l. 15: 278; 2,7 l. 2: 254 n. 12; 2,7 l. 5: 116; 2,9 l. 25: 272f.; 2,9 ll. 25-8: 113 n. 17; 2,11 l. 14: 218; 2,13 l. 1: 111; 2,13 l. 2: 112f.; 2,13 l. 15: 111; 2,13 l. 42: 135; 302; *Fug.* 1,4: 44; 6,1: 73; *Idol.* 5,1: 91; 10,4: 352 n. 10; 12,2: 193ff.; 300f.; 303f.; 12,2f.: 270; 12,3: 193ff.; 12,4: 193 n. 12; 195 n. 18; 304; 12,5: 270; 24,3: 149; *Inter.* 1 p. 274,5: 93; 1 p. 274,7: 78 n. 14; 1 p. 274,8: 272 n. 9; 1 p. 274,9: 77f.; 272 n. 9; 1 p. 274,16: 119; 2 p. 276,12: 356; 2 p. 276,28: 93; 3 p. 277,10: 87; 3 p. 277,19: 69; 3 p. 277,31: 89; 5 p. 279,8: 87; 6 p. 280,12: 79; 8 p. 283,27: 120; 8 p. 283,33: 88; 8 p. 284,9: 393; 9 p. 284,18: 84; 9 p. 285,4: 82; 9 p. 285,7: 82; 9 p. 285,10: 84; 9 p. 285,28f.: 136f.; 12 p. 290,24: 144; 12 p. 291,4: 82; 15 p. 293,14: 178; 15 p. 294,18: 356; 17 p. 296,26: 93; 17 p. 297,14: 134; *Adv. Marc.* 1,29 p. 330,27: 153f.; 1,29 p. 331,3: 178; 1,29 p. 331,18: 183; 1,29 p. 331,21: 157; 2,2 p. 334,2: 92; 2,10 p. 348,18: 42; 2,18 p. 360,1: 79; 2,18 p. 360,3: 77; 3,24 p. 421,5: 44; 4,15 p. 466,3: 210; 4,21 p. 490,24: 381; 4,28 p. 519,17f.: 210; 5,8 p. 598,7: 163; 5,11 p. 613,19: 43; 5,15 p. 628,6: 153; 5,17 p. 635,1: 43; *Mart.* 2,9: 195 n. 18; 407; 3,1: 195; *Monog.* 3,2: 154; 3,3: 175; 196; 8,2: 120; 8,3: 120; 8,7: 183 n. 3; 10,3: 378; 11,7: 175; 11,10: 198; 16,5: 27; 109; 187; 17,1: 192; 17,3: 120; 17,5: 155; *Nat.* 1,19,5: 292; *Orat.* 22 p. 196,6: 129; 22 p. 196,15: 48; 24: 346; 25 p. 197,23: 347f.; 25 p. 198,2: 349; 25 p. 198,4: 351; *Pall.* 4,10: 116; *Patent.* 3,2: 382ff.; 3,2ff.: 381; 3,7: 385; 3,9: 385; 7,5: 298; 13,5: 156; *Praescr.* 3 l. 8: 102; 3 l. 9: 101f.; 3 l. 10: 103; 7 l. 33: 280; 288; 33 l. 6: 393; *Pudic.* 6 p. 229,28: 155; 13 p. 243,2: 393; 14 p. 246,15: 393; 16 p. 252,16: 393; 16 p. 255,4: 198; 16 p. 258,11: 196; 16 p. 255,14: 131; *Resurr.* 3,2f.: 273; 24,12: 393; 40,2: 56; 48,12: 393; 61,6: 129; 156; *Scorp.* 10 p. 167,22: 297; 13 p. 174,25: 392; 13 p. 175,5: 381; 393 n. 4: 13 p. 175,16: 392; *Spect.* 10 p. 12,19: 77; 18 p. 20,5: 376; 18 p. 20,6: 263; 26 p. 25,21: 66; 28 p. 27,8: 301; 30 p. 28,13: 398; 30 p. 28,17: 398; 30 p. 29,5: 292; 30 p. 29,6: 400; 30 p. 29,23: 398; *Test. anim.* 2 p. 136,7: 316; 4 p. 138,27: 37; 4 p. 140,8: 73; *Uxor.* 1,1 l. 4: 238; 1,2 l. 1: 153; 1,2 l. 3: 181; 1,2 l. 8: 181; 1,2 l. 15: 183; 1,3 ll. 9 and 17: 154; 1,3

- 1,40: 196; 1,4,1,20: 129, 229; 1,4,1,25: 30; 1,4,1,27: 142; 1,5,1,10: 110f.; 1,6,1,9: 156; 1,7,1,14: 198; 1,7,1,18: 131; 1,8,1,10: 125; 1,8,1,23: 269f., 272; 1,8,1,25: 212; 1,8,1,27: 274; 1,8,1,29: 120, 271; 1,8,1,31: 238; 2,1,1,2: 238; 2,1,1,24: 175; 2,2,1,6: 393; 2,5,1,16: 137; 2,6,1,1: 218; 2,8,1,20: 131; *Virg. ref.* 3,3: 218; 5,2: 160; 7,2: 254; 9,6: 120; 10,1: 156; 10,4: 125; 14,2: 108; 14,3: 105; 14,6: 108; 15,4: 114f.; 16,4: 378; 16,6: 25, 235f.; 17,4: 253
- THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA (cf. also s.v. Julian of Eclanum), *Abel.* 18: 92; *Am.* 1,1: 92; 4,11: 92; 9,4: 92; 9,11: 92; *I Cor.* 7,8: 177; *In Eph.* 4,8: 73; 4,14: 73; 5,9: 73; 5,15: 73; *In Gal.* 1,1: 73; 4,24: 73; 4,26: 73; *Gen.* 19,31: 80; 19,32: 80; 32,27: 96; *Jon. prof.* p. 317^c: 92; 1,3: 92; *Fr. in Le.* 3,22: 45 n. 6; *Mal.* 2,8ff.: 45 n. 6; *Mt.* 57: 294; *Os.* 2,21: 92; *In Phil.* 2,19: 73; *Pr.* 37,8^a: 94 n. 8; 38,7^b: 143; 44,15^a: 190; 44,16^b: 189, 207; 50 *praef.*: 103; *In I Tim.* 3,8: 259; 5,19: 259; *In 2 Tim.* 4,2: 73; *In Tit.* 2,3: 259; *Zach.* 14,8: 92
- THEODORET OF CYRRHUS, *H. ref.* 2 p. 1308^b: 133 n. 2; 2 p. 1316^b: 339; 3 p. 1325^a: 230; 3 p. 1325^c: 136, 140; 3 p. 1328^a: 61; 3 p. 1333^b: 139; 3 p. 1337^b: 256; 4 p. 1344^a: 61; 4 p. 1349^b: 257; 5 p. 1353^b: 334; 5 p. 1357^a: 331; 7 p. 1365^c: 408; 10 p. 1389^a: 256; 11 p. 1393^b: 338; 11 p. 1393^c: 256; 13 p. 1401^a: 331; 17 p. 1424^a: 331 n. 18, 20 p. 1429^b: 338; 21 p. 1436^b: 256; 26 p. 1468^c: 64; 29 p. 1489^b: 189; 29 p. 1489^b: 256; 29 p. 1492^b: 390 n. 3; 30 p. 1493^a: 61, 252; *Ps.* 6,1: 294 n. 11; 6,6: 294 n. 11; 50,7: 162; 103,21: 40; *Qu. in Ex.* 7: 168; *Qu. in Jos.* 2: 374
- THEODOTUS OF ANCYRA, *Hom.* (Aubineau [1969]) 7,4: 222; *Hom. BVM* 11: 188; *Hom. BVM et Sym.* 3: 368
- THEOPHILUS OF ANTIOCH, *Autol.* 2,4: 92
- PS.-TITUS OF BOSTRA, *Palm.* 12(7): 221; 13(7): 225
- Tractatus Pelagianus*, 1,5 p. 12: 204; 3,3 p. 26: 298; 4,11,1 p. 86: 356; 4,14,4 p. 93: 94; 6,4,2 p. 127: 153; 6,4,3 p. 127: 197; 6,5,1 p. 131: 100; 6,6,1 p. 132: 179; 6,6,2 p. 133: 152, 166; 6,10,7 p. 142: 173; 6,10,8 p. 143: 186; 6,10,8 p. 144: 198; 6,10,9 p. 145: 173; 6,10,10 p. 146: 198; 6,10,12 p. 147: 186; 6,10,13 p. 147: 196; 6,11,1 p. 149: 94; 6,14,2 p. 155: 183; 6,14,4 p. 155: 181; 6,15,4 p. 159: 173; 6,17 p. 161: 180
- TYCONIUS, *Reg.* 1 p. 7,11: 396; 7 p. 72,18: 43
- ULPIAN, *Dig.* 40,7,3,16: 109
- VALERIAN OF CEMELE, *Hom.* 1,8: 112
- VERGIL, *Aen.* 1,752: 265; 2,215: 290; 2,332: 66; 3,173: 296; 7,810f.: 262; 8,389: 58; 10,501: 124; 10,642: 296; 10,790: 326; 11,283: 68f.; 12,64f.: 296; *Ecl.* 3,102: 60, 290; 4,61: 383
- Vetus Latina*, *Eccles.* 7,17 (Jerome, *Adv. Iovin.* 1,14): 275
- VICTOR OF VITA, 1,21: 107; 1,30: 218; 3,23: 107; 3,37: 293
- VINCENT OF LERINS, *Comm.* 1,6: 29; 6,3: 36; 16,1: 262; 18,4: 4
- Vita Antonii*, 28 pp. 43,9 and 43,15: 73
- Vita Caesaris Arelatensis*, 1,9: 280 n. 22
- Vita Eupraxiae*, 6: 139, 253, 303; 14: 139; 19: 64; 34: 65
- Vita Fulgentii Ruspinensis*, p. 115: 334
- Vita Melaniae Iunioris*, *praef.*: 29f.; 1: 123; 22: 82f.; 139; 24: 83; 44: 395; 58: 405; 62: 64, 83; 70: 402
- Vita Pachomii* A. 11: 339; 15: 61; 29: 61; 35: 339
- Vita Pachomii* B. 32: 328 n. 5
- Vita Pachomii* C. 2: 339; 6: 339; 34: 332; 83: 334; 125: 332
- Vitae Patrum* (cf. s.v. *Communiones Sanctorum Patrum*), 5,7,43: 395; 5,8,21: 61; 5,8,23: 145; 5,10,44: 64, 136; 5,18,9: 350
- VOLUSIANUS, *Aug. epist.* 135,2: 383
- Vulgate*, *Esth.* 8,17: 318; *Hebr.* 12,12: 117; *Is.* 3,23: 234; 7,11: 54; *Judith* 6,20: 139; 2 *Par.* 14,14: 318; *Prov.* 4,17: 85; *Psalms.* 3,7: 79; *Rom.* 12,10: 239
- ZENO OF VERONA, 1,1,15: 123; 1,13,7: 106; 1,14,6: 218; 1,15,2: 94; 2,1,18: 29

GENERAL INDEX

- Abel: slaying of 387f.
abortion 109ff.
Abraham 15f.; and Keturah 181f.; tribulations of 387f.
abstract for concrete 129
Adam: as first monk 339; fell because of food 87ff.
adivunctio 171 n. 3, 257
adjective: neuter plural, with dependent genitive 66; and noun, Greek and Latin elements in combinations of 263f.; used substantively 95
agape 308
agraphon 180
alliteration (*homoeographaron*) 98, 115, 121f., 125, 156, 191, 195, 251, 254, 261f., 291, 293, 295f., 310, 317, 321, 324, 329, 345, 366, 376, 391, 396
almsgiving 309; for show 308; and trumpets 308
Ambrose: and Augustine 200; and J. 1ff., 26, 28ff., 32, 38, 71f., 74, 100f., 138, 148, 191, 200ff., 208f., 225, 229 n. 3, 231 n. 8, 232ff., 238ff., 242, 267, 281, 349ff., 363f., 366, 371, 380f., 387, 398ff.
Ambrosiaster: and J. 40, 258, 378
Amnon's incest 103f.
anadiplosis 184, 380f.
anaphora 22, 32 n. 15, 69, 98, 105, 113, 126, 128, 142, 147, 170f., 173, 180, 191, 194, 214, 262ff., 295f., 317, 327, 329, 331, 337, 353, 370, 378, 391, 400
anastrophe 101, 248, 275
angels: consociation with 67; fallen, replaced by humans 396; greet deceased 402; virgin's likeness to 30ff., 176f., 190f.
Anna 404f.
ἀντιθεσις 371
antithesis 59, 62, 208f., 301 n. 5, 331, 392; age and merit 123f.; beauty of soul and body 209; Bible and classics 280f.; carnal and spiritual love 21, 142f.; cold body and mental incandescence 62; *crimen* and *culpa* 80f.; earth and heaven as domains of marriage and virginity 154f.; extravagance and Christ's poverty 307f.; flesh and spirit, applied to domestic relationships 405; food for body and soul 351; fruit and root 162f.; *audium* and *labor* 205; Jerusalem and Rome 288; man and angel 364 n. 6, 366; material and spiritual possessions 299; *necessitas* and *voluntas* 156; obloquy and admonition 258f.; *opere* and *mente* 409; riches and rags 306f.; seeming and being 122; shadow and truth 208, 406; soldier and king 173; son of God and son of man 381ff.
antonomasia 265f., 405
Antony, St. 339
apostles: dreams about 133; imitation of 372f.
apostrophe 32, 238; with general application 356
Apuleius: and J. 108, 116 n. 25
Aramaic 6 n. 18, 300
ark: Noah's, symbolizing church 373f.; of covenant 219f.
ascetics: as exhibitionists 251ff.; as impostors 216; criticized 9; well-born, hailed as first of their kind 123
ass 221
asyndeton 46, 130, 142, 164 n. 15, 170, 173, 184, 194 n. 16, 201, 214, 218, 238, 241, 248, 295, 321, 327, 329, 340, 351, 370, 378, 391
Athanasius: and Ambrose 190, 202f., 366, 398, 405; and Gregory Nazianzen: 360 n. 1; and J. 61, 64, 126f., 136, 176f., 184ff., 190, 193, 202f., 231, 247f., 359ff., 369, 398ff.
Augustine: "biblical" style 6; Ps.-Augustine *De sobrietate et caritate*, date of 69 n. 2

αὐχῆνος 218
avarice 298ff., 342, 344; cause of Judas' fall 359ff.

Babylon 57; confused with Assyria 210

Basil: and J. 101, 129

baths 113

baths: not mentioned 10 n. 42

Behaghel's law 63, 105, 115, 136, 138, 170, 172, 175, 182, 194 n. 16, 214, 248, 277, 289, 351, 353 n. 12, 366, 373, 378, 385, 387, 391; inversion of 69, 120, 128, 156, 180, 194 n. 16, 351, 385

Behemoth 94f., 144

'being what you will be' 408f.

belly: 'and what is under it' 271f.; rattling 137f.

Belshazzar's feast 211

belts 253

bibles: sumptuous 307

birth-pangs: avoidance of 149

Blesilla 122, 124f.

blindness: in eyes and mind 83f.

body: cold 62, 291; leaving 397f.

bread: and raiment, Jacob's request for 313f.; and salt 338f.

breast: beating of 65

brevitas 160, 285 n. 6

chains: worn by ascetics 256

cheeks: ruddy 62, 131

chiasmus 27, 59, 62ff., 66, 70, 77, 80, 89, 93, 98, 109, 138, 161, 175, 183f., 208, 230, 252, 267, 277, 288, 293, 295f., 317, 321, 326f., 331, 335, 349, 356, 360f., 380, 382, 384, 386, 391

children: as consolation for mortality 181; equated exegetically with thoughts 57; wailing 27, 159, 161f. n. 13

Christ: as (jealous) husband 129, 150f., 235; embrace of 16f.; 'garment of' 18f., 159; greets deceased 401f.; poverty of 385

Chrysostom: and J. 1, 5, 10 n. 39, 13, 32, 54, 130, 153, 173ff., 181, 225, 261f., 307f., 375

cicada 146

Cicero: and Ambrose 71 n. 7; and Augustine 71 n. 7; and J. 71 n. 6, 112, 208, 261, 264f., 280f., 288, 293, 296, 390f.; and Lactantius 288

calice 255

cincture: biblical 96ff.

classics: and J. 215ff., 250, 265, 277ff., 283ff., 288f., 293, 309f., 335f., 383 n. 3

clausula 67, 91 n. 5, 120; choriamb cretic 391; cretic spondee 93, 101, 126, 318, 327, 335, 391; cretic tribrach 69, 89, 95, 252, 329, 331, 366; dichoree 175, 277, 326, 331; dispondee 248; double cretic 17 n. 6, 69, 91 n. 4, 121 n. 3, 175, 210f., 248f., 299, 318, 382, 384; fourth peon spondee 351; spondee cretic 337, 353

cliché 2, 5, 27, 29ff., 34, 36, 48f., 71ff., 78 n. 15, 79f., 83f., 89, 91ff., 100, 102, 105, 139, 142, 144f., 153, 157ff., 162, 166, 170ff., 182, 186ff., 190f., 206ff., 228ff., 262, 268, 271f., 279ff., 283, 311, 328f., 341 n. 5, 371, 373f., 382, 384, 388, 390f., 394ff., 407

colloquialism 8, 15, 26, 29, 53, 73, 87, 146, 164, 186, 194f., 224, 246, 248, 251f., 255, 264, 275, 277, 291, 304, 316, 321, 342ff., 355

colloquy with the Lord 228ff.

colour: change of 23, 60; red 270; white 23

communion: taken at home 268f.

companion: ideal 134

complacency: warnings against 46f., 104

- complexio* 351, 370
 computing revenue and expenditure 359
 confession: either of sin or praise 294; no scope for in world below 294
 conscience: 'fire of' 293; pangs of, at death 293
 contraception 109ff.
 Coptic 300, 320
 cross: sign of 352ff.
 crown 35, 387; of virginity 124, 268
 cup: as missile 394; smashed 394
curvus plover 327; *tankus* 17 n. 6, 69 n. 4, 329f.; *welox* 248 n. 7
 Cyprian: and Ambrose 241; and Augustine 200, 229 n. 4; and Chromatius 241; and J. 41, 51, 54 n. 6, 70ff., 105, 107ff., 113 n. 17, 115f., 122f., 131, 149ff., 156, 181, 198ff., 208, 228ff., 241, 250, 301, 314, 373, 376f., 386f., 389, 397ff., 403f. n. 4, 408; and Tertullian 229, 273, 278
 Damascus 200
 Daniel: at prayer 242; eunuch 85; Habakkuk's errand to 84f.; rejection of royal fare 84
 David: and Bathsheba 101ff.
 death: 'dead before' 63; only fit recompense 386
δειματις 285, 296
 demons 16; military vocabulary applied to 69
derivatio 262, 329, 381, 385, 387
 detraction: caveat against 354, 358
 Devil 13, 16, 19f., 39ff., 88, 94, 107, 187, 251, 266, 371, 375, 400
 diction, of opponent: criticized 8, 146, 264, 344 n. 9
δῆτυμα 10, 59, 285, 288
 diminutive 39, 128, 141, 197, 201f., 246, 291
 Dinah 232
 Diomedes 265
distinctio 130, 142, 170, 248, 317, 329, 331, 370, 391
distributio 238
 Donatus: and J. 309f., 329 n. 11, 343
 doors 238ff.; of heart 240f.
 dove 225
 'dream', of J.: 6, 215, 261, 266, 278f., 282 n. 23, 283ff.; date and place 285f.; described in language of martyrdom 292f., 297
 dreams: pious 133; wet 94 n. 7, 145
 earth: needed filling 181
 effort: need for 123, 390, 394f.; short, winning perpetual glory 388f.
 Egypt: brick-making in 221f.
 Elijah: ascension 37f.; 'feeding the feeder' 312; first monk 339; mantle 148; picnic on flight from Jezebel 82; ravens 311; virgin 5, 183ff., 190
 Elisha: deadly portage 83; first monk 339; unseen auxiliaries 37f.; virgin 5, 183ff., 190
 Elizabeth 369
 ellipse 66, 91, 98, 184, 329, 331 n. 19, 391, 394; of word 'epistle' 389
 eloquence: caveat against 29, 215, 275, 283, 285, 297, 335f.
 'enemy within' 70f.
 epidiorthisis 120
 Epiphanius of Salamis: and J. 368
 epiphora 142, 170, 370
 Essenes 336f.
 Ethiopian: flesh 60; wife, Moses' 21ff.
 etymology 15, 57, 182, 192; *κατ' ἀντιπαράθεσιν* 85

- eunuch 85, 130, 156, 180
 Eusebius of Caesarea: and J. 336f.
 Eusebius of Emesa: and J. 8 n. 25, 64, 211
 Eustochium 8f., 25, 122, 222f., 226; age 8f.; 'first noble virgin of Rome' 123
 Evagrius of Antioch: and J. 357f.
 Eve 187ff.
 exclamatio 59, 119, 124
 exegesis: multiple 75ff.
 eyebrows: downcast 253
 eyes: one left unveiled 253; raised heavenwards 327
- face: disfigurement of 252
 family: abandonment of 193f., 286f.; J.'s 286f.
 fasting 288, 321, 346; alternates with over-indulgence 139f.; causes cantankerousness 356; causes pride 355; daily 139; foundation of chastity 93f.; in Lent 335; lasting two and three days 139; lasting a week 64; sham 258; stops wet dreams 94 n. 7
 feather-beds 90f.
 feet: bare 167f., 257; dirty 253
 finger: being pointed out with 246; beringed 261
 flattery 131f., 214f., 218f., 379, 405f.; disavowal of 28, 405 n. 6
 flesh: Ethiopian 60; 'of, but not in' 340f.; virgins in 49
 food 82ff., 226, 322, 335, 355; cause of Adam's fall 87ff.; cooked, avoidance of 61, 331 n. 18; Devil's 4f.; and drink, J.'s obsession with 10, 61, 68, 93, 263, 287, 390, 394; dry 145; employed to tempt Christ 88; incites lust 93f., 140f.; moderate 136, 356; of soul 351f.; too much causes mental torpor 140
 footwear: cheap 117; floppy 260f., 321; foppish 260
 funerals: caveat against attending 195f., 246ff.; preparations under way before death 290f.
- gain: financial, as motive 117f.
 gait: 'broken' 117; steady 332f.; tiptoe 261f.
 garment: black 253, 257; coarse 321; gold-embroidered 130; men's, worn by women 254; 'of Christ' 18f., 159; of skins 147f., 158f.; seamless 159; should eschew extremes of dirt and cleanliness 10 n. 42, 245, 266; unorthodox 246
 gluttony: taunt of 263, 287
 goat 236f.
 goatee 257
 God: humans become 395f.; mother-in-law of 5f., 173
 going out: ban on 135f., 204ff., 228ff., 238ff.
 gold 34, 130, 171
 grace at meals 348f.
 Greek 264
 Gregory Nazianzen: and J. 1, 17ff., 26, 86 n. 1, 172 n. 7, 187f., 190f., 203, 208f., 267, 303, 306, 311f., 340f., 359f., 362, 367, 390
 Gregory of Elvira: and J. 164
 Gregory of Nyssa: and J. 157f., 219
 grossness 93, 138f., 271, 375
 guest: Christ as 226f.; God as 227
- hair: frizzed 261; long 256f.; loose 116f.; shaven 254f.
 Haman 192
 Hebrew 6 n. 18, 6 n. 20, 15, 192, 284f., 300
 hell 294ff.; fear of 61
 Hezekiah: displays treasures 209f.

- Hillary: and J. 381f., 384, 386ff.
 homootelekuton 120f., 142, 181, 201, 214, 233, 241, 265, 270, 329, 331, 339, 356, 370, 385
 Horace: and J. 246, 249f., 275, 280f., 309
 horses: mettlesome 265
 hours: canonical 347f.
 household cares 27
 humility 248, 250f.
 hundredfold, sixtyfold and thirtyfold yield 126f.
 hyperbaton 69, 95, 101, 104, 122, 124f., 179, 198, 248, 252, 265f., 299, 314, 318, 327, 329, 331 n. 19, 337, 382, 391, 398
 hyperbole 108
hypophora 90
 hypotaxis 102

 ictus and accent: correspondence of 248 n. 7, 327
 imagery: botanical 164; fire 55, 72f., 293; military 69, 267, 388; resping 182f.; silviculture 183; springhead 197; watering 140; writing 370; zoological 146
 incarnation: stages of Christ's abasement at 381ff.
 inconcinnity 5, 7, 15, 17 n. 6, 27, 36f., 45, 53, 58, 71, 77f., 83f., 92, 96f., 102, 104, 110ff., 135ff., 151, 159, 162, 165ff., 171, 174, 176, 179, 182, 184ff., 190, 192ff., 197, 199f., 206, 208, 214f., 224f., 242, 254, 261f., 274, 279, 305, 314ff., 335f., 338, 342, 344, 347ff., 353 n. 11, 355, 360ff., 365, 367, 369f., 390, 392, 394, 398
 inconsistency 25, 123, 162, 215, 248, 251, 265, 275, 277, 290, 296, 309, 322, 344 n. 9, 383 n. 3
incrementum 120, 344, 357
 indicative: alternating with subjunctive 87
 inner man 56
 intercession, with judge 295
interpretatio 142, 170, 329f., 391f.
 Isaac: sacrifice of 387f.
 Isidore of Seville 317f.
 isocolon 171, 214, 241, 314, 329, 378, 391, 406

 Jacob: drudgery 391f.; identity of combatant 96; ladder 44; mandrakes 182; request for bread and raiment 313f.
 James and John: calling of 193ff.
 Jeremiah: virgin 185f.
 Jerome: as hermit 59ff.; as priest 259; as show-off 3, 6ff., 14f., 24, 47f., 57, 82f., 86 n. 1, 90, 102, 141, 159, 173, 175, 182, 185f., 192, 203, 215, 217, 233, 242ff., 248f., 264, 271f., 279, 289, 300, 314f., 317, 335f., 360f., 365, 373; borrows from others 1ff., 7f., 14f., 20, 23, 27, 32 n. 16, 34, 38f., 41f., 47, 51, 54, 57ff., 61f., 64, 69ff., 74f., 77f., 82, 84f., 87ff., 91, 93f., 101ff., 105, 107ff., 115f., 119 n. 1, 122ff., 126f., 129, 131, 133, 135ff., 140ff., 144, 148ff., 155f., 158ff., 162, 164, 172 n. 7, 174, 176ff., 181, 183ff., 190ff., 198f., 206, 208f., 211, 213ff., 224ff., 228ff., 237f., 240ff., 247ff., 253, 260ff., 267, 269ff., 276ff., 280, 288, 290, 295f., 298ff., 303f., 306, 309f., 312, 314, 326, 335f., 340f., 344, 346ff., 357ff., 369f., 373, 375ff., 380ff., 389ff., 396ff., 407f.; claims originality 5, 200, 204; imitated by others 21, 32, 56, 69, 71, 75f., 89, 92, 100f., 110, 113, 119f., 136, 140, 155, 161f., 195, 204, 225, 229 n. 3, 241, 247f., 250, 260ff., 273, 306f., 309, 330ff., 341, 348, 351f., 371, 373, 387f., 397; indifferent to context 23, 80, 82, 176 n. 13, 193, 195, 208, 214f., 277; intellectual inferiority-complex 3ff., 24, 30, 86 n. 1, 316, 375 n. 16; superficiality 6, 23 n. 15, 24, 96 n. 13, 98 n. 22, 163, 167, 175, 177, 183f., 195, 198, 299, 346f., 351, 375, 395; unexampled formulations 4ff., 37, 39, 77f., 80, 83ff., 87, 89, 97, 100ff., 135, 137f., 148, 155f., 162, 164f., 168f., 173, 175.

- 185, 230, 232, 250, 252f., 262ff., 274f., 277, 286f., 306f., 310, 314, 319, 321, 336, 341, 350ff., 357, 359ff., 366, 377, 384, 388, 404, 409
- Jerusalem 287f.
- Job 42, 94
- John the Baptist: as first monk 339
- Josephus: and J. 335ff.
- Judas 42: fell because of avarice 359ff.
- Judith 191f.; linked with Esther 192
- Juvenal: and J. 270
- Juvenius: and J. 281
- kin: complacency in regard to 104; figurative language of, taken literally 25, 129, 150
- kissing: the head 132
- Lactantius: and J. 376
- laughter: condemned 213f.; linked with obscenity 213
- Livy: and J. 6 n. 18, 335f.
- loins: denote male genitals 94ff.
- Lot 79ff.: daughters 80; wife 17f., 28
- love: carnal and spiritual 21, 142f.; of Christ 380f., 390ff.
- Lucan: and J. 246
- Lucilius: and J. 309
- Macarii 317
- Magdalen: penitent 63f.
- 'maker and master of the universe' 92
- Manicheans 28, 91, 115; distinguished from other heretics 374; 'filthy' 374; regard body as work of Devil 375; veneer of sanctity contrasted with disgusting life 378
- manual labour 302
- Marcella 9, 123, 405f.
- marriage: consequence of Fall 154ff., 160, 162; denial of attack on 153f., 170; ended by mortality 27; molestation 26, 123, 197ff.; normal under old dispensation 179; 'shackles' 197, 199; source of virgins 170f.; value 27f.
- marrow: attacked by fever 290
- martyr(s) 20, 126, 283, 292f., 297, 386; equated with virgin 371f.; visits to shrines of 135f.
- Mary 359, 399; brings life, as Eve brought death 188f.; first virgin 5, 152, 184, 189f.; model for virgins 362f.; upset by Gabriel's masculine voice 363ff.; virginity 9, 163ff.
- matrons: exert influence on ecclesiastical appointments 132; snobbish 128ff.
- mime 270
- Miriam 399
- mistress 27
- Moaabites and Ammonites 81
- mole: on fair body 249f.
- monks: abbot's discourse to 324; anchoritic 320, 338ff.; cenobitic 320, 323ff.; devout conversations 332; Egyptian 9, 315ff.; gait 333; obedient 323; rennuoth 257, 319ff.; selling wares 317, 321; table-manners 325, 328ff.; womanizing 258
- Moses 21ff., 222; barefooted 167f.; and waters of Marah 83
- 'mother church' 106f.; lap 105f.
- moths 306
- Nebuchadnezzar 40f., 187
- Noah 167; ark, symbolizing church 373f.; drunk 74ff., 79
- Novatian: and J. 151

- nudity: female 233; of Adam and Eve 155
 number: contrast of 391f.; odd and even 167

 obscenity: linked with laughter 213; warning against 212ff.
 observation from life 109, 114, 116, 213, 216, 218, 253, 262, 274, 277
 oil 331; avoidance of 82f.
 'oneness': of God 165; of virginity 165
 Origin: and Antipater of Bostra 370; *Homilies on Ezekiel*, date of J.'s translation 95 n. 9;
 and J. 7, 14f., 17ff., 22ff., 29, 38f., 41ff., 45, 47, 49, 53, 57, 75, 85, 88, 94ff., 133,
 140ff., 144, 157f., 160, 162, 165, 167f., 185, 187, 192, 206, 208, 224, 226, 233, 235,
 237, 242, 283, 299, 344, 347f., 370, 381, 386, 396
 Ovid: and J. 260
 oxymoron 16, 19, 120, 146, 228, 249f., 384

 pagan references: in *Libellus* 148, 265, 335f.; in Septuagint 55
 pallor 62; linked with thinness 134
 Pambo of Cellia 317
 προδιαστολή 317
 paradise: Christian's home 160; mental translocation to 407ff.; virginity in 147, 155, 160
 parataxis 102, 406f.
 parenthesis 26, 149, 242, 342
 parents: *invicta* of 172; obedience to 135; spiritual 135, 405
 parison 66, 70, 121, 142, 170, 188, 201, 230, 248, 250, 257, 280, 296, 317, 321, 349,
 370f., 392
 paronomasia (*adnominatio, parechesis*) 36 n. 5, 69, 80, 101, 108, 110f., 113, 122, 136,
 184, 293, 310 n. 2, 314, 317, 355, 377, 381, 386, 392, 408
 passions: cardinal 249
 Passover: 'one house' of, symbolizing church 373
 Paul, of Thebes 339
 Paul, St. 46f., 49, 73f., 135, 281, 390, 393, unmarried 170, 173ff.
 Paula 9, 135, 172f., 222f., 405f.
 pearl 75f., 164, 171f.; pierced 76f.
 perseverance 9, 11, 13, 17, 28, 141, 204, 390
 Persius: and J. 276f.
 Pharaoh 223f., 399f.
 Philo: and J. 335ff.
 Plato: and J. 6 n. 18, 289, 335f.
 Plautus: and J. 119 n. 1, 289
 polyptoton 45, 130, 134, 142, 155f., 173, 184, 194 n. 16, 214, 230, 248, 340, 377, 387,
 396, 408
 polysyndeton 115
proteritis 61, 86, 250, 385
 praise: disavowal of 5, 26, 29, 32, 200f., 204, 243; hard to scorn 249 n. 10
 prayer 324, 335; as food 352; continuous, incompatible with intercourse 197f.; nocturnal
 137; on going out 350f.; while asleep 346ff.
 pride: as a fault of virgins 33; cause of Devil's fall 251; from fasting 355; 'holy' 130; in
 birth 250; in wealth 250
 priests: foppish 256, 260; gourmet 263; should inspire fear 132; venal 132, 262;
 womanizing 256, 259f., 262
procatalepsis 153
 promised land: entering 222
 proverbs 34f., 54, 57, 72, 100, 171f., 192f., 206, 249ff., 272ff., 290, 312f., 390
 prurience 16f., 51ff., 62, 64, 100ff., 116, 120, 208, 228, 230f., 233f., 272, 279, 284, 392
 psalmody: in bedroom 146f.

punctuation 78, 91, 149f., 161, 288, 300, 304 n. 7, 311, 340 n. 3, 394

Queen of the South 22f.

Quintilian: and J. 335 n. 20; Ps., and J. 274 n. 13

Rachel 182; symbolizing church 182

rags: indicate pure mind 245 n. 2; warning against showing off in 251; worn by rich 306f.

Rahab: symbolizing church 374

reader: appeal to willingness of 301f.; identified with biblical figure 226; identified with writer 148, 234; teasing of 21, 232; told to find own examples 87, 388

Red Sea: crossing 399f.

reddimo 184, 194 n. 16, 230, 248, 296, 377, 392, 408

regressio 238

reproach: divine 47

reward 21, 180, 227, 392, 397f.

rhetoric: disavowal of 29f.; scorned by J. 8 n. 27, 297

rhetorical finesse, of J. 8, 17 n. 6, 22, 27, 29, 36 n. 5, 59, 63, 66, 69f., 77, 79f., 89f., 93, 95, 98f., 102, 104f., 109, 120ff., 124ff., 142, 155f., 170f., 173, 175, 180, 182ff., 188, 193ff., 201, 205f., 208, 210f., 213ff., 225, 230, 241, 248f., 252f., 257f., 262, 264ff., 277, 280, 288f., 293, 295ff., 299, 309, 314, 317f., 326ff., 337, 344f., 347, 349, 351, 360f., 365f., 370, 373, 377f., 382ff., 391f., 394, 398, 400, 406, 408

ring composition 11, 314, 370, 394

rod 163ff.

rose 171f.

sackcloth 60, 255

sadness, of countenance 114f.; fake 258

Sallust: and J. 59, 87, 135

salutariones 132

Sampson 100f.

Sarah 403f.; as Pharaoh's concubine 387f., 404

satire 9ff., 119ff., 128, 131ff., 256, 271, 306, 309f.; and mention of names 309

scent 260

scribal expansion 78, 125 n. 4, 330

scripture 6ff., 10, 13ff., 17, 23ff., 29, 33ff., 39ff., 47f., 51, 54, 59, 67f., 74, 80, 82f., 86, 88, 90, 95ff., 100ff., 105, 107f., 112f., 116, 121, 134, 138, 141, 143, 147, 149ff., 153f., 156ff., 165, 172f., 175, 179ff., 185f., 188, 191f., 194, 196, 198, 204, 206, 212, 216, 218ff., 223ff., 227f., 231ff., 235f., 238f., 241ff., 251f., 254, 258, 267, 269, 279, 281ff., 288ff., 293, 295, 297f., 300ff., 310ff., 316, 327, 335, 338, 346, 349f., 354f., 357ff., 361, 368ff., 380, 383f., 386, 392, 394f., 397, 399ff., 406f., 409; as key to foregoing 58, 236f., 242; juxtaposed with formulations borrowed from elsewhere 7f., 34, 78, 87, 103, 105, 109, 112, 116, 123 n. 2, 159, 163, 187, 195, 209f., 216f., 231, 241, 266, 272, 275, 279, 281, 299, 345f., 354f., 362, 368, 383, 386, 409; juxtaposed with proverbs 34f., 171f., 206; memorizing 350; mistakes in citing 40f., 94, 210; queries about 266f.; rare texts 35, 41, 43, 47f., 52, 54, 103, 105, 116, 141, 157, 171f., 187, 234, 236, 295, 355, 368; reading 138, 225f., 269, 324, 335; reciting 349f.; uncouthness 289f.; words introducing 16, 47, 186, 236

sedans 131

self-imitation 6, 17f., 20, 23, 43, 54, 62, 64, 66, 68, 80, 86, 88f., 92, 95, 97ff., 102, 117, 120, 124f., 133ff., 139, 141, 147, 155, 159, 164f., 185f., 225f., 235, 240, 243, 246, 251, 253f., 261, 263, 266, 274, 293ff., 306ff., 312ff., 323, 326, 338, 344, 352 n. 10, 354, 359, 371ff., 378, 380f., 383, 386; involving language which comes in the first instance from another author 29, 41, 60, 103, 110, 116, 122f., 127, 138f., 148, 193, 209, 247, 264f., 267, 270, 288, 290, 301, 304, 310, 314, 326, 340f., 357, 377, 381, 398f., 407

- Seneca: and J. 29
sententia: to round off passage 58, 89, 152, 166, 169, 279, 395
sermocinatio 111ff., 153, 217f., 272ff., 301, 303f., 313
 servants 266, 268f.
 Severian of Gabala: and J. 280
 sexual: organs, euphemism for 95; temptation 10, 59, 62, 146f., 324
 shoes 167ff.
 sickness 302f., 333ff.; and old age 302f.
 sighs 321f., 327
 silence 332; at table 328ff.; in church 324ff.
 simplicity 208, 218, 225; and rusticity 218
 singular: collective 374
 Siren 55; songs 148
 siting 324; on humans, by Lord 220f.; on low stools 251f.
 skin 168; 'and bones' 290; garments 147f., 158f.; shoes 167f.
 sleep: as prayer 346ff.; over a book 138f.
 sleeves: baggy 321; tight 117
 social round: condemned 128
 Solomon 22: wisdom 103; womanizing 103, 388
 sons of the prophets: virgins 184f.
 source: compression of 23 n. 15, 71, 103, 109, 115, 176f. n. 13, 188, 213f., 232, 241f.,
 244f., 272, 281, 293, 299f., 304, 311, 314, 364, 375, 377; multiple 41, 53, 149, 182f.,
 191, 231, 301, 349, 357, 359f.
 sparrow 38, 146
 speech: affectations of 276ff.; transition from indirect to direct 293
Stichwort technique 7, 39, 141, 153, 156ff., 162f., 225, 238f., 244, 299, 381, 394
 stones 157f.
 structure 10f.; *aspera* and *hinc* 329
 stylistic enhancement, of borrowings 8, 23 n. 15, 27, 60, 69, 71f., 80, 87, 89, 91, 93, 95,
 98f., 108f., 112, 116, 122, 127 n. 6, 131, 133, 136, 138, 150, 187, 193ff., 208, 213ff.,
 217, 230f., 241, 261, 263ff., 301 n. 5, 303ff., 344f., 347, 349, 351, 353, 357, 360f., 366,
 377f., 382f., 385ff., 391, 398, 406, 408
subintroductae 104, 119ff.
συνεπισημασία 116, 164 n. 15, 218, 238, 262, 321
 syllabic pattern 391
 synonymy 22
 table(s): grace at 348f.; seven-day rota in serving 327f.; sharing same 268f.; silence at
 328ff.; violence at 394
 tears 147, 296, 326
 temple: cleansing of 224f.; veil, rending of 225; virgin as 207, 211
 Terence: and J. 213ff., 274 n. 13, 309f.
 Tertullian: and J. 4, 27, 34, 62 n. 3, 69, 77f., 82, 84, 87, 89, 91, 93, 101ff., 105, 108ff.,
 125 n. 4, 131, 136ff., 149, 151, 155, 181, 183, 187, 193ff., 199, 253, 263f., 269ff., 280,
 288, 298, 300f., 303ff., 346ff., 351ff., 381ff., 398, 400, 407
 textual criticism 16, 25, 63, 70, 73, 78f., 91 n. 5, 97, 120f., 125, 136ff., 144, 159, 161,
 164, 180f., 186, 217, 246, 259, 261, 263f., 289f., 312, 320f., 330, 358, 364, 382, 391,
 403
 Thecla 400f.
 thinness 134
 thought: importunate 58f.
 throat: clearing of 325f.
 title: book 13, 197; person 25, 85, 132f., 213, 215ff., 238f., 378
 tongue: adultery of 278f.; chastity of 279

traductio 127 n. 6

tricolon 63, 128, 150, 156, 172f., 182, 193f., 201, 372f.; *crecens* 46, 79, 110, 120, 184, 205f., 225, 253f., 262, 264, 327, 344, 377

unchastity, of mind 48f., 51

unworthiness: professions of 252

upper room: signifies lofty mind 242

Uzzah 207

vainglory: warning against 243ff.

variano 59, 194 n. 16, 230, 285, 288f., 304, 329f., 351, 366, 407; lexical 16, 36, 98, 201f., 255, 370, 391

vegetables: commended 331; eschewed 331

veils 253

Vergil: and J. 58, 60, 68f., 123f., 262, 280f., 290, 295f., 326, 383

verse performances: condemned 275f.

vigils 333; snooping on 333f.

virgin(s): as 'mother of Christ' 367ff.; as temple 207, 211; birth, freeing womankind 188; bride of Christ 25, 370f.; bride of God 129; bride of 'the king' 173; compared to sacred vessels 207, 211; fallen 105ff., 268; foolish 49f.; gait 333; good distinguished from bad 47ff.; heavenly reception 397ff.; heretical 374ff.; in flesh but not spirit 49, 362; more numerous among women 189; 'name' of 117, 376, 378; orthodox 373f.; subsequent marriage 110, 375; visits to 322, 361; worldly 269ff., 359ff.

virginity: against nature 176ff.; connected with baptism 20f.; in paradise 147, 155, 160; inaugurated by Mary and Christ 152, 189f.; no difference of sex 151f.; of daughter, compensating mother 172; optional 156, 170, 173, 176f.; physical, insufficiency of 51; theoretical justification 153ff.

voice: low 252

water: cold 61

wetness, of lust 144f.

wheels 158

widow(s): as second rank of chastity 124; difficulty of calling 125; of Zarephath 311f.; worldly 131ff., 269ff.

windows 238f., 242

wine 68ff., 136f., 331; as Christ's blood 113f.; as poison 68f.; incites lust 68f., 72, 77, 79

womb: bulging, paired with bawling kids 26f., 108f.; duration of Christ's sojourn in 383

word-play 161, 163f., 182, 193f., 223, 233, 257

zeugma 137; 'double' 127 n. 6