John Howell David Scourfield

Jesus College

A LITERARY COMMENTARY ON JEROME, LETTERS 1, 60, 107

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Oxford

Michaelmas Term 1983 [i.e 1984] MT



ABSTRACT

A LITERARY COMMENTARY ON JEROME, LETTERS 1, 60, 107

J. H. D. Scourfield, Jesus College

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
Michaelmas Term 1983

This thesis consists of a commentary on Jerome, Letters 1, 60, and 107, literary pieces which readily lend themselves to a study of aspects of Jerome's art by the narratio method, and bear witness to his position as a Christian writer with roots in the Classical tradition. It is thus essentially a literary commentary, though matters of text, language, history, theology, and Scriptural exegesis are also discussed where they are of special interest or where such discussion helps to illuminate particular passages. The commentary on each letter is prefaced by an introduction setting out the background, considering the letter as a whole, and indicating the main themes and other points of importance. A general introduction briefly dicusses the text and the manuscripts, the readership of the letters, prose-rhythm as a feature of Jerome's style, Jerome's work on the Latin Bible and his citations from it, and his familiarity with and use of Classical literature.

PREFACE

The literature of the fourth and fifth centuries AD has, curiously, been subject to relatively little specifically literary study. This is no less true for Jerome, one of the greatest of Latin prose stylists and a man thoroughly versed in the literature of the Classics, the Bible, and the Fathers, than for writers of far slighter stature. This thesis represents an attempt to take a few steps down this lightly-trodden path. It seeks to explore aspects of Jerome's literary art by detailed study of three of his Letters. The technique employed is the traditional one of the commentary or narratio, which provides a convenient means of illuminating individual points of style and substance (with the bonus that the materials so collected may form the basis of further studies), and at the same time allows close monitoring of the process of composition. Hitherto few of Jerome's works have received treatment of this kind. The only major commentary which has been published is Bartelink's on Letter 57, a work of substance from which I have derived some help; but Letter 57 is a piece very different in character from any of those considered in this thesis. Other commentaries are altogether slighter. Lardet's edition of the adversus Rufinum (CCSL 79) provides a wealth of material on the

manuscript tradition and many critical notes on the text; the Commentary on Jonah has been well annotated by Antin (Sources chrétiennes 43); but neither work is a true commentary.

Letters 1, 60, and 107 presented themselves as particularly suitable pieces for this study. Whether or not they were written for a wide readership, the first two are very much curatius scriptae, and Letter 107, though less carefully composed, is not without literary merit. In different ways all bear witness to the Classical foundations on which Jerome and other Christian writers of the period built, and, equally, give insights into the contemporary Christian Latin world. They are not over-burdened with problems of theology and Scriptural exegesis (though theological and exegetical matters, as well as textual, linguistic, and historical, are discussed in the commentary where they are of special interest or where such discussion helps to illuminate particular passages).

For the background to Jerome's life and work I am indebted above all to Kelly's biography - no single book has been as useful - and also to the earlier works by Grützmacher and Cavallera.

I have not made use of footnotes. They would have been confusing in the commentaries proper, where the notes themselves are essentially footnotes to Jerome's text; and it seemed natural, and simple, to treat the introductions and the general introduction in the same way.

Personal debts are numerous. Most is owed to my supervisor, Michael Winterbottom, who guided me through the early stages of research and was thereafter a constant source of good sense, advice and encouragement. Andrew Louth saved me from my own ignorance of theology. John Matthews drew my attention to many historical points. I have also benefited from conversations and correspondence with many other friends, particularly Nicholas Purcell.

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	ii
Preface	iii
Abbreviations	vii
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
LETTER 1	
Introduction	33
Commentary	49
LETTER 60	
Introduction	140
Commentary	160
LETTER 107	
Introduction	432
Commentary	446
Editions of ancient texts used in citation	625
Bibliography	643

ABBREVIATIONS

Ancient Texts

References to Latin texts generally follow the system of the Thesaurus linguae Latinae (8 completed vols. to date, Lipsiae, 1900-); the few exceptions to this rule should cause no difficulties. References to Greek texts may normally be elucidated from H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (9th edn., revised by H. S. Jones, Oxford, 1940), or from the list of editions of ancient texts used for citation in this commentary (pp.625-42). Books of the Bible, where they are not included in the title of other ancient texts, are abbreviated according to the system of Hart's Rules for Compositors and Readers at the University Press, Oxford (38th edn., Oxford, 1978), p. 5.

Jerome is referred to as J. throughout. The editions of the Letters I have consulted are given in full in the general introduction, sect. 1, and thereafter referred to in abbreviated form, usually by the name of the editor alone.

Periodicals

For periodicals the system of L'Année philologique is employed.

Other Works

Other works are generally referred to by their full title when first cited, a shortened form often being used thereafter. Difficulties may be solved by consulting the bibliography (pp.643-59). A number of works, generally those which are most commonly cited, are referred to in abbreviated form throughout. These are as follows:

Antin, Recueil	P. Antin, Recueil sur saint Jérôme (Collection Latomus 95; Bruxelles, 1968)
Bartelink	G. J. M. Bartelink, Hieronymus: Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula 57): ein Kommentar (supplements to Mnemosyne, 61; Lugduni Batavorum, 1980)
Cavallera	F. Cavallera, Saint Jérôme: sa vie et son oeuvre (2 vols., Louvain, 1922)
Dict. Christ. Biog.	A Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, Sects and Doctrines, edd. W. Smith and H. Wace (4 vols., London, 1877-87)
Forcellini	A. Forcellini, Totius latinitatis lexicon (6 vols., Prati, 1858-75)
Grützmacher	G. Grützmacher, Hieronymus: eine biographische Studie (3 vols., Leipzig and Berlin, 1901-8)
Hagendahl	H. Hagendahl, Latin Fathers and the Classics: a Study on the Apologists, Jerome, and Other Christian Writers (Göteborgs universitets årsskrift 64; Göteborg, 1958)

Jones, LRE	A. H. M. Jones, The Later Roman Empire, 284-602: a Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey (3 vols., Oxford, 1964)
Kelly	J. N. D. Kelly, Jerome: his Life, Writings, and Controversies (London, 1975)
K.-S.	R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, 2: Satzlehre (2nd edn., 2 vols., Hannover, 1912-14)
Lausberg	H. Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik (2 vols., München, 1960)
Lewis and Short	C. T. Lewis and C. Short, A Latin Dictionary (Oxford, 1879)
L.-H.-Sz.	M. Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, and A. Szantyr, Lateinische Grammatik (3 vols., München, 1965-79)
L.-S.-J.	H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon (9th edn., revised by H. S. Jones, Oxford, 1940); with a supplement edited by E. A. Barber (Oxford, 1968)
Murphy, Monument	A Monument to St. Jerome: Essays on some Aspects of his Life, Works and Influence, ed. F. X. Murphy (New York, 1952)
OCD	The Oxford Classical Dictionary, edd. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard (2nd edn., Oxford, 1970)
ODCC	The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, edd. F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone (2nd edn., London, 1974)
OLD	Oxford Latin Dictionary, ed. P. G. W. Glare (8 fascicles, Oxford, 1968-82)
Otto	A. Otto, Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer (Leipzig, 1890)

Otto, Nachträge	Nachträge zu A. Otto Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer, ed. R. Häussler (Darmstadt, 1968)
PLRE 1	A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris, The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire, 1: AD 260-395 (Cambridge, 1971)
RE	Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, edd. A. F. von Pauly and G. Wissowa (24 vols., 19 vols., and supplement (15 vols.), Stuttgart, 1894-1980)
TLL	Thesaurus linguae Latinae (8 completed vols. to date, Lipsiae, 1900-)

Miscellaneous

CCSL	Corpus Christianorum series Latina
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
LXX	Septuagint
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae historica
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
PG	Patrologia Graeca, ed. J.-P. Migne
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. J.-P. Migne

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. The text of the Letters upon which this commentary is based is that of I. Hilberg in the Vienna corpus (Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae (CSEL 54-6; 3 vols., Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1910-18)) - the only properly critical edition to date. Hilberg's work, however, is not without its limitations. In the first place, the establishment of his text rested upon the consideration of only a few MSS for each letter: for epist. 1, seven; for epist. 60, nine, of which one (Γ) represents selections, generally in paraphrase, and another (𝔪) is merely a fragment; and for epist. 107, six, in one of which (B) the letter is represented twice, though in neither case is it complete. Owing to Hilberg's inability, for reasons unknown, to fulfil the promise made in the preface to his third volume, that he would produce a fourth, containing prolegomena and indices, we do not know how he assessed his MSS, or indeed how many MSS he consulted before making his choice - but it is a fact that those on which he relied form a very small proportion of the total of those which are now known to exist. In recent years the MSS of all J.'s works have been catalogued by B. Lambert, Bibliotheca Hieronymiana manuscripta: la tradition manuscrite des oeuvres de saint Jérôme

(Instrumenta patristica 4; 4 vols., Steenbrugis, 1969-72). While Lambert is well aware that his list cannot pretend to be exhaustive (cf. pp. vii-viii), the MSS he records as containing epist. 1, 60, and 107 total respectively 138, 195 and 145, and of these 10, 17 and 13 are dated ninth-to-tenth-century or earlier (Hilberg: 4, 7, and 4, though none of his other MSS postdates the twelfth century).

Secondly, there is reason to doubt the accuracy of the collations which form the basis of the edition. The fragmentary MS m mentioned above has been carefully examined and discussed in two articles by Z. Stewart, 'An Eighth-Century Fragment of Jerome', HLB 4 (1950), 254-8, and 'Insular Script without Insular Abbreviations: a Problem in Eighth-Century Palaeography', Speculum 25 (1950), 483-90. In the former Stewart points out that Hilberg distinguishes only two hands in the MS, whereas in fact there are three; and presents a list of no fewer than fifteen additions and corrections to be made in the apparatus criticus. Most of the additions are trivial, and as Hilberg shows some concern not to make his edition too obese (cf. the preface to his first volume, p. vi: 'integram lectionum farraginem a me enotatam ut nimis prolixam salubribus lituris macrescere iussit Augustus Engelbrecht, cuius prudenti iudicio debetur, quod hoc volumen non in maiorem etiam ambitum crevit') their absence from the apparatus need not imply that the

variants had not been noticed and correctly read. But the presence in a couple of pages of two certain errors and at least one important oversight, whether they are due to personal misreadings or to erroneous reports - Hilberg does not make it entirely clear that all the collations are his own - must undermine confidence in the text as a whole. It is evident that much work remains to be done before a definitive edition can be produced.

Brief descriptions of several of the MSS used by Hilberg may be found in E. A. Lowe, Codices Latini antiquiores: a Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century (11 vols. and supp., Oxford, 1934-71), under the following reference numbers:

K (epist. 1, 60, 107)	CLA	762
L (epist. 1)		1146
Γ (epist. 60)		781
G (epist. 60)		405
𝔘 (epist. 60)		486
𝔪 (epist. 60)		146
𝔅 (epist. 107)		1080

For Γ see also E. A. Lowe, 'Codices Lugdunenses antiquissimi', Bibliothèque de la ville de Lyon: documents paléographiques, typographiques, iconographiques, fascicles 3-4 (1924) (also issued

separately, Lyon, 1924), 47, plates 1 and 35; for K, H. C. Jameson, 'The Latin Manuscript Tradition of Jerome's Vita sancti Malchi', Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's Vitae patrum, ed. W. A. Oldfather (Urbana, Ill., 1943), pp. 507-8. G, placed by Hilberg in the seventh century, is now generally held to belong to the sixth, or to be even older; cf. Jameson, op. cit., pp. 491-2.

Some of the more significant textual points are discussed in the commentary. While aware of the problems raised by Stewart's examination of m I have given full consideration to the variants presented by Hilberg's apparatus (from which some of the relations between the MSS can easily be deduced), inferring on occasion the readings of particular MSS where they are not made explicit (for example, it is reasonable to infer that at epist. 1.5.3 all Hilberg's MSS read superato, and that at epist. 1.4 KL (and QB) read saevum, though it cannot be held certain that where a MS is not mentioned as supporting a given variant it must therefore support the text). I have also consulted for particular readings the following MSS in London and Oxford which Hilberg did not employ:

epist. 1

London, British Library	MS Addit. 33508	f. 164^{v}
	MS Harley 3044	f. 185
	MS Royal 6 C. XI	f. 269

	MS Royal 6 D. II	f. 183^{v}
	MS Royal 6 D. III	f. 268

epist. 60

London, British Library	MS Harley 3044	f. 167
	MS Royal 6 C. XI	f. 243^{v}
	MS Royal 6 D. I	f. 187
	MS Royal 6 D. II	f. 164^{v}
	MS Royal 6 D. III	f. 236^{v}
	MS Royal 8 A. XI	f. 54
Oxford, Bodleian Library	MS Bodl. 702 (fragmentary: l.1 'grandes' - 4.1 'a rigida septen-')	f. 94
	MS Laud. Misc. 252 (f. 73→, *incip. in* l.1 'petitorem et interpellatricem' f. 97→, *desin. in* (f. 102) l.1 'de evangelio')	f. 73, f. 97
	MS Laud. Misc. 423	f. 28

epist. 107

London, British Library	MS Harley 3044	f. 130
	MS Royal 6 C. XI	f. 192
	MS Royal 6 D. I	f. 152
	MS Royal 6 D. II	f. 125
	MS Royal 6 D. III	f. 172^{v}
Oxford, Bodleian Library	MS Bodl. 702	f. 43

Most of the above are dated to the twelfth century; MS Royal 8 A. XI belongs to the early thirteenth century, MS Bodl. 702 to the first half of that century, MS Laud. Misc. 252 to the ninth century. Many are either omitted, or incompletely or inaccurately reported, by Lambert. In the commentary, and below (general

introduction), the phrase 'the MSS' refers to those cited by Hilberg plus these others.

The later - mostly fifteenth-century - MSS in the British and Bodleian Libraries which Lambert included in his catalogue I have examined less systematically. Very occasionally I have found significant readings. In these cases the MS is cited by its full title.

Of editions of the Letters which preceded Hilberg's I have consulted the following:

(a) Editio princeps: 2 vols., Romae [apud Sweynheyn et Pannarz], 1468;

(b) Erasmus: Opus Epistolarum divi Hieronymi Stridonensis (3 vols., apud Inclytam Basileam, 1524);

(c) Victorius: Epistolae d. Hieronymi, Stridonensis, et libri contra haereticos (3 vols., Romae, apud Paulum Manutium, 1564-5) (= Opera Hieronymi (9 vols., 1564-72), vols. 1-3);

(d) Martianay: Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri operum tomus quartus (Parisiis, apud Ludovicum Roulland, 1706) (the fourth volume of five covering the complete works, 1693-1706);

(e) Vallarsi/Migne: Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri opera omnia ... tomus primus (Parisiis, 1864).

(Vallarsi's first edition of the complete works of J., in eleven volumes, was published at Verona, 1734-42. The second edition, also in eleven volumes, was published at Venice, 1766-72. Migne reprinted, in nine volumes (PL 22-30), of which the first contains the Letters, this second edition of Vallarsi. I have consulted only this reprint, in Migne's own second (1864-5) edition.)

One complete edition of the Letters has been published since Hilberg: that of J. Labourt (Saint Jérôme: Lettres (8 vols., Paris, 1949-63)) in the Budé series; it includes a French translation. Labourt's text is based on that of Hilberg (cf. vol. 1, pp. xliii-xlvi); he does not re-examine any of Hilberg's MSS or consult any others. Occasionally, however, he diverges from his predecessor, rarely for the better; the punctuation, too, is worse, and the apparatus, which is dependent on Hilberg's, much inferior. The first volume of the series was criticised on numerous grounds by A. G. Amatucci, 'Per un'edizione delle Epistole di S. Gerolamo', Arcadia, Accademia Letteraria Italiana: atti e memorie, ser. 3 vol. 2.3 (1950), 87-94. Amatucci's own suggestions for the establishment of a good, new edition are largely sensible but scarcely profound.

I have also made use of Select Letters of St. Jerome, ed. F. A. Wright (Cambridge, Mass., and London,

1933), which includes the text, with English translation, of all three letters. Wright follows Hilberg, with a few unoriginal variations.

At the following places I disagree with Hilberg's text (for discussion see commentary):

		Hilberg	Suggested reading
epist.	1.3.3	renis et cordis	renum et cordis
	1.4	minitatus	minatus
	1.8.2	tertius ictus	tertium ictum
	1.9.1	iuxta quem	iuxta quam
	1.10.2	me illi vicarium datis!	me illi vicarium datis?
	1.11	paululum	post paululum
	1.12.1	misericordiam domini celatura nox advenit	misericordia domini celer ac matura nox advenit
	1.13.2	scilicet	si licet
	1.14	focilatur	focillatur
	1.15.2	Mediolanii	Mediolani
	60.5.1	ordinem non tenes!	ordinem non tenes?
	60.10.8	et omne convivium	per omne convivium
	60.10.9	lectione quoque	lectioneque
	60.14.4	in diversas bestias<conversas alias ut Hecubam in canem> commutatam	† in diversas bestias commutatam †
	60.14.4	Hesiodus	† Hesiodus †
	60.14.4	regio	regi
	60.17.3	cernimus	cernamus
	60.17.3	cedere?	cedere.

107.1.3	nutriret et senex	senex nutriret
107.2.2	specu	specum
107.2.3	pugnat	pugnant
107.3.3	praedicat	praedicatae
107.3.3	vestitus	vestitur
107.4.7	virtutem	virtutes
107.5.1	habet	habeat
107.5.2	ducaris	duceris
107.6.1	permanserit	permanserint
107.6.3	litterae eum perducant	littera eum perducat
107.6.4	conceperis	conciperes
107.8.1	nec videat	ne videat
107.8.1	reprehendas	reprendas
107.8.2	iam tunc	iam nunc
107.9.1	scripturarum certum. ediscat	scripturarum. certum ediscat
107.10.2	perpetuo ieiunio	perpetuum ieiunium
107.10.3	properantibus, quamquam	properantibus. quamquam
107.11.2	suscitat	suscitet
107.12.3	vacillet	vacillat
107.13.6	magistrum et nutricium	magistrum me et nutricium

At these points, and at others, where I defend Hilberg's reading, account is taken of factors such as sense, usage, rhythm, and style generally. Sometimes, however, the MSS present acceptable variants between

which there is little or nothing to choose on these grounds. In such cases, in the absence of a comprehensive study of J.'s manuscript tradition, one possible way of proceeding would be to follow the majority of the MSS. The following list indicates places where, under this procedure, Hilberg's reading would be rejected. The differences are minor and are for the most part not discussed in the commentary.

	Hilberg	Majority reading
1.2.1	fragori	fragoribus
1.2.2	spiritu sancto	sancto spiritu
1.3.3	paedore	faetore
1.3.3	volutis	evolutis
1.3.3	testis	testis es
1.7.3	librat	librabat
1.14	tali invidia	tali ergo invidia
60.2.1	inmutaret	mutaret
60.12.3	quam litteris	quam ex litteris
60.14.2	sapienti	sapientium
107.1.1	in fratre	in viro fideli
107.6.1	dexteram aut sinistram	dexteram et sinistram
107.11.1	pertremescat	pertimescat

2. Of J.'s correspondence, 122 letters of many different types survive. 121 may be found in Hilberg's edition, which also includes letters addressed to J. by

other writers, and a few where J. is neither author nor addressee (where these are cited below and in the commentary, the name of the author is given in parentheses after the number of the letter; in the case of those which are translations by J. from Greek originals, this too is indicated); the 122nd is the letter to Praesidius, rescued from banishment among the unauthentic works of J. by G. Morin, who published a revised version of the text in his article, 'Pour l'authenticité de la lettre de S. Jérôme à Présidius', Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes 3 (1913), 52-60. It is beyond the scope of this thesis, which focuses on only three, to inquire into J.'s general characteristics as an epistolographer and to indicate his affinities with the other letter-writers and the epistolary theorists of Antiquity. Individual points of interest are raised in the commentary as they occur. E. P. Arns, La Technique du livre d'après saint Jérôme (Paris, 1953), pp. 92-8, makes some useful comments on a few aspects of J.'s practice. Some standard epistolary topics are discussed in depth by K. Thraede, Grundzüge griechisch-römischer Brieftopik (Zetemata 48; München, 1970), who devotes a considerable amount of space to the evidence of Christian letter-writers, J. included. On Classical epistolography generally the standard work is still J. Sykutris, 'Epistolographie', RE supp. 5, 185-220; on the Latin side, the older study of H. Peter, Der Brief

in der römischen Litteratur (Abhandlungen der philologisch-historischen Classe der Königlich Sachsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 20.3; Leipzig, 1901), is also a helpful guide, though his coverage of late-antique letter-writing is relatively thin.

One question which may appropriately be raised here, however, is this: did J. envisage a readership extending beyond the addressee when he wrote epist. 1, 60 and 107? There are indications which suggest that in writing his letters he sometimes did. For instance, he occasionally refers to a general lector, as at epist. 78.16.2, 108.2.1, and 127.5.3 'rideat forsitan infidelis lector me in muliercularum laudibus inmorari'. epist. 23 seems not to be intended for Marcella's eyes alone (cf. 23.2.1), and the implication of epist. 123.17.2 'non tam tibi quam sub tuo nomine aliis sum locutus' is obvious. In writing epist. 52 he recognises that he may be opening himself up to attacks from his opponents (epist. 52.17). It has even been argued that a few of the letters were intended solely for wider distribution, that in these cases the epistolary situation is in fact an imaginary one (see D. de Bruyne, 'Lettres fictives de S. Jérôme', ZNTW 28 (1929), 229-34). In epist. 1, 60, and 107 there are no internal clues which help to clarify the position (epist. 107.2.2 'ut omittam vetera, ne apud incredulos nimis fabulosa videatur' should not be taken as a sign

that J. was writing for a wider readership; cf. n. ad loc.). We can, in fact, form a judgement only by considering the general character of the letters. It is easiest with epist. 1. The bulk of the letter is related to the addressee, Innocentius, only in as far as it is written at his request, a motif which is in any case highly conventional, and after the second chapter he is completely ignored; cf. on epist. 1.1 Saepe ... non tacerem. The piece could have been addressed to anybody, or nobody. It is also composed with great care and artifice. The suggestion is strong that J. had a wider public in mind. The situations which underlie epist. 60 and 107 are much more personal, and we are obliged, to a much greater extent than in the case of epist. 1, to regard them primarily as private letters. But epist. 60 is so elevated in tone that we may suspect that J. wrote this, too, with half an eye to publication (in the sense of wider distribution). epist. 107 is perhaps the least likely of the three to have been written with a public in mind. Much of it is haphazardly organised, which suggests that it may have been hastily put together, and this does nothing to encourage us to believe that it was designed as a sort of manifesto for the education of girls dedicated to the virgin life.

In conclusion the obvious comment may be made that even if the intention to publish had not been conceived at the time of writing, all three letters may still

have become more widely available later. We know that J. retained copies of some of his correspondence (cf. on epist. 60.9.1 hic ... nepos), and from these further copies could be made and distributed; Damasus, for instance, was allowed to read and transcribe J.'s own copies of letters which he had originally written while in the desert (cf. epist. 35(Damasus).1.2). It is possible that the recipients of his letters also issued copies to others who were interested. Chains of distribution could readily arise. Copies of epist. 22, 54 and 79 - all ostensibly private letters - are known to have circulated, either on J.'s authority or at least with his approval - cf. epist. 52.17.1 (22), 123.17.3 (22,54,79), 130.19.3 (22). The same may easily be true of epist. 1, 60, and 107. In the case of epist. 60 at least, J. thought it a production important enough to be included with De viris illustribus, Adversus Iovinianum, and just a few other pieces, in the list of works mentioned in the preface to his Commentary on Jonah as having been written within the previous three years or so (CCSL 76.377 = PL 25.1117).

3. It is not my intention to undertake an exhaustive account of J.'s literary style. In regard to the letters, this has twice been attempted, and neither time has the the result been particularly successful. J. N. Hritzu, The Style of the Letters of St. Jerome

(Catholic University of America Patristic Studies 60; Washington, 1939), employed a statistical approach, but so uncritically this his figures are almost valueless and his conclusions often facile; the review by J. W. Pirie, 'The Styles of Jerome and Leo the Great', CR 54 (1940), 201-2, indicates some of the shortcomings, and is, if anything, too respectful. The weaknesses of Hritzu's book were not lost on E. Coleiro, who, in an unpublished thesis entitled 'St. Jerome's Letters and Lives of the Hermits with reference to (1) Art and Style, (2) Social and Historical Significance' (University of London Ph.D. thesis 1949), undertook 'a new and more comprehensive approach to the study of Jerome's art'; the bulky volume engendered, however, although it contains a lot of material on language, figures of rhetoric, sentence construction, and so on, leaves the reader with the feeling that his understanding of J. has not been greatly advanced. The fact is that stylistic analysis based on isolating individual features without regard of context - a method on which Hritzu is entirely reliant and which plays a large part in Coleiro's work - does not go very far towards explaining what guides an author in the actual process of composition. I have considered it of much greater value to deal with particular stylistic matters as they arise in the text.

There is, however, one element of style about which little is said in the commentary and which

deserves some attention. Prose-rhythm is a complex subject and imperfectly understood, but it was a factor of some importance to many of the writers of Antiquity and the Middle Ages. J. wrote at a time when the Classical system of metrically scanned clausulae was in the process of giving way to the accentual system of the medieval world, a fact which renders analysis both more interesting and more difficult. Two major studies of rhythm in J. have been produced: P. C. Knook, De overgang van metrisch tot rythmisch proza bij Cyprianus en Hieronymus (Purmerend, 1932); and M. C. Herron, A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies 51; Washington, 1937). From Knook's book I have derived little help; his conclusions about J.'s attention to rhythm, based on his own statistics, are criticised by H. Hagendahl in his review in Gnomon 15 (1939), 84-9. Herron provides statistics derived from a much greater area of text, and her work is not without value, but she fails to take account of the importance of the notion of relative frequencies in the study of clausulae regarded quantitatively, as established by A. W. de Groot, A Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm: 1 (The Hague, 1919), and her statistics for the accentual forms also derive meaning only from comparison with the practice of certain other writers. Much work remains to be done. For consideration of accent, the technique of 'internal comparison' established by T. Janson for

medieval authors might be utilised (Prose Rhythm in Medieval Latin from the Ninth to the Thirteenth Century (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 20; Stockholm, 1975)). Those passages in which one system seems to predominate need to be examined, to see if underlying principles can be detected (does J. pay greater attention to quantity, for example, where his style seems on other grounds to be more elevated?). It might even be useful to go beyond clausulae, and investigate the rhythm of whole sentences.

One cannot hope to draw far-reaching conclusions about J.'s regard for rhythm on the evidence furnished by just three letters. But simply to illustrate from epist. 1, 60, and 107 that rhythmical considerations sometimes play a part in his composition, and may have significant influence upon it, is relatively easy, and, I think, worthwile. Consider the following:

(a) igitur Vercellae Ligurum civitas haud procul a radicibus Álpĭūm sĭtă, olim potens, nunc raro habitatŏrĕ sēmĭrŭtă. hanc cum ex more consulārĭs ĪnvīsĕrĕT, oblatam sibi quandam mulierculam una cum adultero - nam id crimen marītŭs īnpēgĕrăt - poenali carceris horrŏrĕ cīrcŭmdĕdĭt. neque multo post, cum lividas carnes ungula cruēntă pūlsārĕt et sulcatis lateribus dolor quaerĕrēt vèrĭtātĕm, infelicissimus iuvenis volens conpendio mortis longos vitārĕ crŭcĭātŭs, dum in suum mēntĭtūr

sānguĭnĕm, accusāvĭt ălĭēnŭm solusque omnium miser merito vīsŭs ēst pĕrcŭtī, quia non relīquĭt īnnŏxĭae, ūndĕ pŏssēt nĕgārĕ.

(epist. 1.3.1-2)

The high metrical quality of this passage is striking. All but two of the clausulae show rhythms favoured by Cicero and the Ciceronian school: cretic spondee (–∪––×), once resolved into –∪–∪∪× and twice into –∪∪∪–× , double cretic (–∪––∪×) - no less than five times - and cretic dichoree (–∪––∪–×). They also follow, with only one exception ('mentitur sanguinem', where the pause is weak), the preferred accentual forms of the medieval cursus, planus (´––´–), tardus (´––´––), velox (´––`–´–), and trispondaicus (´–––´–), whose position in the cursus is more dubious, in nearly all cases displaying the tendency of the transitional period to coincidence of accent and ictus. It may be that, if questioned about it, J. would have claimed to be paying attention to both quantity and accent.

(b) turpia verba nŏn īntĕllĕgăt, cāntĭcă mūnd(i) īgnŏrĕt, adhuc tenera lingua psalmis dŭlcĭbŭs `īnbŭātŭr. procul sit aetas lascīvă pŭĕrōrŭm, ipsae puellae et pedisequae a saecularium consŏrtĭīs `ārcĕantŭr, ne, quod mălĕ dĭdĭcĕrĭnt, pĕiūs dŏcĕănt. fiant ei litterae vel buxeae vel

eburneae et suis nominibus appellentur. ludat in eis, ut et lusus eius eruditio sit, et non solum ordinem teneat litterarum, ut memoria nominum in cantico mundi transeat, sed ipse inter se crebro ordo turbetur et mediis ultima, primis media miscebuntur, ut eas non sonu tantum, sed et visu noverit. cum vero coeperit trementi manu stilum in cera ducere, vel alterius superposita manu teneri regantur articuli vel in tabella sculpantur elementa, ut per eosdem sulcos inclusa marginibus trahantur vestigia et foras non queant evagari. syllabas iungat ad praemium et, quibus illa aetas delectari potest, munusculis invitetur. habeat et in discendo socias, quibus invideat, quarum laudibus mordeatur.

(epist. 107.4.1-3)

Some of the clausulae in this extract give good quantitative rhythms, but the passage as a whole is metrically much inferior to passage (a). However, some of the clausulae where metre seems to be of little or no importance are accentually very good, e.g. 'ludat in eis' (planus), 'male didicerint' (tardus), 'nominibus appellentur' (velox), and planus, tardus, velox, and trispondaicus forms, irrespective of typology, account for c. 71% of the total number of clausulae in the passage (I disregard 'cantica mundi ignoret', as it is

not clear how hiatus should be treated), a figure very close to that given by Herron for her much larger sample of (final) endings, and almost certainly much higher than comparable figures for 'unaccentual' authors would be; cf. Herron, Clausulae, pp. 68-9. A further indication of J.'s concern for the cursus here is given by 'velox test', for which see the review of Janson, Prose Rhythm, by M. Winterbottom, MAev 45 (1976), 298-300. This touchstone for determining whether or not an author is writing with attention to accent is based on the observation that Latin displays a tendency to prefer paroxytone words to proparoxytone as penultimates. Thus the regular form of the trispondaicus, ´--|--´-, should naturally occur more frequently than the regular form of the velox, ´--|^-´-, and this is generally observed to be so in 'unaccentual' authors; cf. Winterbottom, p. 300. In this passage, however, there are seven velox endings of the ordinary type, and only three such trispondaicus endings. Even in as small an area of text as this, this should be significant.

(c) quodsi Lazarus videtur in sinu Abraham locŏque rĕfrīgĕrĭī, quid simile infernus et rēgnă cāelŏrŭm? ante Christum Abraham ăpŭd īnfĕrŏs; post Christum lātr(o) īn părădīsŏ. et idcirco in resurrectione eius multa dormientium cŏrpŏră sŭrrēxērŭnt et visa sunt in cāelēst(i) Hĭĕrŭsălĕm.

tuncque conpletum est illud eloquium: surge, qui dormis, et elevare et inluminabit te Christus. Iohannes Baptista in heremo personat: paenitentiam agite; adpropinquavit enim regnum caelorum. a diebus enim Iohannis Baptistae regnum caelorum vim pass(um) est et violenti diripuerunt illud. flammea illa rumphea, custos paradisi, et praesidentia foribus cherubin Christi restincta et reserata sunt sanguine. nec mirum hoc nobis in resurrectione promitti, cum omnes, qui in carne non secundum carnem vivimus, municipatum habeamus in caelo et hic adhuc positis dicatur in terra: regnum dei intra vos est.

(epist. 60.3.2-4)

Passages such as this, heavy with Scriptural language and phraseology as well as with direct quotation, tend naturally to be less rhythmical: the Latin Bible, even as revised by J., shows little evidence of careful clausulation on metrical or accentual principles. Nevertheless, even here rhythm does not seem to be completely ignored: for instance, in the last two sentences, where the influence of particular passages of the Bible is perhaps less dominating, four of the five clausulae (I ignore the quotation 'regnum ... est') are good considered either metrically or accentually; and in two of the cases ('reserata sunt

sanguine', 'dicatur in terra') the natural word-order seems to have been altered in order to effect an improved ending.

At other places, too, the choice of word-order appears sometimes to be dictated by considerations of rhythm. For example:

(d) 'nos miseri, qui aut patimur aut patientes fratres nostros tāntă pĕrspĭcĭmŭs' (epist. 60.17.1).

'tanta' should be the object of both 'patimur' and 'patientes', and would be better placed before the first 'aut'. What J. actually wrote, however, is superior metrically, and equivalent accentually, to any other arrangement of the words in the second part of the clause.

(e) 'tibi est providendum, ne ineptis blanditiis feminarum dimidiata dicere filiam vĕrbă cōnsuētŭscās' (epist. 107.4.6).

We might have expected 'verba' to be placed nearer 'dimidiata'; at least transposed with 'filiam'. But again, the given arrangement makes a much better clausula.

(f) (i) 'feminae pālpĭtāt pēctŭs' (epist. 1.12.2);

(ii) 'Romanus superātŭr ēxĕrcĭtŭs' (epist. 60.17.1);

(iii) 'mentem recēpĭt hūmānăm' (epist. 107.2.1);
(iv) 'ad privatas vĕnĭăm dĭgnĭtātĕs' (epist. 60.16.1).

In this type of word-group, deposition of the verb from its more usual position at the end of the clause often appears to depend on rhythmical influence. In (i), (ii), and (iii) the quantitative rhythm shows improvement, and in (iv), where the choice of words does not allow any good metrical arrangement, the velox is easily the best accentual rhythm obtainable. However, groups of this type also occur where rhythm is of no account. A fine example is epist. 107.1.4 'auratum squālēt Căpĭtŏlĭŭm', where to have left 'squalet' to the end would have allowed a far superior rhythm, both metrically and accentually. At epist. 60.12.3 'mens ... in variarum artium redūndăt ēlĕgāntĭăm' the clausula is again highly unrhythmical. These cases offer a salutary warning against overestimating the importance of rhythm. It seems, in fact, that J. has a liking for separating a noun from an attributive adjective or a dependent genitive, whether or not a clausula is being formed. There are many instances - for an extreme example cf. epist. 1.1 'otium quasi quaedam ingenii robigo parvulam licet facultatem pristini siccasset eloquii'. (Cf. also J. N. Adams, 'A Type of Hyperbaton in Latin Prose', PCPhS

NS 17 (1971), 11, who makes the interesting observation that 'verbal hyperbaton', where a noun is separated from its adjective by a verb, is not uncommon in the Vulgate OT - J.'s translation from the Hebrew - but rare in the Old Latin text.)

On prose-rhythm generally, in addition to the works mentioned above see OCD s.v. Prose-Rhythm, with appended bibliography.

4. In the commentary citations from Scripture, and references to Scriptural passages in general, follow the Vulgate text, in the edition of R. Weber (Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem (2 vols., Stuttgart, 1969)). For citations from the Psalms both the Vulgate Psalter, J.'s revision of the Old Latin on the basis of the LXX text of Origen's Hexapla (the 'Gallican' Psalter; denoted 'LXX'), and J.'s translation from the Hebrew (denoted 'Hebr.'), which never gained full acceptance by the Church and is not reckoned part of the Vulgate (though it is included, conveniently, in Weber's edition), are used. Where J. himself quotes Scripture in epist. 1, 60, and 107, I have thought it worthwhile to include in the commentary the Vulgate text of the passage concerned, or at least to indicate any points of difference between the text as quoted in the letter and as given by the Vulgate; in the case of

the Psalms this applies also to the version from the Hebrew. In a fair number of cases J. had already translated or revised the book from which a particular quotation is drawn, and by a comparison of the texts it is thus possible to form some view of J.'s attitude towards his own work on the Latin Bible. It is important, therefore, to outline J.'s part in the making of the Vulgate, and its chronology. For the following two paragraphs I am indebted to H. F. D. Sparks, 'Jerome as Biblical Scholar', The Cambridge History of the Bible, 1: From the Beginnings to Jerome, edd. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 510-26, and to Kelly, pp. 86-9, 158-63, and 283-5.

Although J. is commonly held to have been responsible for the Vulgate as a whole, there are certain books which do not represent his work. In the OT he did not touch Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and Baruch, all of which he considered uncanonical (cf. on epist. 107.12), and these survive in the earlier, Old Latin version. Equally, the whole of the NT apart from the gospels is almost certainly the work of other revisers of the Old Latin. Comparison of the Vulgate text of these books with J.'s quotations from them is therefore of limited significance.

The other parts of the Vulgate are, in greater or lesser degree, J.'s. Some books are revisions of the

Old Latin; others, wholly new translations, though the care and thoroughness with which they were prepared vary considerably from book to book. The chronology of the work done on these books is as follows:

(a) the gospels, c. 383-4: a revision of the Old Latin on the basis of the Greek, carried out at the behest of Damasus, the Bishop of Rome;

(b) the Gallican Psalter, between 386 and c. 390;

(c) the Hebrew books of the OT, translated into Latin from the Hebrew for the first time (the Old Latin was based on the LXX), c. 390 - c. 405. The dates of the translation of individual books cannot be given precisely. The books of Samuel and Kings seem to have been translated first; the Psalter and the Prophets were complete before 393, Job by 394. By 398 only the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Esther remained to be done. At least some work had been done on the Pentateuch before 401. Esther was begun before the death of Paula in January 404; but Paula was dead by the time Joshua was completed;

(d) Tobit and Judith, translated from the Aramaic at the request of Chromatius and Heliodorus (J. did not consider these books to be within the canon; cf. on epist. 107.12), at some time before 407.

This information is sufficient to establish the relative chronology of epist. 1, 60, and 107 (which belong respectively to 375, 396, and 401 or 402; cf. introductions to the letters) and J.'s translation or revision of the books quoted in these letters.

A. Souter, 'Notes on Incidental Gospel Quotations in Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel', JThS 42 (1941), 12-18, showed that a substantial majority of the quotations from the gospels in J.'s Commentary on Matthew, which postdates his revision of the gospels, do not match the Vulgate text. This is also true of certain quotations in epist. 60 and 107, where the quotation postdates J.'s translation or revision of the book from which it is drawn (epist. 1 precedes the whole of J.'s work on the Latin Bible and contains in any case only one Biblical quotation). In the case of the Psalms, which are quoted several times, the situation is comparable: quotations generally resemble the text of the Gallican Psalter more closely than the translation from the Hebrew, though the context never offers more than the hint of a reason why J. should have avoided following the later, more authentic version, and usually not even that (cf. on epist. 60.3.2, 4.1, 6.1, 7.1, 107.7.2).

Such discrepancies are clearly significant; but in assessing them one control must be applied. It is possible, perhaps likely, that in some cases they reflect changes made by scribes in the course of

transmission. J.'s new versions, at least those of OT texts, took centuries to win complete acceptance by the Church (cf. Sparks, op. cit., pp. 520-1); they lived alongside the Old Latin, which by J.'s time existed in many varying forms (cf. Kelly, p. 86). It is not difficult to imagine a scribe bringing the text of a quotation into line with the version with which he was most familiar. Where this was done at an early stage in the tradition there may be no trace of the original form of the quotation in extant MSS.

It is plain, however, that the discrepancies must be due primarily to the fact that in quoting the Bible *en passant*, where textual points mattered little, J. was usually content to rely on his memory. In so doing he would understandably have tended to draw on the forms of the Old Latin version which had been embedded in his mind from an early age. The fact is that he did not regard his own versions of Biblical texts as definitive.

To examine J.'s use and treatment of Scriptural material generally is beyond the scope of this thesis. Quotations and other passages based on Scripture in *epist.* 1, 60, and 107 are considered individually, as they occur.

5. Quotation and other kinds of borrowing from the pagan Classics occurs fairly often in *epist.* 60 and

107; it is less frequent in epist. 1, though the piece clearly reflects J.'s Classical background. It is not for this commentary to examine in breadth and depth J.'s technique of quotation from pagan authors, or his general purposes in doing so; this has been done to some extent by Hagendahl, pp. 298-309. The commentary discusses the Classical references individually, and as fully as seems necessary.

No doubt many of the Classical quotations and other references in these letters were, like the Scriptural ones, drawn from memory; J. will have been thoroughly familiar with authors such as Terence, Virgil, and Horace from his schooldays. Certain passages, however, suggest almost beyond question that J. had a Classical text at his side when he wrote them: Quintilian in the case of epist. 107.4, Cicero's Consolatio in the case of epist. 60.5. This is of some interest, as J.'s attitude to the reading of pagan literature was not consistent. The question whether or not a Christian should read the Classics troubled him. The famous dream of c. 374-5, in which, accused of being not a Christian but a Ciceronian, he swore to renounce worldly books ('codices saeculares') for good (cf. epist. 22.30), is symptomatic of a strong psychological tension. For some years he seems to have kept the promise made in the dream, reading no Classical literature and quoting it, where he did so, only from memory. R. Eiswirth, Hieronymus' Stellung

zur Literatur und Kunst (Klassisch-philologische Studien 16; Wiesbaden, 1955), went so far as to suggest that he never again read the Classics; see esp. pp. 28 f. But the careful examination of the evidence by Hagendahl, pp. 318-28, leads convincingly to the conclusion that this was not so. At some point, probably in the late 380s, J. returned to reading pagan authors. The passages referred to above support this deduction (the attempt of Eiswirth, Hieronymus' Stellung, pp. 24-6, to dismiss the view that at epist. 60.5 J. was drawing directly on Cicero's Consolatio, is a highly unconvincing case of special pleading). As for epist. 1, it is not clear whether it was written shortly before or shortly after the dream; cf. introduction to the letter, with Kelly, p. 41.

J.'s knowledge of pagan literature generally has been well investigated, principally by Hagendahl, pp. 89-328, with a supplement, 'Jerome and the Latin Classics', VChr 28 (1974), 216-27, A. Luebeck, Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit (Lipsiae, 1872), and P. Courcelle, Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources (Engl. tr., Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 58-89. Many Classical references in the Letters are conveniently noted by Hilberg. The extent of J.'s familiarity with particular Classical authors may be gauged from these works, and, except where it is especially relevant, discussion of the question has been excluded from the commentary.

LETTER 1

LETTER 1

Introduction

The first letter in the corpus is probably the earliest extant work from J.'s pen. There has, however, been disagreement concerning its precise date. According to Grützmacher, 1.54, the letter was written at some time between 369 and 373; Cavallera, 2.13-14, argues for the first half of 375; Kelly implies 374 (p. 39, with p. 33, n. 43).

A terminus post quem is provided by the death of Auxentius, the Arian bishop of Milan whose immediate successor in the episcopal seat was Ambrose; cf. 15.2 quis enim valeat digno canere praeconio Auxentium Mediolani incubantem huius [sc. Evagrii] excubiis sepultum paene ante quam mortuum...?. The heterodox interpretation of Grützmacher, 1.53-4, that mortuum here refers not to Auxentius' death but to his earlier condemnation by a Roman synod under Damasus - which Grützmacher put in 369, though the date has been much disputed (the fullest discussion is that of F. Savio, Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300, descritti per regioni. La Lombardia, 1: Milano (Firenze, 1913), pp. 839 ff., who argues for 372) - is scarcely plausible and may easily be explained. Grützmacher nowhere challenges the accepted view that

Auxentius died in 374; and as he also believed, on no good grounds, that the letter must have been written before 373, he had no choice but to dispose of the natural meaning of mortuum. His view need not be further considered.

That Auxentius died in 374 seems to be clear. Paulinus, Ambrose's secretary and biographer, indicates that no great length of time elapsed between Auxentius' death and Ambrose's accession - probably just a few weeks (vita Ambr. 6-9). The date of Ambrose's consecration is well established as 7 December 374. The year is given by J.'s Chronicle, the reading having been firmly fixed by O. Faller, 'La data della consecrazione vescovile di sant'Ambrogio', Ambrosiana: scritti di storia, archeologia ed arte pubblicati nel XVI centenario della nascità di sant'Ambrogio (Milano, 1942), pp. 97-112, against H. von Campenhausen, Ambrosius von Mailand als Kirchenpolitiker (Berlin, 1929), pp. 90-2, and J.-R. Palanque, Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain (Paris, 1933), pp. 484-7, who argued that the true reading was 373. The date and month are enshrined in tradition; see e.g. the Martyrologium Hieronymianum (Acta sanctorum, Nov., 2.2 (edd. H. Delehaye and H. Quentin, Bruxellis, 1931), pp. 628-9) - which assigns Ambrose's baptism to 30 November, thus establishing 7 December as the consecration date (cf. Paul. Med. vita Ambr. 9) - and the Calendar of Beroldus of Milan (Beroldus sive ecclesiae Ambrosianae

Mediolanensis kalendarium et ordines saec. XII, ed. M. Magistretti, Mediolani, 1894). The fact that in 374 7 December fell on a Sunday, the usual day for consecration ceremonies (cf. T. Michels, Beiträge des Bischofsweihetages im christlichen Altertum und im Mittelalter (Liturgiegeschichtliche Forschungen 10; Münster im Westf., 1927)), substantiates the case. Auxentius, then, is likely to have died around October 374.

The letter is addressed to J.'s friend Innocentius, whose own death, while he and J. were both at Antioch, is recorded by J. in his third Letter, to Rufinus (epist. 3.3.1). The date of this piece can be established with reasonable accuracy. Around the end of 372 J. left Aquileia for the East, and probably reached Antioch, where he settled in the house of Evagrius (who is mentioned at c.15, where see nn.), in the latter half of the following year; soon after his departure Rufinus too left Aquileia, and made his way to Egypt, where he observed the persecution which followed the death of Athanasius of Alexandria on 2 May 373 (cf. Kelly, pp. 36-8). A report that Rufinus was at Nitria, the centre of Egyptian monasticism, was subsequently conveyed to J. by their mutual friend Heliodorus, but it came at second hand, and J. did not give it full credence; cf. epist. 3.2.1. It was only when the report had been confirmed by a series of travellers that J. accepted that it was true, and,

overjoyed at the news, wrote to Rufinus, saying that only illness had prevented him from going to Nitria to join him: 'Rufinum enim Nitriae esse et ad beatum perrexisse Macarium crebra conmeantium multitudo referebat. hic vero tota credulitatis frena laxavi et tunc vere aegrotum esse me dolui. et nisi me adtenuatae corporis vires quadam conpede praepedissent, nec mediae fervor aestatis nec navigantibus semper incertum mare pia festinatione gradienti valuisset obsistere' (epist. 3.2.2-3). 'mediae fervor aestatis' sets the piece in summer. This cannot be the summer of 374, when Innocentius must still have been alive, and there is little doubt that by mid-376 J. had left Antioch, where he wrote the letter (he is still with Evagrius; cf. epist. 3.3.2), for the desert of Chalcis; cf. Cavallera, 2.15, Kelly, p. 46 (who dates his departure too early). A date of mid-375 allows plenty of time for J. to have heard that Rufinus was at Nitria, and for the report to have been solidly confirmed.

Innocentius died, then, not later than the summer of 375. Allowing some time for news of Auxentius' death to have reached J. at Antioch, epist. 1 can be placed fairly securely in the first half of that year.

Of Innocentius little is known. He was a close friend of both J. and Evagrius. The latter dedicated to him his translation of Athanasius' Life of Antony (see PL 73.125-6), and J.'s affection for the man is

clearly indicated at epist. 3.3.1, where he describes him as one of his two eyes - the other being Evagrius - and as a part of his soul. J. probably first met Innocentius and Evagrius at Aquileia when he returned to Italy after his stay at Trier; cf. Kelly, p. 33. The suggestion of some that J. had Innocentius as a companion on his journey to the East seems quite unfounded; it is much more likely that Innocentius and Evagrius travelled to Antioch together, and separately from J. (cf. Cavallera, 2.77, Kelly, p. 35). For details of that period in J.'s life when he knew Innocentius see Kelly, pp. 30-40.

Although set in an epistolary framework, the main body of the letter could have been written as a piece complete in itself. It is the narrative account of a remarkable event which had taken place not many years previously at Vercellae in North Italy. A young man and a married woman were falsely accused of adultery and taken before the governor of the province. Under torture the young man confessed to the crime, but the woman, a devout Christian, refused to admit guilt despite suffering every kind of violence. The governor, however, not believing that she was innocent, had her taken to execution, where she withstood seven blows of the executioner's sword, until at last she appeared to die, to prevent the officer in charge from being put to death in her place. A tomb was prepared for her, but, restored to the fullness of life, she was

cared for and concealed from the authorities by Christian priests and virgins, the body of an old woman being buried in her place. At some time the deception and her escape were discovered, and it was only as a result of the intercession of Evagrius with the Emperor that she was finally acquitted.

The structure of the letter is very simple, and follows the chronological order of events. After the preface (cc.1-2) J. sets the scene and describes the tortures (cc.3-6), then passes to the account of the execution (cc.7-11); c.9 is a parenthesis in which are adduced Biblical parallels to the woman's situation. Cc.12-13 deal with the scene at the tomb, and the last two cc. (14-15) depict the concealment and the rescue by Evagrius, who is briefly eulogised at 15.1.

Although one may doubt the miraculous aspects of the story, and the reason which J. gives for them - Christ's protection of the woman is implicit throughout, and made explicit at 8.2 (reading tertium ictum; see n. ad loc.) and at c.11 - the historical background to the situation is real enough. It should be set in the context of the trials for magic and adultery which took place at Rome in the reign of Valentinian I from 368 on and are described at Amm. 28.1. A clear picture of the situation is presented by J. Matthews, Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364-425 (Oxford, 1975), pp. 56-63. Fourth-century legislation on adultery and magic was severe; cf.

particularly Cod. Theod. 9.7 (adultery), 9.16 (magic). Both were crimes regularly excepted from amnesties (cf. Cod. Theod. 9.38.1ff.), and came to be taken in close conjunction with the offence of maiestas imminuta: in 370 the praefectus annonae Maximinus was given a directive by Valentinian to regard accusations of magic as involving the crime of maiestas too (cf. Amm. 28.1.11), and adultery was put into the same bracket (cf. e.g. Amm. 28.1.16). In trials for maiestas the use of torture was permitted generally; and so serious did the Emperor consider the situation to be that Maximinus' directive allowed him to apply torture even to members of the traditionally-exempt senatorial order (cf. Amm. 28.1.11, (for comparison) Cod. Theod. 9.35.1. (AD 369)).

Although most of the evidence deals with trials at Rome it is certain that they took place in the provinces too. Amm. 30.5.11-12 records a case of torture and execution on a charge of magic at Carnuntum in 374. At a later date (c. 385) Priscillian was tortured and executed on a similar charge at Trier; cf. H. Chadwick, Priscillian of Avila: the Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church (Oxford, 1976), pp. 138-44. Into this category falls the case of the woman in this letter. The consularis of the province certainly had the right to torture the accused, and to pass sentence, though technically there could be appeal. The right to appeal, however, could be refused

(cf. Cod. Theod. 11.36.1 (AD 314 or 315) 'cum homicidam vel adulterum vel maleficum vel veneficum, quae atrocissima facinora sunt, confessio propria vel dilucida et probatissima veritatis quaestio probationibus atque argumentis detexerit, provocationes suscipi non oportet, quas constat non refutandi spem habere quae gesta sunt, sed ea potius differre temptare', 11.36.7); and in practice defendants in trials of various kinds were not always given the opportunity of a real defence (cf. e.g. Amm. 14.9.3ff.). There was nothing unusual in the fact that the woman in epist. 1 was taken to execution immediately after being tortured, even though the case against her was far from watertight.

The trial described in this letter took place during the routine circuit assize of the governor of the province of Aemilia-Liguria, where Vercellae lay. It should probably be dated no earlier than 370 (cf. above on Maximinus) and, as he personally intervened in the case before the Emperor (cf. 15.3), before Evagrius left Italy for Antioch around the end of 372 (cf. Kelly, pp. 35-8). The identity of the governor cannot be firmly established (in PLRE 1 he is found as Anonymus 90), but it is not inconceivable that it was Ambrose, who held the office when he was elected bishop; cf. Paul. Med. vita Ambr. 5ff. Regrettably the date of this appointment is unknown, but it could have been as early as c. 369. Petronius Probus became

praetorian prefect of Italy in 368 (cf. PLRE 1.737), and Ambrose was appointed governor during Probus' prefecture (cf. Paul. Med. vita Ambr. 5); time has to be allowed only for Ambrose to have served on his judicial committee (cf. Paul. Med. vita Ambr. ibid.). On the other hand, a later date is no less possible; the sources give no indication how long Ambrose was in office before he was elected to the episcopate, and there is no reason to assume, with F. Homes Dudden, The Life and Times of St. Ambrose (2 vols., Oxford, 1935), 1.61, that he may have required several years as governor to acquire sufficient popularity to be elected bishop by popular acclaim. It is an intriguing possibility that the consularis whose cruel personality J. paints in such lurid colours is none other than the future Bishop of Milan himself (Ambrose was quite capable of employing torture; cf. Paul. Med. vita Ambr. 7, who records that he did so at the time of his episcopal election, though claiming that for him this was unusual). If it is so, it seems improbable that J. was aware of it. It is unlikely that he would have so blackened the character of an orthodox bishop, even anonymously, and, on the personal level, hostilities did not break out between the two until c. 384; cf. Kelly, pp. 143-4, following A. Paredi, 'S. Gerolamo e S. Ambrogio', Studi e testi 235 (Mélanges Eugène Tisserant 5) (1964), 183-98.

The historical reality underlying the situation gave J. scope to write a story with the appearance of truth and an obvious moral, on which he could bring to bear all his powers of description and all the rhetorical devices he had learned in the schools. But it is distinctly overdone, and the final impression is one of exaggeration and, in parts, of caricature - as in the portrait of the consularis in c.4. One is left in no doubt that the piece is the work of a man who had not yet mastered the technique of narrative writing.

J.'s debt to rhetorical theory, as it appears in this letter, manifests itself mainly in two ways. First, there is the frequent manipulation of words for stylistic effect, comprising techniques dealt with in ancient handbooks such as the Rhetorica ad Herennium. There is little value in indicating every instance of figures such as epanaphora, frequent as they are, and the commentary contains discussion of stylistic and rhetorical points only where they appear to be of especial interest or importance; the background to particular rhetorical features may be found in Lausberg. Attention may be drawn, however, to one very striking feature - J.'s fondness for verbal plays. One might note particularly the following:

c.1 'verecunde ac vere';

c.1 'adserebas ... non ... eum posse verba deficere, qui credidisset in verbo';

2.2 'facultatem forsitan quaeras, voluntatem certe flagitare non poteris';

5.2 'de communi scelere alius confitetur, illa pro confitente negat et periclitans ipsa alium vindicat periclitantem';

9.2 'illa liberata per iudicem, ne iret ad gladium, haec a iudice damnata absoluta per gladium est';

15.2 'quis enim valeat digno canere praeconio Auxentium Mediolani incubantem huius excubiis sepultum paene ante quam mortuum ...?'.

Technically, these examples do not all fall into a single, carefully defined category - only the third, for instance, is a case of homoeoteleuton - but the contribution of each to the overall stylistic tone of the letter is based firmly on the effect of some kind of verbal repetition. The various figures which may be included in this bracket are collected by Lausberg, chiefly at 1.310-36 (sects. 608-64); see also L. Arbusow, Colores rhetorici (Göttingen, 1948), pp. 41 ff.

It is not only by means of verbal patterns and arrangement, however, that J.'s rhetorical training makes itself obvious. That he owed much to declamation, with which rhetoric was intimately connected, is clear from the expressions found in the torture chapters (cc.3-6), where see nn. Awareness of certain broad rules is also apparent, e.g. in his use

of the *exemplum* and his adherence to the precept that *exempla* and anecdotes should be given in groups of three (c.9). It is clear that J. had learned his lessons very well.

It remains to discuss the nature of the piece as a whole. Its purpose is clear enough, beyond the ostensible aim of complying with Innocentius' request, and that of offering 'a graceful compliment to his host' (Kelly, p. 39) - Evagrius, who had played an important part at the end of the story. There is no reason to doubt that J. believed that the tale was entirely true, and used it as an illustration of God's support of those who put their trust in him. It is not primarily a symbol of the conflict between Christianity and the temporal power of the Roman Empire, as Grützmacher would have it (1.145). The emphasis throughout is less on the representatives of civil authority, unpleasant though they are made out to be, than on the woman's strength, love, and faith.

As far as conception and content are concerned, the piece does not belong to any clearly defined genre. It has affinities with Christian martyr-literature - the heterogeneous prose *acta* of the early centuries (many of the most important of which may be found in *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs*, ed. H. Musurillo (Oxford, 1972)), the *Peristephanon* poems of Prudentius - where the faithful Christian unflinchingly faces torture and death at the hands of Roman officials. But

the parallel must not be taken too far. The situation which underlies the accounts of martyrdom is essentially different. The martyrs face torture and death because they will not renounce their faith, as required by the authorities to do; they will not sacrifice to the pagan gods, or swear by the Emperor's genius, or give up the Scriptures to be burned. The woman in epist. 1, though her faith is no less, though she will not lie before God, is tried on a charge which has nothing to do with her religion. Had she died at the place of execution, it would not have brought her martyrdom.

Among J.'s own works there is nothing which is directly comparable with this letter. Instances of narratives of this kind are few and far between, and tend to be short; one might compare the story of Antonius and Didymus at epist. 68.2. It is certainly not eulogistic biography of the kind presented by epist. 108 and 127. It does, however, bear distinct similarities to the Vitae monachorum (PL 23.17-60), the biographies of Paul - which was written not long after epist. 1, perhaps around 377 (cf. Kelly, pp. 60-1) - Hilarion, and Malchus, which mark the beginning of something quite new in Latin literature. The obvious differences are that the Vitae are not set in an epistolary framework and that the letter to Innocentius deals fundamentally with a single event - it is not strictly biography at all (though most of vita Pauli

too deals with only one basic incident, viz. Antony's journey and visit to Paul). But much that is true of the Vitae as regards both purpose and narrative and descriptive technique is also true of this letter. All are edifying tales with some basis in historical reality, and all have a point to make - in the case of the letter, that God protects those who are faithful and true, in the case of the Vitae, that the monastic life is something to be admired and followed. E. Coleiro, 'St. Jerome's Lives of the Hermits', VChr 11 (1957), 161-78, makes some perceptive points about the Vitae - albeit not without some exaggeration: Malchus does not 'tower above all the other personalities mentioned' (p. 168), for instance; his wife too is heroic (cf. vita Malchi 6) - and, although he mentions epist. 1 only once, goes a long way towards illuminating it. Particularly valuable is his discussion of 'The Hero' (pp. 167-71). The techniques by which the figures of Paul, Hilarion, and Malchus are built up are essentially the same as those used by J. in delineating the character of the heroine of the letter. Coleiro notes three main approaches. The hermits are distinguished by their fortitude and willpower in the face of hardships and trying situations (cf. e.g. vita Pauli 17, vita Hilar. 9-11, vita Malchi 3, 6); the supernatural, in the form of miracles and prophecy, plays a large part in their lives (cf. e.g. vita Pauli 10-12, vita Hilar. 30, and

frequently); and they gain in stature from being contrasted with other characters who are in some respect inferior to them, e.g. at vita Pauli 7, where Paul's greatness is enhanced by Antony's admission that Paul is his superior in virtue, vita Malchi 9, and often in vita Hilar. Each of these categories is also applicable to the picture of the woman - indeed she fits them even better than the hermits - although the part played by the supernatural is perhaps of less significance than Coleiro suggests in considering 'the building of a heroic personality' (Coleiro, p. 169). The continual emphasis on her strength and endurance, and the clear contrasts drawn between her and the consularis and the young man, and to some extent the first executioner and the mob, are key techniques of composition in this letter.

Although different in formal framework, then, the Vitae monachorum and epist. 1 are closely related. They represent a type of history with a distinct Tendenz; J. is less interested in narrating facts than in making a Christian point, and his way of doing this is to concentrate heavily on a single personality, building it up to heroic proportions. The significance of the events at Vercellae lay for him not in the unfairness of the trial and the summary execution, nor in any clash between Christianity and the state, but in the courage of the victim and the triumph of the Christian faith.

The letter may have influenced parts of the Historia Augusta; for this suggestion see A. Chastagnol, 'Le Supplice inventé par Avidius Cassius: remarques sur l'Histoire Auguste et la Lettre 1 de saint Jérôme', Antiquitas 4.10 (1972) (Bonner Historia-Augusta-Colloquium 1970), 95-107.

DE SEPTIES PERCUSSA. The title is derived from 13.2 septies percussa debet aliquid morte plus perpeti. As the woman's name is never mentioned, this must have presented itself as the most obvious way to refer to her and to the letter.

cc.1-2. The first two cc. of the letter take the form of a dedicatory preface which has no direct relevance to the story which follows. Dedicatory prefaces became very common in Latin literature in the fourth and fifth centuries. They often display features which may be found much earlier, in Late Republican and even Hellenistic literature; the notion of the work in hand being undertaken in response to a request, and the expression of doubt as to the ability of the author to carry out his task successfully, are two examples (see following nn.). The major work on the subject, to which I am much indebted, is T. Janson, Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions (Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 13; Stockholm, 1964), which uncovers the origins of the prose preface in Classical literature, and discusses at some length many of the τόποι found in the conventionalised prefaces of the Late Empire. Equally important, more particularly for consideration of the use of the same τόποι in the literature of the Middle Ages, is G. Simon, 'Untersuchungen zur Topik der Widmungsbriefe

mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreiber bis zum Ende des XII Jahrhunderts', parts 1-2, Archiv für Diplomatik 4 (1958), 52-119 and 5 (1959), 73-153. The magisterial work of E. R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (Engl. tr., London, 1953), is also valuable here.

Many of J.'s works are introduced by a preface. C. Favez, Saint Jérôme peint par lui-même (Collection Latomus 33; Brussels, 1958) - a portrait of J. which uses only material drawn from the prefaces - reckons 111, if one counts the opening of the six works c. Ioh., adv. Iovin., adv. Rufin., c. Vigil., virg. Mar., and vita Malchi, which seem to him, with some justification, to have the character of prefaces (p. 5). Of this total most (69) belong to the Biblical commentaries, the rest to Latin versions of books of the Bible, translations of Greek works, treatises and miscellaneous pieces. (Favez's figure for the number of 'traités et opuscules' with prefaces is fourteen. I can find only thirteen: the six works mentioned above, plus nom. hebr., adv. Pelag., quaest. hebr. in gen., sit. et nom., vir. ill., vita Hilar., vita Pauli. This would make the total 110.) Favez, however, fails to take account of any of those letters of J. of which the opening possesses the features of a preface; Janson, Prefaces, p. 136, n. 21, notes particularly epist. 60, 117, 118, 119, 120, 130, and 140, as well as the present letter. The unauthentic epist. 148 might also

be mentioned in this context. The letter prefaces are also ignored by W. Stade, Hieronymus in prooemiis quid tractaverit et quos auctores quasque leges rhetoricas secutus sit (Rostock, 1925), a work which contains, nevertheless, a great many useful examples of τόποι . Stade's investigation of J.'s debt to laws of rhetoric in his prefaces is not otherwise very illuminating; Janson, Prefaces, pp. 25-6, points out the limited value of referring to rhetorical rules when considering the features of particular prefaces.

J.'s prefaces do not fit into a single general pattern. They vary in content as they vary in length, depending on factors such as the nature of the work to which they are prefaced, the difficulties confronting J. at the time of writing, whether he feels it necessary to defend himself against his critics, and so on. Certain themes and τόποι , however, recur. For example, J. frequently calls on the dedicatee to assist him in his work with his or her prayers (cf. e.g. in Ezech. lib. 10 pref. (CCSL 75.434 = PL 25.295-6), pref. in Pentateuchum (PL 28.152)); God's help is often directly invoked in the same way (cf. e.g. in Is. lib. 9 pref. (CCSL 73.354 = PL 24.313-4)). This is common among Christian writers, a natural development of the literary invocation of a deity that runs right through Classical literature. Janson, Prefaces, pp. 141-5, gives plenty of examples on the theme of requesting assistance in a literary undertaking generally.

Certain of J.'s prefaces possess a number of such topics and conform in outline to a pattern which became common in the Late Empire and resembles that found in prefaces to earlier rhetorical works such as Cicero's Brutus, the basic themes being a request, a dedication, and an expression of unwillingness. Parallels to the topics which occur in the preface to epist. 1 may be found in the notes which follow. At this point it will suffice to quote in full one passage from some years later, which will give an indication of the conventions within which J. was working; its close similarity to the preface to epist. 1 will be obvious. It is a large part of the preface to his exposition of Isa. 13-23, written in 397, and later (408-10) inserted, as Book 5, into his Commentary on Isaiah (CCSL 73.160 = PL 24.153-4):

> hucusque papa Amabilis, columen caritatis et nomen, ac mihi omnium quos terra genuit amantissime, per litteras flagitabas, ut tibi decem visiones quae in Esaia obscurissimae sunt, historica expositione dissererem, et omissis nostrorum commentariis, qui varias opiniones secuti, multa volumina condiderunt, Hebraicam panderem veritatem. meque retractantem, et molestissimum explanationis genus in tempus aliud differentem, saepissime

commonebas. hoc autem anno misisti filium nostrum Heraclium diaconum, qui me manu conserta in ius vocaret, et promissum per momenta exigeret. quid igitur faciam? subeamne opus in quo viri eruditissimi sudaverunt, Origenem loquor et Eusebium Pamphili, quorum alter liberis allegoriae spatiis evagatur, et interpretatis nominibus singulorum, ingenium suum facit ecclesiae sacramenta, alter historicam expositionem titulo repromittens, interdum obliviscitur propositi et in Origenis scita concedit? an taceam et huius generis expositionem nescire me dicam? et quando tibi potero persuadere, me non potuisse magis quam noluisse, quorum alterum imbecillitatis est, alterum superbiae? quibus adactus causis, malui a te ingenium meum quam voluntatem quaeri; breviterque annotabo quae didici, fundamenta iaciens scripturarum.

c.1. Saepe ... non tacerem. J. opens the letter by referring to a request made by Innocentius that he should tell the story of the septies percussa. It was conventional and frequent from Republican times for an author to say that he was writing his work in order to comply with such a request: it provided him with a good reason for undertaking the task. Such compositions often show little personal involvement of

the addressee in the subject-matter: whether the requests are genuine or devised by the author, as might occasionally be true, it is what the author has to say on his subject that is important, and the degree of direct relevance to his correspondent may be very slight. The result is that the correspondent is frequently less an addressee than a dedicatee. This is very apparent in this letter. After c.2 there is no further reference to Innocentius, either by name or by a verb in the second person or by any other means. (The only place where J. could conceivably be attempting to do this is 15.1 'iam enim ad Evagrii nostri nomen advenimus', where the plural verb and possessive pronoun may suggest that he is trying to associate himself more closely with Innocentius; but the plural seems to have a more vague and general reference here.) J. is interested only in his story and in obeying conventional rules of composition. The extent to which the addressee is involved in the narrative does of course vary from letter to letter according to its content and purpose. In epist. 52, for instance, where the topic of the request is displayed, J. returns to the addressee, Nepotianus, at the end (17.1), referring to him by name, and makes numerous references to him in the second person ('tu', 'tibi', etc.) throughout the piece. This is natural, for Nepotianus is closely connected with the content of the letter, the duties of a clericus or monachus.

Innocentius, by contrast, plays no part in the action of epist. 1.

The request-τόπος seems to originate in Hellenistic times. Janson, Prefaces, p. 21, gives as examples two prefaces of Archimedes, where he declares that the dedicatee, Dositheus, has commanded (ἐπιστέλλειν) him to send him the proofs of some theorems. The topic gains wider currency in Latin literature from the first century BC, initially, to judge from extant works, in the prefaces of rhetorical treatises; cf. Janson, Prefaces, pp. 27 ff., 46 ff. Many examples of this formula are collected by A. Gudeman (ed.), P. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus (Leipzig, 1914), p. 41, who includes instances from poetry as well as from prose; cf. e.g. Cic. orat. 3 'quaeris igitur idque iam saepius quod eloquentiae genus probem maxime', Sen. dial. 3.1.1 'exegisti a me, Novate, ut scriberem quemadmodum posset ira leniri', and many of Seneca's Letters, e.g. 7.1, 88.1. Christian writers had adopted the formula long before J.'s time (cf. e.g. Tert. fug. 1 'quaesisti proxime, Fabi frater, fugiendum necne sit in persecutione', Lact. epit. pref.), and it continued to be used later (cf. Sidon. epist. 1.2.1). Simon, 'Untersuchungen', 1.59-65, traces it into the Middle Ages.

There are numerous examples in J.; cf. e.g. epist. 30.2.2 'identidem flagitasti, ut tibi interpretationes singularum edicerem litterarum', 52.1.1 'petis,

Nepotiane carissime, litteris transmarinis et crebro petis, ut tibi brevi volumine digeram praecepta vivendi', vir. ill. pref. (PL 23.601-3) 'hortaris me, Dexter, ut Tranquillum sequens, ecclesiasticos scriptores in ordinem digeram'.

Two further points may be noted. First, the use of the request-τόπος is not confined to passages which display other characteristics common in prefaces. Many of the instances in J. are no more than passing references to a request, and do not fit into a conventional prefatory framework at all. The formula need not, indeed, be expressed in such direct terms as petis, quaeris, etc., nor need it occur at the beginning of a piece; cf. epist. 107.3.1 'propositum enim mihi erat sanctae Marcellae et tuis precibus invitato ad matrem ... sermonem dirigere'. Secondly, the request may come not from the dedicatee but from others. Quintilian's Institutio oratoria is dedicated to his friend Marcellus, but the request that it should be written came from 'certain men' ('quidam') (inst. 1 pref. 1). See Janson, Prefaces, p. 117, Simon, 'Untersuchungen', 1.60.

Innocenti carissime. J., like other writers of his period, frequently addresses a correspondent as carissime, usually in company with the person's name or some such word as frater; cf. e.g. epist. 3.1.1 'Rufine carissime', 58.1.2 'frater carissime'. He uses it

equally of women; cf. e.g. epist. 75.5.1 'carissima filia', 79.11.3 'filia in Christo carissima'. The employment of such titles in Greco-Roman Antiquity has been studied principally in three works: A. Engelbrecht, Das Titelwesen bei den spätlateinischen Epistolographen (Wien, 1893), L. Dineen, Titles of Address in Christian Greek Epistolography to 527 AD (Washington, D.C., 1929), and M. B. O'Brien, Titles of Address in Christian Latin Epistolography to 543 AD (Washington, D.C., 1930). Certain forms of address, together with other linguistic expressions, are indicative of the vertical social relationships which developed naturally out of the pyramidal structure of the society of the Late Empire, assisted by the hierarchical structure of the Church; on this see also H. Bruhn, Specimen vocabularii rhetorici ad inferioris aetatis latinitatem pertinens (Marburg, 1911), and especially H. Dihle, 'Antike Höflichkeit und christliche Demut', SIFC 26 (1952), 169-90. Such titles are often particularly appropriate in contexts where a writer wishes to place himself in a position of submissiveness in relation to his addressee (see on 2.2 pareo iam iubenti). carissime, however, like religiosissime and sancte (see on epist. 107.2.1, 3.1), is shown by O'Brien to be socially colourless, in Christian usage at least. Naturally enough; it is a very obvious term of endearment.

in ... inciderat. The MSS strongly favour nostra aetate and acciderat. It is incidere, however, which is used to denote the timing of an event, with in & acc.; cf. esp. Cic. Phil. 8.8 'omnia [sc. bella civilia] in nostram aetatem inciderunt'. accidere, moreover, seems to have been used particularly of bad or unfortunate occurrences, making it the less appropriate word here; cf. esp. Caper gramm. 7.98.8 Keil 'accidere aliquid adversi dicito, contingere aliquid pulchri', Agroec. gramm. 7.118.22 Keil 'contingunt bona, accidunt mala, eveniunt utraque'. Hilberg's text should stand.

nostram aetatem = 'our time'; perhaps with an implied contrast to Biblical (especially NT) times, the heyday of miracles.

non tacerem. With the indirect command we should expect ne and not ut ... non, but when, in clauses which are fundamentally final in nature, the negative idea attaches itself closely to one word in the clause, effectively expressing something strongly positive, ut ... non is sometimes used; cf. e.g. Quint. inst. 2.9.1 'moneo, ut praeceptores suos non minus quam ipsa studia ament', where 'non minus' is really positive, and more emphatic than ne ... minus, or aeque (ac). So here non tacerem is more emphatic than ne ... tacerem or aliquid dicerem. Cf. K.-S. 2.209-10.

cumque ... diffiderem. J. declares that originally he refused to comply with Innocentius' request because he felt that he could not carry out the task adequately.

There are many instances in Classical literature of recusatio, where a writer expresses unwillingness to undertake a task because he considers himself to be incapable of fulfilling it. His self-distrust may be explicit, as here, or implied, as at Hor. carm. 2.12.13-16 (on which see the useful nn. of R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 2 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 179-82, 193-5). The topic is particularly common in prefaces from the time of Cicero on. It is a branch of self-depreciation or affected modesty by the author, designed, in the case or oratory, to make the jurors favourable to the pleader; cf. Cic. inv. 1.22, Quint. inst. 4.1.8 'ut praecipua in hoc dicentis auctoritas, si omnis in subeundo negotio suspicio sordium aut odiorum aut ambitionis afuerit, ita quaedam in his quoque commendatio tacita, si nos infirmos, inparatos, inpares agentium contra ingeniis dixerimus'. In written works the recusatio topic often has the advantage of providing a kind of escape-clause for the author should his work prove unsuccessful, by putting the responsibility for its being written on the person who requested it; cf. Janson, Prefaces, p. 124, Simon, 'Untersuchungen', 2.113. For the theory put into practice cf. e.g. Cic. orat. 1, Quint. inst. 1 pref. 1

'cum a me quidam familiariter postularent ut aliquid de ratione dicendi componerem, diu sum equidem reluctatus, quod auctores utriusque linguae clarissimos non ignorabam multa quae ad hoc opus pertinerent diligentissime scripta posteris reliquisse'. There is an interesting variation in Quintilian's letter to his publisher Trypho, which stands in our texts as a foreword to the Institutio. Trypho urges Quintilian to publish his work; Quintilian agrees only reluctantly, as he is not convinced that it is yet ready for publication.

In J.'s works most instances of recusatio occur in contexts where he experiences a conflict between his avowed distrust of his own ability and his wish to comply with an insistent request; for such cases see on 2.1 Quid ... non audeo. epist. 60.1.1 'grandes materias ingenia parva non sufferunt et in ipso conatu ultra vires ausa succumbunt', while not an expression of unwillingness to undertake his task, is at least an expression of doubt as to his competence in the matter (see n. ad loc.).

As social conditions changed during the course of the Empire, the self-depreciatory theme became more common and the author's self-abasement more extreme. The underlying notion of humilitas was fostered by the new social structures, the Emperor being set in a position of glory vis-à-vis the ordinary individual and vertical relationships becoming the norm, and sustained

by the spread of Christianity with its own ideas on humility and self-disparagement. That Christianity did not, however, provide the prototype of the formula of submission frequent in the Middle Ages is made clear by Curtius, European Literature, pp. 83-5, 407-13.

Various other manifestations of the theme have been pointed out by Curtius and Janson. These include the use by the author of terms such as mediocritas mea to describe himself, the use of diminutives, and the author's apology for his defective style even when there is nothing defective about it at all. There are countless examples in J.; cf. e.g. epist. 75.4.2 'quo ille desiderio nostra opuscula flagitavit ... non nos honorans, qui parvuli et minimi Christianorum omnium sumus ... sed Christum', 85.3.2 'non debeas turbidos nostri ingenioli rivos quaerere' (diminutive), 142.1.1 'nostra ... parvitate' (in reference to himself), in Zach. pref. (CCSL 76A.748 = PL 25.1418) 'tuae benevolentiae erit, non eruditionem nostram, quae vel nulla, vel parva est; sed pronam in te suspicere voluntatem', and, particularly interesting in view of his recognition of affected modesty in St. Paul, epist. 29.7.2 'nos, ut scis, Hebraici sermonis lectione detenti in Latina lingua rubiginem obduximus in tantum, ut loquentibus quoque nobis stridor quidam non Latinus interstrepat. unde agnosce ariditati: etsi inperitus sum, inquit, sermone, apostolus, sed non scientia. illi utrumque non deerat, et unum humiliter rennuebat;

nobis utrumque deest'.

verecunde. There is a touch of unintentional irony here: to claim verecundia is hardly in itself verecundum.

ut nunc experior: 'as I now find by trial' (Wright), going closely with vere, 'rightly'; to compose the letter proves difficult, thus J.'s earlier refusal was justified.

Unless J., having written just one complete sentence, is exaggerating here, ut nunc experior seems to imply either that the preface was added to the letter when the rest of it had been completed, or that the letter had been through more than one draft. The careful composition suggests that he may have worked on it for a considerable time.

sive quia omnis ... eloquii. J. outlines the reasons for his distrust of his ability to do justice to the story. These causal clauses explain primarily diffiderem: the refusal indicated by negarem is logically dependent upon this distrust.

esset. The great majority of the MSS have est, but esset is certainly right, in view of siccasset just ahead.

laude caelesti: implicit in the story, in which truth and faith in Christ are vindicated.

otium ... eloquii. In what is itself a finely balanced sentence (cum plus two main verbs, two causal clauses explaining the latter verb, and two counter-arguments which prevail over the reasons presented in the explanatory clauses), the verbal balance in this clause is highly stylized. J. indulges to the full his taste for separating a noun from an attributive adjective or a dependent genitive (see general introduction, sect. 3) by doing so in three successive phrases; and the adjective precedes the noun in each case.

ingenii robigo. The metaphorical use of robigo is well attested. Used with words denoting the mind or the emotions, it goes back at least as far as the Augustan period; cf. e.g. Ov. trist. 5.12.21 'ingenium longa rubigine laesum', Sen. epist. 95.36 'illis aut hebetibus et obtusis aut mala consuetudine obsessis diu robigo animorum effricanda est', and in Christian Latin, Cypr. zel. 7 'qualis vero est animae tinea, quae cogitationum tabes, pectoris quanta rubigo', Prud. cath. 7.205 'limat aegram pectorum rubiginem'. In J. the image of rust occurs also at vita Malchi 1 (PL 23.53), epist. 29.7.2 (quoted above at cumque ... diffiderem), and 60.1.2 'stilus ipse quasi sentiens et cera subtristior vel rubigine vel situ obducitur',

where see n.

For the connection between otium and robigo cf. Sen. contr. 2.2.8 (quoted at epist. 60.1.2); also Liv. 33.45.7 'marcescere otii situ ... civitatem', Claud. paneg. Manl. Theod. 174-6 'agrestem dudum me, diva, reverti ¦ cogis et infectum longi rubigine ruris ¦ ad tua signa vocas' (where 'ruris' implies a quiet life of leisure and study in the country as opposed to involvement in affairs of state (cf. 61ff., 114-5)).

parvulam licet facultatem. The self-depreciatory tone is obvious here. Such criticisms of one's own powers of expression are common; cf. e.g. epist. 21.42.1 'non ambigo, quin inculta tibi nostrae parvitatis videatur oratio'.

licet in this sense, = 'albeit', more often precedes the word it qualifies, but there are many instances where it follows. J. is fond of this pattern; cf. e.g. epist. 8.1.3 'iratus licet', 18B.1.4 'pius licet'. He may also have felt that to transpose parvulam and facultatem would damage the balance of the clause.

siccasset. This new image seems rather forced after robigo. J. has combined two ideas: one, that his ingenium has grown rusty through lack of use; the other, that his facultas eloquii has dried up. The latter notion owes something to the idea of a 'flow' of

words or eloquence (cf. e.g. Cic. de orat. 2.188 'flumen ... verborum', Quint. inst. 10.1.61, J. epist. 36.14.1, 58.10.2 'Lactantius, quasi quidam fluvius eloquentiae Tullianae'), and perhaps to the idea that ingenium (of which facultas eloquii is a part) flows in streams (cf. epist 85.3.2 'ingenioli rivos', Iuv. 10.119 'exundans ... ingenii fons'). Despite the mixing of the metaphor, the meaning is quite clear.

tu e contrario adserebas. Despite J.'s doubts about his own ability, Innocentius persists in his request. J. is thus enabled to put the responsibility for the work firmly on the shoulders of his friend.

in dei rebus ... animum. possibilitas is the power or ability to do a thing, animus the resolve or determination to do it ('courage', Labourt; 'will', Wright). To Innocentius the result is less important than the intention, although the next part of the sentence makes clear his confidence that the task will be carried out successfully. For J. it is not quite so simple: he sees a conflict between the two, which is resolved at the end of the next c. Elsewhere, however, he expresses the same idea himself; cf. epist. 68.1.1 'in amicis ... non res quaeritur, sed voluntas, quia alterum ab inimicis saepe praebetur, alterum sola caritas tribuit', 153.1.3. The contrast has parallels in declamation; cf. e.g. ps. Quint. decl. min. 281 p.

145.20 Ritter 'numquam mens exitu aestimanda est', decl. mai. 5.10 p. 97.24-5 Lehnert 'non fortunam tibi debeo, sed affectum, non exitum, sed voluntatem'. possibilitas is the same thing as exitus, but looked at in advance of the action. The importance of intention, as opposed to perpetration, is also found in legal contexts; cf. Cic. Mil. 19 'nisi vero, quia perfecta res non est, non fuit punienda, proinde quasi exitus rerum, non hominum consilia legibus vindicentur', dig. 48.8.14 'divus Hadrianus in haec verba rescripsit: in maleficiis voluntas spectatur, non exitus'.

neque eum ... in verbo. As we subsequently find out, J. does not share Innocentius' confidence.

The play on verbum is a very obvious one to employ in the context. The notion of 'The Word' originates at John 1; but it was well diffused in Christian theology by J.'s time, and there is scarcely a direct allusion to the passage here.

credidisset. The pluperfect implies a definite act of the will capable of being located at a specific point in time. credere can of course simply mean 'to be in a state of belief', but it is also used of accepting the Christian faith; cf. e.g. Tert. adv. Marc. 4.1.4 'nationum, quae ... simul crederunt'. J. is particularly fond of this usage; cf. e.g. epist. 112.5.1 'novum argumentum repperisti, ut adsereres

gentiles, qui in Christum credidissent, legis onere liberos', 125.1.1 'latro credidit in cruce'.

2.1. Quid ... non audeo. The conflict between ability and will, between J.'s feeling that he will be unable to fulfil the task and his wish not to deny Innocentius' request, is laid clearly before us. The dilemma is a common one in prefaces, and regularly results, as here (2.2), in the author's doubts being overcome by his desire to comply with the request. It is part of the technique of self-depreciation and transfer of responsibility (see on c.1 cumque ... diffiderem). One of the best examples is the preface to Cicero's Orator, fully discussed by Janson, Prefaces, pp. 40 ff.: 'utrum difficilius aut maius esset negare tibi saepius idem roganti an efficere id quod rogares diu multumque, Brute, dubitavi. nam et negare ei quem unice diligerem cuique me carissimum esse sentirem ... durum admodum mihi videbatur; et suscipere tantam rem ... vix arbitrabar esse eius qui vereretur reprehensionem doctorum atque prudentium ... quod quoniam me saepius rogas, aggrediar non tam perficiendi spe quam experiendi voluntate; malo enim, cum studio tuo sim obsecutus, desiderari a te prudentiam meam quam, si id non fecerim, benevolentiam' (orat. 1-2). Cf. also Paneg. 3(Mamertinus).1.2 'sed sive errorem nostrum sive consilium congesta et coacervata in unum beneficia vicerunt atque in id

redegerunt necessitatis ambiguum ut mihi aut indiserti aut ingrati esset fama subeunda, malui eloquentiam potius quam pietatis erga te officium meum desiderari', Lact. epit. pref. For examples from the Middle Ages see Simon, 'Untersuchungen', 1.68-9, and particularly Hildebert vita Hug. pref. 'cui sane labori licet impar meum senserim ingenium, malui tamen ridiculus scriptor quam tibi inobediens inveniri'.

There are many instances of the topic in J.; cf. e.g. pref. in Ezram (PL 28.1401) 'utrum difficilius sit, facere quod poscitis, an negare, necdum statui. nam neque vobis aliquid imperantibus abnuere, sententiae est: et magnitudo oneris impositi ita cervices premit, ut ante sub fasce ruendum sit, quam levandum'; in Ezech. lib. 3 pref. (CCSL 75.91 = PL 25.76), in Ioel pref. (CCSL 76.160 = PL 25.949-50), in both of which the dedicatee is asked to look to voluntas rather than vires; and esp. epist. 130.1.1-2, with its striking verbal similarity to the present passage: 'inter omnes materias, quas ab adulescentia usque ad hanc aetatem vel mea vel notariorum scripsi manu, nihil praesenti opere difficilius. scripturus enim ad Demetriadem, virginem Christi, quae et nobilitate et divitiis prima est in orbe Romano, si cuncta virtutibus eius congrua dixero, adulari putabor, si quaedam subtraxero, ne incredibilia videantur, damnum laudibus eius mea faciet verecundia. quid igitur faciam? quod inplere non possum, negare non

audeo: tanta est aviae eius et matris, insignium feminarum, in iubendo auctoritas, in petendo fides, in extorquendo perseverantia'. For the inability to refuse a request cf. also epist. 115.1.1 'obsecro, ut ignoscas pudori meo, quod diu praecipienti, ut rescriberem, negare non potui'.

Quid igitur faciam? The rhetorical question seems very much in place, and is helpful in crystallising the conflict: which course is J. to follow? Cf. e.g. epist. 60.2.1, 84.4.1, 130.1.2 (quoted above), where he uses the same question in the same way. Quintilian includes the expression as an example in his section on rhetorical questions (inst. 9.2.11).

2.1-2. super onerariam ... substiterit. By means of this long nautical metaphor J. seeks to indicate the scale of the difficulty confronting him in his attempt to fulfil Innocentius' request.

The traditional use of metaphors involving the sea and ships, from Classical Antiquity right through the Middle Ages, has been well treated by Curtius, European Literature, pp. 128-31, who gives numerous examples from authors of both poetry and prose, chiefly instances where the metaphor describes the composition of a literary work. Such a usage gives the author an opportunity for further self-depreciation, enabling him to emphasise the difficulty of his task; cf. Janson,

Prefaces, pp. 146-7. By far the most important passage for consideration of J.'s place in this tradition is the preface to Quint. inst. 12, where the author expresses his uncertainty by saying that he has sailed out to the open sea, where he is quite alone, and where 'caelum undique et undique pontus' (inst. 12 pref. 4), a Virgilian quotation used by J. in this very preface (see on 2.1 nunc mihi ... canescunt). It is quite likely that there is a direct connection between the two passages; cf. R. G. Austin (ed.), Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae liber 12 (Oxford, 1948), p. 50.

J.'s frequent use of nautical metaphors has been discussed, inter alia, by J. W. Smit, Studies on the Language and Style of Columba the Younger (Columbanus) (Amsterdam, 1971), pp. 172-89, and by L. M. Kaiser, 'Imagery of Sea and Ship in the Letters of St. Jerome', Folia 5 (1951), 56-60. Kaiser finds three major purposes in his employment of the metaphor: (a) to characterise his counsels to moral conduct (cf. e.g. epist. 79.10.2, where he describes the consequences of sin in terms of a shipwrecked sailor being dashed against the rocks); (b) to describe penitence, likened to the plank to which one clings after shipwreck (cf. e.g. epist. 122.4.3); (c) to characterise some literary undertaking. Unaccountably, Kaiser fails to mention the present instance at all - it falls naturally into his third category - and had he considered it he might have thought twice before

concluding that 'Jerome's imagery almost always is well-devised, functional - not mere rhetorical display'. Such display is clearly the major purpose here. Smit's study is less schematic and altogether more valuable. The navigatio image lends itself naturally to description of difficulties and dangers in life itself - cf. e.g. Sen. epist. 70.2-4, J. epist. 43.3.1, 47.2.1 - and in all its aspects, of which literary work is one.

There are numerous instances in J. They may be extended or very brief. Examples and references may be found in the works cited in this n.; also in Stade, Hieronymus in prooemiis, pp. 88-9. In the nn. which follow those cases are chiefly considered where the metaphor is used to describe a literary undertaking, e.g. epist. 14.10.1 'sed quoniam e scopulosis locis enavigavit oratio et inter cavas spumeis fluctibus cautes fragilis in altum cumba processit, expandenda vela sunt ventis et quaestionum scopulis transvadatis laetantium more nautarum epilogi celeuma cantandum est', 108.27.1 'huc usque prosperis navigavimus ventis et crispantia maris aequora labens carina sulcavit; nunc in scopulos incurrit oratio et tumentibus fluctuum montibus praesens utriusque monasterii intentatur naufragium', in Ezech. lib. 12 pref. (CCSL 75.549 = PL 25.369-70). Perhaps most interesting of all, for its length and its complexity, is in Is. lib. 13 pref. (CCSL 73A.506 = PL 24.441-3): 'multi casus opprimunt

navigantes. si vehementior flaverit ventus, tempestas formidini est. si aura moderatior summa iacentis elementi terga crispaverit, piratarum insidias pertimescunt. atque ita fit, ut fragili animae ligno creditae, aut metuant periculum, aut sustineant, quorum utrumque altero gravius est, vel mortem timere perpetuo, vel quam timueris sustinere. hoc mihi in Esaiae pelago naviganti accidere video; dum enim inoffenso cursu vela tenduntur, et securis nautarum manibus, sulcans aequoris campos carina delabitur, subitus languoris turbo consurgens, tantis undarum molibus et collisorum inter se fluctuum fragore resonante, pavida amicorum corda perterruit, ut dicere cogerentur: magister, salvos nos fac, perimus'.

Cf. also Bartelink, pp. 112-13.

2.1. rudis vector. When the steersman is inexperienced, the voyage is especially dangerous. Cf. J. epist. 125.2.3 'totum ... quod quasi doctus nauta post multa naufragia rudem conor instruere vectorem, illud est, ut, in quo litore pudicitiae pirata sit, noveris', Ven. Fort. carm. 5.6 p. 114.26-7 Leo 'ut hoc pararem conmercii, per incertum pelagi rudis nauta vela suspendi: affectu raptus deferor per fluctus et scopulos'.

homo ... fragori. The contrast is extremely vivid, and is heightened by homo, used as it sometimes is to

denote human weakness or insignificance (cf. e.g. Petron. 130, Quint. inst. 10.1.25). By exaggerating his difficulty to this extent J. prepares the way for his achievement, should he succeed, to appear even greater; his abilities as a steersman will have been proved. Cf. Sen. dial. 6.5.5 'simul cogita non esse magnum rebus prosperis fortem se gerere, ubi secundo cursu vita procedit: ne gubernatoris quidem artem tranquillum mare et obsequens ventus ostendit, adversi aliquid incurrat oportet quod animum probet', Plin. epist. 9.26.4.

scalmus (σκάλμος), properly a thole-pin, a peg to which an oar was strapped, could be used by extension to indicate the whole boat; cf. e.g. Cic. off. 3.59, Amb. in Luc. 1.8 'Petrus et Andreas audita domini voce dicentis: faciam vos piscatores hominum sine ulla conperendinatione reliquerunt scalmum'. J.'s use of the word in conjunction with Euxini maris is particularly interesting in the light of Vell. 2.43.1 'quattuor scalmorum navem ... ingressus effusissimum Adriatici maris traiecit sinum', and esp. of Cic. de orat. 1.174 'tu mihi cum in circulo decipiare adversari stipulatiuncula et cum obsignes tabellas clientis tui, quibus in tabellis id sit scriptum, quo ille capiatur, ego tibi ullam causam maiorem committendam putem? citius hercule is, qui duorum scalmorum naviculam in portu everterit, in Euxino ponto Argonautarum navem gubernarit', of which the present passage may be a

reminiscence (the similarity is noted by Hagendahl, p. 103).

nunc mihi ... canescunt. Images of waves and foam are natural means of indicating difficulty in sea-metaphor; cf. e.g. epist. 14.10.1 'spumeis fluctibus', 108.27.1 'tumentibus fluctuum montibus', adv. Iovin. 2.35 (PL 23.333) (quoted below at 2.2 optatos portus), Ambr. Iac. 1.8.36. The notion of being far out at sea may be used in the same way (cf. e.g. Quint. inst. 12 pref. 4, J. adv. Iovin. 2.35); alternatively, the open sea may be regarded as a place of safety in comparison with shallows or rocks (cf. e.g. epist. 108.27.1, 123.3.1 'nobis de portu egredientibus quasi quidam scopulus opponitur, ne possimus ad pelagi tuta decurrere'). To these images J. here adds that of darkness, which is not normally found in such contexts; it is derived from Virgil (see below), and makes a powerful colour-contrast with canescunt. caeca nocte itself makes a significant contribution to the high stylistic level of the passage, as it is a phrase which occurs frequently in poetry; cf. e.g. Catull. 68.44, Lucr. 1.1115-6, Virg. georg. 3.260.

caelum ... pontus is a quotation from Virg. Aen. 3.193, evoking images of a sea-storm by association with the Virgilian context (the storm in the early part of the Trojans' voyage from Troy). unda ... nimborum

recalls the next two lines: 'tum mihi caeruleus supra caput astitit imber ¦ noctem hiememque ferens, et inhorruit unda tenebris' (Aen. 3.194-5). Aen. 3.192-5 recurs, with few changes, at Aen. 5.8-11. J.'s familiarity with, and fondness for, Virgil made it natural for him to use these passages when seeking poetic colour for this description. It is not long before he uses them again: Aen. 3.194 and 5.9 are quoted at epist. 3.3.1, and at epist. 2.1.4 he conflates Aen. 3.193 and 5.9: 'nunc nova inpedimenta proponens maria undique circumdat et undique pontum'.

inhorrescens is read by nearly all the MSS. There is no need, with Victorius, Martianay, and Vallarsi, to print inhorrescit, which is unattested in the MSS. The sense of motion conveyed by the anaphoric nunc ... nunc is better maintained by a participle than by a finite verb, and there is no problem in understanding with unda a verb such as est or apparet, just as in the first half of the anaphora.

2.2. hortaris. J. is very concerned to emphasise that the responsibility for the writing of the piece is fundamentally Innocentius'. See further below, on pareo iam iubenti.

tumida ... regam. The use of such language is a well-established part of sea-metaphor, particularly where it refers to some literary work; cf. e.g. Cic. Tusc. 4.9

'quaerebam igitur, utrum panderem vela orationis statim an eam ante paululum dialecticorum remis propellerem', Quint. inst. 6.1.52, Plin. epist. 4.20.2, J. epist. 14.10.1, adv. Iovin. 1.3 (PL 23.214) 'cum enim adhuc vix de portu egrediar, et rudentibus vela sustollam, in medium me quaestionum pelagus, subitus loquendi aestus abripuit, hom. Orig. in Ier. et Ezech. pref. (PL 25.586). For cases in non-literary contexts cf. e.g. Cic. Sest. 20 'clavum tanti imperi ... et gubernacula rei publicae', J. epist. 14.6.3 'expedite rudentes, vela suspendite' (in a moral context), and epist. 107.10.3 with n.

pareo iam iubenti. J. finally yields to Innocentius' request. The use of the verb iubere is significant. The emphasis on Innocentius as instigator is put more and more strongly as the preface unfolds: postulasti ... hortaris ... iubenti. J. feels that he has no option but to comply, so important and authoritative is his correspondent. The change in the attitude of authors to their correspondents as seen in the gradual strengthening during the Empire of the verbs used for the request has been dealt with by Janson, Prefaces, pp. 117-20, who connects it with other manifestations of the self-depreciatory theme (see on c.1 Innocenti carissime and cumque ... diffiderem). Simon, 'Untersuchungen', 1.98-100, discusses the notion of oboedientia in the Middle Ages, noting that the

transfer of responsibility is so complete that authors openly declare their certainty that the addressee will pardon any shortcomings in their work.

There are plenty of examples in J. of request-verbs of the stronger type in this sort of context; cf. e.g. epist. 64.8.1 'conpulisti me, Fabiola, litteris tuis, ut de Aaron tibi scriberem vestimentis', 74.6.1 'nos enim et haec ipsa ... vix notario celeriter scribenda dictavimus, non ut inpleremus materiam sed ne tibi in principio amicitiarum aliquid imperanti videremur negare', in Os. lib. 3 pref. (CCSL 76.108 = PL 25.903). iubere is similarly used by Augustine, writing to J. (epist. 82.2 Aug. = 116.2.1 J.).

quia ... non poteris. Beneath J.'s agreement to undertake the task proposed by Innocentius lies the conventional idea that even if he does not succeed, his goodwill is unchallengeable (for examples see on 2.1 Quid ... non audeo); at last he accepts what Innocentius has already said, that what matters is not the outcome but the intention (c.1, where see n. on in dei rebus ... animum). He wishes, however, to give a Christian tone to the expression, and so brings in the ideas of caritas and of the action of the Holy Spirit. quia ... confidam is rather obscure. quia ... potest certainly explains confidam, which must be taken absolutely: prosequente confidam is a strongly rhythmical clausula, and Hilberg would have done well

to punctuate with a comma after it. Now habiturus ... non poteris makes it clear that even with the Holy Spirit guiding his course (note the pun on spiritu), J. is not certain of fulfilling his task - the implication being that God, in the person of the Holy Spirit, may have a different course in mind from that which J. and Innocentius intend (cf. in Ezech. lib. 12 pref. (CCSL 75.549 = PL 25.369-70) 'obsequar igitur voluntati tuae, et flanti spiritui sancto vela suspendam, ignorans ad quae sim littora perventurus'). But J. accepts this, and is happy to entrust himself to the Holy Spirit: 'With the Holy Spirit guiding my course, I shall be confident'. And the reason is that caritas omnia potest. This expression is vague, but is quite likely a shorthand form of 1 Cor. 13.7 'omnia suffert, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet [sc. caritas]', with the emphasis probably on 'omnia suffert'. Even if the result is not what J. would like, caritas will enable him to bear it. The sense is then: 'Because love can endure anything, I shall be quite confident to have the Holy Spirit guiding my course (no matter where I end up); I shall have a comfort in any eventuality - I shall be thought either a good steersman or at least a man of good intent'. infirmior, which in many of the MSS follows gubernator putabor, wrecks the sense; it may represent an insertion by a scribe who wanted to play down J.'s part in the operation, in comparison with that played by the Holy Spirit.

The notion of divine help, or of entrusting oneself to divine guidance, found here in spiritu ... prosequente, has good pagan antecedents right through Classical literature, where the writer implores the gods or the Muses to assist him in his work. Quintilian does so in the preface to his fourth book (inst. 4 pref. 4-5). It was quite natural for Christians to take up this topic and adapt it to their own beliefs. J. does this frequently; cf. e.g. vita Hilar. 1 (PL 23.29) 'scripturus vitam beati Hilarionis, habitatorem eius invoco spiritum sanctum; ut qui illi virtutes largitus est, mihi ad narrandas eas sermonem tribuat, ut facta dictis exaequentur'. For the τόπος in the Middle Ages see Simon, 'Untersuchungen', 1.106-8, Curtius, European Literature, pp. 228-46 (chiefly on the Muses).

Writers may also request help from the dedicatee or general reader; cf. e.g. J. in Is. lib. 2 pref. (CCSL 73.41 = PL 24.57), and frequently.

optatos portus. The image of the harbour as a safe goal in contrast to the dangers of the open sea is an obvious one to employ in sea-metaphor; cf. e.g. J. adv. Iovin. 2.35 (PL 23.333) 'verum iam coepimus terram prospectare de pelago, et post montes gurgitum, et spumosos fluctus, et navim, vel in sublime subrectam, vel in ima praecipitem, paulatim fessis et languentibus portus aperitur', epist. 3.3.1. The metaphor may

equally be used to indicate the commencement of an undertaking; cf. e.g. adv.Iovin. 1.3 (PL 23.214), epist. 123.3.1 (quoted at 2.2 tumida ... regam and 2.1 nunc mihi ... canescunt respectively).

gubernator ... substiterit. The sea-images become much less striking here. gubernator had long been used metaphorically for a director or ruler (cf. e.g. Cic. Rab. perd. 26, Quint. inst. 8.6.9), and will have lost much of its original colour. anfractus is regularly used of discourse; cf. e.g. Cic. div. 2.127 'quid opus est circumitione et anfractu?', part. 21. substiterit loses the nautical imagery completely. The consequence is that the overall effect of this c. on J.'s readers may have been one of banality.

inpolitus: often of speeches and written works; cf. e.g. Cic. Brut. 294, de orat. 2.58.

facultatem ... non poteris. The contrast is drawn more sharply by the verbal and rhythmical similarity of facultatem and voluntatem; cf. e.g. Apul. flor. 20 p. 41.9 Helm, J. epist. 58.7.2 'ingredientem pelagus amicum amicus monui malens a te facultatem meam quaeri quam voluntatem'. See further on c.1 in dei rebus ... animum and 2.1 Quid ... non audeo; also Simon, 'Untersuchungen', 1.102-3.

cc.3-4. J. now turns to the narrative of his story. At Vercellae a woman and a young man, accused by the woman's husband of adultery, are brought before the provincial governor and examined under torture. The young man confesses to the crime; but the woman refuses to perjure herself by admitting an offence of which she is innocent. The governor, revelling in the tortures, orders them to be redoubled.

The character of the heroine is clearly stated from the beginning, and set into relief against the characters of the two men. Her strength and uprightness contrast sharply with the young man's weakness and the governor's bestial ferocity. The characterisation of the governor borders on caricature; but this merely serves to deepen the contrast.

For the historical background to the events described in these and subsequent cc. see introduction.

3.1. Vercellae. For the use of a proper name at the start of a narrative passage cf. Quint. inst. 4.2.1-2 'maxime naturale est, et fieri frequentissime debet, ut praeparato per haec quae supra dicta sunt iudice res de qua pronuntiaturus est indicetur: ea est narratio. in qua sciens transcurram subtiles nimium divisiones quorundam plura eius genera facientium. non enim solam volunt esse illam negotii de quo apud iudices quaeritur expositionem, sed personae, ut: M. Lollius Palicanus, humili loco Picens, loquax magis quam facundus; loci,

ut: oppidum est in Hellesponto, Lampsacum, iudices ...'. In the Vitae monachorum J. always begins the narrative proper - i.e. the part following the preface - in some such way, and in vita Malchi it opens, as here, with a placename (vita Malchi 2 (PL 23.53)).

For the history of Vercellae see RE s.n.

radicibus Alpium. radix is commonly used of the foot of mountains; cf. e.g. Cic. Tusc. 2.52 'radicibus Caucasi'.

raro habitatore semiruta: cf. Lucan. 1.24-7 'at nunc semirutis pendent quod moenia tectis ¦ urbibus Italiae lapsisque ingentia muris ¦ saxa iacent nulloque domus custode tenentur ¦ rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat', (for rarus habitator) Stat. Theb. 4.150. The phrase here has the ring of a cliché.

oblatam ... circumdedit. The historical background to the situation is real enough; but it is also significant that both torture and adultery were topics of declamation. The Controversiae and Suasoriae of the elder Seneca, particularly the former, and the Major and Minor Declamations attributed to Quintilian, contain numerous instances of these themes; cf. e.g. (torture) Sen. contr. 2.5, 8.1, 9.6, ps. Quint. decl. min. 269, 307 Ritter, decl. mai. 7 Lehnert, (adultery) Sen. contr. 1.4, 4.7, 9.1, ps. Quint. decl. min. 244,

273 Ritter. For cases of alleged adultery cf. Sen. contr. 2.1.34-6, 2.7. In contr. 6.6 we read of a slave-girl who gave information about an adultery while under torture; the declamations we have, however, do not contain any exact parallels to the present situation, i.e. the torturing of suspected adulterers themselves, because in Roman declamation adulterers are free-born and the convention was maintained that only slaves could be tortured (in fact the torturing of free citizens is attested as early as Tiberius; cf. e.g. P. A. Brunt, 'Evidence given under Torture in the Principate', Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte 97 (1980), 259). Many of the expressions J. uses in the torture-scene will owe something to the language of declamation; cf. e.g. on 6.1 caede, ure, lacera.

mulierculam. The diminutive is not merely suggestive of the woman's pitiful condition, but taken in conjunction with adultero gives the impression, soon to be shown inaccurate, that she is contemptible. The ambiguity may be deliberate.

crimen ... inpegerat. For impingere used of charges, etc., cf. e.g. Ter. Phorm. 439 'dicam tibi inpingam grandem', ps. Quint. decl. mai. 7.11 p. 143.26-7 Lehnert 'paterni doloris auctoritas facinus <tibi> inpingit alienum', J. adv. Rufin. 3.13 (PL 23.467)

'mihi crimen impingis', 3.20 (PL 23.472), in Matth. 21. 15-16 (CCSL 77.189 = PL 26.152), epist. 57.3.1.

poenali ... circumdedit: 'consigned them to the horrors of the prison, used for punishment'. Strictly, for the woman and the young man the imprisonment and torture did not constitute a poena, but were used for examination; their poena was execution. But carceris horror might generally be called poenalis. horrore may imply both the torture and the appalling physical conditions of the prison (cf. 3.3 paedore). It is again found with carcer at Cypr. epist. 37.3 'squalorem carceris ac receptaculi paenalis horrorem', J. epist. 3.4.4 'abruptae rupes quasi quendam horroris carcerem claudunt'.

3.2. lividas ... veritatem. The description is vivid, but not necessarily overdone. The ungula was a regular instrument of torture in the third and fourth centuries; cf. e.g. Cypr. epist. 10.2, Cod. Iust. 9.18.7 (AD 358) 'si convictus ad proprium facinus detegentibus repugnaverit pernegando, sit eculeo deditus ungulisque sulcantibus latera perferat poenas proprio dignas facinore'. There are many parallels for sulcatis lateribus in particular; cf. e.g. Amm. 14.9.5, 28.1.10.

The main tortures described in this letter, besides the ungula, are the eculeus (3.3, where see n.,

and 5.1), to the effects of which J. is presumably referring at 5.2 solvuntur membra conpagibus, fire (ignis, 5.1), and the sword or dagger (fodit, 5.1; though this may again refer to the action of the ungula (cf. Prud. perist. 10.484)). caede (6.1) probably implies the use of verbera. There is plenty of evidence for the use of such tortures throughout the Empire, though it was subject to certain restrictions which varied from period to period; cf. e.g. Sen. epist. 14.5 'cogita hoc loco carcerem et cruces et eculeos et uncum et adactum per medium hominem qui per os emergeret stipitem et distracta in diversum actis curribus membra, illam tunicam alimentis ignium et inlitam et textam, et quidquid aliud praeter haec commenta saevitia est', Tac. ann. 15.44, 15.57 (an interesting parallel to the present case, where a woman, tortured in an attempt to secure a confession, refuses to give in), Amm. 28.1 (see introduction).

For parallels from declamation cf. e.g. Sen. contr. 2.5.4 'flagellis caeduntur artus, verberibus corpus abrumpitur exprimiturque <sanguis> ipsis vitalibus', 9.6.4, 10.5.6 'ignes, verbera, tormenta', ps. Quint. decl. min. 338 Ritter, decl. mai. 7.11 pp. 143.27-144.1 Lehnert 'deinde non ipse affers eculeos, non ipse disponis ignes? dicerem mehercules te velle torqueri; ego scindo vestes, tu intremiscis, ego ad flagella nudo corpus, te facit pallor exanimem, ego eculeos, ego posco flammas'. J. will have been

influenced by such passages; but it is also true that he and the declaimers had a common field of experience on which to draw.

There is much similar material in Prudentius' Peristephanon poems, written about a quarter of a century after this letter, which deal with the martyrdom of Christians. Relevant passages are cited in the nn. which follow.

conpendio mortis: 'by a swift death'. conpendium here is effect means 'acceleration' or 'hastening'; properly, 'a shortening (of life) consisting of death', where mortis is a descriptive genitive. It is a common enough expression in the Later Empire; cf. e.g. Tert. resurr. 41.6, Heges. 5.18.1, Amm. 16.12.53, J. epist. 36.2.4 'deus nolens eum conpendio mortis finire cruciatus'.

3.3. sexu fortior suo. This is the reading of L alone; Σ originally had sexu fortior suũ. Most of the MSS have sexu infirmior virtute fortior. But to follow L as Hilberg does - agreeing with Erasmus and Victorius - has much in its favour. sexu fortior suo is crisper, the sentiment is one we might expect, and the expression displays the familiar verbal arrangement of noun separated from its adjective (see general introduction, sect. 3). sexus infirmior in c.4 would

seem to support rather than to oppose this reading. The additions in the other MSS may have originated when this phrase from c.4 was brought in as a parallel, and then merged into the text, virtute being added in the interests of sense. I would stand by Hilberg's text.

cum eculeus ... cohiberent. The word eculeus appears to have been used for two different types of torture-instrument, both of which, however, had the function of stretching the victim. The language used in certain sources, e.g. imponere in eculeum, imponere eculeo (cf. Val. Max. 6.8.1, Curt. 6.10.10, Sen. epist. 78.14), seems to indicate a horizontal rack, across which the victim was stretched. Elsewhere, however, the word denotes a stake from which the victim was somehow suspended, some kind of machinery being used to stretch the limbs and dislocate the joints; cf. e.g. Prud. perist. 10.109-14, 452. The process probably resembled this:

> the Executioner is commanded to do his Duty, and begin the Torture, which is done by twisting a small Cord hard round the Prisoner's naked Arms, and hoisting him up from the Ground by an Engine to which the Cord is fastnd, and as if the Prisoner's hanging in the Air by his Arms were not sufficient Cruelty, he has several shakes

> given him by screwing his Body up higher and letting it down with a Jerk, which disjoints his Arms, and makes the Torture the greater.
>
> (J. Partridge's Almanack for 1718 (London, 1718), p. 11, describing the Inquisition)

For full discussion of the evidence see Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines, edd. C. Daremberg and E. Saglio (5 vols., Paris, 1877-1919), s.v. equuleus.

The fact that the woman had her hands tied behind her back suggests that J. was thinking not of the horizontal rack but of the stake; but at 5.1 the stipes and the eculeus seem to be different things, and toto corpore ad eculeum fortius alligato does not make much sense if the woman was suspended from the eculeus. It is difficult to reconcile the two passages. It looks as if J. was muddled; perhaps he had never seen an eculeus of either type, and simply conflated what he had read and heard of them.

oculis ... suspexit ad caelum: in attitude of prayer, as again at 5.2.

tu ... ne peccem. So too Prudentius' martyrs sometimes address Christ in prayer while under torture; cf. perist. 2.413ff., 3.136ff.

scrutator renis et cordis: cf. Ps. 7.10 (LXX) 'consummetur nequitia peccatorum; et diriges iustum et scrutans corda et renes deus' (Hebr.: 'probator cordis et renum'), Wisd. 1.6 'benignus est enim spiritus sapientiae, et non liberabit maledicum a labiis suis, quoniam renum illius testis est deus, et cordis illius scrutator est verus, et linguae eius auditor', Jer. 11.20, 17.10, 20.12. There is no direct allusion to any of these passages in particular; the phrase is merely a way of representing in Biblical terms the God who sees into men's inmost hearts. It seems wholly appropriate that the woman should use a Scriptural phrase in her prayer.

renis is a problem. renis et cordis is read by all the MSS except B, which has cordis et renum, and British Library MS Harley 3044, which has only cordis. The difficulty with renis is that the word is extremely rare in the singular, and then appears always to take the form rien; cf. e.g. Plaut. ap. Fest. pp. 342-4 Lindsay, Char. gramm. 1.28 Keil. It is the plural form which is regularly found in the Vulgate, and this will almost certainly have been true in the Old Latin too (LXX νεφροί). I would print renum et cordis with Martianay and Vallarsi; renis would be an easy slip, especially with the singular cordis following.

non ideo ... ne peccem: 'it is not to prevent my death that I wish to make the denial, but it is so as not to

sin that I am unwilling to tell a lie'.

3.4. miserrime homo: the young man, not the consularis.

cupio mori ... exuere. The wish is natural for a Christian, as the body is susceptible to sin and comes between the soul and God; cf. e.g. Rom. 7.21ff., 2 Cor. 5.6 'dum sumus in corpore peregrinamur a domino'.

Most of the MSS have infirmum hoc corpus, but the original reading of K is invisum, to which L and Q give qualified support. On grounds of sense I would stand by invisum: the phrase is then altogether more telling. Hilberg appears to detect an echo of Virg. Aen. 9.495-6, where the mother of Euryalus, seeing her son's severed head, addresses Jupiter: 'aut tu, magne pater divum, miserere, tuoque ¦ invisum hoc detrude caput sub Tartara telo' ('caput' refers to the woman herself); but it is faint, and there is insufficient reason to assume that J. was drawing on this passage.

praesto ... occiditur. tantum is the reading of all the MSS bar Q, which omits it. The natural meaning would be 'I will take only my innocence with me', but the connection with praesto ... mucronem is then uncertain. Victorius, Martianay, and Vallarsi saw the problem and emended to tamen, the sense being 'I am quite willing to face the sword of execution, but I

shall retain my innocence'; which balances neatly with the preceding sentence, i.e. 'I want to die, but not as an adulteress', saying essentially the same thing in different words. On one interpretation of tantum, however, the text will do perfectly well as it stands. tantum is sometimes found, albeit rarely, as an equivalent to modo, i.e. 'so long as I ...', feram then being a pres. subj.; cf. K.-S. 2.448. Now victurus here is likely to come from vivere rather than from vincere: the contrast between vivere and mori is an obvious one, and the meaning of the sentence is quite clear, that death is nothing to those whom new life awaits. Taking tantum in the sense of modo we may then translate: 'I offer my throat, I accept the glittering sword without fear, so long as I take my innocence with me. Whoever is killed with new life ahead does not really die'. non moritur ... occiditur explains the woman's confidence in praesto ... mucronem; but her confidence depends on her retaining her innocence, the loss of which would cost her the life to come. tantum should remain.

micantem ... mucronem. For the alliteration cf. on c.4 gustatum ... sitit.

innocentiam ... feram. For the notion of taking something with one when one dies cf. Paul. Nol. carm. 21.170-4 'et merito sanctis iste natalis dies ¦

notatur, in quo lege functi carnea ¦ mortalitatis exuuntur vinculis ¦ et in superna regna nascuntur deo ¦ secumque laetam spem resurgendi ferunt', and, in pagan literature, Stat. silv. 2.5.24-5, Suet. Aug. 28.2 'ita mihi salvam ac sospitem rem p. sistere in sua sede liceat ... ut optimi status auctor dicar et moriens ut feram mecum spem, mansura in vestigio suo fundamenta rei p. quae iecero', Flor. epit. 4.8.7 'magnique famam ducis ad inferos secum tulisset, si nihil temptasset ulterius'.

c.4. consularis ... sitit. The simile strongly points the contrast between the consularis and the spiritually-minded woman. R. Godel, 'Réminiscences de poetès profanes dans les Lettres de S. Jérôme', MH 21 (1964), 68, notes the similarity between this passage and Lucan. 1.327-31 'utque ferae tigres numquam posuere furorem, ¦ quas, nemore Hyrcano matrum dum lustra secuntur, ¦ altus caesorum pavit cruor armentorum, ¦ sic et Sullanum solito tibi lambere ferrum ¦ durat, Magne, sitis'. One might also compare Virg. Aen. 10.723-8, where Mezentius is compared with a ravening lion.

pascere is regularly used of the eyes. For its use with lumina cf. Ov. met. 14.728. The expression is found elsewhere in a like context; cf. e.g. Cic. Verr. 2.5.65 'homines maritimi Syracusis ... cum eius cruciatu atque supplicio pascere oculos animumque

exsaturare vellent, potestas aspiciendi nemini facta est', Phil. 11.8 'ac Dolabella quidem tam fuit immemor humanitatis ... ut suam insatiabilem crudelitatem exercuerit non solum in vivo, sed etiam in mortuo; atque in eius corpore lacerando atque vexando, cum animum satiare non posset, oculos paverit suos'. In the present case the image is made somewhat less banal by its association with blood (cf. sanguinem sitit below).

gustatum ... sitit. The alliteration may have seemed less artificial to J.'s readers than it does to us. The whole subject of alliteration in Latin prose is immensely complex. On the question of consciousness in alliterative writing F. R. D. Goodyear, The Annals of Tacitus: Books 1-6 (2 vols. of 4, Cambridge, 1972-81), 1.336-41, is highly sceptical. By contrast H. Marouzeau, Traité de stylistique latine (2nd edn., Paris, 1946), pp. 45-50, considers alliteration among writers of late Latin (where the feature is more pronounced) to be one of the most mannered adornments of style. Especially valuable for its collection of examples, particularly from the Later Empire and after, is M. Winterbottom, 'Aldhelm's Prose Style and its Origins', Anglo-Saxon England 6 (1977), 49, with n.3. Winterbottom's comment on the intention of an author in writing alliteratively is most illuminating: 'I think that, in prose as in poetry, the aim is often to mark

off the phrase or colon from what surrounds it, for ease of recitation and reading, rather than anything more elaborate'. For instances of the feature in the Late Empire cf. e.g. Cypr. unit. eccl. 11 'hos eosdem denuo dominus designat et denotat, dicens', Paneg. 2(Pacatus).16.4, Sulp. Sev. chron. 2.48.2. In J. cf. e.g. epist. 22.13.3 'et quam viderint tristem atque pallentem, miseram et monacham et Manichaeam vocant', 45.2.2, 107.13.3.

sitire is found both absolutely and with an acc. object in the sense 'thirst for', in which case it often bears a metaphorical meaning. It is frequently found with sanguinem or an equivalent; cf. e.g. Cic. Phil. 5.20 'sanguinem nostrum sitiebat', Plin. nat. 14.148, Sen. Thy. 103, Iust. 1.8.13 'satia te inquit sanguine, quem sitisti cuiusque insatiabilis semper fuisti'. B reads gustato ... sanguine which may be the correction of a scribe who did not know that sitire regularly took a direct object.

saevum dentibus frendens. saevum is a genuine adverbial form, equivalent to saeve or saeviter, but rare; the only instances I have noticed are Sil. 1.398, Stat. Theb. 3.589, Claud. rapt. Pros. 1.287 'saevumque fremebant' (as here, with a verb indicating sound). In the present case the majority of the MSS read s(a)evus. In a highly coloured passage, however, the apparently poetic saevum would not be out of place, and saevus

could easily represent a change by scribes unfamiliar with the rarer form. This seems to have happened in the Claudian passage, where four MSS dating from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries have (in three cases) 'seveque' or (in one case) 'secumque'. Certainly the earliest of the MSS of this letter, KL, read saevum. I would be inclined to stand by Hilberg's text.

carnifici minitatus. imitatus, read by some of Hilberg's MSS, is clearly wrong, even with carnificis, which most of these have. minitatus is unattested by the MSS. minatus should be read.

sexus infirmior. infirmus is regularly used of women, and on a number of occasions with sexus; cf. e.g. Cypr. epist. 4.2, Lact. inst. 1.11.28, and particularly ps. Quint. decl. mai. 8.7 p. 152.9 Lehnert, decl. min. 327 p. 285.23-4 Ritter 'nec de femina loquor, cuius infirmior sexus est'; also Ulp. reg. 11.1 'propter sexus infirmitatem'. Just so J. speaks of women as the 'vas infirmius' at epist. 128.3.3 (after 1 Pet. 3.7). The contrast with robur virile in the present case is an obvious one.

c.5. New tortures are brought to bear, and the woman's fortitude is further emphasised. The contrasts between her and the young man and the consularis are again very clear.

5.1. 'Succurre ... supplicia!'. Hilberg seems to assume that these words are uttered by the woman, although there is no indication by means of a word such as inquit, ait, or vox that this is so. Labourt also prints the Latin text with quotation marks, but omits them in his translation. Elsewhere in the letter J. invariably uses some word to denote utterance when he breaks into direct speech. It seems more natural to regard succurre ... supplicia as a comment of J. himself, making the situation more vivid, immediate, and tense by his personal involvement. Coming from the woman the words in any case lack conviction; they reflect neither her certainty of innocence and justification nor her fortitude and do not fit well with what she says in cc.3 and 6. hominem, too, may be more natural coming from J.'s lips than from hers. I would omit the quotation marks.

crines ... alligato. For the two kinds of eculeus, and J.'s apparent confusion over them, see on 3.3. toto ... alligato strongly implies that he here has the horizontal rack in mind, and the stipes, the purpose of which no doubt is to tug at the woman's hair, is presumably to be imagined standing at the head of the rack.

vicinus ... adponitur. There are copious references in declamation and other sources to the use of fire as an

instrument of torture. Sometimes people were burnt alive; cf. e.g. Prud. perist. 6.49ff. For other examples see on 3.2 lividas ... veritatem and 6.1 caede, ure, lacera.

utrumque ... indutiae: cf. e.g. Prud. perist. 4.121-4 'barbarus tortor latus omne carpsit, ¦ sanguis inpensus, lacerata membra, ¦ pectus abscisa patuit papilla ¦ corde sub ipso', 10.451-3 'scindunt utrumque milites teterrimi ¦ mucrone hiulco pensilis latus viri, ¦ sulcant per artus longa tractim vulnera', 14.77-8 'ferrum in papillas omne recepero ¦ pectusque ad imum vim gladii traham'.

inmota ... tormenta. Marcella showed similar insensibility to pain at the time of the sack of Rome; cf. epist. 127.13.2 'caesam fustibus flagellisque aiunt non sensisse tormenta'.

C. Schäublin, 'Textkritisches zu den Briefen des Hieronymus', MH 30 (1973), 56, objects to vetuit on the ground that the perfect interrupts a series of verbs in the present, and that vetare itself is inappropriate when the woman has no power to forbid the tortures to rage about her; he suggests patitur or perpetitur. But J.'s usage of past and present tenses is highly inconsistent in this letter (see on 7.3 librat); and vetuit conveys very well the woman's psychological state as, conscious of her innocence, she refuses to

let the tortures get the better of her.

a dolore ... separato. separato is read by all the MSS. Martianay, followed by Vallarsi, printed superato; inexplicably, for the point is that the woman's spirit is not overcome by her bodily pain. separato in moreover rhythmically superior. Translate: 'her spirit free from the pain her body feels'.

conscientiae bono: 'a clear conscience'. We might have expected simply bona conscientia (cf. Sen. nat. 4a pref. 15 and many other cases); but cf. J. epist. 119.10.1 'fruuntur bono conscientiae' and perhaps 100(tr. from Theophilus).5.3 'securitate conscientiae'. The present instance of bonum conscientiae is the earliest recorded by TLL.

5.2. iudex crudelis. Villains are often characterised as crudelis; cf. e.g. Cic. Verr. 2.1.9 'crudelissimum carnificem civium sociorumque', Sen. contr. 2.5.3 'veniunt in domum crudelissimi carnifices, in quorum vultibus tormenta erant', ps. Quint. decl. min. 305 p. 196.14 Ritter 'crudelis lanista'; also Prud. perist. 10.99f. 'dignus subire cuncta, si me consulis, ¦ quaecumque vestra iusserit crudelitas'. In the present instance the introduction of the word heightens the already strong contrast between the woman and the

judge.

quasi superatus adtollitur: 'rises from his seat as though defeated'; in amazement and horror, presumably. For this use of attollere cf. e.g. Amm. 17.12.10 'solo iussus attolli'. For torture presided over by a sedens cf. ps. Quint. decl. min. 305 p. 198.23 Ritter, decl. mai. 19.13 p. 348.25-6 Lehnert.

illa ... illa ... illa. The repetition underlines the woman's constancy in the face of the tortures and again sets her off in contrast to both the judge and the young man.

solvuntur membra conpagibus: cf. e.g. Sen. contr. 2.5.3 'inter satellitum manus vexatur atque distrahitur', Sen. epist. 14.5, Tac. ann. 15.57.2 'dissolutis membris'.

oculos ... tendit: in prayer, as at 3.3.

de communi scelere: the reading of L, against most of Hilberg's MSS, which have quasi before the de. The sense is little affected whether quasi is retained or not; its insertion merely emphasises that there was no commune scelus at all, a fact J. has already made quite clear, e.g. by innoxiae (3.2). Hilberg is probably right to omit it; it impedes the crisp flow of the

asyndetic clauses and looks very much like mechanical repetition after quasi superatus above.

confitetur ... periclitantem: cf. epist. 12.1.4 'precor, ut et diligentem te diligas et conservo sermonem conservus inpertias', and see introduction.

J. causes the woman to make her denial not merely on her own behalf but on that of the man whose confession has brought her to this position. But it is only an apparent act of love and self-sacrifice; if one denies adultery, one can hardly avoid denying it for one's alleged lover also. J. is employing a trick to build up the woman's stature.

c.6. The woman continues to hold out, to the point where further tortures would have no effect. The consularis then attempts to use an argument from probability to convince the bystanders of her guilt.

6.1. caede, ure, lacera. Expressions such as this are frequent in torture-language, particularly in declamation. They may be uttered by the villain of the piece as he gives orders to the torturer, or, as here, by the victim, as a sort of challenge to the opposition. Cf. e.g. Sen. contr. 1.7.9, 2.5.6 'torque: illa pars enim potest; subice ignes: in illa parte iam exaruit cruor; seca, verbera, oculos lancina', 2.5.7, 10.5.10 'torque, verbera, ure', ps. Quint. decl. mai.

7.12 pp. 144.28-145.2 Lehnert 'concurrite omnes liberi, omnes parentes, urite, lacerate hos ... oculos, distrahite has manus ... hoc corpus, haec membra', 16.9 p. 299.3-4 Lehnert, Prud. perist. 3.91-2 'ergo age, tortor, adure, seca, ¦ divide membra coacta luto'.

The given text is the best that can be got out of muddled MSS. Six of the MSS read c<a>eduntur latera, which is clearly wrong. caede torque latera of KQ is possible, though latera is an easy corruption of lacera, and, given the parallels above, a third imperative looks more likely. torque, which also occurs in Σ , inserted by a second hand between caede and ure, is a plausible alternative to ure (there is little reason for supposing that both should stand), but ure is better attested, and c<a>eduntur latera is most easily explained as a corruption of caede, ure, lacera.

hoc ... excutiat. Most of the MSS have discutiat (-et, in one case), but excutiat/-et is also well attested. On grounds of sense there is little to choose between them. Both excutere and discutere may - pace Lewis and Short, s.v. discutio - mean 'to examine'; cf. e.g. Quint. inst. 5.10.35 (excutere), Aug. epist. 216.5 (discutere). In this sense they are sometimes found in legal contexts. I suspect that what we have here may be a legal term; cf. Cod. Iust. 7.62.1 (AD 209) 'prius de possessione pronuntiare et ita crimen violentiae

excutere praeses provinciae debuit', the only other instance I have noticed of either verb used with crimen. For this reason, and because the clausula is rhythmically superior with excutiat/-et, I would retain excutere; excutiat is, moreover, read by KL, the two earliest MSS. The subjunctive adds an idea of purpose which strengthens the sentence slightly; I would therefore leave the text as it stands.

habebo iudicem meum. Most of the MSS have habeo, but the future seems more natural after veniet.

6.2. iam lassus ... horrebat: cf. e.g. Sen. contr. 2.5.9 'vicerat saevitiam patientia; deerat iam sanguis, supererat fides', Tert. nat. 1.18.4 'sed et tormenta mulier Attica fatigavit tyranno negans', Cypr. epist. 10.2 'steterunt torti torquentibus fortiores et pulsantes ac laniantes ungulas pulsata ac laniata membra vicerunt', and esp. Lact. inst. 5.13.11-12 'nam cum videat vulgus dilacerari homines variis tormentorum generibus et inter fatigatos carnifices invictam tenere patientiam, existimant, id quod res est, nec consensum tam multorum nec perseverantiam morientium vanam esse nec ipsam patientiam sine deo cruciatus tantos posse superare. latrones et robusti corporis viri eiusmodi lacerationes perferre non queunt, exclamant et gemitus edunt, vincuntur enim dolore, quia deest illis inspirata patientia: nostri autem, ut de viris taceam,

pueri et mulierculae tortores suos taciti vincunt et exprimere illis gemitum nec ignis potest'. The first part of this last passage is particularly interesting in the light of the fact that in the present letter the consularis feels it necessary to address the assembled crowd once it is clear that there is no point carrying on with the torture, and of the crowd's later reaction (10.1).

For the lassus tortor cf. also ps. Quint. decl. min. 338 p. 333.26-7 Ritter (reading fatigaverat with MSS), Prud. perist. 5.121ff., 11.59. For nec erat ... locus cf. e.g. Sen. contr. 1.8.3 'nullum iam tibi vulnus nisi per cicatricem inprimi potest', Sen. epist. 78.19 'plus est flamma et eculeus et lamina et vulneribus ipsis intumescentibus quod illa renovaret et altius urgueret inpressum. inter haec tamen aliquis non gemuit. parum est: non rogavit. parum est: non respondit. parum est: risit et quidem ex animo', 85.29, dial. 1.4.11.

iam ... iam is not merely anaphoric; the repetition gives a thrust to the clauses, pushing them towards inquit, i.e. 'all this was happening when the consularis said ...' (cf. 8.2). It is also possible to take each iam closely with the word immediately following so as to explain the action described in the rest of the clause: the torturer is tired and therefore sighs; his savagery is overcome, and he is then able to see the horror of what he has done.

suspirabat in gemitum. suspirare = 'sigh' is generally intransitive, but may take a direct object; cf. e.g. Claud. in Rufin. 1. 257-8 'tacitique sepultos ¦ suspirant gemitus'. suspirabat in gemitum seems a natural expression for 'sighed and (then) groaned'.

consularis. After this c. he is not mentioned again. He has served J.'s purpose in helping to set off the woman in the most favourable light possible. He is probably to be thought of not as being driven off with the executioner at 10.1, but as remaining to supervise the blows of the novus percussor and witness the woman's apparent death in c.11.

quid miramini ... confiteri. The argument from τὸ εἰκότος is rhetorically based; for references see Lausberg, 2.855, s.v. εἰκός . There is, of course, a problem about confession under torture, as Quintilian recognised: 'sicut in tormentis quoque, qui est locus frequentissimus, cum pars altera quaestionem vera fatendi necessitatem vocet, altera saepe etiam causam falsa dicendi, quod aliis patientia facile mendacium faciat, aliis infirmitas necessarium' (inst. 5.4.1). For instances of the confessio theme treated in declamation cf. Sen. contr. 8.1, ps. Quint. decl. min. 272, 314, 379, esp. 379 p. 424.15-17 Ritter 'at enim dixit parasitus. primum unus testis est; deinde parasitus. tortus dixit. eo minus credo: mentiuntur

plerumque torti'.

cc.7-8. Sentence of death is passed on both the woman and the young man, and they are dragged away to place of execution outside the city. The man is decapitated, but, miraculously, the first two blows fail to do more than graze the woman's neck, and, as the executioner prepares to strike a third blow, she with complete confidence does him a remarkable act of kindness. The third blow in turn fails, and when the executioner tries instead to run her through, the blade bends back towards him.

Reports of miracles at the scene of torture or execution are found also in martyr-acts. Many examples are given by H. Delehaye, Les Passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires (2nd edn., Bruxelles, 1966), pp. 207-13. St. Christine and St. Hermias, for instance, survive the flames of a furnace. Stones and arrows fired at St. Cosmas and St. Damian return to strike the throwers and archers. St. Pantaleon and St. Thyrsus survive the blows of a sword because, in the case of the former, the weapon turns soft like wax, and, in the case of Thyrsus, it shatters like glass: particularly good parallels to the present case.

7.1. Pari ... trahit. A similar situation is presented by Prud. perist. 11.59ff., where a group of Christians, tortured in an effort to make them abjure

the faith, refuse to give in, and from torture are taken off immediately to execution: 'ac iam lassatis iudex tortoribus ibat ¦ in furias cassa cognitione fremens - ¦ nullus enim Christi ex famulis per tanta repertus ¦ supplicia, auderet qui vitiare animam - ¦ inde furens quaesitor ait: iam, tortor, ab unco ¦ desine, si vana est quaestio, morte agito'.

totus ... densatur. For the image of whole cities pouring out for a particular purpose cf. epist. 108.29.1 'tota ad funus eius Palaestinarum urbium turba convenit', Matt. 8.34 'tota civitas exiit obviam Iesu'. Both civitas and urbs are occasionally used personally, in place of a word such as cives, and J. was well aware of the metonymy; cf. e.g. in Is. 14.31 (CCSL 73.174 = PL 24.166), 13.13 (CCSL 73.231-2 = PL 24.213) 'unde hoc quod in LXX dicitur: caelum enim furiet, μετωνυμικῶς accipiendum pro his, qui versantur in caelo, quomodo si dicamus, omnis civitas conclamavit et obviam iudici urbs universa processit'.

The ghoulish behaviour of the crowd provides another contrast with the loving woman. The sentence may of course contain a deliberate element of exaggeration, to heighten the impression of ghoulishness. Images involving the action or condition of a whole city or land, or the whole world, are - naturally enough - often exaggerated; for examples see

on epist. 60.14.1 tota hunc ... Italia.

prorsus ... putaretur: 'just as if the city were thought to be migrating', i.e. one would think that the entire city was migrating. The presence of putaretur is due to a contamination of thought; quasi migraret civitas would have been simpler and more natural.

7.2. rasurae ... aspersit: 'sprinkled the blood of a little scratch'; i.e. 'made a scratch just sufficient to draw blood' (Wright).

victam ... torquet: 'he is astonished that his hand has been overcome, the sword becoming powerless, and whirls it for a second blow'. gladio marcescente must be taken absolutely, although in sense it goes very closely with victam dexteram, virtually explaining that phrase. marcescere in its metaphorical sense is generally used of living creatures or abstractions, such as fortitudo (cf. e.g. J. adv. Pelag. 3.9 (PL 23.579)); but gladio marcescente is a good phrase in the context, and the notion is continued below at 7.3 languidus ... mucro and torpet.

The MSS favour iratus over miratus. The sentence still makes sense grammatically, and iratus can be regarded as anticipating furens (7.3). But miratus looks more likely so soon after expavit, and the position in the sentence favours a participle against

an adjective used adverbially, especially as marcescente miratus gives a strongly rhythmical clausula.

7.3. ream. Q has eam; B, after correction by a second hand, and British Library MS Addit. 33518, non ream, which certainly represents an attempt at improvement by a scribe or scribes who thought that reus/-a implied guilt. While it often refers to a guilty party, it can simply mean one under a charge, 'the accused', 'the defendant'.

lictor: the usual term for the attendant on a magistrate. In this letter the lictor is torturer and executioner (tortor, carnifex, percussor); cf. e.g. Prud. perist. 3.97-8 'rape praecipitem, ¦ lictor, et obrue suppliciis!', where the lictor has just been addressed as tortor, 10.1108-9 'elidit illic fune collum martyris ¦ lictor nefandus'. RE s.v. lictor remarks that under the Empire the function of lictors as executioners passed, in the provinces, into the hands of other officials (in Rome executions performed by lictors are unattested for any period); clearly this cannot have happened everywhere by this time, unless J. and Prudentius are using the term imprecisely.

paludamento. The paludamentum was generally worn by people of high rank, especially generals and consuls,

and it may seem inappropriate for an executioner; but it was certainly the garb of lictors (cf. the evidence collected in RE s.v. lictor). Here it is synonymous with chlamys (just below), as it may generally have been; cf. e.g. Plin. nat. 33.63 and Tac. ann. 12.56.3, who, referring to the same event, describe Agrippina as wearing (Pliny) a paludamentum and (Tacitus) a chlamys.

librat. The difficulty of establishing the true text is well illustrated here. librat is read only by KQ, the rest of the MSS having librabat. Rhythmical considerations give no help in deciding between the two, the clausula being the same in each case. Again, J. mixes up present and past tenses to such an extent in this c., even within a single sentence (cf. 7.2, where expavit and torquet appear together), that one cannnot come to a conclusion on grounds of consistency of usage (the letter as a whole does not display any obvious pattern of tense usage either). According to the principle of following the majority of the MSS, librabat should be read; the choice is otherwise entirely arbitrary.

et 'en tibi'. The majority of the MSS have etenim tibi, but etenim does not make good sense here, and is an easy corruption of et 'en'. en, with tibi following as an ethic dative, looks exactly right; the phrase, like ecce tibi (cf. epist. 107.5.2), is common (cf. L.-

H.-Sz. 2.93, TLL s.v. en).

8.1. Rogo ... securitas?: i.e. 'What is the source of this confidence? How remarkable it is!'. The answer is made quite clear by 8.2 sacramentum ... trinitatis (see below), the exempla in c.9, and c.11 stat victima Christo tantum favente munita. But of course the reason for her confidence has been obvious all along. The question is purely rhetorical.

inpendentem ... mortem. With the executioner's sword poised to strike, inpendentem is exactly the right word.

laetatur ... pallet. The executioner is presumably pale at the thought that there is something supernatural at work, giving the woman her confidence and preventing him decapitating her.

This is a nice reversal of the usual situation, already hinted at at 7.3 ferrum ream timeret adtingere.

praestabat beneficium saevienti. The contrast between the woman and the executioner is heightened by her act of kindness; the juxtaposition of beneficium and saevienti makes it still more marked.

8.2. iam igitur ... trinitatis. Text and meaning here are difficult. Most of the MSS have tertius ictus;

tertium ictum appears in three. tertius ictus sacramentum frustraverat trinitatis, however, will not do. The meaning in this context cannot be 'the third blow had made vain the sacred Trinity', i.e. succeeded in killing the woman despite her divine protection; nor does it help to take trinitatis more generally, 'the third blow had nullified the sacrament of threeness', i.e. by striking a third blow the executioner had profaned the holiness of the number three: this gives no indication of the outcome of the blow. Furthermore, et makes no sense in either case. Hilberg attempted to solve the problem by punctuating with a colon after ictus and understanding ictum as the object of frustraverat. But iam ... iam looks anaphoric (and the pluperfect frustraverat, which is otherwise odd, is then natural), suggesting that there is no room for a break in iam ... trinitatis. It is much better to follow Martianay and Vallarsi, and print tertium ictum: 'the sacred Trinity had made vain the third blow, too'. This leads easily into the second half of the anaphora, where the carnifex is exterritus and turns to a different method of execution. Hilberg's colon should be omitted, and a comma printed after trinitatis.

The conjecture of F. Capponi, 'Nota ad Hieron., Ep. 1.8', Koinonia 4 (1980), 101-14, an article known to me only through the synopsis in L'Année philologique 51 (1980), 127 - 'et tertius ictus sacramentum <non> frustraverat trinitatis' - seems quite unnecessary.

speculator: used from the Early Empire to denote guards, particularly bodyguards of the Emperor; cf. e.g. Suet. Claud. 35.1, Galba 18.1. For a speculator as executioner cf. Sen. dial. 3.18.4 'tunc centurio supplicio praepositus condere gladium speculatorem iubet'.

mucronem ... iugulum. aptare normally takes a dative; I have noticed no other instances of its use with in & acc. (TLL s.v. apto seems to be in error in citing as a parallel a passage from Celsus which does not appear in the text of that author). But mucronem aptabat in iugulum - 'put the sword point to her throat', 'made ready the sword point for (= to put to) her throat' - seems perfectly acceptable.

o omnibus ... saeculis! J. is fond, perhaps over-fond, of such interjected exclamation in this letter (cf. cc. 11 and 14), but it was firmly based in rhetoric: admirationes were a regular part of oratory, and care was taken in their delivery (cf. Rhet. Her. 3.24). See also Lausberg, 1.399 (sect. 809). J. uses the device here to underline the extraordinary nature of the situation, and, by implication, the power of faith in God.

velut ... non posse: 'as it were looking at its master in its defeat, admitted that it could not strike'. For

confiteri used of inanimate objects and abstracts cf. e.g. Apul. met. 2.2 'aurum in gemmis et in tunicis ... matronam profecto confitebatur', Paneg. 2(Pacatus).41.3.

c.9. J. now briefly steps aside from the narrative account, and adduces from the book of Daniel three parallels to the woman's situation. In each case innocence and trust in God are justified. The closest parallel is that of Susanna, who was falsely accused of adultery and finally proved innocent; her resolution, too, was firm (cf. Dan. 13.23 'melius mihi est absque opere incidere in manus vestras quam peccare in conspectu domini'). It may have been this very obvious parallel which suggested to J. the other two from the same book.

The stories of Susanna and of Daniel in the pit of lions, and the episode of the young men singing while in the furnace (cf. 9.1 hymnos edidere) occur in Greek texts for which there is no basis in the Hebrew (or Aramaic), and which, after his 'conversion' to the Hebraica veritas (c. 390), J. came to regard as uncanonical (though all remain in the Vulgate, as Dan. 3.24-90 (S. of 3 Ch.), 13 (Sus.), and 14 (Bel & Dr.); the account of Daniel in the lions' pit is also found at Dan. 6 (see below on 9.1 huc beati ... timuerunt)). His later view of these texts is clear from pref. in Dan. (PL 28.1292-3) 'apud Hebraeos nec Susannae habet

historiam [sc. liber Danielis], nec hymnum trium puerorum, nec Belis, draconisque fabulas: quas nos, quia in toto orbe dispersae sunt, veru anteposito, easque iugulante, subiecimus: ne videremur apud imperitos magnam partem voluminis detruncasse' (his subsequent attempt to explain away his objections to these passages by saying that they represent not his own opinion but the criticism of Jews (adv. Rufin. 2.33 (PL 23.454-5)) must be seen in the context of his general self-defence against Rufinus, for which see Kelly, pp. 249-54). At the time of writing this letter he will certainly have considered them within the canon. The use he makes of the passages here does not, in any case, conflict with the theory he subsequently developed about the legitimate use of uncanonical writings, for he does not employ them to corroborate Church doctrines (cf. pref. in libr. Sal. (PL 28.1242-3)). For J. and the Bible canon generally see on epist. 107.12.

exempla are a feature of rhetoric; see the evidence in Lausberg, with his index, 2.699, s.v. exemplum. There are plenty of instances in declamation, where they were sometimes over-used; cf. Sen. contr. 7.5.12-13 'gravis scholasticos morbus invasit: exempla cum didicerunt, volunt illa ad aliquod controversiae thema redigere. hoc quomodo aliquando faciendum est, cum res patitur, ita ineptissimum est luctari cum materia et longe

arcessere'. J. here uses his exempla in conjunction with the lex scholastica mentioned at Plin. epist. 2.20.9 'sufficiunt duae fabulae, an scholastica lege tertiam poscis?'; cf. also Quint. inst. 4.5.3. On J.'s debt to rhetoric in this letter generally see introduction.

9.1. Huc, huc ... huc: certainly anaphoric, and a comma after incendium would be better.

trium ... incendium: cf. Dan. 3, the story of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego, who refused to worship Nebuchadnezzar's golden image.

puerorum: frequently used of young men as well as of boys. Dan. 1.4 employs the word of the three.

frigidos flammarum globos. In extant literature the term flammarum globi first occurs at Virg. georg. 1.473, after which it is found not infrequently. Sulpicius Severus uses the phrase in alluding to this same event; cf. epist. 2.9 'Hebraeisque pueris aequandus inter flammarum globos media licet hymnum domini in fornace cantasset'. frigidos of course refers to the fact that the fire did the men no harm; a nice instance of oxymoron, on which see Lausberg, 1.398 (sect. 807).

circa ... incendium: cf. Dan. 3.94 'capillus capitis eorum non esset adustus, et sarabara eorum non fuissent inmutata'. It is uncertain whether sarabara or sarabal(l)a should be read. The MSS vary, but the weight of their evidence is for sarabara. At a later date J. considered saraballa correct; cf. in Dan. 3.21 (CCSL 75A.802 = PL 25.508) (AD 407) 'pro bracis, quas Symmachus ἀναξυρίδας interpretatus est, Aquila et Theodotio saraballa dixerunt, et non ut corrupte legitur sarabara'. At the time of writing this letter, however, when he had scant knowledge of Semitic languages (his knowledge of Hebrew and Syriac, at least, seems to go back to his stay in the desert of Chalcis; cf. Kelly, pp. 49-50), he may not have held this view, and sarabara may remain.

The word is Aramaic. It was sometimes understood to refer to a type of headgear, sometimes to other clothing; cf. Isid. orig. 19.23.2 'sarabarae sunt fluxa ac sinuosa vestimenta, de quibus legitur in Danielo: et sarabarae eorum non sunt inmutatae. et Publilius: ut quid ergo in ventre tuo Parthi sarabaras ¦ suspenderunt? apud quosdam autem sarabarae quaedam capitum tegmina nuncupantur, qualia videmus in capitibus Magorum picta'. Tert. resurr. 58.7 seems to envisage something other than headgear: 'Babylonii ignes trium fratrum nec tiaras nec sarabara ... laeserunt' (he can scarcely have imagined the men wearing both tiarae and sarabara on their heads). At

in Dan. 3.21 J. takes the word to denote a type of trousers: 'lingua autem Chaldaeorum saraballa crura hominum vocantur et tibiae, et ὁμωνύμως etiam bracae eorum, quibus crura teguntur et tibiae'. In the present context, however, its association with caesariem suggests that it was some kind of headwear that he had in mind.

huc beati ... timuerunt: cf. Dan. 6, esp. vv.16-23, noting particularly v.23 'nulla laesio inventa est in eo [sc. Daniele], quia credidit deo suo'; and also Dan. 14(Bel & Dr.).30-40. The stories are not identical - one is set in the reign of Darius in Persia, the other in the reign of Cyrus - but in each Daniel is thrown into the pit of lions, which did not harm him though they subsequently devoured his enemies. There is no indication that J. was thinking of one of these two accounts in particular. He exaggerates the picture for the sake of colour and to suggest more vividly the power of God: there is no indication in the Biblical passages that the lions were afraid, or that they wagged their tails.

For adulantibus caudis cf. vita Pauli 16 (PL 23.27), where the expression is again used of lions.

iuxta quem. The MSS are divided fairly evenly between quem and quam. With quam the meaning is: '... the story of Daniel, according to which lions with wagging

tails were afraid of their plunder'. The clause could conceivably bear the same sense with quem, which would then refer to Daniel as the author of the story, but this is much less natural. To take iuxta in any other way raises difficulties. Labourt and Wright understand it (with quem) to bear its more usual meaning of 'near', but as quem and praedam suam must both refer to Daniel the sense is then immensely strained: 'near whom wagging their tails the lions were afraid of (him) their plunder'. Again, iuxta can hardly be adverbial here; and to delete it, quem then being the object of timuerunt, with praedam suam in apposition, makes the word-order unsatisfactory and is altogether too radical. iuxta quam, 'according to which', should be read.

leonum ora timuerunt. ora is made the subject of timuerunt by a sort of synecdoche, on which see Lausberg, 1.295-8, 453-4 (sects. 572-7, 907-8). J. is thus enabled to convey better the idea of the fierceness of the lions and the sort of danger to be expected from them; ora also fits well with praedam suam.

9.2. Susanna ... servata est: cf. Dan. 13 (Sus.). For Susanna's condemnation see v.41; for the inspiration of Daniel, v.45.

nobilis ... subeat. Several of the MSS have nobis, but nobilis is certainly right. Susanna is nobilis by reason of her fides; she refuses to sin against God (Dan. 13.23). For the notion that nobilitas does not depend on family but on one's own merits cf. epist. 107.13.4 with n.

illa ... gladium est. The parallel allows J. a neat play on words; see introduction.

For haec ... gladium est cf. Sen. contr. 1.3.7 'damnata deiecta est: absoluta descendit', the opinion of Fulvus Sparsus on the case of a priestess who, convicted of unchastity and sentenced to be thrown from the Tarpeian Rock, survived the fall. The whole controversia is of some interest, as one of the issues involved in the debate whether the priestess should be thrown from the rock a second time is whether her survival was due to divine intervention.

cc.10-11. J. now returns to the narrative account. The crowd, no doubt regarding the failure of the execution as proof of God's feelings in the matter, riot, driving away the executioner. The curator damnatorum, appealing to the crowd not to let him, an innocent man, be executed in her place - the implication seems to be that the curator himself will be put to death if he fails to see his charges duly executed - succeeds in quelling the riot. A second

executioner is brought in and after three more blows the woman appears to die.

J. naturally gives the events a Christian slant. He regards the woman's apparent death as another manifestation of God's power and love. God wishes to save the innocent curator just as much as the innocent woman, and to do this creates the impression that the execution is, in the end, successful.

10.1. ergo: referring back to the events described before c.9.

omnis aetas, omnis sexus. This phrase, or omnis aetas alone, is often used in place of a simple omnes; cf. e.g. Sen. Oed. 53 'omnis aetas pariter et sexus ruit', (for the negative equivalent) Tac. ann. 16.13.2 'non sexus, non aetas periculo vacua'. It is something of a cliché; but still adds a touch of vividness.

coetu ... vidit. The circulus presumably forms around the woman, in her defence. The editio princeps, Erasmus, Victorius, Martianay, and Vallarsi all print exclamat before coeunte, with a stop before non credit. exclamat, however, does not appear in Hilberg's MSS, nor in those I have consulted, with the exception of Bodleian MSS Canon. Pat. Lat. 220 and 221, which date from the fifteenth century. On such tenuous evidence it is rightly omitted.

For the alliteration in coetu ... non credit cf. on c.4 gustatum ... sitit.

Some of the MSS have videt but the perfect tense must be right: 'each man can scarcely believe what he has seen'. The incredulity of the crowd is only to be expected after everything that has happened following the taking to execution of the woman and the young man. vidit is, moreover, defended by the clausula.

turbatur ... glomeratur. The city is presumably Vercellae, which the mob had left in order to see the execution; J.'s earlier comment that totus populus had gone to watch (7.1) looks like exaggeration, and it seems unlikely that another city should be involved.

lictorum: 'attendants of the consularis'; cf. on 7.3. I do not see any causal connection between the confusion in the city and the close mustering of the lictorum caterva. They are separate events dependent upon the riot and the driving off of the executioner.

10.2. e quibus medius: i.e. 'a man in the midst of them'.

canitiem ... turpans: cf. Virg. Aen. 12.611 'canitiem immundo perfusam pulvere turpans'. The slight misquotation may be due simply to a slip of the memory. In Virgil the words describe Latinus, just after he has

heard of the suicide of Amata and during the assault on his city by the Trojans. Clearly J. is borrowing a convenient phrase, and no more; the Virgilian context is of no relevance, except in as much as the curator damnatorum is, like Latinus, in a dangerous situation. The action of sprinkling dust on one's head is of course a sign of grief: cf. e.g. Catull. 64.221-4.

meum ... datis! Earlier editors took these clauses to be questions, and supplied quin before meum. quin, however, does not appear in any of the MSS, and meum and me are much more emphatic without it. Nevertheless, the first clause at least looks like a question - 'is it my life you are seeking, citizens?' reads better in context than 'it is my life you are seeking, citizens!' - and in that case the second clause is likely to be intended as a question too. I would punctuate with a question-mark after datis; but there is no reason to insert quin.

si misericordes ... non debeo. The MSS are divided fairly evenly between damnatum and damnatam, but damnatam is certainly right, the point of the sentence being emphasised by its juxtaposition with innocens: 'if you are merciful and clement, if you wish to spare a condemned woman, I, an innocent man, certainly ought not to suffer being put to death'.

10.3. mirum ... occidi: 'there was a remarkable change of will: although it had been an act of pietas that they had defended her before, it (now) seemed a kind of pietas to allow her to be executed'. pietas here means something like 'pity', perhaps with an idea of duty thrown in. The reaction of the people is not mere fickleness. They are genuinely torn between two conflicting courses, either of which will, it seems, involve the death of an innocent person.

The expression genus est is found especially in oxymoron, as here; cf. e.g. Sen. contr. 10.4.6 'genus est rogandi rogare non posse', Sen. clem. 1.22.1, ps. Quint. decl. min. 248 p. 18.22-3 Ritter 'inprudentis caedis damnari genus absolutionis est', J. epist. 14.2.3 'pietatis genus est in hac re esse crudelem', 38.5.1 'pietatis genus est inpium esse pro domino'. C. Morawski, 'De sermone scriptorum Latinorum aetatis quae dicitur argentea observationes', Eos 2 (1895), 5-6, collects further instances of the phrase.

c.11. o divinae ... maiestas! For the exclamation cf. on 8.2.

paululum ... mori. There is a problem here. mori cannot mean 'be dead' or, in this context, 'be on the point of dying', for the point is that the woman gave the distinct impression of being dead; it is therefore impossible to take paululum as an acc. of extent of

time. It is also doubtful whether paululum can mean 'to a small extent'. Neither 'to some extent she appeared to die', (taking paululum closely with visa est) nor 'she appeared to die a little' (taking it closely with mori) is really plausible. Labourt translates 'peu à peu mourir', but 'peu à peu' would be paulatim. Earlier editors emended to post paululum, which, although it has no support in the MSS, is at least acceptable, and I would be inclined to follow them.

c.12. Preparations for burial are made, but after nightfall the woman is restored to life.

12.1. Clerici ... erat. The conduct of funerals was in the hands of a special class of priests; cf. Aug. conf. 9.31 (on the death of Monica in AD 387): 'audito autem, quid ageretur, convenerunt multi fratres ac religiosae feminae, et de more illis, quorum officium erat, funus curantibus ego ... disputabam', and, from a later period, the pseudo-Jeromian letter on the seven grades of the clergy, ps. J. epist. 12.1 (PL 30.150) 'primus igitur in clericis fossariorum ordo est: qui in similitudinem Tobiae sancti, sepelire mortuos admonentur, ut exhibentes visibilium rerum curam, ad invisibilium festinent: et resurrectionem carnis credentes in domino, totum quod faciunt, deo se praestare, non mortuis cognoscant'.

fossam ... construentes. The precise meaning is slightly obscure; perhaps 'lining with stones the hole made by digging out the soil'.

misericordiam ... advenit. The MSS vary widely, and the text is far from clear. Hilberg's reading, misericordiam domini celatura nox advenit, gives adequate sense: 'night came on to conceal the mercy of the Lord', God's mercy being seen in the restoration of the woman to life. But the majority of the MSS have a phrase involving celeriore followed by a form of natura or mature, in place of celatura; and of these all but one read misericordia. Now as festinato in the previous clause is made emphatic by position and by the hyperbaton (festinato sol cursu), it would be no surprise if J. had repeated the idea of the day drawing to a quick end in this clause. celeratura, for which there is some MS support, would be possible (with misericordiam); but it is tempting to believe that what J. actually wrote more closely resembled Labourt's conjectured misericordia domini celer (or celerior) ac matura nox advenit. In this case God's mercy is shown in his drawing a curtain over the unpleasant proceedings of the execution by causing night to fall swiftly. 12.2 subito then has greater dramatic force: everything is dark and quiet, and suddenly ...; whereas misericordiam cel(er)atura prepares us for further action, as we wait to find out exactly how God reveals

his mercy. matura nox, moreover, is a phrase used by J. elsewhere; cf. vita Malchi 6 (PL 23.56) 'iam igitur venerat tenebrosior solito et mihi nimium matura nox'. celatura and celeratura are plausible errors deriving from celer ac matura. I am inclined to favour celer ac matura; but necessarily with reservations.

12.2. in illam ... erumpere: cf. e.g. epist. 43.3.3 'erumpamus in vocem'; for similar instances with prorumpere cf. epist. 60.1.2 with n.

dominus ... homo: Ps. 117.6 (Vulg.: (LXX) 'dominus mihi adiutor, non timebo ...', (Hebr.) 'dominus meus es; non timebo ...'); a highly appropriate quotation, drawn from a Psalm praising and expressing trust in God.

c.13. An old woman dies, and is buried in place of the heroine. The executioner, regarded by J. as a personification of the devil, returns to the scene in search of the woman, not believing that she could actually die. The clerici show him the new tomb, suggesting that she is in fact dead.

13.1. quas ... opibus. The early Church to some extent certainly fulfilled the role of a charitable institution. Eusebius indicates that the Church at Rome in the third century supported 1500 widows, sick,

and poor (hist. eccl. 6.43). For the fourth century see J. Gaudemet, L'Église dans l'Empire Romain (IVe - Ve siècles) (Histoire du droit et des institutions de l'Église en Occident, ed G. le Bras, vol. 3; Paris, 1958), pp. 694-8. The initiative in providing poor relief seems generally to have been with private individuals and with each bishop in his city. Ambrose's treatise De officiis ministrorum presents his view of the duty of the clergy towards the poor. There is plenty of evidence in J. for support by the Church of widows particularly; cf. e.g. epist. 52.5.5 'multas anus nutrit ecclesia, quae et officium [helping a clericus in sickness] praebeant et beneficium accipiant ministrando', (by implication) 79.7.3, 123.5.8 (following the instructions of Paul at 1 Tim. 5). The letter of Ambrose to the Church of Vercellae includes a general exhortation to Christian actions, and, although there are no specific instructions about the giving of alms, the Church is urged to provide hospitality (epist. 63.105).

debitum ... reddidit. The woman's soul was debitum caelo in the sense that it was from God that she had received it in the first place and the debt had to be repaid; there is probably also the idea that her time on earth was up. For the expression cf. epist. 77.11.2 'debitam Christo reddiderat animam', vita Pauli 14 (PL 23.26-7) 'timebat ... ne ... Christo debitum spiritum

redderet'.

quasi ... operitur: 'with the order of events running as if by design, her body is buried in the tomb as a substitute'. quasi de industria refers particularly to the timely death of the old woman. currere of the order of events is a natural enough usage, esp. as it is used of words such as historia (cf. e.g. Quint. inst. 9.4.18).

in lictore zabulus occurrit. It seems quite natural that J. should regard the executioner as a personification of the devil, as the executioner is set against an innocent, faithful woman who has divine protection. Logically the executioner should be only the instrument of the law, but J. has no need or wish to employ such logic here.

13.2. ingeritur: 'thrust before his eyes'.

erue ... perpeti. It is scarcely conceivable that the words of the clerici are intended as a serious statement, encouraging the executioner to dig up the body; rather, they are spoken with biting sarcasm, apparent particularly in si hoc parum est (i.e. 'if even to attack the tomb is not enough for you').

Whether scilicet, which might be thought to contribute to the sarcastic tone, can stand, is

doubtful. It looks distinctly odd with an imperative; the only possible interpretation is 'by all means', a usage which is rarely attested. si placet is a plausible correction; but si licet - 'dig up the bones, if it is permissible for you (i.e. if you have the authority)' - which is read by KΣ and three MSS in the British Library, is closer in form to scilicet and should be read.

novum sepulchro bellum. The bellum is novum from the point of view of the executioner/devil, not from that of the tomb; to assault the tomb would amount to a new attack on the woman. novum may also have connotations of strangeness.

c.14. The executioner departs. The woman is cared for secretly, and then sent in disguise to the country. She is still pursued by the law.

clam ... transmittitur. Those who harboured accused or condemned persons were severely dealt with under a law of Valentinian's of 374 - 'eos, qui secum alieni criminis reos occulendo sociarunt, par atque ipsos reos poena expectet' (Cod. Theod. 9.29.1) - and it was doubtless dangerous to do so at the time of these events too. The people who looked after the woman must have been strongly convinced of her innocence.

domi: considered by Labourt to be 'la maison presbytérale, adjacente à l'église'.

focilatur. refocil(l)atur occurs in almost all the MSS. The words are essentially interchangeable, and J. uses them both elsewhere; cf. e.g. epist. 32.2 'focilari', vita Malchi 10 (PL 23.60) 'refocillati'. The correct reading here may be focillatur with a double l, giving the clausula -⏑--⏑.

ad secretiorem ... veste mutata. For other cases of the use of disguise recorded in Latin literature cf. e.g. ps. Frontin. strat. 4.7.33 'Voccaei, cum a Sempronio Graccho conlatis signis urgerentur, universas copias cinxere plaustris, quae inpleverant fortissimis viris muliebri veste tectis: Sempronium, tamquam adversus feminas audentius ad obsidendos hostis consurgentem, hi qui in plaustris erant adgressi fugaverunt'; and, more interesting in connection with the present passage, Gild. Brit. 11, on St. Alban: 'caritatis gratia confessorem persecutoribus insectatum et iam iamque comprehendendum ... domo primum ac mutatis dein mutuo vestibus occuluit et se discrimini in fratris supra dicti vestimentis libenter persequendum dedit'.

obducitur. obducere, like inducere, is regularly used in describing the healing of a wound and the formation

of a scar, in both a literal and a metaphorical sense; cf. e.g. Curt. 7.9.11 'obducta cicatrice cervicis', J. in Ier. 30.12ff. (CCSL 74.294 = PL 24.869), in Ezech. lib. 1 pref. (CCSL 75.3 = PL 25.16).

o vere ... malitia! For the exclamation cf. on 8.2.

The expression summum ius summa malitia was proverbial as early as the time of Terence (cf. Ter. Haut. 795-6 'verum illuc, Chreme, ¦ dicunt: ius summum saepe summast malitia') and is found frequently thereafter, in one form or another. Otto numbers it among his Sprichwörter (s.v. ius 1). For other instances cf. Colum. 1.7.2, Cic. off. 1.33 'ex quo illud summum ius summa iniuria factum est iam tritum sermone proverbium', Caecin. 65, and, for the Middle Ages, John of Salisbury Polycrat. 3.11. The phrase means 'strict application of the law is supreme malice (or injustice)'; i.e., in the present case, how unjust it is, that, when the woman's innocence has been clearly demonstrated by the miraculous events, the demands of the law still have to be followed.

For the history of the proverb see J. Stroux, Summum ius summa iniuria (Leipzig, 1926). Stroux concentrates in particular on its Ciceronian context, where it reflects the conflict which developed in the last century of the Republic between strict law and equity, between legal interpretation based on voluntas and that based on verba.

adhuc ... leges. The leges are the laws on adultery; see introduction. The implication of the statement is that at some time the authorities realised that the woman had in fact avoided death. It is odd that J. does not make this clearer.

saeviunt leges sounds Tacitean, though Tacitus nowhere uses saevire of a lex. I have not noticed parallels in other authors.

c.15. The story is concluded with Evagrius, who must have heard of the woman's plight, interceding with the Emperor and securing the woman's acquittal. J. devotes most of the c. to praise of Evagrius, with whom he was staying at this time (see introduction): a pleasant compliment.

15.1. Evagrii. For Evagrius of Antioch, priest and later Bishop of that see, see PLRE 1.285-6 s.n. Evagrius 6, RE s.n. Euagrius 4, and introduction; also on 15.2 quis ... superatis?. J. refers to him a number of times in his writings and devotes a section to him in vir. ill. (c.125 (PL 23.711-13)).

cuius ... non possim. J. cannot do justice to Evagrius' good works and yet is quite unable to pass over them altogether. For the expression of incompetence cf. cc.1-2 and epist. 60.1.1 with nn. Here, however, it has the distinct purpose of

contributing to eulogy: the object of praise is made more distinguished by the writer's avowed inability to tell fittingly of his praiseworthy qualities; cf. epist. 23.2.2 (quoted below at 15.2), 108.1.1 'si cuncta mei corporis membra verterentur in linguas et omnes artus humana voce resonarent, nihil dignum sanctae ac venerabilis Paulae virtutibus dicerem', Greg. Naz. orat. 43.1. This connection between praise and self-depreciation has a basis in rhetoric; cf. e.g. Rhet. Her. 3.11 'ab eius persona, de quo loquemur, si laudabimus: vereri nos ut illius facta verbis consequi possimus'.

si penitus ... non possim. Emotion causes the voice to break forth of its own accord, just as at epist. 60.2.2 J.'s tears flow despite his resistance.

15.2. quis ... superatis?: 'for who would be able in a worthy tone of celebration to proclaim that by this man's vigilance Auxentius, the usurper of Milan, was virtually buried before he was dead, and the Bishop of Rome, when he was all but ensnared in the nets of faction, both defeated his opponents and, when he had overcome them, did them no harm?'. huius excubiis must be taken with both sets of information. With incubantem we might have expected the dative, but there is no problem in taking it absolutely with Mediolani as a locative (Mediolani, not Mediolanii, is the true

locative form, and should stand here). incubare is quite often used of dictatorial figures in later Latin; cf. e.g. Lact. inst. 7.19.1 'capto mundo cum magnis latronum exercitibus incubabit [sc. tyrannus]', and esp. Paul. Med. vita Ambr.6 'Auxentio ... qui Dionysio beatae memoriae confessore ad exsilium destinato, incubabat ecclesiam'.

The two issues mentioned here by J. are important in the religious and political history of the 360s and 370s. Auxentius was Bishop of Milan from 355, when appointed to the see by Constantius II, until his death in 374 (see introduction). He was an Arian, and succeeded in holding down the see of Milan for many years despite condemnation for heresy by councils at Ariminum (359), Paris (360), and Rome (?372; see introduction), and attacks by orthodox Christians such as Hilary of Poitiers, Athanasius of Alexandria, and Philaster of Brescia. In 364 Hilary, accompanied by Eusebius of Vercellae, went to Milan and approached Valentinian on the matter of Auxentius' heresy; his tract Contra Auxentium, in which he relates to other orthodox bishops details of this visit, sheds much light on how Auxentius was able to maintain himself in the city. We know nothing more about Evagrius' attempts to put down Auxentius; but he was certainly a friend of Eusebius, who, on his return to Italy from the East in 362 brought Evagrius with him and ordained him priest (cf. Kelly, p. 33), and it is clear that he

belonged to the ultra-Nicene wing of the Church. For a good brief account of the period of Auxentius' episcopate at Milan see Homes Dudden, Ambrose, 1.64 ff.

The matter of the factionis laqueis is rather more complicated. The Romanum episcopum is Damasus, elected to the see of Rome in 366 on exactly the same day as Ursinus was consecrated bishop by a separate group of priests and deacons. There followed a long period of violent troubles and intrigue, with various attempts to embarrass Damasus, who was generally more favoured by the civil authorities than was his rival; Ursinus indeed suffered banishment on more than one occasion. Eventually the aspersions cast on Damasus by his opponents in attempts to unseat him were wiped out by a council called in 378 to rehabilitate him morally. Brief accounts of the dispute may be found in e.g. A. Alföldi, A Conflict of Ideas in the Late Roman Empire (Engl. tr., Oxford, 1952), pp. 80-3, and A. Piganiol, L'Empire chrétien (2nd edn., Paris, 1972), pp. 212-4; for the part played by the Government of Valentinian I see R.S.O. Tomlin, 'The Emperor Valentinian I' (unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis, Bodleian MS D. Phil. c. 1154), pp. 421-8. The events of 366 are discussed in some detail by A. Lippold, 'Ursinus und Damasus', Historia 14 (1965), 105-28.

Although Ursinus, like Damasus, was an orthodox Christian, it seems likely that Damasus had strong backing within the Church. His connection with

Evagrius is again mentioned by J. at epist. 15.5.1, and it is probable that the whole of the strongly anti-Arian party stood on the same side. In 371 Ursinus returned from banishment in Gaul to Milan, from where he attempted by indirect means to overthrow Damasus. His connection with the Arians is made explicit by Ambrose: 'qui [sc. Ursinus] plerumque ... cum Arianis copulatus atque coniunctus erat eo tempore, quo turbare Mediolanensem ecclesiam coetu detestabili moliebatur cum Valente: nunc ante synagogae fores, nunc in Arianorum domibus miscens occulta concilia, et suos eis iungens; et quoniam ipse aperte in eorum congregationes prodire non poterat, instruens et informans quemadmodum pax ecclesiae turbaretur: quorum furore respirabat, quod eorum posset fautores et socios emereri' (epist. 11.3). J. too alludes to the association; cf. epist. 15.4.3. The pro-Damasus factio may well have consisted of essentially the same group of people as opposed Auxentius. With them J.'s own orthodox sympathies naturally lay.

Further details and sources concerning the main figures in these issues may be found under the appropriate names in PLRE 1, RE, Dict. Christ. Biog., and O. Seeck, Die Briefe des Libanius (Texte und Untersuchungen 30.1-2; Leipzig, 1906).

quis ... praeconio: cf. epist. 23.2.2 'conversationem Leae nostrae quis possit dignus elevare praeconio'.

15.3. Verum ... relinquo: Virg. georg. 4.147-8, where Virgil recalls himself to his theme after the digression about the Corycian gardener. J. here recognises that this letter is not the place to go into details about the activities of Evagrius, and returns to his subject; in a sense the declaration Verum ... relinquo is more appropriate here than in Virgil's context, for J. has digressed rather less than Virgil when he employs the vv. For the putting of a stop to a digression cf. epist. 60.16.5, 107.3.1, where see n.

This quotation warns us against being too trusting of the MSS, some of which display not merely verbal errors but great insensitivity to metre. K, with in quibus for iniquis and praeterea for praetereo, seems particularly bad. Ds have exclusis for exclusus, though it will not scan. All Hilberg's MSS omit the me before memoranda (it is, however, present in British Library MSS Harley 3044, Royal 6 D. I and Royal 6 D. II). The impression one gets is of slavish copyists who pay little attention to the sense and rhythm of what they are writing.

imperatorem: Valentinian I. The Emperor's powers were absolute; cf. Jones, LRE, 1.321. The clergy did sometimes solicit the Emperor to intervene in difficult situations. Theodoret hist. eccl. 4.5-6 records how a number of bishops tried to persuade Valentinian to step in and play a part in appointing a successor to

Auxentius as Bishop of Milan at a time when the lack of a strong candidate was causing civil disturbances.

industria: 'energetically'.

precibus fatigat. Nearly all the MSS have flagitat, but fatigat improves the sense and gives a metrically superior rhythm (double trochee).

merito lenit: 'softens him by his kindness', or '... by the services he has done him'; not, as Wright has it, 'secures his sympathy by the merits of the case'. A meritum is frequently a kindness or service which deserves recompense; the recompense in this case is the clearing of the woman's name.

promeretur ... libertati. Finally, after all her trials and difficulties, the woman in her innocence and faith is vindicated.

For the repetition in redditam ... redderet cf. e.g. 5.2, 9.2, 10.3, and see introduction.

LETTER 60

LETTER 60

Introduction

The letter may be dated securely to 396. It postdates the death of Fl. Rufinus (cf. 16.1), which occurred on 27 November 395 (cf. Socr. hist. eccl. 6.1); and belongs to the year following the invasion of the eastern provinces by the Huns (cf. 16.4 anno praeterito), which took place after the death of Theodosius on 17 January 395 (for the date see O. Seeck, Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste für die Jahre 311 bis 475 n. Chr. (Stuttgart, 1919), p. 384), and while Rufinus was still alive (cf. e.g. Claud. in Rufin. 2.1-35, Socr. loc. cit.).

As for the time of year, the summer has generally been accepted, on the strength of epist. 77.1.1 'quartae aestatis circulus volvitur, ex quo ad Heliodorum episcopum Nepotiani scribens epitaphium, quidquid habere virium potui, in illo tunc dolore consumpsi'. But T. D. Barnes, Tertullian: a Historical and Literary Study (Oxford, 1971), pp. 235-6, suggests that spring - which might easily be subsumed under aestas - may be more likely. In the preface to his Commentary on Jonah J. indicates that he had written 'ad Nepotianum, vel de Nepotiano duos libros', i.e. epist. 52 and 60, and his commentaries on the prophets Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, and Haggai, within

the previous three years, or thereabouts: 'triennium circiter fluxit, postquam quinque prophetas interpretatus sum ...' (in Ion. pref. (CCSL 76.377 = PL 25.1117)). These commentaries had in fact been composed by the time J. wrote the De viris illustribus in the fourteenth year of Theodosius' reign, i.e. the year ending 19 January 393 (cf. vir. ill. 135 (PL 23.717-9); for the date see O. Seeck, Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt (3rd edn., 5 vols., Berlin, 1910-13), 5.125, 479). To reconcile these two passages, therefore, the further the date of the letter can be pushed back towards the beginning of the year, the better: 'triennium circiter' ought at least to be closer to a three-year period than to a four-year one. On the other hand, time must be allowed for the banishments of Abundantius and Timasius, the responsibility for which rested with Eutropius, whose rise to high power came after Rufinus' death (see 16.1 with nn.), and for J. to have heard about them. Spring 396 looks about right.

One further point requires comment. At 16.1, when J. proposes to add to his list of ill-fated emperors the names of men of private station who have also experienced personal disaster, he says that he will go back no more than two years to find them. But the earliest of his examples is Rufinus, who can have died only six months or so previously. Why then biennium? J. can hardly have consciously antedated such recent

events by a year or more. If biennium does not simply reflect vagueness or carelessness, we can only presume that he had in mind other figures too, men whose exitus went back further than those of Rufinus, Abundantius, and Timasius, but then chose not to mention them; ut ceteros praetermittam may well be a clue pointing in the same direction. There is of course no question of this curiosity affecting our view of the dating of the letter.

J.'s friendship with Heliodorus, to whom the letter is addressed, probably went back to student days. When J. left Aquileia for the East in 372, Heliodorus went on his own pilgrimage to Jerusalem, and later met up with his friend at Antioch. In 374 or 375 J. tried to persuade Heliodorus to accompany him to a hermit life in the Syrian desert, but he chose instead to return to Italy to look after his sister and nephew (see 9.1); nor did he respond positively when J. subsequently wrote to him from the desert, urging him to join him there (epist. 14). At some time before 381 Heliodorus became bishop of his native town Altinum. He was a great supporter of J.'s literary projects, and regularly provided him with money to pay for copyists. For further details, and sources, see Kelly, passim.

The letter is a consolatory epistle on the death of Heliodorus' nephew Nepotianus, for whom in 394 J. had written a manual (epist. 52) on how a priest should

live. Everything we know about him is derived from these two pieces.

After expressing his inadequacy to the task he has undertaken, and his own grief at Nepotianus' death (c.1), J. outlines the dilemma in which he finds himself: as a Christian, Nepotianus will have gone to heaven, and should not, therefore, be mourned; but he, J., finds it quite impossible not to grieve (2.1-2). Shelving the problem for the moment, he proceeds to tell of the destruction of death and the opening of heaven to believers by Christ at his resurrection (2.2-3.4), adding further heartening, though exaggerated and scarcely relevant, comments to the effect that Christianity has now spread throughout the entire world (c.4). The thought that Nepotianus is now with God is of course the ultimate consolation to Heliodorus; but there is much more that J. wishes to say, and c.5 marks a fresh start. Indicating that he is conscious of standing in a tradition of consolatory literature which reaches far back, J. gives encouragement to himself and Heliodorus by citing examples, derived almost certainly from Cicero's Consolatio, of men from the annals of Greek and Roman history who displayed great fortitude in time of bereavement (c.5). Turning then to Biblical material, he shows again that, in the wake of Christ's redeeming work, to grieve for Christians who have died is quite inappropriate. He will not, however, have recourse to all the relevant Scriptural passages in

consoling Heliodorus: this method he employed twelve years before when writing to Paula on the death of Blesilla (epist. 39), and he now wishes to tread a different path (c.6).

At the beginning of c.7 J. returns to the problem posed but not answered in c.2. How is it possible to reconcile the fact that he cannot help grieving for Nepotianus with his firmly-held Christian conviction that Nepotianus is now with Christ? The solution presented is an obvious one: he and Heliodorus are grieving not for Nepotianus but for themselves, who lack his company and are conscious that they do not share with him in the joys of heaven. Such grief, when it springs from pietas, is quite legitimate; Jesus himself wept for Lazarus. However, restraint should be exercised, and J. urges Heliodorus to dry his tears and listen for a while to the praises of his nephew; he should not grieve that he has lost him, rather be glad that he has had him at all.

The eulogistic section runs from c.8 to c.12. J. refuses to take into account, as the rhetoricians prescribed, Nepotianus' ancestry or any of his external advantages, for nothing is relevant but the merit of the individual soul; he will merely describe his life after his rebirth by baptism (c.8). This account is slightly delayed, for in c.9 J. employs the technique of praeteritio to mention Heliodorus' refusal to accompany him to the desert many years before, and the

beginnings of Nepotianus' life as a Christian, before he was baptised and became fully committed. The laudes then begin in earnest.

Though he hankered after the monastic life, Nepotianus refused to abandon his uncle Heliodorus, who was an ideal model of virtue, and was ordained presbyter. He displayed great qualities: he was - among other things - humble, willing and ready to help the needy, sexually continent, industrious, prayerful; he fasted, but in moderation; he was learned in the Scriptures and in patristic writings (c.10). He persistently requested J. to write something specifically for him, and when J. eventually complied and sent him a treatise on the clerical life (epist. 52) he held it in the highest regard. He loved the written word generally, in contrast to many monachi of the time, who desired only wealth (c.11). In lesser matters, too, he displayed the same character, taking trouble over the cleaning and adornment of his church, and neglecting none of his duties there. He even decorated, with leaves and flowers, other churches (c. 12).

J. next describes, in an emotional, lamentative style, the scene at Nepotianus' deathbed; even as he died, the young man had J. in his thoughts (c.13). The fourteenth chapter is difficult. It rambles through a range of consolatory ideas which are not, however, presented in a directly consolatory way, until

eventually (14.5-6) Heliodorus is again urged to control his grief. As a bishop he stands open to the public gaze and must be careful not to give the impression that he now despairs of God; he will, after all, see Nepotianus again one day.

Cc.15-16 present an account of the disasters which have in recent years afflicted the Roman world: Emperors and men of private rank alike have met unhappy ends, and the Empire has suffered a heavy battering at the hands of barbarian peoples. The purpose of this excursus is to show Heliodorus how fortunate Nepotianus has been in dying at such a time; his death should be regarded as nothing other than a happy escape. In the following c. J. attributes the havoc wrought by the barbarians to the anger of God engendered by Roman sin, and issues a call to repentance, which will see the situation change; while he does this, Nepotianus is briefly forgotten. Having thus gone beyond his consolatory purpose - true not only of c.17 but to some extent also of cc.15-16, which rather bear the stamp of a lamentation over the world's ills - J. proceeds to take a broader view of the world. It lies in a state of general decay, and human life grinds on towards inevitable death (c.18). The lives of Heliodorus and himself are almost imperceptibly ticking away. But the love of Christ prevents them from being utterly without purpose; it binds J. and Heliodorus firmly to each other and to Nepotianus, in spite of death. Finally

Heliodorus is encouraged to be strong, and to hold Nepotianus fast in his thoughts (c.19). This ending of hope and triumph stands in striking contrast to the stunned grief of c.1.

In writing this letter of consolation J. was standing in a literary tradition which stretched far back, as he was well aware (cf. 5.2 with nn.). To offer consolation to someone experiencing grief is an act naturally human, but in Classical Antiquity philosophical and rhetorical influences helped to raise it to the level of an art form. These influences are traced by R. Kassel, Untersuchungen zur griechischen und römischen Konsolationsliteratur (Zetemata 18; München, 1958), a work also valuable for its collection of consolatory material, presented as notes on the Consolatio ad Apollonium of Ps.-Plutarch. Kassel distinguishes, as far as possible, the different approaches of the various philosophical schools. This is a subject of some interest, but of little importance in considering the consolatory work of J. Long before his time writers of consolation frequently practised a broad eclecticism in the choice of material, content to apply whatever remedies seemed best without adherence to the doctrines of any particular sect; cf. esp. Cic. Tusc. 3.76.

The literary consolations of Antiquity are broadly divisible into three categories, though the edges are not always totally distinct: letters, treatises, and

funeral orations, in which consolation often played a part, sometimes an important one (cf. e.g. Ambr. obit. Valent. 40. 'ad vestram, sanctae filiae, consolationem revertar', exc. Sat. 1.14 'consolandi hodie, non tractandi partes recepi', 2.3 'proposuimus, fratres carissimi, solari nos'; and the rules of Menander Rhetor, for which see below). In the commentary the terms consolationes and 'consolations' are reserved for works which belong essentially to one of these groups; 'consolation', 'consolatory literature', and similar expressions may have a wider reference, covering, in addition, relevant passages in works of a fundamentally different nature. For certain themes of consolationes are regularly shared by other genres - sepulchral epigrams and epicedia such as Catull. 101, Prop. 3.7, and Hor. carm. 1.24, dealing as they do with the subject of death, the basis of most, though not all, consolationes, come readily to mind - and may, naturally enough, occur almost anywhere.

The history of Greco-Roman consolation-literature was traced almost a century ago by C. Buresch, 'Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque scriptarum historia critica', Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie 9 (1886), 1-170, a work still worthy of consultation. The first figure of major importance in the tradition was Crantor of Soli (c. 325 - c. 275 BC), whose Περὶ πένθους, a treatise of which only fragments remain, addressed to a certain Hippocles upon the death

of his children, exercised considerable influence upon later writers. J. claims to have read it (5.2), but is more likely to have got at it only through Cicero's Consolatio, which used it as a model (see nn. ad loc.).

It appears to have been this work of Cicero's, written to console himself on the death of his daughter Tullia in 45 BC, which above all transmitted to the Latin world the consolatory literature of the Greeks. It is now lost; but much of its substance is preserved in the first and third books of the Tusculan Disputations, which deal with the problems of death and the alleviation of grief, and in which reference is made several times to the earlier work (Tusc. 1.65, 76, 83; 3.70, 76; also 4.63). Buresch, 'Cons. hist. crit.', pp. 95-9, outlines the probable points of contact between the two.

A few examples of the consolatory letter survive in the Ciceronian corpus. The best, perhaps the most famous of all the consolationes of the ancient world, is the masterpiece of Servius Sulpicius Rufus, sent to Cicero on Tullia's death (Cic. ad fam. 4.5). Of Cicero's own compositions the letter to Titius (ad fam. 5.16) is probably the most noteworthy.

The other major writer of Latin consolationes in this period is the younger Seneca. One thinks particularly of the Dialogues addressed to Marcia, Polybius, and Helvia (dial. 6, 11, 12), the first two of which offer consolation on the death of a close

relative, while in the third Seneca seeks to console his mother about his exile. It is precisely in pieces such as these, which are directed to a particular and personal situation but read more like essays than letters, that the distinction between letters and treatises becomes hard to define. Among the letters to Lucilius, epist. 63 and 99 are good specimens of the genre.

Some consolationes were written in verse; see especially Ov. Pont. 4.11, Stat. silv. 5.1, and the pseudo-Ovidian Consolatio ad Liviam. Among later and lesser pagan writers may be mentioned Fronto, Apollonius of Tyana, the Emperor Julian, and Libanius; the Plutarchan corpus contains three pieces, the De exilio and the touching Consolatio ad uxorem by the real Plutarch, and the unauthentic Consolatio ad Apollonium, 'a dreary congeries of all possible topics' (R. G. M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1 (Oxford, 1970), p. 280), but nevertheless important as a source for the work of Crantor.

Christian writers naturally approached the task of consolation from a rather different angle. There was a wealth of Biblical matter to be utilised, and the belief that fellow-Christians who had died would be resurrected to a new life in heaven must have been a comfort to the bereaved far beyond any which the pagan tradition could provide. But the τοποι which had been

grounded in the philosophy of the pagans were not abandoned. Some Christian consolationes were, it is true, based very largely on the Scriptures and on Christian doctrine generally (so Augustine's in particular), but many used in addition materials which had long been available to non-Christians. It was natural for a man like J., who had been steeped in Classical literature, to do so, without any sense of awkwardness. Many of the stock τόποι, after all, did not remotely conflict with Christian beliefs; the notion of death as an escape from ills, or the idea that we should not grieve the loss of loved ones, rather be grateful for having once had them, fit equally well into pagan and Christian consolations.

The fundamental work on the Christian consolation in Latin is C. Favez, La Consolation latine chrétienne (Paris, 1937), which is supplemented by the altogether slighter study of M. M. Beyenka, Consolation in Saint Augustine (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies 83; Washington, 1950). On the Greek side R. C. Gregg, Consolation Philosophy: Greek and Christian Paideia in Basil and the two Gregories (Patristic Monograph Series 3; Cambridge, Mass., 1975) is helpful. The debt of many of the Christian consolers to their pagan antecedents is made quite apparent in these works.

One important consolation survives from the third century: Cyprian's treatise De mortalitate, originally

perhaps a sermon (cf. Favez, Consolation, p. 18), which offers comfort to the faithful inhabitants of Carthage who had lost relatives and friends at a time of plague and persecution, but is directed chiefly at strengthening their faith in these difficult circumstances. Much more remains from the fourth and early fifth centuries. Of the Greeks Basil is the main letter-writer; the best examples of his work are probably epist. 5, 6, 301, and 302. Gregory of Nazianzus contributes a few, as well as some funeral orations, e.g. orat. 7, on his brother Caesarius, and orat. 18, on his father. Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, and (a little later) Theodoret of Cyrus may also be mentioned.

In the West the genre is represented by, among others, Paulinus of Nola, who provides a consolatory letter in verse (carm. 31), and another (epist. 13), in prose, addressed to Pammachius on the death of his wife Paulina (J. himself wrote to the same man on the same occasion (epist. 66)); Augustine (epist. 92, 259, 263, and serm. 172 and 173); and Sulpicius Severus (epist. 2). The most important Christian consolatores who write in Latin, however, are Ambrose and J. himself. (For the sake of keeping the commentary within bounds I have ignored the Middle Ages, for which see the massive work of P. von Moos, Consolatio: Studien zur mittellateinischen Trostliteratur über den Tod und zum Problem der christlichen Trauer (4 vols., München,

1971-2); Moos conveniently assembles testimonia from Classical and patristic as well as medieval consolations. The most famous of the consolations of the Middle Ages, the De consolatione philosophiae of Boethius, is not a typical representative of the tradition, and has no strictly Christian content.) Ambrose's contribution lies chiefly in the field of the funeral oration - the two speeches on the death of his brother Satyrus, and those on the deaths of the Emperors Valentinian II and Theodosius are works of great interest, which provide much valuable material. Two letters are also extant, epist. 15 and 39, and the treatise De bono mortis. But it is among the works of J. that the Christian consolatory epistle is best represented, considering Greek authors as well as Latin.

Apart from epist. 60, there are extant nine letters of J. which may broadly be considered consolatory: epist. 23, 39, 66, 75, 77, 79, 108, 118, and 127. In length as in character they vary widely. epist. 23 covers about three pages in Hilberg's edition; epist. 108, forty-five. In the latter the strictly consolatory element is very slight. Its avowed purpose is to console Eustochium on Paula's death (108.2.2), but J.'s main concern is to celebrate the praises of her distinguished mother; the result is a memoir, or an obituary, with considerable biographical content, rather than anything else.

epist. 127 performs, in fewer words, the same function for Marcella, and here a consolatory aim is still less apparent. The eulogistic element also looms large in epist. 77, but before J. can turn to the laudes of Fabiola he has to make excuses for her act of divorcing her first husband and remarrying, and emphasise that she herself was penitent. In epist. 39 he expends considerable energy in attacking the excesses of grief which Paula has displayed upon Blesilla's death; this letter offers rebuke no less than consolation. epist. 66 is remarkable for being devoted largely to praise not of the deceased but of the bereaved (a curious fact plausibly explained by Kelly, p. 215). epist. 118 is less concerned to comfort Julian for the loss of his wife and two daughters than to encourage him to adopt a new life of poverty. These few points give some indication of the flexibility of the genre and of J.'s approach; he employs no stereotype, but writes each time in a manner suggested by the nature of the circumstances and of the persons involved. All the letters are discussed briefly by Favez, Consolation, pp. 23-32.

It may be that in writing to his great friend Heliodorus on the death of his nephew J. felt that he ought to call upon all his considerable literary powers. For epist. 60 must rank high among his consolations. Its most obvious characteristic is its length. Covering twenty-seven pages in Hilberg, in

this respect it is second only to epist. 108, a piece very different in nature, and substantially longer than most of the consolatory letters of other authors. Those of, for instance, Cicero, Fronto, Augustine, and Basil are on a very much smaller scale, and the contributions of Libanius and Theodoret in particular tend to be no more than notes, sometimes only a few lines long. Only the Dialogues of Seneca, if we may regard them as letters, can really compare.

Nor can one fail to be struck by the scope of the piece; the movement beyond the normal bounds of consolation to reflections on wider matters (cc.4, 17-18). Far from being exclusively fixed on deceased and consoland, the focus undergoes changes. The combination of Christian and pagan materials, too, is much more marked than in any other of J.'s consolationes; his use of both traditions is wide, and fully conscious.

In overall conception, however, epist. 60 goes much deeper than this. It has been noted above that antique consolationes can be roughly grouped in three categories, but that the divisions cannot be considered rigid. This is certainly true of epist. 60. It exists on two levels: not only as a letter, but also as a funeral oration.

Nearly all J.'s consolations have something of the character of a funeral oration to the extent that they contain eulogy. For while eulogy is an important,

often the most important, function of a funeral speech, it is - naturally enough - not a necessary constituent of the consolatory epistle. (It may, of course, be regarded as an aid to consolation, particularly to Christians: to emphasise the virtues of the deceased is to reinforce the point that they are now in heaven.) In shorter letters there is in any case no room for a large laudatory element, and where it occurs it tends to consist of a few comments of a general nature; cf. e.g. Basil's letter to the Church of Neocaesarea on the death of Bishop Musonius (epist. 28). In longer pieces too praise of the deceased may be absent (see on 7.3 audias ... eius). But of J.'s consolatory letters only in epist. 118 is the eulogistic content negligible and the chief purpose of that letter (see above) is sufficient explanation of that. Even in the relatively short epist. 23 room is found for praise of the subject (cf. 23.2.2), and in certain of the letters, as has been said, it is the main ingredient.

By itself, however, the presence of a laudes section, substantial and carefully defined as it is, does no more than indicate an affinity between epist. 60 and funeral speeches, an affinity shared by many other letters of consolation. But in c.1 J. has already made it clear that the relation is closer. First, the letter - designated an epitaphium - is described in terms of a floral tribute upon Nepotianus' grave (1.2). Then follows: moris quondam fuit, ut

super cadavera defunctorum in contione pro rostris laudes liberi dicerent et instar lugubrium carminum ad fletus et gemitus audientium pectora concitarent: en rerum in nobis ordo mutatus est et in calamitatem nostram perdidit sua iura natura: quod exhibere senibus iuvenis debuit, hoc iuveni exhibemus senes (1.3). There can be little doubt about the meaning of this. J. imagines himself upon the rostra, pronouncing an oration over Nepotianus' body, a task in which Heliodorus seems to be associated (cf. the plural senes, etc.). What we have is effectively a funeral oration in epistolary form, a fact which has not gone unnoticed in major studies of the Roman laudatio funebris; cf. F. Vollmer, 'Laudationum funebrium Romanorum historia et reliquiarum editio', Jahrbücher für classische Philologie supp. 18 (1891-2), 475, W. Kierdorf, Laudatio funebris: Interpretationen und Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der römischen Leichenrede (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 106; Meisenheim am Glan, 1980), p. 65. Seen in this light, the unusual length of the letter is easily understood.

The Greek rhetorician Menander, writing around AD 300, distinguished three types of funeral speech: ὁ παραμυθητικὸς λόγος, ὁ ἐπιτάφιος λόγος, and ἡ μονῳδία (epid. 2.9, 11, 16 Russell and Wilson; for a full examination see J. Soffel, Die Regeln Menanders für die Leichenrede (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 57; Meisenheim am Glan, 1974)). The differences between

them are largely differences of emphasis, not of material: in the first, consolation predominates, in the second, eulogy, in the third, lament. In common with other writers on rhetoric, what Menander has to say has relevance not only to oratory, and is clearly of importance in the present case. A number of points he makes are reflected in this letter, and noted in the commentary; there is no reason to think that J. knew his work directly, but he will have been well acquainted with the rhetorical tradition of which he is representative. Broadly, the letter most resembles - as we should expect - the paramythetic type of speech. The element of lamentation is relatively slight (mainly cc.1 and 13), and to praise Nepotianus is not J.'s main aim. In form, however, it does not closely adhere to Menander's pattern. The rhetor prescribes that the first part of the speech should consist of lamentation and encomium, and that consolation should follow. So too in the ἐπιτάφιος λόγος consolatory matter is left until the end. In epist. 60 there has already been a considerable amount of consolation by the time J. reaches the encomiastic part at c.8. J. knew the rules of the rhetoricians, but was not going to be constrained by them - as he makes explicit, in regard to one particular point, at 8.1. Menander provides valuable background material, but must not be regarded as a model.

The commentary aims to give colour and depth to these general outlines, and to provide much more besides. But no amount of relevant material can communicate the power with which epist. 60 is pregnant: it is one of the great consolatory works of Antiquity.

AD HELIODORUM EPITAPHIUM NEPOTIANI. The MSS present a variety of readings for the title. Hilberg judiciously includes the word epitaphium, which appears in some; J. refers to the letter as such at 1.2, epist. 77.1.1, and again at epist. 112.3.2, while discussing the proper title of De viris illustribus: 'epitaphium autem proprie scribitur mortuorum, quod quidem in dormitione sanctae memoriae Nepotiani presbyteri olim fecisse me novi'.

c.1. J. expresses doubt in his own ability to write an epitaphium on Nepotianus, because his ingenium is inadequate to the task; and it is the more difficult because his mind is clouded by the grief which the young man's death has caused him.

1.1. Grandes ... explicare. J. claims, implicitly, that he is incapable of doing justice to his subject: an example of self-depreciation, designed to magnify the importance of that subject. The idea goes far back. There are good cases in Greek oratory of the fourth century BC; cf. e.g. Isoc. paneg. 13 'τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλους ἐν τοῖς προοιμίοις ὁρῶ καταπτύνοντας τοὺς λόγους καὶ προφασιζομένους ὑπὲρ τῶν μελλόντων ῥηθήσεσθαι, καὶ λέγοντας τοὺς μὲν ὡς ἐξ ὑπογυίου γεγονέναι σφίσι τὴν παρασκευήν, τοὺς δ' ὡς χαλεπόν ἐστιν ἴσους τοὺς λόγους τῷ μεγέθει τῶν ἔργων ἐξευρεῖν', , panath. 36, Dem. Phil. 2.11. Sometimes this kind of claim has a distinctly

eulogistic function; cf. epist. 1.15.1 with n. Generally it is instructive to compare epist. 1.1-2, where the notion of incompetence is combined with a request-τόπος and an expression of unwillingness to undertake the task (see nn. ad loc.)

Normally one might expect a writer to choose a field in which his abilities would not be overwhelmed; cf. Hor. ars 38-9 'sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, aequam ¦ viribus'.

ultra vires ausa: for the expression cf. Manil. 3.1-3 'in nova surgentem maioraque viribus ausum [sc. me] ... ducite, Pierides'.

Nepotianus meus, tuus, noster. For Nepotianus see introduction. At epist. 3.4.1 J. describes Bonosus in similar terms: 'Bonosus tuus, immo meus et, ut verius dicam, noster'; and Marcella is described almost identically at epist. 127.1.3. Favez, Consolation, p. 131, points out that in Christian consolation the consoler sometimes implictly expresses sympathy with the bereaved by referring to the departed as meus or noster; see further on reliquit ... confecit below. It is noteworthy that in this letter Nepotianus is never mentioned by name without noster being added.

quia Christi, idcirco plus noster. Because all three, J., Heliodorus, and Nepotianus, are united in the

family of Christ, the bond between them is stronger than it would be if the ties were simply those of kin or friendship.

reliquit ... confecit. senes, sc. nos. J. indicates his own grief at Nepotianus' death, thus associating himself closely with Heliodorus and offering him sympathy, in itself a kind of consolation. Expressions of this kind occur frequently enough in Christian writers; cf. e.g. J. epist. 39.1.2 'quis enim siccis oculis recordetur viginti annorum adulescentulam tam ardenti fide crucis levasse vexillum ...?', 75.1.1 'lugubri nuntio consternatus super sancti et venerabilis mihi dormitione Lucini vix brevem epistulam dictare potui', Ambr. epist. 15.1 'dum semper affixum tenere animo desidero virum sanctum, atque omnes actus eius quasi in specula positus exploro, hausi, nimia indagine sollicitudinis, amaritudinem nuntii celerioris', obit. Valent. 26, Bas. epist. 301 ad init., 302 ad init. 'Ὅσον μὲν ἐστενάξαμεν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀγγελίᾳ τοῦ πάθους τοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἄριστον τῶν ἀνδρῶν Βριόνιν τί χρὴ καὶ λέγειν;'.

Among pagans, too, the consoler may indicate that he shares in the grief of the bereaved. Cicero and Sulpicius Rufus both claim to be so grief-stricken as to require consolation themselves; cf. Cic. ad fam. 4.5.1 (Sulpicius), 5.16.1, 5.18.1. Seneca sympathises with Lucilius (cf. epist. 63.1 'moleste fero decessisse Flaccum, amicum tuum'), and Plutarch with Apollonius

(cf. ad Apoll. 1 (101E) 'καὶ πάλαι σου συνήλγησα καὶ συνηχθέσθην'). Cf. also Julian epist. 201 Bidez 'οὐκ ἀδακρυτί σου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἀνέγνων, ἣν ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς συνοικούσης θανάτῳ πεποίησαι, τοῦ πάθους τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ἀναγκαίαν', Liban. epist. 1473.1 'καὶ γὰρ ἐστενάξαμεν καὶ ἐδακρύσαμεν καὶ πεπλήθομεν σοῦ τὴν λύπην'. Generally, however, expressions of sympathy play a smaller part in pagan than in Christian consolation; among pagans it is reason which is held to be of the greatest importance, and Seneca, for example, while never devoid of feeling, maintains a cooler, more detached approach to the task of alleviating someone else's grief.

For the rhetorical theory that the comforter should begin by showing that he shares in the grief of the consoland see Nisbet and Hubbard, Horace: Odes 1, pp. 280-1.

desiderii ... vulneratos. There are many instances in Latin literature of vulnerare and vulnus used in reference to the mental effect of emotions such as grief and love. In the Late Republic and Early Empire the usage is generally poetic, but later there are frequent examples in prose. In J. cf. e.g. epist. 66.1.1 'vereor, ne nunc inportunius loquar et adtrectans vulnus pectoris tui ... commemoratione exulcerem [sc. id]', 107.7.2 'caritatis iaculo vulnerata', hom. Orig. in cant. (PL 23.1138) 'alius iaculum carnei amoris excepit, alius ex terrena

cupidine vulneratus est'. J. also uses the wound-image in another important way, namely to denote the effect of committing a sin; cf. e.g. epist. 79.10.2 'cavendum est vulnus, quod dolore curatur', 122.1.4 'Samuhel quondam plangebat Saul, quia superbiae vulnera paenitentiae medicamine non curabat'.

iaculum does not appear to be used in a metaphorical sense until about the time of Tertullian (cf. e.g. nat. 1.9.4 'opinor, ut contemptores deorum vestrorum haec iacula [sc. omnem cladem publicam vel iniuriam] eorum p<rovo>camus'). Examples akin to its use here occur from the end of the fourth century; cf. e.g. Rufin. Orig. in cant. 3 (PG 13.162) 'se vulneratam sentit esse iaculis charitatis' and the cases quoted above. sagitta, which at an earlier time was the regular word for the dart of love (cf. e.g. Ov. am. 1.1.25), is sometimes found in a similar sense; cf. e.g. epist. 65.12, where it is used more or less interchangeably with iaculum.

1.2. quem ... tenemus. For the notion that the natural order of things has been reversed, implicit here, cf. 1.3 rerum ... senes with n.

cui iam ... in funere sum. In Nepotianus J. has lost his source of inspiration; his faculties are paralysed by shock and grief; though he wishes to compose an epitaphium for Nepotianus he is quite unable. J. is of

course exaggerating - he can hardly have been so smitten with grief at a time when Heliodorus' own grief has subsided (cf. 15.1), and he quickly disproves that he cannot write the epitaphium - but that he should wish to emphasise his genuine sorrow in this way is entirely understandable.

meum sudabit ingenium. sudare = 'exert oneself' is not unusual, but I do not think it is commonly found with ingenium. J., however, uses the expression elsewhere; cf. epist. 39.8.1 'illam [sc. Blesillam] mea lingua resonabit, illi mei dedicabuntur labores, illi sudabit ingenium', 114.3.1 'tibi enim meum sudavit ingenium et facundiam Graecam Latinae linguae volui paupertate pensare'.

litterulae. In the sense of epistulae, TLL records no instances of the diminutive between Cicero and J., who uses it several times (cf. e.g. epist. 52.5.7, 85.1.1, 143.2.3). There is a fuller tradition for its use in referring to individual characters; J. employs it thus at epist. 7.1.1. At epist. 128.1.3 it probably refers to literature generally, though here too it may mean single letters (Buchstaben). In the present case, the likely meaning is simply 'writings'.

The diminutive perhaps continues the self-depreciation begun at 1.1 ingenia parva; cf. on epist. 1.1 cumque ... diffiderem.

ἐργοδιώκτης. This word was clearly a problem for the copyists. Many of the MSS omit it altogether. The early MS G has epidioctes, which Labourt holds to be similar in meaning to ἐργοδιώκτης ; but the only instance of ἐπιδιώκτης recorded by L.-S.-J. occurs in the Corpus glossariorum Latinorum, ed. G. Goetz (7 vols., Lipsiae, 1888-1923), 2.307.57, as equivalent to persecutor. ἐργοδιώκτης , for which there is better MS support, gives excellent sense ('taskmaster', 'inspirer of my labours' (Wright)), and is much better attested elsewhere; cf. e.g. Philo quis rer. div. heres 255, LXX Exod. 3.7, J. epist. 28.1 (where it is certainly the true reading, though it still caused the scribes considerable problems).

cygneo ... dulcior. It was an ancient notion that the swan sang immediately before its death and that this song was particularly sweet, and expressions such as this became proverbial; cf. e.g. Plato Phaedo 84E, Sen. Phaedr. 302 'dulcior vocem moriente cycno', Aelian nat. anim. 2.32, Ambr. hex. 5.12.39, Prud. c. Symm. 1.62-3 'blandosque susurros ¦ in morem recinens suave inmorientis oloris', Otto, p. 105, with the Nachträge. At de orat. 3.6 Cicero, telling of L. Licinius Crassus' last speech in the senate before his death, says 'illa tamquam cycnea fuit divini hominis vox et oratio'. Here there is certainly a conscious connection between the dying swan and the dead Nepotianus. J. uses the

image again at epist. 52.3.5 'ad poetas venio, Homerum, Hesiodum, Simonidem, Stesichorum, qui grandes natu cygneum nescio quid et solito dulcius vicina morte cecinerunt'. It is possible that it occurred in Cicero's Consolatio, and it was this which reminded J. of it in the present case; cf. Cic. Tusc. 1.73, and for J.'s debt to the Consolatio in this letter, and its connections with the Tusculans, nn. on c.5.

stupet ... balbutit: typical effects of shock; cf. e.g. Sen. contr. 1.1.16 'non potui, inquit, sustinere illud durum spectaculum. offensam mihi putas tantum excidisse? mens excidit, non animus mihi constitit, non in ministerium sustinendi corporis suffecerunt pedes, oculi subita caligine obtorpuerunt', 7.1.17, Quint. inst. 9.2.43, ps. Quint. decl. min. 286 pp. 152.31-153.2 Ritter, Ambr. obit. Valent. 3 'oculi non solum corporis, sed etiam mentis hebetati ¦ sunt, et quadam caecitate omnis sensus obductus est, quoniam ereptus est mihi'. J. claims to have been similarly affected in writing his epitaphium on Paula: 'quotienscumque stilum figere volui et opus exarare promissum, totiens obriguerunt digiti, cecidit manus, sensus elanguit' (epist. 108.32). Other kinds of emotion may also provoke such responses; cf. e.g. (fear) Lucr. 3.152-6 'verum ubi vementi magis est commota metu mens, ¦ consentire animam totam per membra videmus ¦ sudoresque ita palloremque exsistere toto ¦

corpore et infringi linguam vocemque aboriri, ¦ caligare oculos, sonere auris, succidere artus', (passion) Catull. 51.9-12 'lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus ¦ flamma demanat, sonitu suopte ¦ tintinant aures, gemina teguntur ¦ lumina nocte' (from Sappho fr. 31).

balbutit (or balbuttit): a favourite word of J.'s; cf. e.g. epist. 22.29.6, 79.6.3, 107.1.3 and 13.6, 108.26.5, 128.1.1, adv. Pelag. 3.17 (PL 23.587), hom. Orig. in Ier. 1 (PL 25.591). In most of these cases it refers to the stammering, ill-formed words of a little child; here it must mean 'babbles', or perhaps 'stutters'. The earliest instances recorded by TLL are Cic. div. 1.5., Tusc. 5.75, where it means something like 'babble on' or 'speak unclearly', but the word seems onomatopoeic, and may be very old.

quidquid ... videtur: 'whatever I shall say ... seems voiceless'; the present videtur suggests that J.'s words appear voiceless now, even in advance of his speaking them. mutus of something said is unusual; but cf. perhaps Lucan. 1.247 'tacito mutos volvunt in pectore questus', Claud. rapt. Pros. 3.160 'abrumpit mutas in fila querellas'.

stilus ... obducitur. obducitur must be taken with both stilus and cera. It is not unusual for a plural

subject to have a singular verb, and there is no need to follow B, with idcirco in place of cera.

J. seems to be suggesting that he has been so affected by grief that he has been unable to write anything for a long time. The death of Paula certainly had some such effect on him; cf. epist. 99.2.2 (written a few months after her death; cf. Cavallera, 2.43) 'ita enim sanctae et venerabilis Paulae dormitione confectus sum, ut absque translatione huius libri [i.e. Theophilus' Paschal Epistle for 404] usque in praesentiarum nihil aliud divini operis scripserim'. But even if he did have a short break from writing when he heard that Nepotianus had died, it could hardly have been long enough for his pen to become rusty! Here too he is exaggerating, to show how much he shares Heliodorus' sorrow (cf. above on cui iam ... in funere sum). This exaggeration, involving the image of rust, recalls Catull. 64.42, where a single day's holiday produces rust on ploughs. For the notion that rust or mould is caused by lack of use cf. Sen. benef. 3.2.3 'quae in usu sunt et manum cottidie tactumque patiuntur, numquam periculum situs adeunt', Apul. flor. 17 pp. 31-2 Helm 'gladius usu splendescit, situ robiginat', and esp. (noting the context) Sen. contr. 2.2.8 'memini Latronem in praefatione quadam dicere quod scholastici quasi carmen didicerunt: non vides ut immota fax torpeat, ut exagitata reddat ignes? mollit viros otium, ferrum situ carpitur et rubiginem ducit,

desidia dedocet'. For other instances of the image of rust in Latin literature see on epist. 1.1 ingenii robigo.

quasi sentiens: 'as though it felt his loss' (Wright).

subtristior: a very rare word. Forcellini gives only four instances, of which this is the only one in the comparative, and the only one where it is applied to an inanimate object; the others are Ter. Andr. 447, Cypr. epist. 11.4, J. epist. 107.9.3. It would give a false impression, however, to suggest that the word is an archaism recalled to use in the Later Empire. Compound adjectives with sub- could easily be formed when required, and it is perhaps due to little more than chance that the extant occurrences of subtristis fall centuries apart.

in verba prorumpere: cf. e.g. Tac. ann. 11.2, Apul. met. 6.17 'turris prorumpit in vocem subitam', ps. Quint. decl. mai. 19.6 p. 341.25 Lehnert, and many instances in J., e.g. epist. 21.5.1 'in verba prorumpimus', 46(Paula and Eustochium).4.1. For erumpere used similarly cf. epist. 1.12.2 with n.

super ... spargere. The metaphor comes from the Roman practice of scattering flowers over the tomb of the deceased; cf. e.g. Virg. Aen. 5.79 'purpureosque iacit

flores [sc. Aeneas]' (over Anchises' tomb), Auson. epit. 31.1-4 'sparge mero cineres bene olentis et unguine nardi, ¦ hospes, et adde rosis balsama puniceis. ¦ perpetuum mihi ver agit inlacrimabilis urna ¦ et commutavi saecula, non obii', J. epist. 66.5.3 'ceteri mariti super tumulos coniugum spargunt violas, rosas, lilia floresque purpureos et dolorem pectoris his officiis consolantur: Pammachius noster sanctam favillam ossaque veneranda elemosynae balsamis rigat'. See also J. M. C. Toynbee, Death and Burial in the Roman World (London, 1971), pp. 62-4.

epitaphii huius is a defining genitive - 'the flowers consisting of this epitaphium' - but J. may also have in mind the flores verborum or eloquentiae which the epitaphium contains. There are plenty of instances in J. of flos used in this kind of way; cf. e.g. in Zach. lib. 3 pref. (CCSL 76A.848 = PL 25.1497) 'nimio verborum flore luxuriat', adv. Iovin. 1.3 (PL 23.212) 'eloquentiae suae flore', epist. 52.1.2 'calentibus adhuc rhetorum studiis atque doctrinis quaedam scolastico flore depinximus', (for the plural) adv. Iovin. 1.1 (PL 23.212) 'verborum floribus ornatus'.

For other types of flower-imagery cf. on 13.2 and epist. 107.4.8.

inplentur oculi: cf. 2.2, 13.3, epist. 39.1.4 'lacrimis ora conplentur, singultus occupant vocem';

and for the same kind of exaggeration in different contexts, Cic. Cael. 60 'haec facta illius clarissimi ac fortissimi viri mentio et vocem meam fletu debilitavit et mentem dolore impedivit', J. epist. 45.6.1 'haec ... flens dolensque conscripsi', 46(Paula and Eustochium).1.3, 123.15.4 'non possum absque lacrimis Tolosae facere mentionem'.

totus in funere sum: 'I am wholly absorbed in his death'. The use of totus qualifying the verb, where an adverb would be used in English, is found early (cf. e.g. Plaut. Cist. 535 'tota sum misera in metu'), and there are many instances later on (cf. e.g. Cic. Cluent. 72 'totus ex fraude et mendacio factus', Hor. sat. 1.9.1-2 'ibam forte via sacra ... nescio quid meditans nugarum, totus in illis', Ov. fast. 6.251 'in prece totus eram'). In J. cf. e.g. epist. 3.4.3, 49.13.5 'totus in certamine positus est', 98(tr. from Theophilus).19.2 (plural). omnis can be used similarly (cf. e.g. Hor. epist. 1.1.11 'omnis in hoc sum'); and other words, such as multus and frequens, may follow the same construction (cf. K.-S. 1.236). The use of ὅλος in Greek is comparable; cf. e.g. Dem. fals. leg. 127 'ὅλος πρὸς τῷ λήμματι', Lucian Hermot. 2 'ὅλος ἐν τῷ πράγματι'.

1.3. moris ... concitarent. For the construction moris ... fuit, with the genitive, see L.-H.-Sz. 2.62.

The expression moris est or mos est is quite common in Latin literature; cf. e.g. Virg. Aen. 7.601 'mos erat Hesperio in Latio ...', Val. Max. 2.8.6 'moris est ab imperatore ducturo triumphum consules invitari ad cenam', Plin. epist. 3.21.3 'fuit moris antiqui, eos qui vel singulorum laudes vel urbium scripserant, aut hominibus aut pecunia ornare', J. epist. 147.5.2. Sometimes it introduces a kind of ἔκφρασις, as here; one may compare the use of est locus (cf. e.g. Virg. Aen. 1.159, Ov. met. 8.788).

The practice here mentioned - the laudatio funebris - is described more full by Polybius 6.53.1-3; cf. also Cic. de orat. 2.341, Tac. ann. 3.5. The tribute was of course awarded only to people of distinction. O. C. Crawford, 'Laudatio funebris', CJ 37 (1941), 17-27, gives a good brief account of the practice; its history is outlined by Vollmer, 'Laudationum funebrium Romanorum historia'. On Roman funerary rites generally see Toynbee, Death and Burial, pp. 43-61. It may be worth noting that among Christians mourning at funerals was strictly suppressed (contrast instar ... concitarent, Polybius 6.53.3); cf. P. Brown, The Cult of the Saints: its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity (London, 1981), pp. 70, 157-8.

Taken in conjunction with en rerum ... senes following, this passage makes it clear that J. conceived of this letter as a sort of laudatio

funebris; see introduction.

instar lugubrium carminum: 'as though by means of dirges'. For this use of instar cf. in Ezech. 25.8-11 (CCSL 75.340 = PL 25.236-7) 'quidquid in saeculo dogmatum perversorum est, quidquid ad terrenam scientiam pertinet et putatur esse robustum, hoc dialectica arte subvertitur et instar incendii in cineres favillasque dissolvitur', Cassian. c. Nest. 4.6.7 'bene apostolus instar divinorum verborum docens ... ipsum descendisse dicit quem ascendisse'.

rerum ... senes. J. has already expressed the feeling that the natural order of things has been reversed (cf. 1.2 quem heredem putavimus, funus tenemus), and does so again at 14.1 praecessit te successor tuus. For the idea that it is natural and proper for people to outlive their elders cf. e.g. Cic. sen. 84 '[Cato, filius meus] cuius a me corpus est crematum, quod contra decuit, ab illo meum', amicit. 15 'cum illo quidem ... actum optime est, mecum incommodius, quem fuerat aequius, ut prius introieram, sic prius exire de vita' (Laelius of Scipio Aemilianus), Virg. Aen. 11.160-1, Plut. ad Apoll. 34 (119E) 'σὲ ἔδει ὑπ' ἐκείνου [sc. ὑιοῦ σου] τελείου γενομένου κηδευθῆναι μεταλλάξαντα τὸν βίον· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι κατὰ φύσιν', Ambr. exc. Sat. 1.37 'haec tu, frater, mihi iustius exhiberes, haec ego a te expectabam, haec ego officia desiderabam'; the wish of parents that

their children should survive them is a regular form of this theme (cf. e.g. Plaut. Asin. 16-17, Sen. contr. 1.1.6 'aliquis peribit fame qui filium suum optat superstitem?', Sen. dial. 6.1.2, Quint. inst. 9.2.98 'ita mihi contingat herede filio mori', Lact. inst. 4.28.13). The notion is found also in sepulchral epigrams; cf. e.g. Anth. Pal. 7.261 'ἡθέῳ γὰρ σῆμα βιώνοι χεῦλτο μήτηρ · ¦ ἔπρεπε δ' ἐκ παιδὸς μητέρα τοῦδε τυχεῖν' , Carmina Latina epigraphica, ed. F. Buecheler (Lipsiae, 1895-7), 164 'quod par parenti fuerat facere filium, ¦ mors immatura fecit ut faceret pater', 165-78, 1479 'si non fatorum praepostera iura fuissent, ¦ mater in hoc titulo debuit ante legi', 1480-5, Carmina Latina epigraphica, ed. E. Engström (Gotoburgi, 1911), 31-4. See further E. Courtney, A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal (London, 1980), p. 477 (on Iuv. 10.240-1).

in calamitatem ... natura: 'to our misfortune, nature has lost her privileges' (according to which the old die first).

c.2. J. now confronts the problem of grief which faces Christians when they lose a loved one. He knows that

he should not weep over Nepotianus, who is not dead but asleep, but finds it impossible not to do so. A solution to the problem is not, however, presented until c.7. Instead, in a complex and allusive passage he describes the destruction of death by Christ, creating a mood of hope after the sorrow and near-despair of c.1, and explaining more fully why grief is inappropriate.

2.1. Quid igitur faciam?: cf. epist. 1.2.1 with n.

iungam ... suscitatus est. J. rejects the idea that he should mourn Nepotianus' death. The Bible clearly indicates that for Christians death is merely a falling asleep, which will be followed by resurrection into heaven; it is therefore quite inappropriate to grieve when they die. The same point is made at epist. 39.4.6 'nos vero, qui Christum induimus ... non debemus super mortuos [sc. Christianos] contristari'; elsewhere cf. e.g. const. apol. 6.30, Cypr. mort. 20, Bas. grat. act. 6. Conversely it is appropriate enough to mourn those who at their death will not go to be with Christ; cf. e.g. epist. 39.3.2 'lugeatur mortuus, sed ille, quem gehenna suscipit, quem tartarus devorat, in cuius poenam aeternus ignis exaestuat', Aug. serm. 302.18.

The three pieces of Biblical evidence which J. presents in answer to his question seem to show a

gradual progression in importance. First comes Paul's prohibition, with his opinion that the Christian dead are only asleep; then a saying of Jesus himself, to the effect that a girl who appears to be dead is in reality not dead at all; and finally the case of Lazarus, whose raising by Jesus proves that he was only asleep all along. J. does not mention that Jesus raised up the girl too, perhaps to allow a climax in the third piece of evidence. The cases of Lazarus and the girl, instances of resurrection in this world, appear to indicate to J. the truth of celestial resurrection, which all Christians will experience.

The image of death as sleep among Christian writers depends on NT passages such as these and others, e.g. 1 Cor. 15.6. It is not, however, exclusively Christian; cf. the examples collected by P. B. Albers (ed.), S. Ambrosii Mediolanensis episcopi de obitu Satyri fratris laudatio funebris (Bonnae, 1921), p. 52. In pagan consolation cf. e.g. Plut. ad Apoll. 12 (107D) 'εἰ γὰρ δὴ ὕπνος τίς ἐστιν ὁ θάνατος καὶ περὶ τοὺς καθεύδοντας μηδέν ἐστι κακόν, δῆλον ὡς οὐδὲ περὶ τοὺς τετελευτηκότας εἴη ἄν τι κακόν. ἀλλὰ μήν γ' ὅτι ἥδιστος ἐστιν ὁ βαθύτατος τί δεῖ καὶ λέγειν;'.

iungam ... lacrimas. For the expression cf. in Ezech. lib. 3 pref. (CCSL 75.91 = PL 25.75) 'quis crederet ut totius orbis exstructa victoriis Roma corrueret ... ut

cotidie sancta Bethleem, nobiles quondam utriusque sexus atque omnibus divitiis affluentes, susciperet mendicantes? quibus, quoniam opem ferre non possumus, condolemus, et lacrimas lacrimis iungimus'.

apostolus ... vocans: cf. 1 Thess. 4.13-4 'nolumus autem vos ignorare, fratres, de dormientibus, ut non contristemini sicut et ceteri qui spem non habent. si enim credimus quod Iesus mortuus est et resurrexit, ita et deus eos qui dormierunt per Iesum adducet cum eo'. For the passage used by J. in similar contexts cf. epist. 3.3.2, 39.3.7, and esp. 75.1.3 'adversum mortis ergo duritiam ... hoc solacio erigimur, quod brevi visuri sumus eos, quos dolemus absentes. neque enim mors, sed dormitio et somnus appellatur. unde et beatus apostolus vetat de dormientibus contristari, ut, quos dormire novimus, suscitari posse credamus'. The text also forms the basis of Augustine's Sermons 172 and 173.

non est ... dormit: Matt. 9.24 (Vulg.: 'non est enim mortua puella sed dormit'), Mark 5.39 (Vulg.: 'puella non est mortua sed dormit'), Luke 8.52 (Vulg.: 'non est mortua [some MSS: + puella] sed dormit'). J. will not have been thinking of any one of these gospels in particular.

Lazarus ... suscitatus est: cf. John 11.1-44, esp. v. 11 'Lazarus amicus noster dormit; sed vado, ut a somno exsuscitem eum'.

quia dormierat = 'because he had only fallen asleep'.

laeter ... illius? The alternative course is now presented. The implied answer is of course 'yes', but as J. goes on to say, he cannot but weep.

For raptus ... illius cf. Wisd. 4.11 (= 4.14) 'raptus est ne malitia mutaret intellectum illius ... placita enim erat deo anima illius'. The passage is highly appropriate to Nepotianus, as the author of Wisdom is speaking of the iustus morte praeoccupatus (cf. Wisd. 4.7). It is frequently employed in Christian consolation, providing a comforting explanation of someone's death; cf. e.g. epist. 39.3.1, 75.2.1, 79.2.4, Cypr. mort. 23, Paul. Nol. epist. 13.6, and Ambrose's adaptation, exc. Sat. 1.30 'raptus est, ne in manus incideret barbarorum, raptus est, ne totius orbis excidia, mundi finem, propinquorum funera, civium mortes, postremo ne sanctarum virginum atque viduarum, quod omni morte acerbius est, conluvionem videret'. For the idea of death as an escape from ills generally see on 15.1.

2.2. sed invito ... fluunt. invito et repugnanti, sc. mihi. Contrast Sen. epist. 99.18-19 'cum primus nos nuntius acerbi funeris perculit, cum tenemus corpus e complexu nostro in ignem transiturum, lacrimas naturalis necessitas exprimit et spiritus ictu doloris inpulsus quemadmodum totum corpus quatit, ita oculos, quibus adiacentem umorem perpremit et expellit. hae lacrimae per elisionem cadunt nolentibus nobis: aliae sunt quibus exitum damus cum memoria eorum quos amisimus retractatur'. For J.'s exaggeration cf. on 1.2 cui iam ... in funere sum and inplentur oculi.

praecepta virtutum: 'the teaching of virtue'; presumably, that one's mind ought not to be overcome by grief. This idea has a Stoic flavour, but it seems improbable that J. was thinking of the doctrines of any particular philosophical school.

credulam ... affectus: cf. epist. 108.21.4 'cum os stomachumque signaret et matris dolorem crucis niteretur inpressione lenire, superabat affectus et credulam mentem parentis viscera consternabant'.

credulus is most often used of persons, but it is not rare with words such as mens, which are essentially personal in nature; cf. e.g. Sen. Herc. O. 965 'mens credula', Tro. 3 'animum ... credulum', Thy. 962-3 'credula ... pectora', Cod. Theod. 16.6.4 'credulas mentes', and, in a Christian sense, = 'believing in

God', Apring. in apoc. 21.22 'credul[a]e ... mentes', Drac. laud. dei 1.466 'credula corda'. Cf. also 14.6 incredulas mentes with n.

mens, animus, etc. are also frequently found with frangere; cf. e.g. (for mens) Sen. dial. 11.5.4, Lucan. 1.353-5 'pietas patriique penates ¦ quamquam caede feras mentes animosque tumentes ¦ frangunt', Auson. ecl. 2.20.

o mors ... dissocias!: cf. epist. 75.1.2 (quoted below at 2.2-3 adduxit ... confossa sunt), with Hos. 13.15.

Although J. does not hold Nepotianus to be mortuus (cf. 2.1), he now appears to be unable to shake off the idea of the cruelty of earthly mors. The feeling behind this sentence, however, is that its cruelty lies in its effect on those who survive: an idea conceptualised more clearly at 7.1 desiderium ... dolentes.

The personification of death is widespread in both Greek and Latin literature, going back at least as far as Hom. Il. 14.231. The usage is also Biblical; cf. e.g. Job 28.22, 1 Cor. 15.55, Rev. 6.8.

2.2-3. adduxit ... confossa sunt: a very difficult passage, designed to show that God has triumphed over death. J. is addressing mors throughout. It is illuminating to compare epist. 75.1.2-3 (AD 399), where J. uses much of the same material and expresses the

same fundamental idea; the whole passage is worth quoting:

> verum est illud super necessitate mortis prophetale vaticinium, quo fratres dividat et carissima inter se nomina crudelis et dura dissociet. sed habemus consolationem, quod domini sermone iugulatur et dicitur ad eam: ero mors tua, o mors, ero morsus tuus, inferne; et in consequentibus: adducet urentem ventum dominus de deserto ascendentem, qui siccabit omnes venas eius et desolabit fontem illius. exivit enim virga de radice Iesse et flos de virginali frutice pullulavit, qui loqueretur in Cantico canticorum: ego flos campi et lilium convallium. flos noster mortis interitus; ideoque et mortuus est, ut mors illius morte moreretur. quod autem de deserto dicitur adducendus, virginalis uterus demonstratur, qui absque coitu et semine viri deum nobis fudit infantem, qui calore spiritus sancti exsiccaret fontes libidinum et caneret in psalmo: in terra deserta et invia et sine aqua, sic in sancto apparui tibi.

(a) adduxit ... fontem tuum: cf. Hos. 13.15 'adducet urentem ventum dominus de deserto ascendentem et siccabit venas eius et desolabit fontem eius', where 'eius' refers to the figure of Ephraim, representing

all the tribes of northern Israel. Hos. 13 presents many problems of interpretation, but is essentially concerned with the firm stand taken by God against the wickedness of Ephraim. At 13.15 Ephraim's destruction is foretold in these images of drought.

J. applies the verse to the destruction of death, which has already been mentioned at Hos. 13.14 (for J.'s misunderstanding of this verse see (d)). At epist. 75.1.3 he clearly understands the ventus to be Christ, and the same interpretation occurs in his Commentary on Hosea 13.14-15 (CCSL 76.150-1 = PL 25.939-40) (AD 406):

> superest ut ventum urentem quem adducet dominus de deserto ascendentem, illum intellegamus, de quo et in Abacuc legimus: deus ab Austro veniet, et sanctus de monte Pharan ... hunc itaque ventum urentem, qui siccet venas mortis, et fontes eius arefaciat, adducet dominus de deserto ascendentem; de deserto autem humani generis, in quo et diabolus quaerens requiem, invenire non potuit. sive desertum intellegimus sanctae Mariae uterum virginalem, quod absque semine humano nullo frutice pullulaverit; sed virga simplex atque purissima et unione fecunda ediderit eum florem qui dicit in Cantico canticorum: ego flos campi et lilium convallium. et pulchre tam in Esaia quam in praesenti loco, flos ascendens et ventus ascendens dicitur, quia de humilitate carnis ad

excelsa conscendit, et nos secum duxit ad patrem, dicens in evangelio: cum exaltatus fuero, omnia traham ad me. ipse quasi radix ascendet de terra inhabitabili, et nequaquam mors in eum, sed ipse morti superveniet, neque enim mors in eo ullam suae potestatis viam repperit, et hoc est quod in Proverbis dicitur: impossibile est super petram serpentis invenire vestigia. et ipsa [leg. ipse] loquitur in evangelio: ecce veniet princeps mundi huius et inveniet in me nihil. iste siccabit venas mortis, et desolabit fontes eius. venae mortis et fontes et aculeus, peccata ab apostolo nominantur; quibus arefactis, mors quoque ipsa siccabitur.

That J. has the same idea in mind in the present passage seems certain, as will be shown.

(b) devorasti ... salvaretur. The image is changed, and death presented in the guise of the great fish which swallowed Jonah (cf. Jonah 2.1). The idea recurs at in Ion. 2.1 (CCSL 76.393 = PL 25.1131) (AD 396 - the same year as this letter) 'et praeparavit dominus piscem grandem, ut deglutiret Ionam. LXX: et praecepit dominus ceto magno, et devoravit Ionam. morti et inferno praecepit dominus, ut prophetam suscipiat. quae avidis faucibus [cf. (e)] praedam putans, quantum in devoratione laetata est, tantum luxit in vomitu. tuncque completum est illud quod

legimus in Osee: ero mors tua, o mors: ero morsus tuus, inferne [cf. (d)]'. Although Jonah appears to have succumbed to death, he is released on praying to God (cf. Jonah 2.2-11); death is thus defeated. He subsequently preaches in Nineveh and the people of the city repent (cf. Jonah 3.4-5). For the quelling of the storm cf. Jonah 1.15; it is of no concern to J. that in fact the storm ceases after Jonah has been thrown into the sea but before he is swallowed by the fish. mundi suggests that J. understands the storm allegorically, referring to the trouble which arises out of the world's disregard for God, a disregard which Jonah shares (cf. Jonah 1.3) and which indirectly causes his being cast into the sea; cf. in Ion. 1.4 (CCSL 76.384-5 = PL 25.1124) 'dominus autem misit ventum magnum in mare, et facta est tempestas magna in mari et navis periclitabatur conteri ... potest fuga prophetae [sc. Ionae] et ad hominis referri in communi personam, qui dei praecepta contemnens, recessit a facie eius, et se mundo tradidit, ubi postea malorum tempestate, et totius mundi contra se saeviente naufragio, compulsus est sentire deum, et reverti ad eum quem fugerat'. In this letter, however, Jonah's own sins, having no place in the argument, are suppressed.

The story of Jonah, then, is seen as an indication that death is not all-powerful. There is more to it than this, however. Jonah is undoubtedly a type of Christ; cf. e.g. in Ion. 2.2-3 (CCSL 76.394 = PL

25.1131-2) 'si Ionas refertur ad dominum, et ex eo quod tribus diebus ac noctibus in utero ceti fuit, passionem indicat salvatoris, debet et oratio illius typus esse orationis dominicae'. The parallel comes from the words of Jesus himself at Matt. 12.39-41 and Luke 11.29-30, where he uses the Jonah story as a symbol for his own death and resurrection, his descent into hell being represented by Jonah's being swallowed by the fish. At epist. 53.8.10 J. again refers to the parallel, understanding Nineveh as a symbol for the gentiles: 'Ionas, columba pulcherrima, naufragio suo passionem domini praefigurans mundum ad paenitentiam revocat et sub nomine Nineve salutem gentibus nuntiat'; hence, perhaps, Nineve nostra here. The tempestas mundi was quelled by Christ's passion; cf. in Ion. 1.15 (CCSL 76.392 = PL 25.1130) 'consideremus ante passionem Christi, errores mundi, et diversorum dogmatum flatus contrarios, et naviculam totumque humanum genus, id est creaturam domini periclitantem, et post passionem eius tranquil<l>itatem fidei, et orbis pacem, et secura omnia, et conversionem ad deum, et videbimus quomodo post praecipitationem Ionae steterit mare a furore suo'.

(c) ille, ille ... quaerentium eam. At first glance this section may appear to refer still to Jonah (fugitivus propheta, qui reliquit domum suam), and indeed at in Ion. 4.3 (CCSL 76.412 = PL 25.1145-6)

Jonah is made to say 'dimisi domum meam, reliqui haereditatem meam'. But in fact it is not so much Jonah as Jeremiah who is meant; cf. Jer. 12.7 'reliqui domum meam, dimisi hereditatem meam, dedi dilectam animam meam in manu inimicorum eius'. The mental leap from one figure to the other will have been quite easy. Again the point of the allusion is to express the overcoming of death. Jer. 11 tells that a plot has been laid against Jeremiah's life; in c.12 Jeremiah prays to God to destroy the wicked (12.7 is part of the prayer), and God promises to do so unless they repent. Death is overcome, presumably, by Jeremiah's escape from the plotters and God's promise to crush them.

Jeremiah, like Jonah, is later definitely viewed as a *persona* of Christ; cf. *in Ier.* 11.18-20 (CCSL 4.117 = PL 24.756) (*c.* AD 414-6) 'omnium ecclesiarum iste consensus est, ut sub persona Hieremiae a Christo haec dici intellegant', 12.7-8 (CCSL 74.123 = PL 24.760) 'qui in evangelio locutus est: surgite, abeamus hinc, et iterum: relinquetur vobis domus vestra deserta, hic etiam in propheta eadem comminatur et, quod facturus est, fecisse se dicit'. At *in Ier.* 12.7-8 the *hereditas* of Jeremiah is also taken as a symbol of the *hereditas* of Christ. In the light of the rest of the passage the parallel must hold good here too. (The interpretation may owe something to Origen, as often; cf. *hom. in Ier.* 10.7, on Jer. 12.7.)

quaerentium eam is not derived from Jer. 12.7, where both the text of the Vulgate and the quotation of the verse in the Commentary on Jeremiah have 'in manu inimicorum eius', and LXX has 'εἰς χεῖρας ἐχθρῶν αὐτῆς'. It comes from conflation with other passages in Jeremiah, e.g. 19.7, 21.7, 22.25, 34.20.

(d) qui per Osee ... vivimus. J. now returns to Hosea, and states the overthrow of death with absolute clarity. In the OT the speaker of ero mors ... inferne (Hos. 13.14; text as Vulg.) is dominus deus tuus (13.4). To J. this is none other than Christ; cf. in Os. 13.14-15 (CCSL 76.148 = PL 25.937) 'liberavit autem omnes dominus, et redemit in passione crucis et effusione sanguinis sui, quando anima eius descendit in infernum, et caro eius non vidit corruptionem; et ad ipsam mortem atque infernum locutus est: ero mors tua, o mors. idcirco enim mortuus sum, ut tu mea morte moriaris. ero morsus tuus, inferne, qui omnes tuis faucibus devorabas'. The allusion to Christ in illius morte tu mortua es, illius morte nos vivimus is in any case quite apparent. The florilegium Γ makes it explicit: de morte x̃pi mors mortua est o mors x̃pi morte nos vivimus.

It is interesting that ero mors ... inferne, which represents J.'s translation, arises from a misunderstanding of the Hebrew text. The passage is certainly very difficult, and LXX, Symmachus, and

Aquila all give slightly different versions (see J.'s commentary ad loc. (CCSL 76.148-50 = PL 25.937-9)). The nature of the problem is fully explained by W. R. Harper, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea (Edinburgh, 1905), pp. 404-5. Briefly, to make sense of the passage in its context, it is necessary to take the preceding clauses, 'de manu mortis liberabo eos, de morte redimam eos', as questions, to which the implied answer is in the negative; and then to translate what follows not by ero mors ... inferne but rather, keeping more closely to LXX, by something like 'ubi est causa tua, mors? ubi est aculeus tuus, inferne?' (J.'s translation from LXX in his commentary), meaning not 'Your judgement has been done away with, death', as Paul understands the words at 1 Cor. 15.55, but 'Come with your judgement, death'. Only thus may the sense of Hos. 13 be retained: God resolute against those who have spurned him.

(e) devorasti ... confossa sunt. The section is brought to a triumphant, climactic end: death is ripped apart. The connection between Jonah and Christ is finally made clear. Death is still envisaged in terms of the great fish (cf. faucibus, praedam, interiora tua, adunco dente; and devorasti, repeated from 2.2), but its prey is now Christ, God become man (adsumpti corporis; adsumere is frequently found with

corpus, caro, and the like, in reference to the incarnation of Christ). For the image of the hook cf. in Ion. 1.12 (CCSL 76.390 = PL 25.1129) 'me cupit devorare mors, ut vos pariter occidat, et non intellegit, quia velut in hamo escam capit, et mea morte moriatur'.

It is evident, then, that the figure of Christ underlies the whole passage, and that Jonah and Jeremiah are, to J.'s mind, symbolic personae of him. The work of Christ in overcoming death was adumbrated long before it was finally achieved.

For further discussion of the passage, particularly its relation to the Commentary on Jonah, see Y.-M. Duval, Le Livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine: sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme (2 vols., Paris, 1973), 1.283-6. On typology generally see the bibliography in ODCC s.v. Types.

2.2. deserto. The neuter singular is found only in late, and almost exclusively in Biblical and ecclesiastical, Latin. The plural, which is used regularly in the Late Republic and Early Empire, continues to be used as well, but, to judge from TLL, much less frequently than the singular. The ecclesiastical writers will generally have followed the usual Biblical form, desertum, which will almost

certainly have been influenced by the Greek ἔρημος (singular).

desolavit fontem tuum. For desolare used with words like fons cf. also Isa. 11.15 'desolabit dominus linguam maris Aegypti', 19.5 'fluvius desolabitur atque siccabitur'.

2.3. iugulavit. The verb is quite natural, given the personification of mors, and iugulare is occasionally used with abstracts in any case; cf. e.g. Cic. Phil. 13.38 'causa ... iugulata', Mart. 1.106.9 'durum iugules mero dolorem', J. epist. 75.1.2 (quoted at 2.2-3 adduxit ... confossa sunt), 143.1.2 'heresis Caelestina iugulata est'.

o mors ... inferne. At in Os. 13.14-15 (CCSL 76.149 = PL 25.938) J. carefully distinguishes between mors and infernus: 'inter mortem autem et inferos, hoc interest: mors est quo anima separatur a corpore; infernus, locus in quo animae recluduntur, sive in refrigerio, sive in poenis, pro qualitate meritorum'. By inferne here J. understands 'hell' in the broad sense, referring to the time before Christ opened the gates of heaven; see on 3.2 si Abraham ... regno?.

avidis faucibus. For the fauces of death, envisaged as a beast, cf. e.g. Arnob. nat. 2.78 'mortis reperiamur

in faucibus', Claud. paneg. 4 cons. Hon. 58 'leti rapuit de faucibus urbes'; and of other personified abstractions, e.g. Cic. Catil. 3.1 'urbem ... paene ex faucibus fati ereptam', Arch. 21 'belli ore ac faucibus'.

interiora: = viscera; cf. e.g. Sen. nat. 3.1.3, Plin. nat. 20.101, Aug. serm. 277.8.8 'viscera nostra, interiora nostra, quae dicuntur intestina'.

c.3. By Christ's death and resurrection death itself was overcome. In consequence the kingdom of heaven was opened to all those who had followed God in time past and to all believing Christians: an obvious consolation to Heliodorus as he grieved for his nephew.

With this c. it is instructive to compare epist. 39.4, which uses much of the same material, but is aimed more directly at showing that the bereaved has no reason to grieve.

3.1. salvator: a Christian neologism, equivalent to the Greek σωτήρ . For full discussion of its origins and usage see C. Mohrmann, 'Les Emprunts grecs dans la latinité chrétienne', VChr 4 (1950), 201-5 (= Mohrmann, Études sur le latin des chrétiens (4 vols., Roma, 1958-77), 3.135-9).

creatura: another exclusively Christian word, frequently used in the Bible as equivalent to κτίσις or κτίσμα. It may refer either to the act of creation (cf. e.g. Rom. 1.20, J. epist. 123.11.1), or to what is created, as here and at e.g. Rom. 1.25, J. epist. 64.18.10.

adversarium. J. is referring to mors, of course, but there may be a loose mental connection with Satan, to whom the word adversarius is often specifically applied; cf. e.g. Tert. anim. 35.3 'in diabolum transfertur adversarii mentio' (i.e. 'the word "adversary"'), J. in Eph. 4.27 (PL 26.511) 'diabolus Graecum verbum est, quod Latine dicitur criminator: lingua vero Hebraea Satan appellatur, id est, adversarius, sive contrarius'.

periret: a clever ambiguity; not only 'die' in the natural sense, but also 'die' in the sense of 'enter infernus' (cf. 3.2), thus not gaining eternal life.

regnavit ... praevaricationis Adam: Rom. 5.14 (Vulg.: 'sed regnavit mors ab Adam usque ad Mosen etiam in eos qui non peccaverunt in similitudinem praevaricationis Adae'). J.'s use of the passage keeps it very much within its Pauline context. Paul is dealing with the reconciliation of man to God through the death of Christ: through Adam's sin death held sway over all

men, but through Christ came eternal life. Paul's point about Moses is not that with the coming of the Mosaic Law death ceased to reign, but that it held sway even then, before the Law, when technically there could be no sin as there was no set standard to sin against, because of the transmitted effect of Adam's sin in violating an express command of God. Quoting the verse here enables J. to introduce easily Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who preceded Moses, and to say that until Christ opened heaven even these great patriarchs were trapped in infernus (3.2); how great then was the work of Christ in overcoming death.

praevaricationis. The word is originally a technical term, meaning collusion between advocates in legal cases; cf. e.g. Cic. Cael. 24 'at praevaricatione est Asicius liberatus'. In Christian Latin, however, it is used to mean any transgression or breach of law in a Christian sense; cf. e.g. Rom. 4.15, Hebr. 9.15.

3.2. si Abraham ... regno? In pagan Latin infernus was frequently used as an adjective referring to the underworld. Christian writers took over the word and fitted it into their own theology. Often it means the place of punishment for the wicked after death (cf. e.g epist. 96(tr. from Theophilus).12.1 'quis enim infernus haec mala suscipere potest, qui tartarus de rebus istius modi cogitare?'), but it may also refer to the

abode of all the dead, of which the place of punishment is a part (cf. e.g. Aug. in psalm. 85.18). Augustine indicates that there was a controversy over what the word ought to mean; cf. quaest. hept. 1.126 'solet esse magna quaestio, quomodo intellegatur infernus: utrum illuc mali tantum an etiam boni mortui descendere soleant'.

In the broader sense infernus could be used only of the time before Christ harrowed Hades (ᾍδης, = infernus; cf. Ambr. bon. mort. 10.45) and brought out the souls of all the faithful. It is to this time that J. here refers. The sense of the c. as a whole is that until the resurrection of Christ the souls of all the dead were in infernus, which admitted of degrees of comfort and discomfort (cf. on quodsi ... caelorum? below). At the resurrection the gates of heaven were opened, and the souls of the dead went either to heaven or to hell, as everyone subsequently did directly they died (cf. 7.1: Nepotianus is cum Christo). In effect there is both a 'Virgilian' and a Christian eschatology here. J. identifies paradisus and regnum caelorum, though a distinction came to be drawn between them: after the harrowing of hell, the souls of the blessed went first to paradise and only later, after the Last Judgement, when all the souls in purgatory had been purged, to heaven. In J.'s time, however, the doctrine of purgatory had not been fully developed, and J. here implies nothing about the Last Judgement.

The same idea occurs elsewhere in J., with much of the same Biblical material employed; cf. epist. 129.2.1, in Eccl. 3.18-21 (CCSL 72.281 = PL 23.1041) 'hoc autem dicit ... quod ante adventum Christi omnia ad inferos pariter ducerentur. unde et Iacob ad inferos descensurum se dicit. et Iob pios et impios in inferno queritur retentari. et evangelium, chasmate interposito, apud inferos et Abraham cum Lazaro et divitem in suppliciis esse testatur. et revera, antequam flammeam illam rotam, et igneam romphaeam, et paradisi fores Christus cum latrone reseraret, clausa erant caelestia et spiritum pecoris hominisque aequalis vilitas coarctabat', and, in consolation, epist. 39.4.1-2 'quomodo me lugere prohibes, cum et Iacob Ioseph in sacco fleverit ...? perfacilis ad ista responsio est: luxisse Iacob filium, quem putabat occisum, ad quem et ipse erat ad infernum descensurus dicens: descendam ad filium meum lugens in infernum, quia necdum paradisi ianuam Christus effregerat, necdum flammeam illam romphaeam et vertiginem praesidentium cherubin sanguis eius extinxerat - unde et Abraham, licet in loco refrigerii, tamen apud inferos cum Lazaro scribitur'. Cf. also in Os. 13.14-15 (quoted at 2.2-3 adduxit ... confossa sunt (d)): infernus there is clearly the abode of the souls of all the dead.

It is possible that J. took the idea from Origen; cf. the latter's Homily on 1 Sam. 28.3-25, esp. c.9: 'Πρὸ τῆς τοῦ κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίας ἀδύνατον

ἦν τινα παρελθεῖν ὅπου τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς ... διὰ τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας Σαμουὴλ οὐκ ἠδύνατο διελθεῖν, οὐκ Ἀβραάμ. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Ἀβραὰμ βλέπεται ὑπὸ τοῦ κολλωμένου ... περιέμενον οὖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπιδημίαν καὶ πατριάρχαι καὶ προφῆται καὶ πάντες, ἵν' οὗτος τὴν ὁδὸν ἀνοίξῃ'.

On J.'s eschatology in general see the useful study of J.P. O'Connell, The Eschatology of Saint Jerome (Mundelein, Ill., 1948).

si amici ... obnoxii. erant should be understood with sub poena; to take tenebantur obnoxii with everything which precedes is awkward, especially in view of the variation between sub poena and peccatis. amici tui and qui non peccaverant refer to the same group of people, Abraham and the rest; tui must refer to Christ.

dixerunt ... ad unum: cf. Ps. 13.1, 3 (LXX) 'dixit insipiens in corde suo: non est deus. corrupti sunt et abominabiles facti sunt in studiis suis ... omnes declinaverunt, simul inutiles facti sunt; non est qui faciat bonum, non est usque ad unum', (Hebr.) 'dixit stultus in corde suo: non est deus. corrupti sunt et abominabiles facti sunt studiose ... omnes recesserunt, simul conglutinati sunt; non est qui faciat bonum, non est usque ad unum'. The fact that the quotations more closely resemble the text of the Gallican (LXX) Psalter than that of the version from the Hebrew, which had been completed by this time (cf. general introduction, sect. 4), probably indicates no more than that J. was quoting from memory.

The verses are by no means quoted out of context. For J. they usefully characterise the wicked man.

quodsi ... caelorum? For the story of Lazarus and the rich man see Luke 16.19-31. On this passage J. wrote a homily, still extant (CCSL 78.507-16), in which he again makes the point that until the resurrection of Christ no-one was in paradise (CCSL 78.515.269-72). The souls of the dead were all in infernus, but this was divided between a place of refreshment and comfort, the nearest thing to paradise (cf. 510.92-6 'paradisus pauperis, sinus erat Abrahae. Abraham a longe, et Lazarum in sinu eius. dicat mihi aliquis: in inferno est paradisus? ego hoc dico, quia sinus Abrahae paradisi veritas <non> est: sed et sancti sinum paradisum fateor') and a place of torment, giving indications of the ultimate torment which would be suffered after the Judgement (cf. 514.247-515.268). But the locus refrigerii, J. says here, is nothing in comparison with heaven itself.

The allusion to the story of Lazarus and the rich man suggests an answer to the question posed immediately above: if even those who had done no sin were held liable for Adam's wrongoing, and so entered infernus, what is one to believe of the wicked? Answer: that they entered a part of infernus that was far worse.

quodsi: 'even if'; cf. Cic. ad Q. fr. 1.1.27 'quod si te sors Afris aut Hispanis aut Gallis praefecisset,

immanibus ac barbaris nationibus, tamen esset humanitatis tuae consulere eorum commodis et utilitati salutique servire'.

locoque refrigerii. For refrigerium and its complexity of meaning see C. Mohrmann, 'Locus refrigerii', in B. Botte and C. Mohrmann, L'Ordinaire de la messe (Paris and Louvain, 1953), pp. 123-32 (= Mohrmann, Études, 2.81-91). In the context of the rich man, Lazarus and Abraham, the expression is probably derived from Luke 16.24 'mitte Lazarum ... ut refrigeret linguam meam'.

3.3. ante ... paradiso. For the latro cf. Luke 23.39-43. J. brings the redeeming work of Christ into the sharpest possible focus. Before his resurrection even Abraham was in infernus, and the implied answer to the question above, si Abraham ... regno?, is of course 'no-one'. But at his resurrection Christ opened heaven even to a latro. The contrast between Abraham and the robber, between the time before and the time after, is made greater by the fact that J. does not mention the robber's repentance, a point he stresses in the Homily on Luke 16.19-31 (cf. CCSL 78.515.274ff., esp. 275-6 'magnitudo enim fidei meruit magnitudinem praemiorum').

inferos. inferi = the inhabitants of the infernus locus, in either the Christian or the pagan sense (see on 3.2 si Abraham ... regno?); and sometimes, by metonymy, = the infernus locus itself (cf. e.g. Ambr.

in psalm. 40.30 'caelum aperuit, inferos clausit').

paradiso. The word is a borrowing from Greek, but derived ultimately from oriental languages. The fundamental meaning is 'fruit-garden'; cf. e.g. Gell. 2.20.4 'vivaria autem quae nunc vulgus dicit ... παραδείσους Graeci appellant', Aug. serm. 343.1 'conscripta sunt verba eius, quae habuit in paradiso; hoc est in viridario suo'. Among Christians it meant particularly the Garden of Eden (cf. e.g. J. epist. 52.5.4), and was often used, as here, for heaven, the place of the faithful after death. Epiphanius of Salamis differentiates between paradisus and caelum (cf. J. epist. 51(tr. from Epiphanius).5.7); but J. here clearly identifies the two (see on 3.2 si Abraham ... regno?).

et idcirco ... Hierusalem: cf. Matt. 27.50-3 'Iesus autem iterum clamans voce magna emisit spiritum ... et monumenta aperta sunt, et multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierant surrexerunt, et exeuntes de monumentis post resurrectionem eius venerunt in sanctam civitatem et apparuerunt multis'. Matthew is clearly talking about an earthly resurrection, the purpose of which seems to have been to give a sign that Jesus had actually been resurrected. At epist. 46.7.6 Paula and Eustochium (in reality, almost certainly J. himself; cf. Kelly, pp. 124, 141) strongly assert that this resurrection must

have been terrestrial: 'nec statim Hierosolyma caelestis, ut plerique ridicule arbitrantur, in hoc loco intellegitur, cum signum nullum esse potuerit apud homines domini resurgentis, si corpora sanctorum in caelesti Hierusalem visa sunt'. Here, however, J. introduces caelesti, thus giving a different sense to Matthew's account: the dormientium corpora must refer to those in infernus who were released upon Christ's resurrection (for dormientium see on 2.1 iungam ... suscitatus est). Significantly, at in Matt. 27.53 (CCSL 77.276 = PL 26.213) J. expresses uncertainty whether the earthly or the heavenly Jerusalem is meant: 'sanctam autem civitatem in qua visi sunt resurgentes aut Hierusalem caelestem intellegamus aut hanc terrenam quae ante sancta fuerit'; and the present interpretation of Matthew's words is found also at epist. 120.8.8 'monumenta quoque ... ideo sunt aperta, ut egrederentur de his, qui prius in fidelitate mortui erant, et cum resurgente Christo atque vivente viverent et ingrederentur caelestem Hierusalem et haberent municipatum nequaquam in terra, sed in caelo [cf. 3.4], morientesque cum terreno Adam resurgerent cum Adam caelesti'. For a similar application to the heavenly Jerusalem of a Biblical detail about the earthly Jerusalem cf. epist. 22.41.3 'tunc vere super asinam dominus ascendet et caelestem ingredietur Hierusalem'.

corpora, being taken directly from the gospel account, implies nothing about J.'s view of the

substance of persons in *infernus* or in heaven. In fact he shared the orthodox view of the time, that people had some kind of physical body in heaven; cf. e.g. *epist*. 75.2.4, 84.5.1, *c. Ioh*. 23-36 (PL 23.373-89).

eloquium: 'saying'. In this sense *eloquium* is common in late Latin, but extremely rare earlier, when it is generally found as equivalent to *eloquentia*.

surge ... Christus: Eph. 5.14 (Vulg.: 'surge, qui dormis, et exsurge a mortuis, et inluminabit tibi Christus'). The Vulgate text of Ephesians is not J.'s (see general introduction, sect. 4), but in quoting the v. at *in Eph*. 5.14 (PL 26.525-6), and again at *epist*. 46(Paula and Eustochium).3.2, if this is indeed J.'s work (see on *et idcirco ... Hierusalem* above), he writes 'exsurge a mortuis', and there is no strong reason why he should have preferred *elevare* here. The Greek is 'ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν'. If *elevare* is not simply used for stylistic variety after *surge*, or drawn from an alternative version which had stuck in J.'s mind, it may be that it reflects a wish to emphasise Christ's part in the action, i.e. 'be raised up' rather than 'rise'.

In applying these words to those released from *infernus* and admitted to heaven at Christ's resurrection J. employs them differently from the author of Ephesians, who uses them in reference to the

living. But J. knew the passage to be a quotation from an unknown document - probably a liturgical formula or hymn (cf. T. K. Abbott, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians (Edinburgh, 1897), p. 158); J. himself held it to be some liturgical work (cf. in Eph. 5.14 (PL 26.525)) - and he will have felt no difficulty in investing it with this new meaning.

Iohannes ... adpropinquavit enim regnum caelorum: cf. Matt. 3.1-2 'in diebus autem illis venit Iohannes Baptista praedicans in deserto Iudaeae et dicens: paenitentiam agite; adpropinquavit enim regnum caelorum'. It is natural that J. should think of John's prophecy in the present context, but the sentence is rather abruptly introduced, and he proceeds to explain it at 3.4 a diebus ... illud, where see n.

heremo = ἐρήμῳ ; it is preferred here to the Vulgate 'deserto', though the quotation paenitentiam ... caelorum matches the Vulgate exactly. Like the Greek, heremus is feminine (from ἔρημος χώρα); there may also have been a neuter form (cf. TLL s.v. eremus). In Latin the word appears from Tertullian on.

3.4. a diebus ... illud: cf. Matt. 11.12 'a diebus autem Iohannis Baptistae usque nunc regnum caelorum vim patitur et violenti rapiunt [al. diripiunt; so also J. in Matt. 11.12 (CCSL 77.80 = PL 26.72)] illud'. The

Matthew passage is difficult, not least because it is not clear whether it is an editorial comment by Matthew himself or a continuation of Jesus' words in vv.7-11. A further problem is whether the violence mentioned is to be understood as violence directed against the kingdom of heaven in the persons of John the Baptist and other Christian preachers, or as that of the resolute, who alone can press into the kingdom. In the present case J. clearly understands it in the latter sense, as he does elsewhere; cf. in Matt. 11.12 (CCSL 77.80 = PL 26.72) 'grandis est enim violentia in terra nos esse generatos et caelorum sedem quaerere possidere per virtutem quod non tenuimus per naturam', epist. 22.40.3 'regnum caelorum vim patitur et violenti diripiunt illud. nisi vim feceris, caelorum regna non capies'. From the time of John heaven was no longer inaccessible to men, but could be stormed by the righteous: not that J. believed that anyone actually did burst into heaven until after Christ's resurrection; he will have held that the assault was only begun in John's time.

The force of enim is somewhat obscure. a diebus ... illud cannot be taken as explaining the previous sentence. Logically it should be explained by it: it was from the time of John that the kingdom of heaven suffered violence, because John was the first to preach repentance and the imminent coming of the kingdom. In his commentary ad loc. J. indeed sets out this

explanation. enim must, I think, be understood as explaining why J. has introduced the previous sentence, which is rather loosely attached to what has preceded; i.e. 'I have introduced this comment about John preaching the coming of the kingdom in this connection because it was from that time on that the kingdom was assaulted and men were enabled to enter it by storm'.

J.'s thoughts are clearly no longer focused on the souls of the righteous which are in infernus; he is, rather, looking at the opening of heaven from the point of view of Christians on earth.

flammea ... sanguine: cf. Gen. 3.24, where, after the expulsion of Adam from Eden, the cherubim and a flaming sword are stationed on guard before paradise. There is no mention of gates; but it seems an easy addition to the picture here, and there may have been some influence on J.'s thought from Gen. 28.17, where Jacob, after his dream, describes Bethel as the gate of heaven, or perhaps from the idea of the gates of hell (cf. e.g. Isa. 38.10, Matt. 16.18). Cf. also epist. 108.9.3 'diligit dominus portas Sion ... portas, quibus infernus non praevalet, per quas credentium ad Christum ingreditur multitudo'. restincta refers properly to the flammea rumphea, reserata to the gates of heaven; grammatically, however, reserata agrees with cherubin. J. has mentally reconstructed praesidentia foribus cherubin with fores as the subject, but keeps reserata

neuter to preserve grammatical harmony.

J. uses the same images, with minor changes, such as breaking down rather than unlocking the gate, at epist. 39.4.2 (quoted at 3.2 si Abraham ... regno?).

rumphea: = ῥομφαία ; spelled variously in Latin. It denotes some kind of weapon, sometimes apparently a lance or spear (cf. e.g. Liv. 31.39.11), more often a sword (cf. e.g. Isid. orig. 18.6.3), and seems to be associated particularly with the Thracians (cf. Plut. Aem. 18.5, Liv. 31.39.11, Gell. 10.25.4). It is found a number of times in LXX and Greek NT; cf. e.g. 1 Sam. 17.51, Luke 2.35, where it is rendered in the Vulgate by gladius. In its Latin form it appears in the Vulgate only in Ecclus., 2 Esd. (= 4 Esd.), and (once) Rev., which do not represent J.'s work (see general introduction, sect. 4). Its presence here, from LXX Gen. 3.24 'ῥομφαίαν' , may be explained by the fact that J. had not yet begun his revision of the Latin Octateuch on the basis of the Hebrew (see general introduction, sect. 4); the word will have stuck in his mind from the LXX or Old Latin text.

praesidentia ... cherubin. cherub is normally masculine, but TLL notes a few instances where it is found in the neuter; cf. e.g. Tert. adv. Marc. 2.22.1. Some years later J. certainly held it to be masculine; cf. in Ezech. 9.2-3 (CCSL 75.105 = PL 25.87) (AD 410-

14) 'quamquam plerique τὰ Χερουβὲμ neutrali genere numeroque plurali dici putent, nos scire debemus singulari numero esse cherub, generis masculini, et plurali eiusdem generis cherubim, non quo sexus in ministris dei sit, sed quo unumquodque iuxta linguae suae proprietatem diversis appelletur generibus', 28.11-19 (CCSL 75.395 = PL 25.272).

nec mirum ... intra vos est: 'nor is it surprising that we are promised this [i.e. entry into heaven] when we are resurrected, since all of us who live in the flesh but not according to the flesh have citizenship in heaven, and while we are still here on earth are told "The kingdom of God is within you"'.

omnes ... in caelo draws on three passages of Scripture: 2 Cor. 10.3, where a distinction is drawn between in carne and secundum carnem; Rom. 8.12-13 'debitores sumus non carni, ut secundum carnem vivamus; si enim secundum carnem vixeritis, moriemini; si autem spiritu facta carnis mortificatis, vivetis'; and Phil. 3.20 'nostra autem conversatio [πολίτευμα ; J.'s municipatus] in caelis est'. The combination of these ideas found here seems quite natural.

municipatus is a rare word. TLL records one instance of its use to mean 'township'. Normally it means 'the condition of being a citizen', and almost always in relation to heaven (from Phil. 3.20); cf. e.g. Tert. adv. Marc. 3.24, 5.20, J. epist. 14.3.1,

58.2.3, in Ier. 17.12-13 (CCSL 74.168 = PL 24.790). It seems very likely that it was found in the Latin text of Phil. 3.20 familiar to J.; or else that he felt consistently that it rendered πολίτευμα better than conversatio.

hic ... intra vos est. The quotation regnum ... est is from Luke 17.21 (text as Vulgate). The words are addressed by Jesus to the Pharisees. In the Greek, the meaning of 'ἐντὸς ὑμῶν', here rendered by intra vos, is not clear. The most obvious meaning is 'within you', i.e. 'within your hearts', but this does not seem appropriate to the Pharisees; 'among you', i.e. in the persons of Jesus and the disciples, is a possibility; and Cyr. Alex. in Luc. 17.20-1 suggests 'within your grasp'. Now although intra was sometimes confused with inter (cf. TLL s.v. intra), intra vos ought naturally to mean 'within you'; and this is the sense required in the present context. J. is not interested here in the problem of how Jesus could have made such a statement to the Pharisees; but if it was applicable to them it must, by extension, have been applicable to all good Christians, and thus quite appropriate here.

c.4. A further consequence of Christ's resurrection is that knowledge of God has spread throughout the whole terrestrial world. There is some exaggeration here, of course; but J. creates a mood of triumph and

exhilaration which may have been of some help to Heliodorus in his grief. It is, however, only an apparent consolation. J. has glided from giving cogent reasons why there is no need to lament Nepotianus' death (death itself is overcome, and faithful Christians enter heaven) into something very much more general, which really has nothing to do with Nepotianus at all.

4.1. notus ... nomen eius: cf. Ps. 75.2 (Vulg.: (LXX) 'notus in Iudaea deus, in Israhel magnum nomen eius', (Hebr.) 'cognoscetur [al. cognoscitur] in Iudaea deus, in Israhel magnum nomen eius'). If J. was consciously quoting from the LXX version here, when his translation from the Hebrew was complete (cf. general introduction, sect. 4), it may have been to avoid the awkwardness of what he took to be a future tense in the Hebrew; but he is probably quoting from memory, with no thought of the textual difficulty. The Psalm is concerned with the victorious power of God, but J. is not interested in the context, only in this particular v., which enables him, with the insertion of tantum, to compare the extent of knowledge about God before and after Christ's resurrection. The limitation of the field of this knowledge to Judah and Israel, though not implied in the Psalm, is natural for J., who will have believed that the OT gave a full account of God's relations with man before the coming of Christ.

The same contrast is drawn elsewhere, in the same terms; cf. epist. 58.3.2 'postquam siccato Iudaeae vellere universus orbis caelesti rore perfusus est et multi de oriente et de occidente venientes recubuerunt in sinu Abraham, desiit notus esse tantum in Iudaea deus et in Israhel magnum nomen eius, sed in omnem terram exiit sonus apostolorum et in fines orbis terrae verba eorum', tract. in psalm. 75.2 (CCSL 78.49) 'antequam inluminaret crux mundum, antequam videretur dominus in terra, notus erat in Iudaea deus, in Israhel autem magnum nomen eius: quando autem venit salvator, in omnem terram exivit sonus eius, et in fines orbis terrae verba eius'.

ipsi ... trahebantur: see nn. on 3.1-3. ipsi = 'even those'.

totius ... oceani. J. describes the extent of the world by looking at it first in an east-west, and then in a north-south, direction.

In ancient writers India, and in particular the Ganges, was often regarded as the eastern boundary of the world, or at least of 'pars nostra terrarum' (Plin. nat. 2.242), while the western boundary was generally held to be Spain, especially Cadiz and the Pillars of Hercules; cf. e.g. Plin. nat. 2.242 'pars nostra terrarum ... ambienti, ut dictum est, oceano velut innatans longissime ab ortu ad occasum patet, hoc est

ab India ad Herculis columnas Gadibus sacratas', Sen. nat. 1 pref. 13, Iuv. 10.1-2 with the nn. of J. E. B. Mayor (ed.), Thirteen Satires of Juvenal (2 vols., London, 1888), 2.65, and nearer J.'s own time, Ambr. Abr. 2.7.40 'ab Indiae quoque litoribus usque ad Herculis ut aiunt columnas', Sidon. carm. 5.286-7. On the western side, however, the distance of Britain from the centre of the Roman world also became a standard topic; cf. e.g. Catull. 29.4 'ultima Britannia', Hor. carm. 1.35.29-30, Claud. paneg. Manl. Theod. 51. Heges. 2.9.1 refers to Britain as 'extra orbem posita'. Here J. ignores the Spain-tradition and more realistically refers to Britain to indicate the world's western extremity.

For ancient notions of the geography of India see A. Dihle, 'The Conception of India in Hellenistic and Roman Literature', PCPhS NS 10 (1964), 15-23, who points out that among Christian writers part of India was conceived of as bordering on Ethiopia; in this connection cf. J. epist. 53.5.2 'de Aethiopia, id est de extremis mundi finibus, venit'. Generally the Christian conception of India was wider than the pagan conception at the same period and accorded better with the geographical details known since the second century AD, often embracing the whole of modern India and as far as and including Indo-China.

By septentrionis plaga J. means the region of the far north; he is not necessarily thinking of the

northernmost climatic zone in the technical sense, according to which the earth was divided into five zones corresponding to zones in the heavens, as described, for example, by Virg. georg. 1.233ff., Macr. somn. 2.5.11-12. (On this techical usage see K. Abel, 'Zone', RE supp. 14.989-1188.) In contrast fervores Atlantici oceani must refer to the southern extremity of the known inhabited world. J. is probably thinking of the sea to the west and south-west of Europe, as he seems to be when he uses the phrase Atlanticus oceanus at in Is. 21.13-17 (CCSL 73.208 = PL 24.193); but it is not inconceivable that he has in mind the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean, which Strabo, for example, regarded as part of the Atlantic (cf. A Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography, ed. W. Smith (2 vols., London, 1873-8), 1.312, s.vv. Atlanticum mare; the whole article contains a valuable survey of the evidence for the use of the term 'Atlantic'). fervores is taken by both Labourt and Wright to mean 'heat', as often, thus contrasting with the idea of cold in rigida ... plaga; but this seems awkward with oceani, as the phrase in itself more naturally means 'the motion of the Atlantic', i.e. of the tides, etc., as at Cic. nat. deor. 3.24. I suspect that J. was in fact thinking of the movement of the water, the primary contrast being one not of temperature but of mobility; the rigida septentrionis plaga would include the elder Pliny's 'mare concretum' beyond Thule (nat. 4.104). rigida,

'stiff with cold' (cf. e.g. Lucr. 2.521 'rigidis ... pruinis', Virg. georg. 2.316), is thus much better than frigida, which is the reading of B alone and in any case the lectio facilior.

tantarum: common for tot in late Latin; cf. L.-H.-Sz. 2.206.

quam ... armis: Virg. Aen. 8.723. The quotation comes from the description of that part of Aeneas' shield which depicts Augustus reviewing the peoples he has conquered. It is thus very appropriate here, for what J. goes on to say is effectively that Christ has now 'conquered' all the peoples of the world. The passage thus gains in meaning from association with its original context.

ritu: often of animals; cf. e.g. Lucr. 4.1265, Cic. amicit. 32, Liv. 3.47.7, J. epist. 98(tr. from Theophilus).3.5 'in ritum brutorum animalium'. J. also uses the word of peoples whose behaviour he would have considered bestial; cf. epist. 69.3.6 'Scottorum et Aticottorum ritu ac de Re publica Platonis promiscuas uxores, communes liberos habeant'.

conterebantur: 'trodden down', 'crushed'; i.e. they were no better off than the lowest of the animals.

absque ... pecus est. The idea seems distinctively Christian. A pagan would most likely have regarded the intellect as the differentiating factor between men and beasts; cf. e.g. Sall. Catil. 1.1-2.

passionem. passio in the sense of 'suffering' is found only in Christian writings. For discussion of the term see C. Mohrmann, 'Pascha, passio, transitus', Ephemerides liturgicae 66 (1952), 37-52 (= Mohrmann, Études, 1.205-22).

4.2. taceo de .... On praeteritio see Lausberg, 1.436-7 (sects. 882-6). The device is frequently employed by J.; cf. e.g. epist. 52.2.2, 112.2.5 ('taceo de ...'); 4.1.2, 92(tr. from Theophilus).6.1, 112.2.5 ('praetermitto ...'); 100(tr. from Theophilus).9.1, 108.20.7 ('quid memorem ...?').

Hebraeis ... dedicavit: cf. Luke 23.38 'erat autem et superscriptio inscripta super illum litteris graecis et latinis et hebraicis, hic est rex Iudaeorum', John 19.20. The other evangelists do not mention in what languages the superscription was written; cf. Matt. 27.37, Mark 15.26. It is not clear in what sense J. regarded the superscription as instrumental in dedicating these nations to the Christian faith.

By the Latin natio J. presumably means Latin-speakers.

inmortalem ... philosophantur. The immortality of the soul, a question what exercised the minds of the great pre-Christian philosophers, who held varying opinions on the matter, is now held to be true even by barbarian peoples from remote lands: such has been the power of Christ's resurrection.

Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p. 66, n. 64, suggests that this passage is derived from Cicero's Consolatio, which is the probable source of nearly all of c.5, including the list of Greek philosophers at 5.2 (see nn. on c.5). This is certainly arguable: the Consolatio is closely related to the Tusculans (see introduction), where reference is made to the views of Pythagoras and Democritus on the soul's immortality and to Socrates' discussion of the matter in prison (cf. e.g. Tusc. 1.38, 1.82, 1.72). But it is also true that J. knew about Pythagoras' doctrines from other sources (see below on Pythagoras ... somniavit), he may well have known the basic line of the Phaedo from elsewhere, even if, as is probable, he did not read it at first hand (see on 14.2 Platonis ... mortis), and Democritus' view too he may have found mentioned by other authors.

philosophor is intransitive, and esse must be understood with inmortalem ... subsistentem; quod is the relative pronoun after the virtual acc. & inf. clause, i.e. 'That the soul is immortal ... a thing which Pythagoras dreamed about ... is the philosophy of the Indian ...'.

dissolutionem corporis. dissolutio (corporis) as a synonym for mors is found in both Christian and pagan authors; cf. e.g. Cic. fin. 2.101 'dissolutione, id est morte, sensus omnis exstinguatur', Sen. epist. 77.9, Ambrosiast. in Rom. 5.12 'mors autem dissolutio corporis, cum anima a corpore separatur', Hil. in psalm. 119.18. It is the Latin equivalent of the Greek διάλυσις (cf. e.g. Plato Phaedo 88B).

Pythagoras somniavit. For Pythagoras' belief in metempsychosis, and his doctrines generally, see W. K. C. Guthrie, A History of Greek Philosophy (5 vols., Cambridge, 1962-78), 1.146-340. J. knew of his philosophy through a number of later writers, including Cicero, Seneca, Origen, and Porphyry; cf. adv. Rufin. 3.39-40 (PL 23.484-7), with Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, pp. 65-6 and 72-3.

By somniavit J. may have wished to suggest that Pythagoras' thoughts on the soul's immortality were never more than a dream: as a pagan he would never have experienced the reality.

Democritus: with Leucippus, one of the founders of Greek atomism. He considered the soul to be as perishable as the body. For fragments of his work see Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, edd. H. Diels and W. Kranz (6th edn., 3 vols., Berlin, 1951-2), 2.130-207; and for the philosophy of the atomists, Guthrie, Hist.

Greek Philos. 2.382-507.

in consolationem ... in carcere. The story is told in full by Plato in the Phaedo, which J. had probably not read directly (see on 14.2 Platonis ... mortis).

Indus ... Aegyptius. J. is of course aiming at an impressionistic picture, and he would not have pretended that Christianity had absorbed the whole of these peoples. But it had certainly penetrated them all by this time. The Church appears to have reached the Malabar coast of India by the end of the second century; its foundation in Egypt was traditionally ascribed to St. Mark the Evangelist, and Alexandria was an important Christian centre very early; it existed in Persia, or more precisely, Armenia, from the late third century, when it was brought by Gregory the Illuminator; and the Visigoths were converted around AD 382-95. For details see ODCC s.vv. Armenia, Christianity in, Coptic Church, India, Christianity in, with appended bibliographies, A. S. Atiya, A History of Eastern Christianity (London, 1968), and E. A. Thompson, The Visigoths in the Time of Ulfila (Oxford, 1966), c. 4.

With this impression of the wide extent of Christianity one might compare epist. 46(Paula and Eustochium).10.2, where mention is made of pilgrims to Jerusalem from Gaul, Britain, Armenia, Persia, India,

Ethiopia, Egypt, Pontus, Cappadocia, Coele-Syria, and Mesopotamia. Cf. also epist. 107.2.3 with nn.

Bessorum feritas: i.e. Bessi feri; a Thracian tribe, known to Herodotus (7.111.2). They are noted as brigands by Strabo 7.5.12. For details of their involvement in the Greco-Roman world see RE s.n. Bessoi. Their conversion to Christianity is likely to have been recent, for in AD 400 Paulinus of Nola writes of it as if it is still topical: 'nam simul terris animisque duri ¦ et sua Bessi nive duriores ¦ nunc oves facti duce te gregantur ¦ pacis in aulam. ¦ quasque cervices dare servituti ¦ semper a bello indomiti negarunt, ¦ nunc iugo veri domini subactas ¦ sternere gaudent' (carm. 17.205ff.).

pellitorum ... populorum. The expression is vague; J. is probably thinking loosely of the northern barbarian peoples, such as the Goths and Huns, whose incursions into the Roman world had been frequent in recent years (cf. c.16 with nn.). The conversion of the Huns is referred to at epist. 107.2.3.

mortuorum ... inferiis: 'at the funerals of the dead'; inferiis is virtually a locative. Some of the MSS have inferis, i.e. 'sacrificed men to the dead', but mortuorum is thus rendered redundant, and the phrase, of which I have noticed no other instances, seems

highly unnatural.

fregerunt: 'softened'.

melos: = μέλος . The word is common in late Latin, though unusual in the literature of the Late Republic and Early Empire. Its usage goes back to Comedy. There are a number of instances in J.; cf. e.g. in Is. 16.11-13 (CCSL 73.264 = PL 24.238), tract. in psalm. 136.2 (CCSL 78.297).

totius ... est: a triumphant ending, with a powerful double-cretic clausula. For the exaggeration cf. e.g. epist. 65.12.3 'his sagittis [sc. dei] totus orbis vulneratus et captus est', 78.14.3 'ad apostolos quoque ... descenderit spiritus sanctus et divisis linguis credentium totus evangelica praedicatione mundus expletus sit'; and see further on 14.1 tota hunc ... Italia.

c.5. Having made the points he has made in cc.2-3, J. need really go no further in his attempt to console Heliodorus, as he has made it quite clear that Nepotianus, being a Christian, must be in heaven, which is the ultimate consolation. But the purpose of the letter is not merely consolatory; the central section, cc.8-12, while it may have served to convince Heliodorus of Nepotianus' place in heaven by recounting

his virtues, is intended as a eulogy of the young man in the manner of a laudatio funebris, which J. in one way conceived the letter to be (see introduction). Further, on the consolatory side itself, J. has not yet tapped the great well of material available to him from predecessors, who form a tradition in which he plainly feels himself to stand, as this c. shows. He therefore carries on, first encouraging both Heliodorus and himself in their grief by quoting examples from pagan history of staunch fortitude in bereavement.

5.1. Quid agimus, anima? The phrase recurs at epist. 108.27.1. For the device of addressing one's own heart or soul, which goes back to Homer, see G. Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford, 1968), pp. 461-2.

quid tacemus?: certainly any vices Nepotianus might have had!

exciderunt ... non tenes! praecepta rhetorum here is a vague, general phrase; dicendi ordinem indicates that J. is thinking mainly about the dispositio of his material, on which see Lausberg, 1.241-7 (sects. 443-52). At epist. 118.1.2-3 (exhortatory consolatio to Julian) he professes a rather different attitude: 'extemporalis est epistula absque ordine sensuum, sine lenocinio et conpositione sermonum, ut totum in illa

amicum, nihil de oratore repperias ... nos leporem artis rhetoricae contemnentes et puerilis atque plausibilis eloquii venustatem ad sanctarum scripturarum gravitatem confugimus, ubi vulnerum vera medicina est'. This claim, however, is not without some exaggeration: while the style of the piece is fairly low-key, its organisation is not entirely haphazard.

The sentence seems to read better as a question than as an exclamation, and earlier editors took it in this way; J. is not despairing of his ability to write the piece, but encouraging himself to do so. Some of the MSS have _excideruntne_, and this is printed in the earlier editions; but a simple question-mark will suffice.

Anaxagorae ... mortalem. J. means that he knew quite well that Nepotianus was mortal and would inevitably die, and so should not be so overwhelmed by grief.

At _Tusc_. 3.28ff. Cicero discusses the view, which he attributes to the Cyrenaic school, that it is the unexpected evil which causes distress. Future ills should therefore be anticipated; cf. _Tusc_. 3.29 'haec igitur praemeditatio futurorum malorum lenit eorum adventum, quae venientia longe ante videris'. In his account (3.30) he quotes the saying of Anaxagoras (_c_. 500 - _c_. 428 BC) on hearing of the death of his son in exactly the same words as J. uses here, and at 3.28

quotes three lines spoken by Telamon in a play now lost but generally considered to be Ennius' Telamo (but perhaps Pacuvius' Teucer; cf. The Tragedies of Ennius, ed. H. D. Jocelyn (Cambridge 1967), p. 394): 'ego cum genui, tum morituros scivi et ei rei sustuli. ¦ praeterea ad Troiam cum misi ob defendendam Graeciam, ¦ scibam me in mortiferum bellum, non in epulas mittere'. Both sayings illustrate the principle that praemeditatio mitigates the distress caused when evils befall. It seems highly probable that J. draws the references here from this section of the Tusculans, or more likely still, from Cicero's Consolatio, from which most of c.5 is derived (see subsequent nn.). Admittedly the dicta are known to other authors (cf. e.g. (Anaxagoras) Val. Max. 5.10.3, Plut. ad Apoll. 33 (118D), cohib. ira 16 (463D), trang. anim. 16 (474D), Symm. epist. 3.6.3, (Telamon) Sen. dial. 11.11.2, Fronto p. 217 Naber), but the fact that they are found in combination in Cicero (who refers to them again at Tusc. 3.58), and that Anaxagoras' words are presented by J. in precisely the same form as they are given by Cicero (which is not true of Valerius Maximus, or of Symmachus, who merely alludes to them), makes the probability of a Ciceronian source overwhelming. It is in any case highly likely that Cicero was the source for Symmachus and Valerius too (cf. on 5.2-3 proponunt ... explicavit).

The notion that grief may be alleviated by advance consideration of potential misfortune is frequently found in consolationes; cf. e.g. Cic. ad fam. 5.16.2 'est autem consolatio pervulgata quidem illa maxime, quam semper in ore atque in animo habere debemus, homines nos ut esse meminerimus ea lege natos, ut omnibus telis fortunae proposita sit vita nostra', Sen. epist. 63.15 'tunc ego debui dicere, minor est Serenus meus: quid ad rem pertinet? post me mori debet, sed ante me potest. quia non feci inparatum subito fortuna percussit', Plut. ad Apoll. 21 (112C) 'ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ἥλπιζον φησί ταῦτα πεισεσθαι, οὐδὲ προσεδόκων. ἀλλ' ἐχρῆν σε προσδοκᾶν ... καὶ οὐκ ἄν νῦν ἀπαράσκευος ὥσπερ ὑπὸ πολεμίων ἐξαίφνης ἐπελθόντων ἐλήφθης', Ambr. exc Sat. 1.35 'cuius [sc. Satyri] ego casum, quo esset tolerabilior, nec praemeditari potui: ita pavebat animus de illo tale aliquid cogitare'.

As most consolations deal with the grief engendered by someone's death, the praemeditatio τόπος is often closely related to the notion that death is inescapable, which is itself frequently employed as a means of consoling the bereaved. In pagan consolation cf. e.g. Cic. ad fam. 4.5.4 (Sulpicius) 'si hoc tempore non diem suum obisset, paucis post annis tamen ei moriendum fuit, quoniam homo nata fuerat', Sen. epist. 93.12, 99.8 'omnis eadem condicio devinxit: cui nasci contigit mori restat', dial. 6.10.5, 11.1.4 'maximum ergo solacium est cogitare id sibi accidisse quod omnes

ante se passi sunt omnesque passuri', Cons. ad Liv. 360, Plut. ad Apoll. 6 (104A). The idea is taken up by Christian writers and sometimes, naturally enough, connected with their belief in resurrection; cf. e.g. J. epist. 39.3.1 'dolemus quemquam mortuum: ad hoc enim nati sumus, ut maneamus aeterni?', 75.1.3 'adversum mortis ergo duritiam et crudelissimam necessitatem hoc solacio erigimur, quod brevi visuri sumus eos, quos dolemus absentes', 108.27.3, Ambr. epist. 39.5 'caro enim nostra perpetua esse ac diuturna non potest; necesse est occidat, ut resurgat', obit. Valent. 48 'nihil ergo habetis, quod gravissime doleatis in fratre: homo natus est, humanae fuit obnoxius fragilitati', exc. Sat. 1.4, 2.3, Paul. Nol. epist. 13.6 'commune enim tibi cum omnibus amisisse mortalem', Bas. epist. 6.2 'ἀνάβλεψον πρὸς τὸν οὐρανόν· καὶ οὗτός ποτε λυθήσεται· πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον· οὐδὲ οὗτος διαμενεῖ. οἱ ἀστέρες σύμπαντες, ζῶα χερσαῖα καὶ ἔνυδρα, τὰ περὶ γῆν κάλλη, αὐτὴ ἡ γῆ, πάντα φθαρτά, πάντα μικρὸν ὕστερον οὐκ ἐσόμενα. ἢ τούτων ἔννοια παραμυθία ἔστω τοῦ συμβεβηκότος'.

For a detailed account of these τόποι see H. T. Johann, Trauer und Trost (München, 1968), pp. 63-84.

5.2. Crantorem ... Cicero. The work entitled Περὶ πένθους by Crantor of Soli (c. 325 - c. 275 BC), philosopher of the Old Academy, exercised considerable influence on

later writers; cf. e.g. Diog. Laert. 4.27 'θαυμάζεται δὲ αὐτοῦ μάλιστα βιβλίον τὸ Περὶ πένθους'. Plut. ad Apoll. 6 (104B-C) states that it was addressed to one Hippocles on the death of his children; fragments may be found in Fragmenta philosophorum Graecorum, ed. F. W. A. Mullach (3 vols., Parisiis, 1860-81), 3.139-52. Cicero refers to Crantor and this work several times; cf. e.g. Tusc. 1.115, 3.71, and esp. acad. prior. 2.135 'legimus omnes Crantoris, veteris Academici, de luctu; est enim non magnus, verum aureolus et, ut Tuberoni Panaetius praecipit, ad verbum ediscendus libellus'; and the elder Pliny, as well as J., makes it clear that it was on the Περὶ πένθους that Cicero based his own Consolatio on the death of his daughter Tullia in 45 BC (cf. nat. pref. 22 'in Consolatione filiae Crantorem, inquit [sc. Cicero], sequor').

It is most improbable that J. had read Crantor's work, despite his claim here; see below on Platonis ... percucurrimus.

confovendum. confovere, common in late Latin, appears in extant literature first at Afran. com. 143, and apparently not again until Apul. met. 8.7.

Platonis ... percucurrimus. Among Plato's writings consolatory elements are found in the Apology, Menexenus, and Phaedo (with the pseudo-Platonic Axiochus, considered spurious certainly by the time of

Diogenes Laertius (first half of third century AD?); cf. Diog. Laert. 3.62). None of these is a consolatio proper, but the funeral oration in the Menexenus, and the other two works, contain arguments which have some consolatory function or effect. Whether J. knew any of these works at first hand is doubtful. Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, pp. 64-70, discusses the evidence for J.'s knowledge of Plato and shows that, for all his claims to have read him, his references and allusions to Platonic writings rarely presuppose personal acquaintance with the Greek text. He never alludes to the Apology or the Menexenus, and his knowledge of the Phaedo may be entirely second-hand (cf. on 14.2 Platonis ... mortis). If he had read them, it may have been very quickly (cf. percucurrimus), and with the aid of a Latin translation; he certainly knew of the Protagoras through Cicero's version (cf. Courcelle, p. 67).

It is still less likely that he had read directly the consolatory works of the other philosophers here mentioned (Diogenes (c. 400 - c. 325 BC), founder of the Cynic school; Clitomachus (187/6 - 110/09 BC), pupil of Carneades (214/3 - 129/8 BC), founder of the New Academy; and Posidonius (c. 135 - c. 51/50 BC), historian and philosopher, who greatly influenced many Latin writers, Cicero and Seneca among them) - items such as Clitomachus' book 'quem ille eversa Karthagine misit consolandi causa ad captivos cives suos; in eo

est disputatio scripta Carneadis, quam se ait in commentarium rettulisse' (Cic. Tusc. 3.54). Courcelle, pp. 65-6, argues cogently that J. derived what he knew about them from Cicero's Consolatio, and that the same is true of his knowledge of Crantor (the same view had been expressed long before by Buresch, 'Cons. hist. crit.', pp. 47-8). Elsewhere J. certainly exaggerates his first-hand knowledge of Greek philosophers (cf. epist. 84.6.2 and adv. Rufin. 3.39 (PL 23.484)), while the Consolatio is the source for the rest of this c. (cf. on 5.2-3 proponunt ... explicavit), and is closely connected with the Tusculans (see introduction), in which reference is made to all these writers (cf. 1.104 (Diogenes), 2.61 (Posidonius), and 3.54 (Clitomachus and Carneades; quoted above)). J. may of course have come across scattered references to them in other writers too; Diogenes, for example, is mentioned a number of times by Seneca.

There is nothing surprising in J.'s exaggerated claim to have read Crantor and the rest. For one thing, it will have helped to convince Heliodorus that J. was well equipped to undertake his task. He was in any case prone to exaggerate; one might compare his claim that 'novum testamentum Graecae reddidi auctoritati' (epist. 71.5.3; see also vir. ill. 135 (PL 23.717)), whereas in fact it is unlikely that he revised any of the NT other than the gospels (see general introduction, sect. 4).

vel libris vel epistulis. At times J. draws an explicit constrast beteen libri and epistulae; cf. e.g. epist. 28.1 'epistulae brevitatem causati sumus et rem libri non posse explicari litteris praetexuimus', epist. ad Praesidium p. 55.51-2 Morin 'longam orationem conpendio breviem - epistola quippe librum redolere non debet'. In these cases the difference is one of scale; J. was highly conscious of the precept that a letter (epistula) should be short, though he often admits to having failed to observe the due limit (cf. Arns, La Technique du livre, pp. 96-8, Bartelink, pp. 89-90, 120-1; for the precept in general see e.g. Demet. de eloc. 228, Iul. Vict. rhet. 27 p. 448 Halm, and the unknown author in the same volume, p. 589). But there appears to be little reason why he should wish to make the same distinction here. He may have in mind, on the one hand, general treatises on consolation and, on the other, more personal pieces; but it is quite plausible that he wrote the phrase without any thought of precise connotations.

etiamsi ... inrigari. For this use of arere cf. Ennod. epist. 2.7 'nos ab scolarum gymnasiis sequestrati, arentis ingenii guttis quaedam oceani fluenta provocamus', Paul. Nol. carm. 15.41 'in quorum [sc. populorum] arentes animas pia gratia fluxit'. fontibus suggests not only sources of supply for a dry ingenium, but original sources of supply. The word is often used

in reference to philosophers; cf. e.g. Cic. acad. post. 1.8 'sed meos amicos in Graeciam mitto ... ut ea a fontibus potius hauriant quam rivulos consectentur', nat. deor. 1.120 'Democritus ... cuius fontibus Epicurus hortulos suos inrigavit, de orat. 1.42, where there is a metaphor of Socrates as fons.

5.2-3. proponunt ... explicavit. This group of men who have displayed great fortitude in the face of bereavement, and are thus examples to J. and Heliodorus, is particularly interesting in as much as the same exempla are found in other authors to illustrate the same quality:

(a) Cic. Tusc. 3.70: Q. Maxumus, L. Paulus, M. Cato, and 'reliqui, quos in Consolatione conlegimus';

(b) Cic. ad fam. 4.6.1: Q. Maximus, L. Paullus, Galus, M. Cato;

(c) Val. Max. 5.10: Horatius Pulvillus, Aemilius Paulus, Q. Marcius Rex, Pericles, Xenophon, Anaxagoras;

(d) Sen. dial. 6.13: Xenophon (not named), Pulvillus, Paulus; in c.12 he mentions Sulla, in c.14 Bibulus and Caesar;

(e) Plut. ad Apoll. 33 (118C-119D): Anaxagoras, Pericles, Xenophon, Dion of Syracuse, Demosthenes, Antigonus (Gonatas);

(f) Symm. epist. 3.6.3: Pericles, Anaxagoras, M. Horatius (Pulvillus).

It is possible that some of these *exempla* were proverbial by J.'s time, and earlier; but C. Kunst, *De s. Hieronymi studiis Ciceronianis* (Dissertationes philologae Vindobonenses 12; Vindobonae et Lipsiae, 1918), pp. 124-31, has made out a very strong case that they are all derived by J. from Cicero's *Consolatio*, which he mentions here as containing a wealth of *exempla* which he does not trouble to detail. Cicero will in turn have drawn the Greek *exempla* from Crantor's Περὶ πένθους, which was almost certainly Plutarch's source too. It appears extremely likely that Valerius Maximus, Seneca, and Symmachus were also dependent on the *Consolatio*.

The occurrence of the case of Anaxagoras in Valerius and Symmachus among other examples of fortitude suggests that it played a similar part in the *Consolatio*; it certainly did so in Crantor, to judge from the Plutarch passage. J., however, has just used the Anaxagoras story to illustrate the principle of *praemeditatio futurorum malorum* (see on 5.1 *Anaxagorae ... mortalem*), which is how Cicero treats it in the *Tusculans*. J. may of course have used both the *Tusculans* and the *Consolatio* as sources for this c.; but it seems quite possible that in the *Consolatio* the case of Anaxagoras was used twice, as illustrative both of fortitude in bereavement and of the *praemeditatio* principle.

To display fortitude at times of loss was regularly considered virtuous and the notion is often found in consolation (the only one of the passages mentioned above which has nothing directly to do with consolation is (c)). Cf. also Sen. contr. 4 pr. 6 'o magnos viros, qui fortunae succumbere nesciunt et adversas res suae virtutis experimenta faciunt! declamavit Pollio Asinius intra quartum diem quam filium amiserat: praeconium illud ingentis animi fuit malis suis insultantis', Sen. epist. 99.6 'innumerabilia sunt exempla eorum qui liberos iuvenes sine lacrimis extulerint, qui in senatum aut in aliquod publicum officium a rogo redierint et statim aliud egerint. nec inmerito; nam primum supervacuum est dolere si nihil dolendo proficias; deinde ...'. The elder Seneca, however, considered it possible to be too thick-skinned; cf. suas. 2.15.

5.2. Periclen ... concidisse. These stories about Pericles (c. 495 - 429 BC), the great Athenian statesman, and Xenophon (c. 428/7 - c. 354 BC), the author and follower of Socrates, are not found in any extant contemporary sources (except, in the case of Pericles, for the passage from Protagoras quoted by Plutarch (see below)). The details about Pericles occur at Val. Max. 5.10.ext.1; Symm. epist. 3.6.3 merely says 'Pericles amissis recens filiis venit in curiam'. Of sources not dependent on Cicero's

Consolatio, Plut. Per. 36.6-8 and Aelian var. hist. 9.6 make reference to Pericles' great fortitude in the face of losing his sons (and other members of his family, according to Plutarch) during the plague early in the Peloponnesian War, but do not mention this particular incident. The origins of this story may lie with Protagoras, whose account is quoted by Plut. ad Apoll. 33 (118E); it is quite likely that Crantor had excerpted Protagoras' words first, and that Plutarch took them from him.

The story of Xenophon as told by Plut. ad Apoll. 33 (118E-119 A) and Val. Max. 5.10.ext.2 tallies closely with what J. says here. Sen. dial. 6.13.1 presents only slight variations. Aelian var. hist. 3.3 is very close, and is probably indebted either to Plutarch or to Crantor himself (at the same point in his work he also gives the stories of Anaxagoras, Dion, and Antigonus, all of which occur in Plutarch). Diogenes Laertius knows the story (cf. 2.54), but is rather muddled about it. He declares that Ephorus is his source for the incident of the death of Xenophon's son Gryllus at Mantinea, but when he mentions the announcement about it made to Xenophon, uses the vague 'φασί'. He also (2.55) attributes to Xenophon the famous phrase of Anaxagoras at the news of his son's death (see on 5.1 Anaxagorae ... mortalem), perhaps following confused sources. The anecdote may well have originated with a fourth-century historian or perhaps a

eulogy of Gryllus (cf. Diog. Laert. 2.55 'φησὶ δ' Ἀριστοτέλης ὅτι ἐγκώμια καὶ ἐπιτάφιον Γρύλλου μυρίοι ὅσοι συνέγραψαν, τὸ μέρος καὶ τῷ πατρὶ χαριζόμενοι'), from either of which Crantor could have derived it.

J. may have drawn the phrase Xenophontem Socraticum from Cicero, who at Tusc. 2.62 wrote 'Socraticum Xenophontem', and perhaps expressed himself similarly in the Consolatio; but it is an easy shorthand phrase, found in Iulius Paris' epitome of Valerius Maximus (5.10.ext.2), where Valerius himself wrote 'Xenophon ... quod ad Socraticam disciplinam adtinet ...'.

coronatus: cf. Protagoras ap. Plut. ad Apoll. 33 (118F) 'ἐστεφανωμένον κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος' (of Pericles).

5.3. quid memorem ...? For praeteritio see on 4.2 taceo de ....

Pulvillus ... sepeliri. The story is found also at Val. Max. 5.10.1, Sen. dial. 6.13.1-2, and Symm. epist. 3.6.3, of whom only Symmachus gives the detail that Pulvillus gave orders for the corpse to be taken away for burial. Iulius Paris' epitome of Val. Max. 5.10.1 presents Pulvillus as saying 'tolle ... cadaver', though our text of Valerius contains nothing of the kind; it seems likely that Valerius originally included

the detail, and that it fell out in the course of transmission. Its absence, however, does not destroy the value of the episode as an example of fortitude in bereavement, as long as it is made clear that Pulvillus continued to perform the rite of dedicating the temple in spite of the news, and both Seneca and Valerius do this.

For historical accounts of the dedication of the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol (Capitolium can mean either the hill or the temple only), which traditionally took place in 509 BC, see Liv. 2.8.6-8 and Plut. Public. 14, both of which mention Pulvillus' order. The story appears to have been famous, and is touched on by Cicero at dom. 139.

For details of what is known about M. Horatius Pulvillus see RE s.n. Horatius 15.

Capitolium dedicans. Sen. dial. 6.13.1 has 'Capitolium dedicanti', and Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 127, n. 1, says 'eum [sc. Hieronymum] Senecam hoc imitari putes breviloquio'. This is possible, if J. had a text of the Ad Marciam before him as well as one of the Consolatio; but the expression need hardly be derivative at all, in view of the liking of fourth-century writers for the present participle, and of the fact that J. is clearly aiming for brevity in all his exempla here.

ut nuntiabatur. The perfect would have been more usual, and there seems to be no obvious reason for the use of the imperfect here.

Lucius ... ingressus est. The bereavement of L. Aemilius Paul(l)us, who defeated Perseus of Macedonia at Pydna in 168 BC, is mentioned also by Cic. Tusc. 3.70, ad fam. 4.6.1, amicit. 9, Sen. dial. 6.13.3-4, and Val. Max. 5.10.2. Of these only the Cicero letter specifically records the detail of seven days, but Valerius states that one son died four days before Paulus' triumph (celebrating the victory over Perseus), the other three days after it (Iulius Paris' epitome is slightly different here). The story of Paulus' loss appears to have been very famous; cf. also Liv. 45.40.7-8, Diod. 31.11.1, Vell. 1.10.3-5, Plut. Aem. 35, App. Mac. 19, most of which note that the sons died within a matter of days of each other, on either side of Paulus' triumph. Polybius does not make much of it, mentioning only that his sons predeceased him (31.28.2).

For details of the life of Paulus see RE s.n. Aemilius 114.

praetermitto ... quaesisse. With this instance of praeteritio (for which see on 4.2 taceo de ...) J. leaves behind his pagan exempla and suggests that he is about to draw others from the Christian world. In

similar fashion he passes from examples from Biblical history to one from the contemporary world (Melanium) at epist. 39.5.4 'quid vetera replicem? praesentia exempla sectare'.

Maximos ... Aufidios: such as Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator, M. Porcius Cato the censor, and C. Sulpicius Galus, cos. 166 BC, all of whom displayed great fortitude at the deaths of their sons; cf. Cic. ad fam. 4.6.1 (all three), Tusc. 3.70 (Maximus, Cato), sen. 12 (Maximus), 84 (Cato), amicit. 9 (Cato, Galus).

The fact that Maximos heads the list suggests that J. may be indulging in a pun here.

Consolationis libro: see previous nn. on this c.

ne videar ... quaesisse. For the idea cf. epist. 52.2.1 'quod ne de gentili tantum litteratura proferre videamur, divinorum voluminum sacramenta cognosce'. aliena = 'examples from the pagan world', nostra = 'examples from the Christian world'.

quamquam ... infidelitas: 'although these pagan examples too must be briefly mentioned, to make us feel ashamed if faith should fail to provide what unbelief afforded them'. For a similarly constructed sentence cf. epist. 123.7.1 'quod [i.e. restrictions on marriage] quidem observat et gentilitas in

condemnationem nostri, si hoc non exhibeat veritas Christo, quod tribuit mendacium diabolo'.

sug(g)illatio is literally a mark of bruising, from sug(g)illare, = 'beat black-and-blue'. It thence comes to mean an insult or affront, here with some idea of shame. J. uses the word elsewhere; cf. e.g. epist. 49.2.1.

c.6. After 5.3 ne videar ... quaesisse and the opening sentence of c.6 one expects J. to give instances of Jewish (OT) and Christian fortitude in bereavement, as he does at epist. 39.5.3-5. Instead, however, he uses relevant examples from the Bible to show that while before the redeeming work of Christ grief at someone's death was appropriate, as the prospect was then infernus (cf. 3.1-2), it is certainly not appropriate now, when the prospect for Christians is heaven (cf. 3.3-4). This idea has already been implied throughout cc.2-3. Suddenly, however, he breaks off, and says that he has already, in epist. 39, used all the relevant Scriptural material on the subject of the expression of grief, and intends now to tread a different path.

6.1. non plangam ... resurgentes. For Jacob cf. Gen. 37.33-5, where he weeps for Joseph when he thinks he has been devoured by a wild beast; for David cf. 2 Sam. 18.33, where he weeps for Absalom. Both examples

recur, and at greater length, at epist. 39.4.1-2, where J. anticipates Paula using them in objection to his criticism of her weeping, and makes it clear that there was nothing inappropriate in the actions of Jacob and David, since their sons would inevitably have entered infernus, and Absalom in any case had sinned, rebelling against David (cf. 2 Sam. 15-18).

resurgentes is general, and does not refer to the filios; 'those who rise again'. evangelio = 'the Gospel dispensation' (Wright), as opposed to the Law.

For morientes, = mortuos, cf. below on 6.2 et Moyses ... plangitur.

Iudaeorum: i.e. Jacob, David, etc. Death, of course, is still a matter of grief for the Jews, who do not accept the resurrection of Jesus; cf. epist. 39.4.6 'flent usque hodie Iudaei et nudatis pedibus in cinere volutati sacco incubant ... nos vero, qui Christum induimus et facti sumus iuxta apostolum genus regium ac sacerdotale, non debemus super mortuos contristari'.

ad vesperum ... laetitia: Ps. 29.6 (so Vulg. LXX; Hebr.: 'ad vesperum commorabitur fletus et in matutino laus'). Again the quotation follows the LXX version (cf. on 3.2, 4.1), this time possibly because laetitia (ἀγαλλίασις) makes better sense here than laus; otherwise it may just be a question of memory, as often.

In Ps. 29 the psalmist thanks God for deliverance. In its context the meaning of this v. seems to be that the joy occasioned by God's favour will supersede the weeping caused by his anger, which will endure only briefly. J. finds it easy to apply it to the situation before and after Christ's resurrection.

demorabitur = 'linger'; as often, without any idea of delay or hesitation.

nox ... adpropinquavit: Rom. 13.12 (Vulg.: 'adpropiavit' for 'adpropinquavit', though many MSS have the latter form). An appropriate v.; Paul is talking about the dies salutis. There is, however, a slight difference. In talking of the dies salutis Paul appears to be thinking of the second coming of Christ, though his words will also fit the case of any individual Christian to whom death comes, bringing salvation. In any case, Paul is looking forward; it is clear that for him the day has not yet dawned. But for J. that day has already arrived, both for Christians generally, because of the opening of heaven at Christ's resurrection, and for Nepotianus in particular, who will now have entered heaven. The imagery in this v. fits in well with that of the previous quotation.

6.2. et Moyses ... plangitur: cf. Deut. 34.8, where the children of Israel weep for the death of Moses for thirty days; understandably so, for as yet there had

been no redemption, and even so good and great a man as Moses (et Moyses) would not be able to enter heaven immediately.

moriens plangitur is a good example of the use, common in late Latin, of the present participle when the action it depicts should strictly be represented in the past; Moses is lamented not moriens but mortuus. See L.-H.-Sz. 2.386-7. morientes above (6.1) is similar.

Iesus ... sepelitur. The death and burial of Joshua 'in monte Ephraim' are recorded at Josh. 24.29-30. J. infers that the burial was absque funere et lacrimis from the fact that they are unmentioned in the Bible account (see quotation from epist. 39 below). Joshua is of course here meant to be understood as a type of Christ, the point being that grief at someone's death was appropriate only in the days before Christ.

The same contrast between Moses and Joshua/Jesus is found at epist. 39.4.5, which greatly illuminates this passage: 'nequeo scripturae satis laudare mysteria et divinum sensum in verbis licet simplicibus admirari, quid sibi velit, quod Moyses plangitur et Iesus Nave, vir sanctus, sepultus refertur et tamen fletus esse non scribitur; nempe illud, quod in Moysi, id est in lege veteri, omnes sub peccati Adam tenebantur elogio et ad inferos descendentes consequenter lacrimae prosequebantur secundum

apostolum, qui ait: et regnavit mors ab Adam usque ad Moysen etiam super eos, qui non peccaverunt [cf. 3.1]; in Iesu vero, id est in evangelio, per quem paradisus est apertus, mortem gaudia prosequuntur'. Cf. also epist. 78.36.4 'Aaron plangitur, Iesus non plangitur. in lege descensus ad inferos, in evangelio ad paradisum transmigratio', (for the contrast put to a different use) adv. Iovin. 1.22 (PL 23.240-1). At epist. 53.8.4 Joshua is expressly declared to be a type of Jesus, 'non solum in gestis, verum et in nomine' (it may well be that his typological significance is derived primarily from his name, esp. as the far less important OT figure, Joshua the son of Jehozadak (Iesus Iosedech), is also regarded by J., and other Fathers, as a type of Christ; cf. adv. Iovin. 2.4 (PL 23.288), in Agg. 2.2-10 (CCSL 76A.730 = PL 25.1403), J. Lécuyer, 'Jésus, fils de Josédec, et la sacerdoce du Christ', Recherches de science religieuse 43 (1955), 82-103). For an illuminating discussion of Joshua/Jesus typology in the early Church see J. Daniélou, From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers (Engl. tr., London, 1960), pp. 229-43.

quidquid ... vestigia. Having just touched on the cases of Jacob, David, Moses, and Joshua, J. now tells Heliodorus that he has already set out, in epist. 39 (eo libro), written in 384 to Paula on the death of her daughter Blesilla, all the Scriptural material which

deals with lamentation. By this he seems to be referring to those passages which suggest guidelines for right behaviour in cases of bereavement, and which he discusses mainly at epist. 39.4-5. These include, indeed, the examples already mentioned briefly in this c. (see previous nn.). J. does not wish simply to repeat himself in the present letter. He says he will approach his task of indicating the proper reaction to Nepotianus' death differently, so as not to seem unoriginal, and thereby accords Nepotianus some importance, which will doubtless have pleased Heliodorus. Whether Heliodorus was actually in a position to read epist. 39, and see the difference, one cannot tell (for the circulation of J.'s letters see general introduction, sect. 2); the point is that he should be aware of the special treatment being accorded him. (There is something of an element of deception here, however: J. subsequently does bring up further Biblical material on lamentation, some of which has already appeared in epist. 39 (cf. on 7.2).)

The concept of originality expressed in nunc ... vestigia is very reminiscent of passages in writers of an earlier time; cf. Lucr. 1.925-7 'mente vigenti ¦ avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante ¦ trita solo', Virg. georg. 3.291-3 'sed me Parnasi deserta per ardua dulcis ¦ raptat amor; iuvat ire iugis, qua nulla priorum ¦ Castaliam molli devertitur orbita clivo', Quint. inst. 1 pr. 3. J. uses similar language again at

epist. 123.1.1 'in veteri via novam semitam quaerimus et in antiqua detritaque materia rudem artis excogitamus elegantiam, ut nec eadem sint et eadem sint. unum iter et perveniendi, quo cupias, multa conpendia'. In the present case the high-flown character of the sentence comes as something of a surprise after the low key of the rest of c.6.

c.7. J. now for the first time specifically states that Nepotianus is in heaven. Grief is therefore quite inappropriate; but it is difficult not to grieve, because he and Heliodorus miss Nepotianus, and regret that they cannot enjoy the blessings he now enjoys. Even Paul and Jesus himself were capable of grief at the death of people who would be resurrected, and indeed to display such grief is an indication of love. However, restraint should be exercised, and Heliodorus should now listen to the praises of his nephew.

7.1. Scimus ... dei nostri. Nepotianus has not been mentioned by name since 1.1, and not at all since 2.1. What J. has said about the destruction of death and the opening of heaven, about fortitude in bereavement and the inappropriateness of grief, has of course been inspired by the death of Nepotianus and would naturally have been understood by Heliodorus as applying to his case, but it has all been couched in rather general

terms. As he is dealing with a deeply personal matter, J. now takes it in hand to particularise the points he has already made.

Shift from general to particular, and the notion that the general principle is more important, is very common in rhetorical precept and practice; cf. e.g. Cic. orat. 45 'nam quoniam, quicquid est quod in controversia aut in contentione versetur, in eo aut sitne aut quid sit aut quale sit quaeritur:- sitne, signis; quid sit, definitionibus; quale sit, recti pravique partibus; quibus ut uti possit orator, non ille vulgaris sed hic excellens, a propriis personis et temporibus semper, si potest, avocet controversiam; latius enim de genere quam de parte disceptare licet, ut quod in universo sit probatum id in parte sit probari necesse', Sen. contr. 9.4.9 'nondum de propria sed de communi causa loquor. si efficio ut qui cecidit patrem possit absolvi, pro hoc animosius agam', ps. Quint. decl. min. 244 pp. 2-3 Ritter, 288 p. 155 Ritter. M. L. West (ed.), Hesiod: Works and Days (Oxford, 1978), pp.142-3, lists instances in Greek poetry going back to Homer.

To declare that someone is with Christ, or in heaven, is the most obvious τόπος of Christian consolation. For other instances cf. e.g. epist. 39.6.1 'parce filiae iam cum Christo regnanti', 75.2.1 'obsecro te ... ut Lucinum tuum desideres quidem ut fratrem, sed gaudeas regnare cum Christo', Ambr. epist.

15.2 'inter angelorum ministeria Christo adhaereret', 15.4 'est igitur iam superiorum incola, possessor civitatis aeternae illius Hierusalem, quae in caelo est'.

sanctorum: 'saints' in the broad sense, i.e. all those in heaven.

rimabatur. Wright's 'groped after' gets the sense of attempting to apprehend something unseen, but misses the point of in terris, which not only means 'on earth' as opposed to in heaven, but suggests the idea of the soil; rimari is often used in agricultural contexts, meaning to turn up the ground, as at Virg. georg. 3.534. 'Scrabbled around for' might be better.

aestimatione. The idea is a general one of estimation or judgement, without any technical sense of valuation; almost 'guess-work' (Wright). Cf. e.g. epist. 119.7.3 'erravit Paulus et humana aestimatione deceptus est'. Tert. anim. 9.3 is helpful: 'sed nos corporales quoque illi inscribimus lineas, non tantum ex fiducia corporalitatis per aestimationem, verum et ex constantia gratiae per revelationem'. Here aestimatione contrasts with videntem below.

sicut ... dei nostri: Ps. 47.9 (Vulg.: (LXX) 'sicut audivimus sic vidimus in civitate domini virtutum, in

civitate dei nostri', (Hebr.) 'sicut audivimus ita vidimus in civitate dei exercituum, in civitate dei nostri'). The presence of elements from both versions of the Psalter suggests that J. was again quoting from memory (cf. e.g. on 3.2, 6.1).

The Psalm is concerned with the glory of God and its manifestation, so the use of the v. here does not remove it far from its original context. But J. conveniently interprets civitate domini as referring to the celestial kingdom of heaven, whereas in the Psalm it actually refers to the earthly Jerusalem.

desiderium ... dolentes. J. now finds a solution to the problem presented at 2.1-2: he knows he should not weep for Nepotianus, who is in heaven, but cannot help it. The explanation here put forward is that the grief experienced is grief not for the condition of the deceased, but for that of the bereaved themselves, who are by his death separated from him. This idea occurs frequently in consolations; cf. e.g. epist. 39.1.1 'non quo lugenda sit illa, quae abiit, sed quod nobis inpatientius sit dolendum, quod talem videre desivimus', 75.1.1 'non quo eius vicem doleam, quem scio ad meliora transisse ... sed quo torquear desiderio non meruisse me eius viri videre faciem', 108.30.2 'nos nostram vicem dolemus ...' (note the similarity of expression in these passages; Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 132, points out that alicuius

vicem dolere is a very Ciceronian phrase, and desiderium ferre likewise), Ambr. epist. 39.5 'verum forte asseras securum te de meritis eius ac fide; nequire tamen ferre desiderium, quod eam iam non videas secundum carnem, idque tibi summo dolori sit', obit. Valent. 46. There is a similar emphasis on the bereaved, rather than on the deceased, at J. epist. 77.9.1 'nos hoc tantum dolemus, quod pretiosissimum de sanctis locis monile perdidimus'. The question whether one's grief is really grief for oneself or for the dead occurs also in pagan consolation; cf. e.g. Sen. dial. 6.12.1 'dolor tuus ... utrum sua spectat incommoda an eius qui decessit?', 11.9.1, Plut. ad Apoll. 19 (111E) 'οἱ πενθοῦντες τοὺς οὕτως ἀποθανόντας ἑαυτῶν ἕνεκα πενθοῦσιν ἢ τῶν κατοικομένων;'. The same kind of notion occurs at Sen. dial. 12.14.1, although the grief of the consoland there is caused by something other than someone's death. See further Johann, Trauer und Trost, pp. 92-9. For the question of the legitimacy of grieving for oneself see below on 7.2 flebant ... caritatis.

7.2. quanto ... bono. The grief occasioned by the sense of loss and separation when someone dies is aggravated for Christians by the knowledge that they do not share with him in the joys of heaven. But it is important that the emotion underlying the grief should not be envy; cf. epist. 108.30.2 'nos nostram vicem

dolemus et invidere potius gloriae eius videbimur, si voluerimus diutius flere regnantem'.

flebant ... caritatis. J. now introduces two cases from the NT which give evidence that grief may be proper even when the person lamented has passed to a new life in heaven; in other words, when grief is felt by the bereaved for their own condition. In so doing J. rather goes against what he has said at 6.2 about having already used up in epist. 39 all the Scriptural material which deals with grief and intending to tread a new path (see on 6.2 quidquid ... vestigia): the case of Lazarus is mentioned at epist. 39.2.1, and that of Paul and Epaphroditus is a Biblical item not found in that letter.

These examples also show in what sense it is legitimate for a bereaved person to grieve for his own condition. It would be possible to lament the loss of the usefulness to oneself of a friend who has died, but this would be selfish and quite wrong; Cicero makes the point: 'si id dolemus, quod eo iam frui nobis non licet, nostrum est id malum quod modice feramus, ne id non ad amicitiam sed ad domesticam utilitatem referre videamur' (Brut. 5). Grief is legitimised, however, when its stimulus is love, or pietas, towards the deceased. So here, the sorrow which Paul anticipates he will feel if Epaphroditus dies comes desiderio caritatis, and Jesus' tears for Lazarus are said to

have been shed ut veros hominis exprimeret affectus. This kind of grief is often found mentioned, with the writer's tacit approval, in Christian consolation; cf. e.g. J. epist. 75.2.1 (quoted above at 7.1 Scimus ... dei nostri), 79.1.3 'mortem iuvenis mariti sic flevit, ut exemplum coniugii dederit', Ambr. exc. Sat. 1.10 'non omnis infidelitatis aut infirmitatis est fletus ... pietatis indices', 2.14, obit. Theod. 54 'fles, Honori, germen augustum, et lacrimis pium testificaris adfectum'. Paulinus of Nola crisply delineates the conflict between the demands of pietas and those of Christian faith; cf. carm. 31.7-10 'heu! quid agam? dubia pendens pietate laboro, ¦ gratuler an doleam? dignus utroque puer; ¦ cuius amor lacrimas et amor mihi gaudia suadet, ¦ sed gaudere fides, flere iubet pietas'.

flebant ... suscitaturus erat. For the story of the raising of Lazarus see John 11.1-44. John does not in fact mention Martha weeping, though it is understandable that J. should include her with Mary here (sorores), especially as she plays a considerable part in the story as a whole. ut ... affectus may owe something to vv.35-6 'et lacrimatus est Iesus. dixerunt ergo Iudaei, ecce quomodo amabat eum', though it would in any case have been a reasonable assumption that Jesus' tears were caused by his love for Lazarus.

The case of Jesus weeping is used elsewhere by consolers to legitimise a certain amount of grief. Even in epist. 39, where he strongly criticises Paula's excessive mourning for Blesilla, J. uses the incident to justify his own grief at the girl's death: 'matris prohibituri lacrimas ipsi plangimus. confiteor affectus meos, totus hic liber fletibus scribitur. flevit Iesus Lazarum, quia amabat eum' (39.2.1). Another good example is Paul. Nol. epist. 13.4.

apostolus ... caritatis. Although Paul knows that for a Christian death is a good thing, he would still have grieved, out of love, if Epaphroditus had died: another good precedent for regarding grief of a certain kind as permissible.

cupio ... cum Christo: Phil. 1.23 (Vulg. (giving the context): 'coartor enim e duobus, desiderium habens dissolvi et cum Christo esse; multo magis melius. [24] permanere autem in carne magis necessarium est ...'). cupio probably reflects J.'s good sense of latinity; it is clearly superior to 'desiderium habens' of the Vulgate (which for Philippians is not J.'s work; cf. general introduction, sect. 4), a literal rendering of the Greek 'τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων'. mihi ... lucrum: Phil. 1.21 (text as Vulgate).

For Epaphroditus cf. Phil. 2.27 'infirmatus est [sc. Epaphroditus] usque ad mortem, sed deus misertus

est eius, non solum autem eius verum etiam et mei, ne tristitiam super tristitiam haberem'. There is no explicit mention of gratiae, but it was reasonable for J. to infer it from the context. Where J. derived the form Epaphras from is not clear; the Greek is Ἐπαφρόδιτος, rendered in the Vulgate by 'Epafroditus' (Phil. 2.25). It may simply be a slip.

agit ... redditus sit ... haberet. J.'s use of tenses here breaks the formal rules, but his thought is clear. After the pluperfect dixerat we should have expected egit, but agit imparts vividness, making the Biblical situation more immediate and thus perhaps giving it greater apparent relevance to the present case. After agit, redditus sit follows normal primary sequence of tenses (though historic sequence after a historic present would not have been unusual), but we should then have habeat. The imperfect haberet may be explained partly by the presence of 'haberem' in the Biblical passage, partly by the temporal ambiguity of agit; between agit and haberet the immediacy of the situation has faded in J.'s mind.

non incredulitatis ... caritatis: 'not in the fear engendered by unbelief but in the longing caused by love'. incredulitas nearly always appears, as here, in the sense of religious unbelief.

7.3. episcopus: = ἐπίσκοπος , 'bishop', the head of a Christian community. On the use of the term, and of parallel terms, in the early Church, see C. Mohrmann, 'Episkopos-Speculator', in her Études, 4.231-52. For grades of the clergy at J.'s time see on 10.3 fit ... ordinatur.

in carne ... pater: not strictly in carne, of course, but pater is a fairly loose word which can be applied to anyone who fulfils a father's function or inspires fatherly respect (cf. e.g. Virg. Aen. 5.348), or is simply of a father's years (cf. 13.3 with n.). As Nepotianus' father is presumably dead, Heliodorus is in any case the nearest thing he has to a real father. As for the spiritual role, bishops and other Christian leaders are often referred to as pater, by extension, presumably, from the designation of God as such in the NT.

aves ... suspiras. The metaphor in viscera, boldly sustained in divulsa, is vivid but not too harsh after pater: viscera is sometimes used to represent a child, the product of the womb and virtually a part of oneself; cf. e.g. Ov. met. 8.478, Quint. inst. 6 pr.3 'unum igitur optimum fuit, infaustum opus et quidquid hoc est in me infelicium litterarum super inmaturum funus consumpturis viscera mea flammis inicere'. In both these instances, interestingly, the context

concerns death, and the viscera are imagined on a pyre; and the Quintilian passage is particularly significant here, as it deals with the author's grief at the death of his son. For viscera more generally, as the object of one's affection, cf. epist. 89(Theophilus).1.1 'noluit ante proficisci, nisi te et sanctos fratres, qui tecum sunt in monasterio, quasi sua viscera amplexaretur et inviseret', and Ambr. obit. Valent. 58, where the author speaks of the dead Valentinian as his viscera. The word is clearly very emotive when used in this kind of sense.

suspiras & acc., = 'long after', seems very elevated; it occurs mainly in poetry.

aves is read only by Φ , B (with habes in a second hand), and Bodleian MS Canon. Pat. Lat. 221 (fifteenth century). Two of the MSS have habes simply, the rest doles. Previous editors printed doles abesse. aveo and habeo were frequently confused; cf. TLL s.v. aveo. doles would be possible, and without abesse; but aves looks much better, esp. in view of suspiras just ahead.

obsecro ... nimis. Although grief is understandable and permissible when a loved one has died, it must still be kept under restraint. The notion is common in Christian consolation; cf. e.g. Ambr. epist. 39.8 'nec nimio maerore tuam in dubium adducas sententiam', exc. Sat. 2.11 'non enim mediocre malum est inmoderatio

doloris aut metus mortis', Paul. Nol. epist. 13.10 'his ... et verborum et exemplorum caelestium auctoritatibus ut ad pietatem lacrimarum usus es, ita etiam ad earum modum utere ... scriptura divina, quae producere nos lacrimas quasi evaporando dolore permittit, terminos quoque designato praescribit tempore, cum dicit amaritudinem luctus uno ferendam die', Bas. epist. 28.1, 62 'κλαῦσαι ἡμῖν ... μὴ λυπεῖσθαι ὡς καὶ οἱ λοιποί, οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα, οὐ μὴν οὐδ' ἁπλῶς ἔχειν πρὸς τὸ συμβάν, ἀλλὰ τῆς μὲν ἡμέρας ἀλοθάνεσθαι, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς λύπης μὴ καταπίπτειν', Greg. Naz. epist. 165.2 'οὔτε τὸ λίαν ἁπαθὲς ἐπαινῶ, οὔτε τὸ ἄγαν περιπαθές· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀπάνθρωπον, τὸ δὲ ἀφιλόσοφον. ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὴν μέσην βαδίζοντα, τῶν μὲν ἄγαν ἀσχέτων φιλοσοφώτερον φαίνεσθαι, τῶν δὲ φιλοσοφούντων ἀκριβῶς ἀνθρωπικώτερον', and esp. J. epist. 39, where he is especially anxious to restrain Paula's grief, e.g. 5.2 'ignoscimus matris lacrimis, sed modum quaerimus in dolore', 6.4 'detestandae sunt istae lacrimae plenae sacrilegio, incredulitate plenissimae, quae non habent modum, quae usque ad vicina mortis accedunt'.

Christians, of course, had good reasons for not mourning the deaths of other Christians. Excessive grief would suggest that faith was lacking (cf. e.g. J. epist. 39.6.4, quoted above), and hence give a handle to unbelievers, which J. is at pains to avoid at 14.6, where see n. The notion that grief should be

moderated, however, appears frequently in pagan consolation too, and is chiefly due to the idea that to grieve is natural, but to over-indulge it, weak: this attitude certainly exercised some influence on Christian consolers (cf. esp. the passage from Greg. Naz. quoted above). Good examples are Plato Menex. 20 (247C-248C), Cic. ad Att. 12.10 'tuus autem dolor humanus is quidem, sed magno opere moderandus', ad fam. 5.18.2, Sen. epist. 63.1 'moleste fero decessisse Flaccum ... plus tamen aequo dolere te nolo', 99.16, dial. 6.7.1 'at enim naturale desiderium suorum est. quis negat, quam diu modicum est?', 11.18.6 'fluant lacrimae, sed eaedem et desinant', 12.16.1 'non prohibuerunt [sc. maiores] luctus sed finierunt; nam et infinito dolore, cum aliquem ex carissimis amiseris, adfici stulta indulgentia est, et nullo inhumana duritia', Plut. ad Apoll. 3-4 (102C-E) 'τὸ δὲ πέρα τοῦ μέτρου πυκτεφέρεσθαι καὶ συναύξειν τὰ πένθη παρὰ φύσιν ἔνιοί φασι ... οὐτ' ... ἀπαθεῖς ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων συμφορῶν ὁ λόγος ἀξιοῖ γίγνεσθαι τοὺς εὖ φρονοῦντας οὔτε δυσπαθεῖς· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄτεγκτον καὶ θηριῶδες, τὸ δ' ἐπιλελυμένον καὶ γυναικοπρεπές', 28 (116C), ad uxor. 2 (608B-C). Only occasionally does the notion occur that one ought to let one's grief have full rein; cf. e.g. Stat. silv. 2.6.1-2, Hor. carm. 1.24.1-2 (an epicedion rather than a consolatio), and in these poems too a sterner position is taken at the end.

The philosophical view that such μετριοπάθεια was the proper means of dealing with grief - as opposed to ἀπάθεια and to complete submission to it - seems to have been held by Crantor (cf. Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 133, Gregg, Consolation Philosophy, pp. 83-4), and thus probably had a place in Cicero's Consolatio (cf. on 5.2). The notion is so widespread, however, and so understandable for Christians to hold, that there is no need to postulate a single source for what J. says here, as Kunst seems to do.

The concept of the value of moderation, in all things, not merely in grief, is of course originally Greek, the saying 'μηδὲν ἄγαν' (ne quid nimis) being attributed by Aristotle to Chilon (Arist. rhet. 1389B). It appears early in Latin; cf. e.g. Ter. Andr. 61. J. quotes the saying and the doctrine elsewhere; cf. epist. 108.21.4 (in connection with Paula's extremely hard life in the convent), 130.11.1-2 (on moderation in fasting).

obligatoque ... vulnere. For vulnus used to denote the mental effect of grief see on 1.1. The metaphor is easily sustained by obligato, a word frequently used of wounds.

audias ... eius. It was by no means essential, according to the tradition, that a letter of

consolation should contain eulogy of the deceased. There is none, for example, in Sen. epist. 63, or in dial. 11, and neither of these works is directed to giving consolation on the death of a child, when it might have been difficult to devote a section to praise. But the close relationship between letters of consolation and funeral orations (see introduction), which regularly contained panegyric, meant that the former often had a partially encomiastic function. This is particularly true of the present letter, which J. conceived as a laudatio funebris in epistolary form (see introduction); the lengthy eulogistic section which J. is about to introduce thus fits naturally into his scheme for the piece.

The rhetorical handbooks, in their discussions of epideictic oratory, give clear indications of the kind of things which would have been expected in eulogy; cf. e.g. Rhet. Her. 3.10 'laus igitur potest esse rerum externarum, corporis, animi. [The classification goes back to Plato and Aristotle; cf. H. Caplan (ed.), [Cicero] ad C. Herennium (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1954), p. 174.] rerum externarum sunt ea, quae casu aut fortuna ... accidere possunt: genus, educatio, divitiae, potestates, gloriae, civitas, amicitiae, et quae huiusmodi sunt et quae his contraria ... corporis sunt ea, quae natura corpori attribuit ... velocitas, vires, dignitas, valetudo, et quae contraria sunt. animi sunt ea, quae consilio et cogitatione nostra

constant: prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo, modestia, et quae contraria sunt', Cic. inv. 2.177-8, Quint. inst. 3.7.10ff. Much later Menander Rhetor, discussing the ἐπιτάφιας λόγας , says much the same: 'ἐγκωμιάσεις δὲ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τόπων τῶν ἐγκωμιαστικῶν , γένους , γενέσεως, φύσεως , ἀνατροφῆς , παιδείας, ἐπιτηδευμάτων, τελευτὴν δὲ τὴν φύσιν δίχα , εἴς τε τὸ τοῦ σώματος κάλλος, ὅπερ πρῶτον ἔφης, εἴς τε τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς εὐφυΐαν' (epid. 2.11 (420.10-14) Russell and Wilson).

External qualities were not valued purely for their own sake but for the use to which the possessor put them; cf. e.g. Cic. inv. 2.178 'videre autem in laudando et in vituperando oportebit non tam, quae in corpore aut in extraneis rebus habuerit is, de quo agetur, quam quo pacto his rebus usus sit', Rhet. Her. 3.13, Quint. inst. 3.7.13. In an interesting passage Statius regards them as of relatively little importance: 'laudantur proavis aut pulchrae munere formae, ¦ quae morum caruere bonis, falsoque potentes ¦ laudis egent verae: tibi quamquam et origo niteret ¦ et felix species multumque optanda maritis, ¦ ex te maior honos, unum novisse cubile, ¦ unum secretis agitare sub ossibus ignem' (silv. 5.1.55-6). In Christian writers res externae and corpus are generally omitted altogether as subjects for praise (as in this letter; cf. c.8), in accordance with the Christian emphasis on personal responsibility and spiritual

qualities, and while prudentia, modestia, and other aspects of animus still find a place in eulogy, specifically Christian virtues such as faith, prayer, and humility have greater importance; see, for example, the sort of things J. praises in Nepotianus in c.10. Only rarely are features such as physical beauty praised by Christians; when Ambrose does so at obit. Valent. 58ff. it is by way of quotations from the Song of Solomon, and the body is regarded as the home of the soul, which is what is really important (cf. Favez, Consolation, p. 108; also 13.2 ubi totius corporis dignitas, quo veluti pulchro indumento pulchritudo animae vestiebatur?). Generally, eulogy is seen as a means of glorifying not man but God; cf. e.g. Paul. Nol. epist. 13.13 'non enim hominis, sed divina per hominem opera laudamus'.

Favez's c. on eulogy of the dead (pp. 106-26) is very helpful.

cuius ... laetatus es. The transposition of semper and virtute from the normal word-order results in a fine double-cretic clausula. For the influence of prose-rhythm on word-order in J. see general introduction, sect. 3.

nec doleas ... habueris. The τόπος belongs to both Christian and pagan consolation; closely related is the idea that one received the other person as a gift from

God or from fortune in the first place. Cf. e.g. J. epist. 108.1.2 'non maeremus, quod talem amisimus, sed gratias agimus, quod habuimus, immo habemus', 118.4.2 'non contristor, quod recepisti, sed ago gratias, quod dedisti', Ambr. exc. Sat. 1.3 'laetandum enim magis est, quod talem fratrem habuerim, quam dolendum, quod fratrem amiserim; illud enim munus, hoc debitum est', Paul. Nol. epist. 13.6, Bas. epist. 5.2 'οὐκ ἀπεστερήθημεν τοῦ παιδός, ἀλλ' ἀπεδώκαμεν τῷ χαρίσαντι', 269.2 'μὴ οὖν, ἐπειδὴ ἀφῃρέθημεν αὐτόν, ἀγανακτῶμεν, ἀλλ', ὅτι τὴν ἀρχὴν συνωκήσαμεν, χάριν ἔχωμεν τῷ συγχύσαντι'; Cic. Tusc. 1.93, Sen. epist. 63.7 'desine beneficium fortunae male interpretari: abstulit, sed dedit', 99.3 'si amicum perdidisses, danda opera erat ut magis gauderes quod habueras quam maereres quod amiseras', dial. 6.12.2, 11.10.1 'illud quoque ... necesse est te adiuvet cogitantem non iniuriam tibi factam quod talem fratrem amisisti, sed beneficium datum quod tam diu tibi pietate eius uti fruique licuit', Plut. ad uxor. 8 (610E), Liban. epist. 1473.3 'τοιαῦτα γὰρ τὰ τῆς Τύχης· ἔδωκεν, εἶτα ἀφείλετο'; and, for contrast, Plin. epist. 8.5.2 'habet quidem Macrinus grande solacium, quod tantum bonum tam diu tenuit, sed hinc magis exacerbatur quod amisit; nam fruendis voluptatibus crescit carendi dolor'.

The general balance of the clauses nec ... amiseris and sed ... habueris - the rhythm, the equal

number of syllables - and their rhyme are most striking.

sicut ... virtutum. There is a slight anacoluthon here. The true comparison is between the map-makers and J. himself; but after sicut ... pingunt, after which would normally follow some expression like 'so I have delineated his virtues', J. recalls that Heliodorus has been the subject of every clause after obsecro, ut, and wishing to preserve the construction (although the force of obsecro is very weak by the time we get to cernas and suscipias), he is forced to break from the logical arrangement imposed by sicut ... pingunt. The sense is nevertheless quite clear.

On maps in the Later Empire see J. O. Thomson, History of Ancient Geography (Cambridge, 1948), pp. 378-81. Whether J. is here thinking of maps of the world or of a smaller area is not clear; probably just maps generally.

For the image of the brevis tabella cf. epist. 73.5.1, 123.13.1 'quasi in brevi tabella latissimos terrarum situs ostendere volui, ut pergam ad alias quaestiunculas ...', 147.12, in Is. 66.22-3 (CCSL 73A.796 = PL 24.675).

terrarum situs is a well-established phrase; cf. e.g. Cic. div. 2.97, Hor. epist. 2.1.262.

cernas ... virtutum: a borrowing from Cic. Cael. 12 (on Catiline): 'habuit enim ille, sicuti meminisse vos arbitror, permulta maximarum non expressa signa sed adumbrata virtutum'. J. is of course merely interested in the expression; he does not intend to draw a parallel between Catiline and Nepotianus! That he knew the speech well is clear from his numerous reminiscences of it; see J. F. Gilliam, 'The Pro Caelio in St. Jerome's Letters', HThR 46 (1953), 103-7. This particular passage is imitated also by Ambr. fug. saec. 3.14 'habemus haec genera non adumbrata, sed expressa virtutum', and Symm. or. 3.7 'agnosco in te non adumbrata vestigiis sed expressa veterum signa virtutum'.

non vires, sed voluntatem: cf. epist. 1.1-2 with nn.; the intention is far more important than the ability to do the proposed task well. Here, as there, J. is being self-depreciating, but in the present case the self-depreciation is obviously not designed to transfer the responsibility for what he is about to write, should it not be successful: Heliodorus has not asked him to write laudes Nepotiani. For a similar claim of inability to do justice to a task cf. c.1.1 Grandes ... explicare with n.

The words vires and voluntas are similarly contrasted at Ov. Pont. 3.4.79. The alliteration may have influenced J. in his choice of words, making the

contrast more pointed; at epist. 1.2.2 he chooses instead the rhyme-effect of 'facultatem ... voluntatem'. For alliteration generally see on epist. 1.4 gustatum ... sitit.

c.8. The eulogistic section opens with a rejection of the precept that one should begin with consideration of the subject's ancestors. Family, like physical attributes, is unimportant and irrelevant. What matters is the individual soul, and J. proposes to praise Nepotianus simply with regard to his own merits, starting from the time of his baptism, when he was reborn in Christ.

8.1. Praecepta ... videatur. Ancestors belong to the category of res externae; see on 7.3 audias ... eius. What J. says here about the handling of the theme accords closely with the rhetorical handbooks; cf. Rhet. Her. 3.13 'ab externis rebus: genus, in laude, quibus maioribus natus sit; si bono genere, parem aut excelsiorem fuisse; si humili genere, ipsum in suis, non in maiorum virtutibus habuisse praesidium', Quint. inst. 3.7.10 'ante hominem patria ac parentes maioresque erunt, quorum duplex tractatus est: aut enim respondisse nobilitati pulchrum erit aut humilius genus inlustrasse factis'. The author of Rhet. Her. also puts res externae first in the order of the three categories from which praise is to be drawn (Rhet. Her.

3.13); J. clearly knows of this principle. Polybius, interestingly, describes the laudator recounting the deeds of the ancestors of the deceased only after the deceased himself has been eulogised (6.54.1).

For avitis ... videatur cf. also Greg. Naz. orat. 43.8 (on Basil) 'εἰ γὰρ μέγα τοῖς ἄλλοις τὸ προσλαβεῖν τι πρὸς τῶν ἄνωθεν εἰς φιλοτιμίαν, μεῖζον ἐκείνῳ τὸ προσθεῖναι τοῖς ἄνω παρ' ἑαυτοῦ, καθάπερ ῥεύματος ἀναπέχοντας'.

J. refuses to praise the distinguished lineage of his subjects at other places too; cf. epist. 77.2.3, 79.2.1, 108.3.1 'alii altius repetant et ab incunabulis eius ipsisque, ut ita dicam, crepundiis matrem Blesillam et Rogatum proferant patrem ... nos nihil laudabimus, nisi quod proprium est', 127.1.3 'neque vero Marcellam tuam ... institutis rhetorum praedicabo, ut exponam inlustrem familiam, alti sanguinis decus et stemmata per consules et praefectos praetorio decurrentia. nihil in illa laudabo, nisi quod proprium est'. Only personal qualities are of any account. At epist. 130.3.1 he writes: 'rhetorum disciplina est abavis et atavis et omni retro nobilitate ornare, quem laudes, ut ramorum sterilitatem radix fecunda conpenset et, quod in fructu non teneas, mireris in trunco' and then goes on briefly to praise Demetrias' father, before recalling himself (4.1): 'verum quid ago? oblitus propositi, dum admiror iuvenem, laudavi aliquid bonorum saecularium, cum in eo mihi virgo magis nostra laudanda sit, quod haec universa contempserit'. See on

epist. 107.13.4 for the concept of a new nobilitas based not on ancestry but on Christian virtue.

eorum ... repetantur. With repetere, alte or altius often has a temporal sense; cf. e.g. Cic. orat. 11, Cluent. 66, J. epist. 108.3.1 (quoted above at Praecepta ... videatur). This is also the obvious meaning here. The transposition of altius from its more natural position before the verb is likely to be due less to a wish of J. to suggest in addition the greatness of the ancestors' deeds (altius gesta) than to a wish to improve the rhythm: though altius repetantur makes a flawless clausula accentually, metrically it gives a hexameter-type (dactyl-spondee) ending, which J. may well have wanted to avoid. gesta repetantur is highly acceptable either way.

avitis paternisque: a very common formula for 'ancestral'.

carnis ... non requiram. carnis bona are 'physical advantages', in contrast to qualities of soul - the category of corpus in the rhetoricians (see on 7.3 audias ... eius). Nepotianus' disregard of the flesh is made quite clear in the following cc.

cum ... natus. J. uses three examples from the Bible to show that considerations of genus are irrelevant

when someone's personal qualities are being assessed; ancestry can be quite misleading.

For Ishmael cf. Gen. 16.1-12, esp. 11-12, where the angel declares to Hagar that he will be a 'ferus homo, manus eius contra omnes et manus omnium contra eum'. He is not, however, a particularly happy choice as a sinner son of a father who is sanctus, for elsewhere in Genesis God blesses him (17.20) and says that he will make of him a great nation (21.18). For Esau's birth cf. Gen. 25.25; his sin must be his intention to kill Jacob (cf. Gen. 27.41). For Jephthah cf. Judg. 11.1 (the son of a meretrix), Hebr. 11.32ff. (inclusion in a list of faithful men). J. of course believed Hebrews to be a work of Paul, hence apostoli voce.

e regione: 'on the other hand', as at e.g. epist. 54.5.4, 107.6.3, adv. Iovin. 2.7 (PL 23.295). The usage is derived by extension from the more literal meaning, 'opposite', which occurs at e.g. Caes. Gall. 7.36.5, Cic. nat. deor. 2.103, J. epist. 108.13.2, Exod. 19.2 'castrametati sunt in eodem loco, ibique Israhel fixit tentoria e regione montis'.

8.2. anima ... vivet. J. uses Ezekiel to give further evidence that ancestral vices and virtues are irrelevant to the individual soul; the stress is entirely on one's own actions. The quotation, anima

... morietur, comes from Ezek. 18.4, repeated at 18.20 (text as Vulgate). The converse idea, quae non peccaverit, ipsa vivet, while not necessarily entailed by what precedes, as ergo would suggest, is an obvious corollary found also at Ezek. 18.19. It receives support in the gospels; cf. e.g. John 8.51, 11.26 'omnis qui vivit et credit in me [sc. Iesum] non morietur in aeternum' (both passages quoted by J. at in Ezech. 18.3-4 (CCSL 75.230 = PL 25.170)).

Ezekiel is consciously rejecting the Mosaic view of the transmission of sin based on the commandment-passage at Exod. 20.5 'ego sum dominus deus tuus, fortis, zelotes, visitans iniquitatem patrum in filiis in tertiam et quartam generationem eorum qui oderunt me'; the case of the Gibeonites and the descendants of Saul at 2 Sam. 21 is an instance where God is said to have put his threat into operation. At epist. 39.2.3-4 J. accepts both Ezekiel's view and the Mosaic view as possible for the present time, but with his continual emphasis on personal action and responsibility seen, for example, in the rigorous ascetic life he often prescribes and his critical attitude towards worldly people, he must generally have adhered to the Ezekiel line. He holds this view at epist. 107.6.2-3, modifying it in the case of young children, who cannot be held wholly responsible for their actions (see nn. ad loc.).

inquit: almost 'it is written', without a conscious subject.

ab eo tempore ... renascimur: i.e. all that matters for the individual is how he lives after baptism, which washes away all past sins and original sin, and is essential for salvation. That baptism is implied in renascimur is clear from John 3.5 'respondit Iesus: amen, amen dico tibi, nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu, non potest introire in regnum dei' and from the reference to the Jordan which follows; J. is also thinking of baptism at 9.2, where see n. See further on epist. 107.6.3.

Paulus ... caput. The example of Paul is introduced to show the irrelevance of one's life before baptism to the assessment of one's vices and virtues. Nepotianus is also set off in a splendid light by the implicit comparison with the great apostle (cf. the direct comparison with Timothy at 10.4).

The image of the lupus rapax is drawn from Gen. 49.27; Jacob, describing how each of the twelve tribes shall be, says of Benjamin: 'Beniamin lupus rapax; mane comedet praedam, et vespere dividet spolia'. Paul was of the tribe of Benjamin; cf. Rom. 11.1, Phil. 3.5. The figure of the wolf is well suited to Paul before his conversion, and J. uses it elsewhere; cf. e.g. epist. 38.1 'Paulus, lupus rapax et Beniamin

adulescentior, in extasi caecatur, ut videat'. For his persecution of the Church cf. Acts 7.59, 8.3, 9.1ff.

mane and ad vesperum are of course to be taken metaphorically, referring to the time before and after Paul's conversion (for the imagery cf. 6.1 with nn). The story of Ananias' hospitality towards Paul, and of the latter's baptism just a few days after his blinding on the Damascus road, is told at Acts 9.10-19. The only reference to food (9.19), however, indicates Paul and not Ananias as the recipient; Ananiae cannot then be the indirect object after escam dedit, which must be taken absolutely as an extension of the image of the wolf. Whereas previously Paul was rapax, he now provides food - in physical or spiritual form, to the needy, presumably. This interpretation is confirmed by epist. 69.6.7, where 'Ananiae ovi' definitely forms a phrase: 'Paulus, persecutor ecclesiae et lupus rapax Beniamin, Ananiae ovi submittit caput'. I would print a comma after escam.

The metaphor of Paul as a wolf contrasts easily with that of Ananias as a sheep, an image derived ultimately from the Biblical picture of Christians as sheep (cf. e.g. John 21.15-17), and perhaps from the idea of the sheep led to the slaughter (cf. Isa. 53.7), where the emphasis is on the mildness of the animal.

igitur ... nascatur. As with Paul, so with Nepotianus; J. says that he will consider only his life after

baptism. The images of the infantulus vagiens and the rudis puer suggest that he had been baptised only relatively recently. It is understandable that J. should name the Jordan in this context, in view of the baptism in it of Jesus by John (cf. Matt. 3.13ff., Mark 1.9).

J. takes up a similar position in the case of Fabiola; cf. epist. 77.2.2 'novis mihi est efferenda praeconiis et ordine rhetorum praetermisso tota de conversionis ac paenitentiae incunabulis adsumenda', after which he says that he will not go on to boast of her ancestors.

c.9. After c.8 it is a surprise to find that J. does not immediately begin his account of Nepotianus' life post-baptism. Instead, by means of two instances of praeteritio (for which see on 4.2), he touches first on Heliodorus' return to Altinum from the East many years before, undertaken for the sake of Nepotianus and his mother, and then describes Nepotianus' life in the palatii militia before he became a fully committed, baptised Christian.

9.1. Alius ... nepos. Around 375 J. was bent on leaving Antioch, where he had temporarily settled (see introduction to epist. 1), and going to the Syrian desert to take up the hermit life. He tried to persuade Heliodorus to accompany him, but the latter

eventually declined, and decided to return to Altinum, saying, however, that when J. had settled in the desert, he should write inviting him to join him (see Kelly, p. 44).

To Heliodorus' departure from the East J. here refers. The incident, however, has nothing to do with the laudes Nepotiani, which is the task in hand. It is hard to see what use any other eulogist could make of it, even without J.'s self-imposed restrictions on the categories which are appropriate to eulogy; at best it could be regarded as praise of a representative of Nepotianus' genus, and this view would be scarcely convincing. Judging from the interpretation J. puts on the incident - that Heliodorus left the East for creditable reasons, ob salutem illius - it seems to have been brought in to show Heliodorus that J. recognises his love for Nepotianus; but J. would have done better to make that point elsewhere, without a framework of praeteritio - it is most oddly placed here.

The passage is also rather curious for another reason. The attitude which J. here displays towards Heliodorus' departure is very different from that shown at the time, in the letter which he wrote to his friend when he had settled in the desert (epist. 14); cf. e.g. epist. 14.2.2-3 'recordare tirocinii tui diem, quo Christo in baptismate consepultus in sacramenti verba iurasti: pro nomine eius non te matri parciturum esse,

non patri. ecce adversarius in pectore tuo Christum conatur occidere; ecce donativum, quod militaturus acceperas, hostilia castra suspirant. licet parvulus ex collo pendeat nepos, licet sparso crine et scissis vestibus ubera, quibus nutrierat, mater ostendat, licet in limine pater iaceat, per calcatum perge patrem, siccis oculis ad vexillum crucis vola! pietatis genus est in hac re esse crudelem'. From this passage comes the line at the end of 9.1, licet parvulus ... nepos. It is most strange that J. should so obviously allude to a letter in which he criticises Heliodorus' action, when he is trying to set it in a favourable light. All in all, both within its context and in itself, 9.1 is a rather unsatisfactory passage.

scriberet ... lactaveris. The perf. subjs. dimiseris and lactaveris follow easily after scriberet, the indefinite force of which makes it virtually equivalent to a present or a future.

lactaveris means not so much 'nourished' as 'deceived', as Labourt sees; greater point is thereby given to carissimum sodalem tuum. For lactare in this sense cf. e.g. Varro Men. 350 'quibus suam delectet ipse amusiam, ¦ et aviditatem speribus lactet suis', J. epist. 82.8.1 'nos usque ad praesentem diem ficta pacis ostensione lactaverit'. Again it is odd that J. should allude to his own irritation at Heliodorus' departure from the East and failure to return in a letter in

which one would have expected all possible friction to be avoided (see previous n.).

For heremum see on 3.3.

sororem ... viduam. Nothing is known about Heliodorus' sister or the circumstances of her widowing. As Nepotianus served for a time in the palatii militia (cf. 9.2), her husband was presumably a man of some standing.

hic ... nepos: 'Yes, Nepotianus [whom we are now considering] is that person about whom I once said to you, with visionary insight, "Though your little nephew hang from your neck"'. vaticinatus sum is very obscure. The passage from which licet ... nepos is drawn (epist. 14.2.2-3, quoted above at Alius ... nepos) contains no element of prophecy; and an extension of the basic meaning such as 'babbled like a prophet' seems to make no good sense either. It may be that J. is playing on the words nepos and Nepotianus; if, when he wrote epist. 14, he did not know Nepotianus' name, he may in retrospect have felt it curious that he had quite accidentally named him almost exactly. Equally, if Heliodorus had left the East to return to a pregnant sister, J. may not have known the child's sex when he wrote; 'parvulus' and 'nepos' will then have been guesses. But these possibilities are not convincing. The true point of vaticinatus sum

remains a mystery.

The fact that J. can quote verbatim from a letter he wrote some twenty years or so before is a sure indication that he retained copies of at least some of his correspondence; cf. epist. 35(Damasus).1.2, where it is made clear that in 384 J. had a collection of letters which he had written during his time in the desert. Augustine recognises that J. may have preserved copies of letters which he (J.) had sent him; cf. Aug. epist. 71.2 (= J. epist. 104.2.1), 82.30 (= J. epist. 116.30.1). (The practice was not unusual; cf. e.g. J. Matthews, 'The Letters of Symmachus', Latin Literature of the Fourth Century, ed. J. W. Binns (London, 1974), p. 64, on Symmachus.) It is, of course, no surprise that he should preserve in his archive a literary piece like epist. 14, of which he later (AD 394) wrote: 'dum essem adulescens ... scripsi ad avunculum tuum, sanctum Heliodorum, exhortatoriam epistulam plenam lacrimis querimoniisque et quae deserti sodalis monstraret affectum. sed in illo opere pro aetate tunc lusimus et calentibus adhuc rhetorum studiis atque doctrinis quaedam scolastico flore depinximus'. The letter may have circulated widely, as certain of J.'s letters are known to have done; see general introduction, sect. 2.

The image of the child around an adult's neck is a favourite of J.'s; cf. epist. 107.4.8 'cum avum viderit, in pectus eius transiliat, e collo pendeat',

128.1.3 'de matris pendeat collo'.

For nepos = nephew cf. e.g. Ven. Fort. carm. 6.2.16 'non cecidit patruus, dum stat in orbe nepos'.

9.2. referret ... baptizatum: a second instance of praeteritio, more explicable than the first; J. wishes to point out that Nepotianus lived a good and Christian life before he was baptised, when in the palatii militia, but cannot say so by direct means because he has ruled out as irrelevant consideration of his life before baptism. At the end of the passage he indeed expresses dissatisfaction with Nepotianus' lack of total commitment. In itself the fact that Nepotianus was in the palatii militia does not seem to have mattered very much; cf. epist. 79.2.4, where J. says of Nebridius: 'nihil nocuit militanti [sc. Nebridio] paludamentum et balteus et apparitorum catervae, quia sub habitu alterius alteri militabat'.

palatii militia. It is possible that this was not the army but the civil service. Most civil servants ranked as soldiers from the time of Diocletian, and Constantine completed the system by granting military privileges and status to the palatine offices. Civil servants were issued with a uniform, and wore a cingulum; and although the duties entailed were different from those of real soldiers, service in a government department was still called militia

(officialis, as opposed to armata). An official could be called a miles, and the other military language of 10.1 - alienis signis, castrensis peculii, etc. - would not be out of place in a civil service context, especially when a deliberate contrast is being drawn between Nepotianus as a miles serving the Emperor or the state, and Nepotianus as a miles Christi. On the superficial military character of the civil service see Jones, LRE, 2.566.

On palatini generally see the references in the index to Jones, LRE, and the article in RE s.v.

Heliodorus too had been in the militia; cf. epist. 14.6.4.

chlamyde ... lino. The Roman military uniform seems to have comprised three garments, pallium (cloak), chlamys (tunic), and sticharium (shirt), the last of which is probably represented by candenti lino here; cf. Jones, LRE, 2.624-5.

cilicio. cilicium = κιλίκιον , material made originally from the hair of Cilician goats. For its various uses see RE s.v. cilicium. Christians used it for ascetic purposes - hair-shirts, or rough mattresses; cf. e.g. epist. 130.4.4 'aiunt ... eam ... ciliciolum in nuda humo habuisse pro stratu'. To wear it was a mark of penitence, for which there was Biblical authority; cf. e.g. epist. 147.8.1 'hortatus sum, ut ageres

paenitentiam et in cilicio et cinere volutareris', 1 Kgs. 21.27 'cum audisset Ahab sermones istos, scidit vestem suam et operuit cilicio carnem suam ieiunavitque et dormivit in sacco', Isa. 22.12 (quoted by J. at epist. 122.3.5, 1.5). See further P. Antin, 'Le Cilice chez saint Jérôme', La Vie spirituelle, supp. 1 (1947), 58-61 (= Antin, Recueil, pp. 305-9), R. Grégoire, 'Cilicium induere', Homenaje a Fray Justo Pérez de Urbel (2 vols., Abadia de Silos, 1976-7; = Studia Silensia 3-4 (1976-7)), 2.299-320, who traces the practice through the Middle Ages up to modern times.

tritum sit ... portaverit ... militarit ... habuerit. For the perf. subj. after referret cf. on 9.1 scriberet ... lactaveris.

saeculi potestates: 'powers of the world', 'temporal powers'. saeculum, like mundus, is common in J. in its normal Christian sense.

lurida ... portaverit. J. often describes the physical effects of fasting in terms of paleness; cf. e.g. epist. 22.7.2 'pallebant ora ieiuniis', 54.6.2 'pallor ex ieiuniis'. For fasting as a Christian activity generally see on epist. 107.8.2, 10.

sub alterius ... militarit: cf. epist. 79.2.4 (quoted above at referret ... baptizatum). alteri, of course,

is Christ. For the image of the Christian as a soldier see on epist. 107.4.8.

centurionem ... baptizatum: cf. Acts 10, which recounts the story of the calling and baptism of the centurion Cornelius, 'vir iustus et timens deum' (v.22). J. means that one becomes iustus through baptism; cf. Rom. 6.1-11, esp. v.4, and 5.19. Nepotianus' dedication to God's service was incomplete while he was still unbaptised.

c.10. J. now passes to the time when Nepotianus left the militia and began to devote himself fully to the service of Christ. Though anxious to become a monk, he would not leave his uncle Heliodorus, who was to him a pattern for his life, and consequently became a clericus, though claiming that he was unworthy. He had many virtues: care for others, humility, sexual continence, prayer, moderate fasting, knowledge of Scripture and of the writings of the Fathers. Favez, Consolation, pp. 109-26, collects many instances in Christian letters of consolation and funeral speeches where the deceased is eulogised in respect of qualities such as these; I have included a sample in the nn. which follow.

The descriptive parts of the passage, particularly from 10.5, are kept stylistically very simple: J. allows the facts to speak for themselves.

10.1. Verumtamen ... erogavit. J. makes no mention of baptism here; but as what follows is clearly, in J.'s terms, legitimate praise of Nepotianus, one must assume that Nepotianus was baptised around the same time as he left the militia. J. does not seem to have felt that to leave the militia was an essential part of the total dedication to Christ which baptism symbolised, but complete renunciation of worldly things was an ideal encouraged by Christ's words at Matt. 19.21 (quoted below), and right for a clericus (cf. epist. 52.5.2), which Nepotianus soon became. It did not matter that Nebridius was in the militia (cf. epist. 79.2.4, quoted at 9.2 referret ... baptizatum), indeed he could not effect a total renunciation as he had a family (cf. epist. 79.4.1), and J. praises him without any suggestion that he lacked full commitment; he must have been baptised, especially as he 'dormivit in domino' (epist. 79.6.1).

incunabula ... fidei. The image is familiar; cf. e.g. Cic. de orat. 1.23 'repetamque non ab incunabulis nostrae ... doctrinae quendam ordinem praeceptorum', J. epist. 52.4.3 'ab incunabulis fidei', 77.2.2 'de conversionis ac paenitentiae incunabulis', Salv. eccl. 4.42 'quasi exordia et quasi incunabula conversionis suae'.

ut ... sit. It is difficult to see how ut can have a sense of purpose here. The clause is best taken to be causal, i.e. 'seeing that ... '. For ut in this sort of sense see L.-H.-Sz. 2.647-8.

donandus laurea sit. J. is thinking of the laurel as a symbol of military victory, borne at triumphs. For the image applied to a member of the army of Christ cf. e.g. Prud. perist. 5.537-40 'tu solus, o bis inclyte, ¦ solus bravii duplicis ¦ palmam tulisti, tu duas ¦ simul parasti laureas'. For the expression cf. Hor. carm. 4.2.9 'laurea donandus Apollinari'.

balteo posito. J. probably regards balteus and cingulum (9.2) as the same item; at epist. 64.12.1, when discussing the vestments of priests, he takes the words to be synonymous.

castrensis peculii: a technical phrase, explained by the jurists; cf. e.g. Paul. sent. 3.4a.3 'castrense ... peculium est, quod in castris adquiritur vel quod proficiscenti ad militiam datur', Macer dig. 49.17.11 'castrense peculium est, quod a parentibus vel cognatis in militia agenti donatum est vel quod ipse filius familias in militia adquisiit, quod, nisi militaret, adquisiturus non fuisset'.

in pauperes erogavit. So too did Paula and others praised by J. give their possessions to the poor; cf. e.g. epist. 75.4.1 (Lucinus), 79.4.1 (Nebridius), 108.5.1 (Paula) 'quid ergo referam amplae et nobilis domus et quondam opulentissimae omnes paene divitias in pauperes erogatas?'. At epist. 120.1.4 J. suggests that the Christian poor should be helped above all: 'haec dicimus, non quo in pauperes Iudaeos sive gentiles et omnino, cuiuslibet gentis sint pauperes, prohibeamus faciendam elemosynam, sed quo Christianos et credentes pauperes incredulis praeferamus'.

To give to the poor was obviously an important Christian duty, but by itself it was not sufficient for the perfect Christian life; cf. e.g. epist. 66.8.4, 71.3.2-3, in Matt. 19.21 (CCSL 77.170-1 = PL 26.137).

legerat ... sequatur me. qui ... me is adapted, from the second person to the third, from Matt. 19.21 'ait illi [i.e. the rich young ruler] Iesus: si vis perfectus esse, vade, vende quae habes et da pauperibus, et habebis thesaurum in caelo, et veni, sequere me'. Nepotianus' action reveals his obedience to God, who speaks to men though Scripture (cf. on epist. 107.9.3).

non potestis ... mamonae: cf. Matt. 6.24 (Jesus speaking) 'nemo potest duobus dominis servire; aut enim unum odio habebit et alterum diliget, aut unum

sustinebit et alterum contemnet. non potestis deo servire et mamonae', Luke 16.13 'nemo servus potest duobus dominis servire; aut enim unum odiet et alterum diliget, aut uni adherebit et alterum contemnet. non potestis deo servire et mamonae'.

At in Matt. 6.24 (CCSL 77.39 = PL 26.44) J. explains 'mamonae': 'mammona sermone syriaco divitiae nuncupantur'.

10.2. excepta ... reservavit. For the idea that clothes should be simply practical, worn to keep out the cold, cf. epist. 107.10.1 and n. on 107.5.1.

operimento pari, sc. excepto.

cultus ... erat. For the avoidance of any kind of ostentation in dress cf. e.g. Greg. Naz. orat. 18.23, J. epist. 22.27.3 'vestis nec satis munda nec sordida et nulla diversitate notabilis [sc. sit]', 52.9.1 (J. advising Nepotianus) 'vestes pullas aeque vita ut candidas; ornatus et sordes pari modo fugiendae, quia alterum delicias, alterum gloriam redolet', 125.7.1 (a slightly different view) 'sordes vestium candidae mentis indicio sint, vilis tunica contemptum saeculi probet ita dumtaxat, ne animus tumeat, ne habitus sermoque dissentiat'.

Ostentation was of course to be avoided in all things, being contrary to the virtue of humilitas, and

it was important that the practice of virtue itself did not become ostentatious; cf. e.g. epist. 23.2.2 'inculta vestis, vilis cibus, neglectum caput, ita tamen, ut, cum omnia faceret, ostentationem fugeret singulorum', 58.2.2 'nihil est ... grande tristi et lurida facie vel simulare vel ostentare ieiunia'.

aut ... aut ... vel. Such a combination of disjunctive particles is by no means rare; cf. e.g. Quint. inst. 3.6.72 'ut aut de nomine aut scripto et sententia vel ratiocinatione quaeratur'.

Aegypti monasteria. Christian monasticism originated in Egypt around the beginning of the fourth century, St. Antony traditionally being regarded as its founder (though no fourth-century sources call Antony the founder of monasticism, and in vita Pauli J. made a case for the priority of Paul of Thebes). At epist. 22.34-6 J. discusses the three classes of monks in Egypt. There is a wealth of literature on the subject of Egyptian monasticism and early monasticism generally; see e.g. P. de Labriolle, 'Les Débuts du monachisme', Histoire de l'Église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours', edd. A. Fliche and V. Martin (21 vols., Paris, 1934-52), 3.299-369, with his bibliography, and, more recently, D. J. Chitty, The Desert a City (Oxford, 1966), O. Chadwick, John Cassian (2nd edn., Cambridge, 1968), c. 1. On the ascetic

movement as a whole see the works cited in the introduction to epist. 107.

monasterium = μονάστηριον . By origin it probably referred to the dwelling of a single monk, as Isidore later noted: 'monasterium unius monachi habitatio est. μόνος enim apud Graecos solus, στήριον statio; id est solitarii habitatio' (orig. 15.4.5). Generally, however, it denotes the dwelling of a colony of monks (monachi; monachae, if women), or simply the colony itself, without the associated idea of a building. See the examples in TLL. monachus showed a similar extension of its original meaning; cf. on 10.3.

Mesopotamiae ... choros. choros presumably refers to bands of monks. The origins of monasticism in Mesopotamia are rather obscure; see e.g. Labriolle, 'Monachisme', 3.347, E. C. Butler, 'Monasticism', The Cambridge Medieval History, edd. H. M. Gwatkin et al. (8 vols., Cambridge, 1911-67), 1.526-7.

insularum ... solitudines. insularum Dalmatiae presumably refers to the archipelago extending along the east coast of the Adriatic, with freto referring not to a narrow strait but to the whole width of that sea. In comparison with Egypt or Mesopotamia these islands are very close indeed to Altinum. J. can hardly mean the small islands of the lagoon on which

Altinum stood, to which the inhabitants of the city moved after the destruction of Altinum itself by Attila in 452 (cf. RE s.n. Altinum); Dalmatiae would then be rendered pointless.

J. is almost certainly thinking of the same islands when he writes to Julianus in 407: 'extruis monasteria, multus a te per insulas Dalmatiae sanctorum numerus sustentatur' (epist. 118.5.6); and it was probably to one of them that Bonosus withdrew around 374 (cf. epist. 3.4, Kelly, p. 35).

avunculum ... non audebat. The references to Heliodorus in the third person in this part of the letter (cf. 10.3, 10.6-9, 13.2-3) are distinctly functional. They help to fix the focus very much on Nepotianus and away from Heliodorus, giving the laudes section an appropriately general context, and allowing Heliodorus to view with greater objectivity and better perspective the character-portrait of Nepotianus which is being drawn.

pontificem. The word is from the fourth century occasionally used of a bishop, as at e.g. epist. 108.6.1. See the comments of C. Mohrmann, 'L'Étude du grec et du latin de l'Antiquité chrétienne', in her Études, 4.99-100.

tota ... virtutum: 'seeing in him representations of virtue that were quite complete in themselves'. For this use of tota see D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Propertiana (Cambridge, 1956), p. 93.

J. readily seizes the opportunity to flatter Heliodorus.

domique ... disceret. For the idea cf. Sen. contr. 1.1.3 'quid porro tam longe exempla repeto, tamquam domi [Bursian's conjecture for MSS 'modo'] desit?', ps. Quint. decl. min. 287 p. 154.17 Ritter 'iam domi habet exemplum'. The expression here, however, appears to be proverbial, as Otto, p. 120, notes; cf. Ter. Ad. 413 'domi habuit unde disceret', and esp. Sidon. epist. 7.9.19 'ut proverbialiter loquar, domi habuit unde disceret'.

10.3. in uno ... venerabatur: cf. epist. 52.7.6 'esto subiectus pontifici tuo et quasi animae parentem suspice ... plura tibi in eodem viro observanda sunt nomina: monachus, pontifex, avunculus'.

monachum = μοναχόν. Properly, a monachus was a Christian who for his religion's sake chose to live in isolation; cf. e.g. Rut. Nam. 1.441-2 'ipsi se monachos Graio cognomine dicunt ¦ quod soli nullo vivere teste volunt', J. epist. 58.5.1 'monachus, id est solus', and esp. 14.6.1 (addressing Heliodorus) 'interpretare vocabulum monachi, hoc est nomen tuum: quid facis in

turba, qui solus es?'. Augustine too recognises that, strictly speaking, the word should not be applied to ascetics living in communities; cf. in psalm. 132.6. In practice, however, it came to be used for members of the various ascetic sects irrespective of whether they lived in groups (like the cenobites) or as solitaries (like the anchorites). Orosius is altogether broader in his definition: 'monachi, hoc est Christiani, qui ad unum fidei opus dimissa saecularium rerum multimoda actione se redigunt' (hist. 7.33.1).

A distinction is frequently drawn between monachi and clerici; see below on fit ... ordinatur. It was, however, quite possible that the same man should be both monachus and clericus - there are many instances - and there is nothing odd in Heliodorus being described as both monk and bishop.

episcopum: see on 7.3, and below on fit ... ordinatur.

non ... adsiduitas ... fecerat: cf. epist. 45.2.2 'adsiduitas familiaritatem, familiaritas fiduciam fecerat'.

'Familiarity breeds contempt' was certainly a Latin proverb in the Middle Ages; cf. ps. Aug. scal. parad. 8 'vulgare proverbium est, quod nimia familiaritas parit contemptum' - a work apparently written by one Guigo, a Carthusian, much later (twelfth century?) (cf. PL 40.997-8). I have noticed no

instances prior to the present one, however.

in plerisque: 'in many people'. illius, sc. Heliodori.

ita admirabatur ... cerneret: 'he so admired him as if each day he saw him afresh', i.e. his admiration for him never faded through over-exposure, picking up adsiduitas ... fecerat.

quid multa?: sc. dicam, as often.

fit ... ordinatur. A clericus (κληρικός) was an ordained minister of the Church, as opposed to a member of the laity (laicus). For fourth- and fifth-century views of the origin of the title, and of what the word actually covered, cf. e.g. J. epist. 52.5.1 'clericus, qui Christi servit ecclesiae, interpretetur primum vocabulum suum et nominis definitione praelata nitatur esse, quod dicitur. si enim κλῆρος Graece sors Latine appellatur, propterea vocantur clerici, vel quia de sorte sunt domini vel quia dominus ipse sors, id est pars, clericorum est', Aug. in psalm. 67.19 'et cleros et clericos hinc appellatos puto, qui sunt in ecclesiastici ministerii gradibus ordinati, quia Matthias sorte electus est, quem primum per apostolos legimus ordinatum', Cod. Theod. 16.2.2 (AD 319) 'qui divino vultui ministeria religionis impendunt, id est

hi, qui clerici appellantur'. The word could be applied to all orders of the clergy (see below). monachi of course were something quite different, and distinctions are often made between the two groups (cf. e.g. J. epist. 14.8.1 'alia ... monachi causa est, alia clericorum'); monks could nevertheless be ordained, as was the case with Heliodorus, combining the roles of monachus and clericus.

Within the clergy were various orders or grades. Isidore, writing in the early seventh century, recognised a definite hierarchy of nine grades (cf. orig. 7.12.2 'generaliter autem clerici nuncupantur omnes qui in ecclesia deserviunt, quorum gradus et nomina haec sunt: ostiarius, psalmista, lector, exorcista, acolythus, subdiaconus, diaconus, presbyter, episcopus'), but there were variations on this pattern (cf. ODCC s.vv. Orders and Ordination). The minor orders began to be established from the third century (they are first found mentioned by Pope Cornelius in a letter written to Fabius of Antioch in 252 and quoted by Euseb. hist. 6.43.11; of those on Isidore's list only the psalmist is missing), but were never of great importance; only episcopi, presbyteri and diaconi had major sacerdotal and liturgical functions (in the case of diaconi these were limited - in particular they were forbidden by the Council of Nicaea to celebrate the eucharist - and it is not clear whether or not they could strictly be called sacerdotes (see on 10.4

sacerdotio)), the lesser clergy merely attending them and carrying out some less important duties. J. sometimes writes as if there were only three grades - bishops, presbyters, and deacons - altogether (cf. e.g. epist. 14.8.4-5, 49.21.3), but it is clear that he knew of others (cf. e.g. epist. 51.2.1 'diaconos et hypodiaconos', 52.5.6 'lector ... acolythus ... psaltes'). (The 'archipresbyteri' and 'archidiaconi' mentioned at epist. 125.15.1 refer not so much to separate grades as to the principal presbyter and deacon in each church.) Exactly what grades Nepotianus had to pass through to become a presbyter, other than that of deacon (as we may presume), is uncertain. Paulinian seems to have started off by being ordained deacon; cf. below on 10.3-4 Iesu ... indignum.

The first three books of the old work of J. Bingham, Origines ecclesiasticae, or The Antiquities of the Christian Church, still provide an invaluable survey of the organisation of the early Church and its offices. For the differences in the functions of bishops and presbyters who were under episcopal authority see bk. 2, c. 3, in e.g. the 8-volume London edition of 1834. Also helpful on questions of this kind is E. Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Churches (3rd edn., London, 1888). For J.'s view that in apostolic times the terms 'bishop' and 'presbyter' were synonymous, referring to the same office, cf. in Tit. 1.5 (PL 26.562-3), epist. 146, with

Kelly, p. 147.

ordinatur. Christian writers adopted ordinare to mean 'appoint to an office in the ministry', but there are pagan antecedents for this kind of usage; cf. e.g. Suet. Vesp. 23.2 'candidatum ad se vocavit; exactaque pecunia ... sine mora ordinavit'.

10.3-4. Iesu ... indignum. Resistance to ordination, as either presbyter or bishop, was typical of the fourth century. Ambrose and Augustine were effectively forced to be ordained; cf. Paul. Med. vita Ambr. 6-9, Possid. vita Aug. 4, Aug. serm. 355.2. John Chrysostom recounts his own efforts to avoid the priesthood at sacerd. 1.6, and there is a very interesting account of the ordination of J.'s brother Paulinian in a letter from Epiphanius of Salamis to John of Jerusalem, written in 394 and translated by J., = J. epist. 51.1.5-6: 'cum igitur celebraretur collecta in ecclesia villae, quae est iuxta monasterium nostrum, ignorantem eum [sc. Paulinianum] et nullam penitus habentem suspicionem per multos diaconos adprehendi iussimus et teneri os eius, ne forte liberare se cupiens adiuraret nos per nomen Christi, et primum diaconum ordinavimus proponentes ei timorem dei et conpellentes, ut ministraret; valdeque obnitebatur indignum esse se contestans. vix ergo conpulimus eum et suadere potuimus testimoniis scripturarum et

propositione mandatorum dei. et cum ministrasset in sanctis sacrificiis, rursus cum ingenti difficultate tento ore eius ordinavimus presbyterum'. Other instances are collected and discussed by P.-H. Lafontaine, Les Conditions positives de l'accession aux ordres dans la première législation ecclésiastique (300-492) (Ottawa, 1963), pp. 72-91. To some extent such resistance reflects the view that the priesthood (and esp. the episcopate) is a great office which can be exercised worthily only with difficulty; but at times it must have been motivated simply by a wish to avoid sacerdotal responsibility. It may even have become something of a conventional response.

For the same kind of resistance to accepting offices of other kinds cf. Paneg. 1(Pliny).5.5-6 'recusabas enim imperare, recusabas, quod erat bene imperaturi. igitur cogendus fuisti' (of Trajan), and the tradition associated with the appointment of a new Speaker in the House of Commons.

10.3. Iesu bone: for the oath cf. epist. 77.7.1 'Iesu bone, quo illa fervore, quo studio intenta erat divinis voluminibus', 130.6.2.

10.4. ferre: sc. clericatum.

iuvenalem aetatem. There seems to be no good reason why J. should have opted for this phrase instead of

iuventus itself, which was certainly found in the abstract sense of 'youth' at the time.

sacerdotio. The term sacerdos (priest) certainly covered both bishops and presbyters (but cf. on 11.1 sacerdotii); whether deacons could strictly be called sacerdotes or not is a vexed question (cf. Bingham, Antiquities, bk. 2, c. 20, sects. 1-2, who sets out evidence on both sides). At epist. 108.28.3 J. seems to imply that in his view deacons were not sacerdotes: 'aderant ... episcopi et sacerdotum inferioris gradus ac Levitarum innumerabilis multitudo', where 'Levitarum' refers, as often, to deacons.

clamabat indignum. The emphatic position of indignum at the end helps to stress the contrast with dignior, and at the same time allows a superior clausula (cf. the more natural indignum clamabat). For J.'s attentions to prose-rhythm see general introduction, sect. 3.

vidimus ... esse presbyterum. Although Nepotianus was young he was quite fitted to be a priest by reason of his wisdom and lifestyle. Cf. epist. 58.1.2 'noli igitur ... annorum aestimare nos numero nec sapientiam canis reputes, sed canos sapientia Salomonis teste: cani hominis prudentia eius. nam et Moyses septuaginta presbyteros iubetur eligere, quos ipse sciret esse

presbyteros, utique non aevo, sed prudentia iudicandos, et Danihel adhuc puer et longaevos iudicat, atque inpudicos senes aetas lasciva condemnat'.

For Timothy cf. 1 Tim. 4.12 'nemo adulescentiam tuam contemnat, sed exemplum esto fidelium in verbo, in conversatione, in caritate, in fide, in castitate'. Nepotianus of course gains in stature by comparison with his Biblical predecessor. Sidonius Apollinaris couches in similar terms a parallel drawn between Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, and St. James the Less: 'alter saeculi tui Iacobus' (epist. 6.1.1). For nostri temporis cf. Bartelink, p. 111.

canos in Sapientia alludes to Wisd. 4.8-9 'senectus enim venerabilis est non diuturna, neque numero annorum conputata; cani sunt autem sensus hominibus, et aetas senectutis vita immaculata'; electum ... presbyterum to Num. 11.16-17 'et dixit dominus ad Mosen: congrega mihi septuaginta viros de senibus Israel, quos nosti quod senes populi sint ac magistri ... ut sustentent tecum onus populi et non tu solus graveris'. It is clear from epist. 58.1.2 (quoted above) that J. understands Moses to have chosen presbyteri (πρεσβύτεροι , = senes) by reason not of their age but of their wisdom; it is therefore a very good parallel to the case of Nepotianus.

10.5. clericatum ... onus: cf. epist. 69.8.3 'si quis episcopatum desiderat, bonum opus desiderat: opus, non

dignitatem, laborem, non delicias'. The play on honos/ onus is a well-established pun; cf. e.g. Quint. inst. 4 pr. 2, Paneg. 3(Mamertinus).1.4. J. employs it again, in a like context, at epist. 82.8.1 'fratrem meum causam dicit esse discordiae, hominem, qui quiescit in monasterii cellula et clericatum non honorem interpretatur, sed onus'. Sidonius pushes it to the limit; cf. epist. 8.8.3 'is profecto inveniere, quem debeat sic industrium quod latentem non tam honorare censor quam censetor onerare'.

clericatum = the state of being a clericus, for which see on 10.3.

humilitate. One should not of course be too humble; cf. e.g. epist. 22.27.4 'ne satis religiosa velis videri nec plus humilis, quam necesse est, ne gloriam fugiendo quaeras'. For the importance of avoiding ostentation in the practice of virtue see on 10.2.

nullam ... fabulam. At 7.3 there is a definite reminiscence of a passage in Cicero's Pro Caelio (see n. ad loc.). It is possible that there is another here, but it is less obvious; cf. Cael. 69 'hic etiam miramur, si illam commenticiam pyxidem obscenissima sit fabula consecuta?'. J. uses the same expression at epist. 79.5.2 'in primo aetatis flore tantae verecundiae fuit, ut virginalem pudorem vinceret et ne levem quidem in se obsceni rumoris fabulam daret' and

adv. Iovin. 1.41 (PL 23.272) 'obsceni rumoris ... fabulam'; it is a sort of personal cliché (cf. on 11.1 interpellatricem).

mordebantur. There seems no reason to regard this as a deponent usage, as Wright and Labourt suggest ('railed against his youth', 'auraient critiqué sa jeunesse'). mordeor can, at least in late Latin, mean 'be aggrieved', 'be envious' (cf. invidiam above) - rather more than the regular 'be hurt', 'be worried' - though it is rare in this sense. TLL gives as parallels Hesych. in lev. 19.17 'non invidere operantibus iustitiam, nec morderi quando alii secundum Christum glorificantur', and Cassiodorus' Latin version of Josephus' Jewish Antiquities 10.14 'Daniel ... invidiae apud ceteros crimine laborabat: mordentur enim, qui quosdam ... plus quam se valere conspiciunt', where Josephus' original Greek gives 'βασκαίνουσι ... οἱ ... ἑτέρους ... βλέποντες' (ant. Iud. 10.250).

stuperent ad continentiam. continentia, the ideal sexual condition (see introduction to epist. 107), was naturally considered to be more difficult to achieve in youth, the time of giving free rein to one's passions (cf. e.g. Cic. Cael. 39-42). Nebridius too was very much in control of his sexuality in his youth (cf. epist. 79.5.1-2); and so was the Emperor Valentinian II (cf. Ambr. obit. Valent. 17) (both passages in eulogy).

subvenire ... fuit. J. paints in these few strokes a clear picture of Nepotianus' social actions. The effect of the sequence of historic infinitives is a sense of timelessness, continuity, and vividness - the device is regularly used in bright descriptive passages; cf. K.-S. 1.135 ff., L.-H.-Sz. 2.367 f. - but they may originally have been inspired by the direct quotation of Rom. 12.15 (see below). At epist. 52.15.1-2 J. has some similar thoughts on Nepotianus' duty as a clericus: 'officii tui est visitare languentes, nosse domos, matronas ac liberos earum ... consolatores potius nos in maeroribus suis quam convivas in prosperis noverint'. Furia is instructed in a similar way; cf. epist. 54.12.2 'nudum vesti, esurientem ciba, aegrotantem visita'. Fabiola went to enormous lengths to help the sick and the poor, founding a hospital and giving out money lavishly (epist. 77.6); and Paula too took it upon herself to assist those who needed help of this kind (epist. 108.5). To succour the needy was to succour Christ; cf. epist. 130.14.7-8 'tibi [sc. Demetriae] aliud propositum est: Christum vestire in pauperibus, visitare in languentibus, pascere in esurientibus, suscipere in his, qui tecto indigent'.

provocare hospitio. Wright's 'challenged others to acts of hospitality' gets the sense quite well.

blanditiis: 'gentle words', without any notion of flattery or allurement.

gaudere ... flentibus: Rom. 12.15 (text as Vulgate), which is part of a list of instructions to Christians.

caecorum ... lugentium. The chiastic order slightly relieves the monotony.

caecorum baculus. So J. says to Pammachius: 'caecorum oculus sis, manus debilium, pes claudorum' (epist. 66.13.1). The metaphor of the staff is an obvious one; cf. e.g. Tobit 10.4 'baculum senectutis nostrae, solacium vitae nostrae' (of a son), ps. Ambr. act. Seb. 2.7 'o filii, meae baculum senectutis'.

baculus, the masculine form, appears alongside the neuter baculum from the third century AD; prior to that, however, there are no certain masculine instances (cf. TLL).

esurientium cibus. The primary meaning must be that Nepotianus literally provided food for the hungry; cf. J.'s instructions at epist. 52.5.3: 'mensulam tuam pauperes et peregrini et cum illis Christus conviva noverit'. The notion of spiritual food, which occurs at e.g. Ezek. 34.2-3, John 21.15, may not be entirely absent from J.'s mind, however.

solamen. The choice of this word, rather than solacium, elevates the style somewhat; it belongs firmly to poetry in the first century BC and AD.

10.6. extremus in ordine. This should mean that Nepotianus put himself in the lowest place: a positive virtue rather than a simple fact of rank. He may have been guided partly by the idea that the first would be last and the last first (cf. Matt. 19.30, 20.16, Mark 10.31, Luke 13.30).

quidquid ... dicebat: another aspect of Nepotianus' humility.

in publico ... noverat: showing respect in both situations. Heliodorus is referred to as Nepotianus' pater also at 7.3, where see n.

intellegeres. For the imperf. subj. of potentiality in the past see L.-H.-Sz. 2.334.

10.7. viduas ... castitate. A clericus was naturally expected to be very careful in his relations with women; cf. epist. 52.5.4-6 'omnes puellas et virgines Christi aut aequaliter ignora aut aequaliter dilige. ne sub eodem tecto manseris; ne in praeterita castitate confidas ... si propter officium clericatus aut vidua tibi visitatur aut virgo, numquam domum solus

introeas'.

For *virgines Christi* see on *epist.* 107, esp. the introduction.

relicto ... monachorum: i.e. while his duties as a *clericus* were pastoral, involving him in practical work with other people, he could when at home live a monastic type of life, with the emphasis on inward activities such as prayer.

creber ... precando. Prayer, being a means of direct communication with God, was a vital part of a Christian's life, and must have been especially important in the case of those who had completely dedicated their lives to God's service; see on *epist.* 107.9.3. The quality is praised in other subjects of J.'s eulogy, too (cf. e.g. *epist.* 39.1.2 (Blesilla), 79.2.3 (Nebridius)); and in Valentinian (cf. Ambr. *obit. Valent.* 32).

orare and *precari* are synonymous. The adoption of *orare* and *oratio* by the early Christians as the regular words for 'pray' and 'prayer' is particularly interesting; see E. Löfstedt, *Syntactica* (2nd edn., 2 vols., Lund, 1956), 2.463-4.

lacrimas ... offerebat. Tears, a sign of contrition, are a usual part of the patristic experience of prayer. For a detailed examination of the subject see

I. Hausherr, Penthos: la doctrine de la componction dans l'Orient chrétien (Orientalia Christiana analecta 132; Roma, 1944).

ieiunia ... moderabatur: cf. J.'s advice to Nepotianus at epist. 52.12.1 'tantum tibi ieiuniorum impone, quantum ferre potes. sint pura, casta, simplicia, moderata, non superstitiosa ieiunia'. J., like others, was very concerned that fasting should not be overdone; see on epist. 107.10.2. In moderation, however, it was held to be a good thing; see on epist. 107.10, esp. the introductory n. For the difference between fasting (ieiunium) and abstinence (abstinentia) see on epist. 107.8.2.

Marcella too is praised for her restrained fasting (cf. epist. 127.4.2); Paula, by contrast, was over-strict with herself (cf. epist. 108.17.3). Ambrose praises Valentinian for indulging in the practice; cf. obit. Valent. 16.

The parallel with the charioteer who does not push his horses too hard when they are weak or tired will have occurred readily to J., who was fond of metaphors and similes with auriga. Some examples are: epist. 52.13.3 (Nepotianus as Christ's auriga), 64.21.2 (God as auriga of the chariot of the universe), 66.2.2 (Jesus as auriga of the chariot pulled by Paula, Eustochium, Paulina, and Pammachius), 69.6.1 'solus spiritus dei in aurigae modum super aquas ferebatur',

107.10.3, adv. Iovin. 2.10 (PL 23.299) 'sensus corporum quasi equi sunt, sine ratione currentes, anima vero in aurigae modum retinet frena currentium'.

ut ... reservaret. To exercise restraint (continentia) in eating was important (see on epist. 107.10), and certain foods, which fomented the passions, were best avoided altogether; these included meat and even certain vegetables (see on epist. 107.8.2). Wine was allowed for health reasons, but was otherwise also to be avoided on the same ground (ibid.), and it is likely that it was excluded altogether from Nepotianus' diet; cf. epist. 52.11.3 'numquam vinum redoleas, ne audias illud philosophi: hoc non est osculum porrigere, sed propinare. vinolentos sacerdotes et apostolus damnat et vetus lex prohibet'. Superstitious abstinence, however, was different, and quite contrary to Christian teaching; the Jewish law contained a long list of food prohibitions (cf. Lev. 11), but the early Christians lifted these restrictions, except for a very few (cf. Acts 15.29), presumably on the ground that the whole of God's creation was good (cf. 1 Tim. 4.1-7 and epist. 121.10.23). For this reason Nepotianus ate a small amount of everything on the table; he did not want it to seem that he was cutting out items for the wrong reasons (cf. J.'s advice to him at epist. 52.12.1, quoted above at ieiunia ... moderabatur).

Food taboos were not merely Jewish (for which cf. epist. 107.8.3 with n.), but belonged also to other non-Christian religions; cf. e.g. epist. 107.8.3 and 10.2, on Bragmanae, gymnosophistae, and the devotees of Isis and Cybele.

10.8. sermo ... habebatur. Marcella too liked to discuss Scriptural questions (cf. epist. 127.7.1), and showed great modesty in the answers she gave (cf. 127.7.3).

omne convivium is difficult: it is hard to see how it can mean 'his favourite form of entertainment' (Wright), esp. in the context of taking meals, and to regard it as an acc. of extent of time, expunging et or reading erat, with G, in its place, is equally implausible. Schäublin, MH 30 (1973), 59-60, following earlier editors, suggested reading per for et; this appears to be the best solution. It is perhaps too radical to delete sermo eius, which Schäublin saw as an interpolation going back to a marginal note.

For eruditionis ... habebatur cf. 10.4 eoque ... indignum.

10.9. Tertulliani ... Arnobius: Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus (c. 160 - c. 240); Thascius Caecilius Cyprianus (c. 200 - 258); L. Caelius (?Caecilius) Firmianus Lactantius (c. 240 - c. 320); Hilarius, Bishop of Poitiers (c. 315 - 367); M. Minucius Felix (fl.

200-40); Victorinus, Bishop of Pettau (d. _c_. 304) (though see below); Arnobius (d. _c_. 330): all Christian writers of some distinction, and all except Hilary and Victorinus, Africans. There are articles on each of them in _RE_, _OCD_, and _ODCC_.

J. himself regarded these writers sufficiently highly to devote to each of them, except Lactantius, a section of _De viris illustribus_ (cc.53, 58, 67, 74, 79, 100 (PL 23.661-701)), and Lactantius is at least mentioned in c.58, on Minucius Felix. At _epist_. 49.13.4 he lists together all but Arnobius, and does so again at 49.19.4, though this time omitting Minucius as well. A brief but illuminating critique of their literary styles is given at _epist_. 58.10 (Minucius is omitted here, too); all but Cyprian and Lactantius face the charge of obscurity in some form or other. At _epist_. 70.5 J. quickly runs over some of their works, again with occasional stylistic comment; Juvencus is added here. There are other references to them scattered throughout the corpus. Nepotianus doubtless knew their writings well, and those of authors whom J. does not choose to name.

It is impossible to be sure that the Victorinus here named is that Victorinus who was Bishop of Pettau and a well-known exegete; it could conceivably be C. Marius Victorinus, the fourth-century rhetor and theologian from Africa, whom J. also includes in _De viris illustribus_ (c.101 (PL 23.701)). However, the

Victorinus of epist. 58.10 and 70.5 is certainly the Bishop, as J. makes reference to his martyrdom (cf. vir. ill. 74 (PL 23.683)), and it is a reasonable assumption, in view of the similarity of the group of names in all three passages, that he has the same man in mind here.

me ... medium. J. cannot resist mentioning what was to him an obvious source of pride.

quia ... diligebat: 'because he loved me for my friendship with his uncle'. J. again stresses his own close connection with Heliodorus.

lectione ... Christi. quoque GK Ψ is odd: J. is not making an entirely new point, rather summing up what he has just said about Nepotianus' knowledge of the Scriptures and other Christian writings. lectioneque, which is read by a majority of the MSS, looks more natural (perhaps with a comma after medium); a case could even be made out for reading lectione adsidua with B, without a connecting particle at all. quoque probably comes from dittography after me quoque just above.

c.11. Continuing the theme of Nepotianus' reading of the works of the Fathers, including himself, J. lays stress on his own friendship with Nepotianus by telling how the young man persistently requested that J. should

write something specifically for him, and how the request was eventually, after some initial resistance, fulfilled. Nepotianus' favourable reaction to the libellus is fulsomely described, and J. goes on to praise his love of the written word, which contrasted strongly with the materialist attitude of many monachi of the time.

11.1. Quotiens ille ... impetraret. Similarly, Paula made an insistent request that J. should read the Bible with Eustochium and expound it to her; for a time J. refused, 'propter verecundiam', but finally consented (epist. 108.26.2).

With the present case one might compare those instances in literary prefaces where the author displays reluctance to undertake a literary task imposed by someone else, for which see on epist. 1.1-2. The points of contact are clear: a request, a refusal for reasons of (affected) modesty, and eventual acceptance because personal ties with the maker of the request demand compliance. In the letter he actually wrote, J. again refers to the frequency of Nepotianus' request (epist. 52.1.1, quoted in following n.; certainty is impossible, but the work to which J. here alludes can hardly be anything other than epist. 52), though without saying that his refusal to undertake the task earlier had been due to pudor or verecundia; he does, however, claim to have had no option but to

comply (cf. epist. 52.17.1 'coegisti me', etc.).

deprecatus est ... scriberem. In fact Nepotianus' request was more specific; cf. epist. 52.1.1 'petis, Nepotiane carissime, litteris transmarinis [cf. transmarinis epistulis] et crebro petis, ut tibi brevi volumine digeram praecepta vivendi et, qua ratione is, qui saeculi militia derelicta vel monachus coeperit esse vel clericus, rectum Christi tramitem teneat, ne ad diversa vitiorum diverticula rapiatur'.

Lucinus did not ask J. to write him something, but he was very anxious to acquire copies of works J. had already completed; cf. epist. 75.4.2.

nocturnum ... viduam. J. borrows two parables from Luke to illustrate how importunate and persistent requests are rewarded. nocturnum ... petitorem refers to the parable of the friend who calls with a request in the middle of the night (Luke 11.5-8); cf. esp. v.8 '[some MSS: + et ille si perseveraverit pulsans] dico vobis, et si non dabit illi surgens eo quod amicus eius sit, propter inprobitatem tamen eius surget et dabit illi quotquot habet necessarios'. interpellatricem ... viduam alludes to Luke 18.1-8, the parable of the persistent woman and the judge who finally agreed to avenge her on her adversary, saying (v.5) 'quia molesta est mihi haec vidua vindicabo illam, ne in novissimo veniens suggillet me'. Like J. in the case of

Nepotianus' request, the judge here 'nolebat per multum tempus' (v.4).

In the gospel the parables illustrate how one should pray; but they easily lend themselves to the use J. makes of them here.

interpellatricem. TLL records only five instances of the feminine form, three of which are by J., the others being epist. 79.1.4 and in Is. 62.6-7 (CCSL 73A.716 = PL 24.607); in both these cases the word occurs in the phrase interpellatricem duri iudicis, alluding to the same passage in Luke, and the context of the phrase at epist. 79.1.4 is very similar to that here. These are certainly the earliest examples. The masculine form appears more frequently, and as early as Rhet. Her. 2.16. Doubtless the shortage of feminine instances is attributable simply to the fact that they were rarely required, literary references to women generally being much less common.

The fact that J. uses the expression interpellatricem duri iudicis in referring to this parable on three occasions is especially interesting in that the account in Luke does not include interpellatrix or any cognate word, and the judge is not described as durus (though J. is accurate in representing him as such). This freedom from dependence on the language of the Biblical account stands in contrast to other passages in which J.

clearly reveals his indebtedness to it; cf. e.g. 7.2, where ne haberet tristitiam super tristitiam is almost a direct quotation of Paul's own words in describing the situation to which J. there refers. The repeated use of the phrase also marks it down as another Jeromian cliché (cf. on 10.5 nullam ... fabulam).

exhibuit: 'played the part of'.

pudore ... postulantis: 'overspread the modesty of the request with the modesty of the refusal'. In the context suffunderem also suggests a blush; the verb is commonly used with rubor in this sense (cf. e.g. Virg. georg. 1.430, Liv. 30.15.1).

precatorem: 'as an intercessor', 'to ask on his behalf'. The word is not merely 'ante-classical', as Lewis and Short suggest; cf. e.g. Stat. silv. 5.3.152, Fronto p. 192 Naber, Ambr. in Luc. 5.11.

sacerdotii. As Nepotianus himself was a presbyter, this must refer specifically to the episcopate. It perhaps reflects an old usage: in Cyprian the term nearly always refers to the episcopate, and is applied to presbyters only by extension (cf. E. W. Benson, Cyprian: his Life, his Times, his Work (London, 1897), p. 33, n. 3). Normally both bishops and presbyters are covered by the word (see on 10.4 sacerdotio).

11.2. brevi libello: epist. 52. Later in the c. J. refers to his work as opusculo, and scedulas (11.3), though it has wider connotations, primarily relates to it too (see n. ad loc.). But it is doubtful whether the use of these diminutives represents an affectation of modesty. libellus often occurs virtually as a synonym for liber, and Arns, La Technique du livre, p. 106, points out that the fact that in the fourth century it is found accompanied by adjectives such as brevis, parvus, and parvulus, suggests that it has by then lost its diminutive force. Equally, opusculum is frequently employed simply to refer to something written (cf. esp. epist. 65.6.2); and J. has a clear preference for scedula over scheda generally. Furthermore, the context lends no weight to the idea that J. is modestly playing down epist. 52 - especially in the case of libello, immediately followed as it is by the rather pompous amicitias ... consecravi.

amicitias ... consecravi. At epist. 125.8.2 J. describes epist. 52 as 'editus ad Nepotianum liber'. Certainly he conceived of it as something more than a personal letter; it was intended for a wider circulation, and, to judge from the present comment, designed still to be read in later times. The outline of the life of the clericus it presents was of course applicable not only to Nepotianus. Other ostensibly personal letters too received a wide readership; see

general introduction, sect. 2.

The plural amicitias may indicate that J. is thinking not only of his friendship with Nepotianus, but also of that with Heliodorus, who is mentioned in epist. 52 (1.1, 4.4).

Croesi ... divitias. The wealth of Darius, King of Persia 521-486 BC, and more especially of Croesus, King of Lydia c. 560 - 546 BC, was proverbial among Classical writers, and Christian authors continued to use the motif; see the many examples collected by Otto, pp. 98-9. Darius' riches are mentioned in a proverbial way as early as Plato (cf. Lysis 211E); it was Croesus, however, who particularly caught the imagination of the Romans, and in Latin literature there are numerous instances from Catull. 115.3 on (the first Latin reference to Darius as a symbol for great wealth is in fact earlier; cf. Plaut. Aul. 85-6). Sometimes there is reference to the wealth of the Persians generally; cf. e.g. Plaut. Stich. 24-5, Stat. silv. 1.3.105. J. is particularly fond of the expression. At times he refers only to Croesus (cf. e.g. epist. 53.11.3, 125.10.1, 127.4.2, vir. ill. 75 (PL 23.685)); at others he adds Darius, indeed, to judge from Otto, he seems to connect the two more frequently than any other writer (cf. epist. 118.5.4 'neque enim Darei opes et Croesi explere valent pauperes mundi', adv. Rufin. 1.17 (PL 23.411), 3.4 (PL 23.459)).

For the notion of a letter from a friend as great wealth cf. Liban. epist. 1488.1, 1525.3 'Εὐάνθου δὲ ἥκοντος καὶ δῶρόν μου φέροντος παντὸς χρυσίου κάλλιον, γράμματα σά ...'.

The image of riches here is picked up in 11.3; Nepotianus contrasts with those monks who pursue worldly wealth, by regarding the written word (of God and Christians only, one may suspect) as the true thing of value.

evolveret: sc. librum.

laetabatur ... testimonio: 'took delight in the evidence of my regard for him'; i.e. by showing, or reciting, the letter to his visitor. One might have expected the order nostro super se testimonio.

quidquid minus ... erat: 'whatever shortcomings there were in my work'.

distinctione ... varietate: 'well-regulated verbal articulation and variety in tone'. In the context of spoken language distinctio generally refers to the careful separation of words and phrases from each other, resulting in clarity of diction; cf. e.g. Quint. inst. 11.3.52 'nec volubilitate nimia confundenda quae dicimus, qua ... distinctio perit'. pronuntiatio may involve all aspects of oratorical delivery, including

facial expression and gesture (cf. e.g. Rhet. Her. 1.3), or refer simply to the handling of spoken words, 'pronunciation' or 'tone', which seems more likely here: epist. 52 does not give great scope for gesture in recitation.

in recitando illo ipso. Most of the MSS have ipse, which would put the emphasis on Nepotianus: 'in reading it out, it was he [not J.] who each day seemed to please or displease'. But this comment does not have much point. If illo is taken to refer to the whole opusculum, ut ... videretur does not hang at all well from quidquid ... pensabat; if to the weaker parts of the letter (quidquid minus ... erat), it is pointless to stress Nepotianus in contrast to J., as if J. could have given any pleasure by what he had written badly, and displicere is also quite out of place. With ipso, however, an adequate sense results: 'in reading out the very same passage he seemed to please or displease, varying from day to day'; i.e. if he was on form in his recitation, he could make the weaker parts of the letter appear good, whereas, if he was not, all the weaknesses would stand out. It is not ideal, for we should have expected J. to say that Nepotianus' delivery always made the poorer passages seem good, without any mention of displeasure, and cotidie is a little odd when the required sense is 'according to the day'; but it is at least preferable to ipse.

11.3. unde hic ... dei? At last J. moves on from his absorbing interest in his own work and focuses more clearly on Nepotianus.

unde legis ... dedit? In the context of reading, which continues through 11.3 (cf. scedulas), legis Christi should refer not just to Christian teaching and principles but specifically to the Scriptures, or at least to the NT. Consideration of Nepotianus' reading of his letter has led J. to think also of his Biblical reading, his fondness for which has already been suggested at 10.8-9.

legis ... indefessa meditatio recalls epist. 52.7.1, where J. urges Nepotianus to read the Scriptures continually. For the phrase cf. epist. 100(tr. from Theophilus).3.3 'medicina praeteritorum ac praesentium futurorumque vitiorum legis indefessa meditatio'. Marcella too is said to have practised legis meditatio, and for her that involved acting on what she had read; cf. epist. 127.4.1 'meditationem legis non replicando, quae scripta sunt ... sed in opere intellegens'. Nepotianus' social actions (cf. 10.5) could be seen in the same light.

For praise of enthusiasm for Scripture in others cf. epist. 75.4.1 (Lucinus), 77.7 (Fabiola), 108.26.1 (Paula).

alii ... mendicos. J. frequently attacks corruption of Church, clergy and monks by satire such as this; see the well-documented account of D. S. Wiesen, St. Jerome as a Satirist (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 34; Ithaca, New York, 1964), pp. 65-112. Often it is against rich and money-seeking monks and clerics that he inveighs; cf. e.g. epist. 40.2.2 'volo in nummarios invehi sacerdotes', 52.6.4-5 (legacy-hunting), 52.9.1 'sunt, qui pauperibus parum tribuunt, ut amplius accipiant, et sub praetextu elemosynae quaerunt divitias: quae magis venatio appellanda est quam elemosyna. sic bestiae, sic aves, sic capiuntur et pisces: modica in hamo esca ponitur, ut matronarum in eo sacculi protrahantur', in Soph. 3.1-7 (CCSL 76A.696 = PL 25.1374). The problem was certainly a real one; monachi and clerici (and certain other, non-Christian, groups; cf. Wiesen, pp. 76-7, n. 38) were legally forbidden by Valentinian II to receive legacies, a fact to which J. refers at epist. 52.6.1, complaining bitterly that the passing of the law was deserved.

marsuppium ... obsequiis: 'keeping a tight grip on their purses, let them hunt with their flattery the wealth of married women'. marsuppium suffocantes is a good clausula, requiring that matronarum be taken not with marsuppium but with opes; marsuppium must refer to the purses of the monks themselves, which they refuse to open, as they should, to give money to the poor (cf.

epist. 52.9.1, quoted above at alii ... mendicos).

marsuppium = μαρσύππιον . Very common in Plautus, the word is then found on very few occasions until J., who employs it frequently; cf. e.g. epist. 84.3.5, 127.3.4, in Agg. 1.6 (CCSL 76A.720 = PL 25.1394).

diabolo. διάβολος fundamentally = 'slanderer', but comes often to represent Satan or the devil; cf. e.g. LXX 1 Chr. 21.1, Matt. 4.1. There are numerous instances of the Latin form with this sense, in the Vulgate and in ecclesiastical writers generally.

suspiret ... mendicos. The contrast and paradox are made more marked by the emphatic position given to mendicos and by its verbal similarity with mundus.

suspiret = 'sigh over' (Wright).

scedulas consectatur. J. uses the word scedula (schedula, scidula, etc.) - the diminutive of scida or scheda, 'a sheet of paper' - many times; cf. e.g. epist. 59.4.1, 114.1.2, adv. Rufin. 3.5 (PL 23.460). Here one thinks primarily of epist. 52, but the contrast with aurum strongly suggests that scedulas should be taken to have a more general reference: 'bits of paper', i.e. the Scriptures (cf. unde legis ... dedit), and other written works, of which epist. 52 is representative. It is significant that in place of scedulas Γ has scripturas.

consectatur = 'seeks', 'strives to obtain'. The present tense, like those which follow, is vivid, as though Nepotianus is still alive.

paupertate ... ornatum. The contrast between Nepotianus' attitude to himself and to the Church is brought out clearly by the combination of the repetitious ornatior - ornatum, with both words emphatically placed, and the oxymoron in paupertate ornatior, with which cf. epist. 108.1.1 'potens quondam divitiis, sed nunc Christi paupertate insignior [sc. Paula]'.

c.12. In matters of lesser importance, too, Nepotianus displayed the same virtuous spirit. He took great trouble to keep his church clean, tidy, and beautifully adorned, and was careful not to neglect any of his priestly duties. J. draws parallels from Biblical and Classical history to Nepotianus' artistry in church decoration.

12.1. Ad conparationem ... dicturi sumus: cf. Tac. dial. 39.1 'parvum et ridiculum fortasse vide<bi>tur quod dicturus sum, dicam tamen'. ex conparatione or in conparationem would be more usual than ad conparationem, but cf. e.g. ps. Aug. quaest. test. 1.1.6, Pelag. in 2 Tim. 1.11 'ad comparationem aliorum possunt dici magistri'.

ut ... sollertiam. There are a number of passages such as this in J.'s works, in which the power of God the creator is represented as being clearly manifested in little animals; often there are close verbal similarities. The extracts are conveniently collected and discussed by G. J. M. Bartelink, 'Hieronymus über die Minuta Animalia', VChr 32 (1978), 289-300.

in caelo: 'in regard to heaven'; a common enough usage.

et ... animalibus: perhaps 'even in tiny animals too'; but et ... quoque is more probably straightforward tautology.

formica, culice. There seems to be no good reason for this lapse into the singular.

istius modi genere: 'species of this sort'.

pro otioso ... rationem: cf. Matt. 12.36 (Jesus speaking to the Pharisees) 'dico autem vobis, quoniam omne verbum otiosum quod locuti fuerint homines, reddent rationem de eo in die iudicii'. If one is held liable for so slight a thing as an idle word, argues J., one ought to be careful in all matters, even those which seem quite unimportant. For a curious parallel cf. Cato ap. Cic. Planc. 66 'clarorum virorum atque

magnorum non minus oti quam negoti rationem exstare oportere'.

12.2. sollicitus, si. sollicitus sum generally functions like a verb of fearing, introducing the subordinate clause by ne or ne non; so here one might have expected sollicitus, ne non niteret altare, 'anxious lest the altar should not shine', i.e. 'anxious that the altar should shine'. The si-clauses which stand in place of the ne-clauses are best explained by postulating a transition of thought from an idea of mental state (sollicitus) to one of action, which might often have been expressed by a verb of attempting, such as conari or experiri: these are often followed by a si-clause (cf. L.-H.-Sz. 2.666). One might translate: 'anxiously made efforts to ensure that ...'.

niteret ... lucentia. Bingham, Antiquities, bk. 8, gives a full account of the construction and furnishings of early churches. For the sanctuary (sacrarium) and altar see c. 6, sects. 1-3. Veils and hangings (vela) are discussed at c. 6, sect. 8; they were used to cover doors, as here, and for other purposes, such as to divide the chancel from the rest of the church. vasa are probably utensils of the altar, used for administering the eucharist; for these see c. 6, sect. 21.

Nepotianus kept his church are splendid as was possible, but it is unlikely to have been very richly adorned, as J. had warned him against such extravagance; cf. epist. 52.10.1-2 'multi aedificant parietes et columnas ecclesiae subtrahunt: marmora nitent, auro splendent lacunaria, gemmis altare distinguitur et ministrorum Christi nulla electio est. neque vero mihi aliquis opponat dives in Iudaea templum, mensam, lucernas, turibula, patellas, scyphos, mortariola et cetera ex auro fabre facta. tunc haec probabantur a domino, quando sacerdotes hostias immolabant ... nunc vero, cum paupertatem domus suae pauper dominus dedicarit, cogitemus crucem et divitias lutum putabimus. quid miramur, quod Christus vocat iniquum mammonam?'. This attitude squares with that expressed by J. in other situations; cf. e.g. his comments on the personal adornment of the younger Paula at epist. 107.5.1, where see n.

altare. Until the time of Petronius this word is found only in the plural, altaria, which represents one altar or many. Petronius is the first to give an instance of altare (135.3), and subsequently three other singular forms occur: altaris, altarium, and altar.

fuligine: such as would be produced by the candles in the church.

in omnes ... disposita: 'his respectful concern, devoted to all religious rites'. The sense of ordering or arrangement seems untranslatable.

ubicumque ... invenires. ubicumque seems more likely to mean 'whenever' than 'wherever': Nepotianus so busied himself about details in the church that one was always likely to find him there. To say 'wherever in the church you looked for him, you would find him' is a good deal less logical.

12.3-4. nobilem ... testaretur. J.'s thoughts now pass from Nepotianus' care in keeping his church clean and tidy to his attention to its adornment and to that of others (cf. hoc ... testaretur). exempla are introduced to parallel the artistry he displayed in decorating the basilicae and martyrum conciliabula. The cases of Hiram and Bezalel perform this function adequately, and Fabius Pictor is an apposite choice, as his renown came from painting a temple (see following n.). The inclusion of Hippias of Elis (philosophus ille), whose artistry had nothing to do with the adornment of a religious building, is less apt, but the exemplum follows fairly easily after the simile quomodo ... elegantiam.

For exempla generally see on epist. 1.9.

12.3. nobilem ... invenit. J. confuses two Fabii and makes them the same person. The Romanae scriptor historiae was Q. Fabius Pictor, the earliest Roman annalist, whose history of Rome, written in Greek, appeared around the end of the third century BC; for details of his life and work see RE s.n. Fabius 126. The name Pictor, however, was first acquired by his ancestor C. Fabius (RE s.n. Fabius 122), who in 304 BC painted the walls of the temple of Salus on the Quirinal, and added his name (cf. Val. Max. 8.14.6, Plin. nat. 35.19); he is mentioned also at Cic. Tusc. 1.4. It is this Fabius who makes the true parallel to the case of Nepotianus. One cannot tell whether J. had read the passages in Valerius and Pliny, but as an aetiology for a famous name the story is likely to have been well known in any case, and the parallel with Nepotianus clearly works much better if J. knew of Fabius as a temple-decorator and not simply as a painter.

At Tusc. 1.4 Fabius is called 'nobilissimo homini', at Val. Max. 8.14.6 'nobilissimus civis'. There is, however, no reason to assume that J. was directly indebted to either work (though he certainly knew the Tusculans well; cf. Hagendahl, with his index). He will naturally have thought of the Fabii, an ancient consular family, as nobiles, and characterised C. (or Q.) Fabius as such, even if he did not know for sure that the family had been ennobled

by that time. The use of the term nobilis was in any case widening in the fourth century; cf. on epist. 107.13.4.

Beselehel ... fabricati sunt. For Bezalel cf. Exod. 31.1-11, where God tells Moses that he has called Bezalel and Oholiab to make the tabernacle and the ark and all the furnishings of the tabernacle; cf. esp. v.3 'implevi eum spiritu dei, sapientia, intellegentia, et scientia in omni opere'. To make the parallel with Nepotianus closer J. omits to say that Bezalel made the tabernacle as well as its contents.

For Hiram cf. 1 Kgs. 7, where he makes the bronze furnishings for Solomon's temple; cf. esp. vv.13-14 'misit quoque rex Salomon et tulit Hiram de Tyro, filium mulieris viduae de tribu Nepthali patre Tyrio, artificem aerarium et plenum sapientia et intellegentia et doctrina'.

quomodo ... luxuriant. Hilberg suggests that there is here a reminiscence of Virg. georg. 1.111-2 '... ne gravidis procumbat culmus aristis, ¦ luxuriem segetum tenera depascit in herba'. The verbal parallels are not especially close; but J. was familiar with the Georgics (cf. Hagendahl, with index), and it is possible that we have here an unconscious reminiscence of that passage. Similarly, laetae segetes may have been fixed in J.'s mind from his reading of georg. 1.1

(a parallel Hilberg misses). On the other hand, laetus, with its sense of burgeoning, is an obvious word to use of crops, and often occurs with other similar words, such as fructus, flores, and gramen; and laetae segetes itself is found in Columella (2.15.4, 2.17.3). culmus, arista, and luxuriare all belong to basic agricultural language, and are again used by writers such as Columella and Varro. Consequently the reasons for assuming some kind of debt to Virgil in this sentence are slight; an agricultural simile of this kind would naturally employ such terms.

Similes are an important feature of rhetoric, their function being to help prove a point in argument, to clarify, sometimes simply to add colour, and so on; see the material collected by Lausberg, 1.232-4 and 420-2 (sects. 422-5 and 845-7). They are closely related to exempla, both being comparisons, and hence highly appropriate here; cf. e.g. Rhet. Her. 4.62 'id [sc. exemplum] sumitur isdem de causis, quibus similitudo [cf. 4.59]', Quint. inst. 5.11.22 'proximas exemplo vires habet similitudo'. One case of similitudo given by Quintilian is especially interesting in the present context: 'si animum dicas excolendum, similitudine utaris terrae, quae neglecta sentes ac dumos, culta fructus creat' (inst. 5.11.24).

redundat. The verb is singular after the nearer subject, mens, though of course it goes with ingenia too.

12.4. apud Graecos ... gloriatus est. The philosopher is Hippias of Elis; the story comes from Plato Hipp. Min. 368B: 'πάντως δὲ πλείστας τέχνας πάντων σοφώτατος ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπων ... ἔφην δὲ ἀφικέσθαι ποτὲ εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν ἃ ἐχεις περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἅπαντα αὐτοῦ ἔργα ἔχων· πρῶτον μὲν δακτύλιον ... ὃν ἐχεις αὐτοῦ ἔχειν ἔργον ... ἔπειτα ὑποδήματα ἃ ἐχεις ἔφην αὐτὸς σκυτομῆσαι, καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον ὑφῆναι καὶ τὸν χιτωνίσκον' . The reference does not, however, necessarily presuppose direct knowledge of Plato's text; it may be drawn from another writer who had alluded to the passage (possibly from Cic. de orat. 3.127, though Cicero, while mentioning Hippias's boast that he had made his own cloak, ring, and boots, does not say explicitly that the boast extended to all his attire). In fact, had J. read the dialogue at first hand, he could hardly have failed to notice that Socrates' praise of Hippias is ironical (noted by Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p. 68), making the allusion singularly inappropriate in the present context. For J.'s knowledge of Plato generally see on 5.2 Platonis ... percucurrimus.

basilicas ... conciliabula. Up to this point the impression has been that Nepotianus was in charge of a single church; now the suggestion is that he undertook the adornment of several, for basilicas ecclesiae et martyrum conciliabula could hardly be held to be parts of a single building. As it is most improbable that as a presbyter he was responsible for more than one church (an inference from Hatch, Early Christian Churches,

p. 196), it seems likely that he took it upon himself to decorate other churches of Altinum, which were under the overall jurisdiction of Heliodorus: a good instance of his great enthusiasm for the faith.

From the time of Constantine basilica was used of individual churches, many pagan basilicae (halls of exchange and judicature) originally being converted to Christian use (cf. e.g. Auson. grat. act. 1.3), and the name then being applied to Christian churches generally; this is a much more likely explanation of the Christian use of the term than that proposed by Isidore, namely, that in churches worship was offered to God, king (βασιλεύς) of all (orig. 15.4.11).

conciliabula also refers to churches, as at e.g. epist. 123.11.2, in Zach. 8.6 (CCSL 76A.810 = PL 25.1467): a natural extension of its basic meaning of 'meeting-places'. By martyrum conciliabula must be meant those churches built over a martyr's grave or called by his name to preserve his memory, such as those of Thomas the Apostle at Edessa and of Peter and Paul at Rome, and referred to at epist. 107.9.2 as basilicas martyrum. For the history of the development of martyria, their architecture and iconography, see A. Grabar, Martyrium: recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique (2 vols., Paris, 1943-6), and J. B. Ward-Perkins, 'Memoria, Martyr's Tomb and Martyr's Church', JThS 17 (1966), 20-38 (with Grabar's

review, 'Martyrium ou "vingt ans après"', Cahiers archéologiques 18 (1968), 239-44); and for martyr-cults in the early Church, H. Delehaye, Les Origines du culte des martyrs (Bruxelles, 1933). J.'s own attitude to the veneration of martyrs is outlined at n. on epist. 107.9.2. The word martyr (μάρτυς, μάρτυρ) itself, though fundamentally equivalent to testis, was used in Latin almost exclusively to refer to those Christians who by suffering testified to the truth of their faith.

diversis ... adumbraret. For the practice of adorning churches with flowers and foliage cf. Aug. civ. 22.8 'aliquid de altari florum, quod occurrit, tulit', and perhaps Paul. Nol. carm. 14.108-10. Doubtless J. greatly preferred this sort of decoration to that involving precious metals and jewels, for which he expresses some lack of enthusiasm at epist. 130.14.7 'alii aedificent ecclesias, vestiant parietes marmorum crustis, columnarum moles advehant earumque deaurent capita pretiosum ornatum non sentientia, ebore argentoque valvas et gemmis aurea vel aurata distinguant altaria - non reprehendo, non abnuo ... sed tibi aliud propositum est: Christum vestire in pauperibus, visitare in languentibus ...'; cf. also epist. 52.10.1-2 (quoted at 12.2 niteret ... lucentia).

in ecclesia: 'in church'; any church which Nepotianus decorated.

visu: appearance per se, as opposed to arrangement (dispositione).

c.13. Having described Nepotianus' virtues, J. turns to his death, and recounts in vivid language how, suffering from fever, he came to the end of his life with calmness and confidence. The happiness he showed was in stark contrast to the grief of those around him, clearly indicating his deep faith (another instance of virtue), and to the end he was mindful of others.

J., of course, was not present when Nepotianus died, and this account must be a reconstruction, involving a greater or lesser degree of imagination, based - like many of the personal details about Nepotianus in cc.9-12 - on what he had heard from other sources, and above all, one may suspect, from Helicdorus himself. This may seem curious, but it did not matter. J.'s concern was not to provide Heliodorus with information about his nephew, but to eulogise the young man using whatever facts he knew.

Similar passages, describing the subject's last days and the deathbed scene, are found in other of J.'s consolations. Marcella too died smiling, while Principia wept (epist. 127.14). Blesilla died of fever, pale and weak, surrounded by her propinqui, and humbly asking them to pray to Jesus to pardon her (epist. 39.1.3-4). The best parallel, however, is the account of the death of Paula (epist. 108.27-8), to

which more space is devoted even than to the death of Nepotianus here. She fell ill, and was tended lovingly by Eustochium, until at last she died peacefully, in the presence of countless virgins, monks, and clergy. In all cases the consoland is encouraged by being reminded with what fortitude and confidence the subject faced death.

13.1. Macte virtute: a common stereotyped phrase, going back to very early Latin literature (Pacuvius, Accius, etc.); = 'be blessed for your virtue'. For other instances in J. cf. e.g. epist. 58.8.2, 86.1.2.

o miserabilis ... vivimus!: cf. epist. 22.15.2 (on the early death of Blesilla) 'o infelix humana condicio et futuri nescia', 108.27.3 (on the death of Paula) 'o mortalium fragilis et caduca natura et, nisi Christi fides nos extollat ad caelum et aeternitas animae promittatur, cum bestiis ac iumentis corporum una condicio!'.

Hilberg suggests that there is here a reminiscence of Ps. 38.6 'ecce mensurabiles posuisti dies meos, et substantia mea tamquam nihilum ante te. verumtamen universa vanitas, omnis homo vivens' (LXX), 'ecce breves posuisti dies meos, et vita mea quasi non sit in conspectu meo; omnia enim vanitas, omnis homo stans' (Hebr.). But the thought seems natural, and it is stretching credibility to see a direct connection.

vanum ... vivimus: not 'the fact that we live is utterly meaningless [without Christ]', where totum would be more in place than omne, but 'our whole life is meaningless', vivimus being treated as a transitive verb; cf. epist. 21.5.1, 140.13.2 'quicquid igitur vivimus et in quo delectabilis est vita mortalium, septuaginta annorum spatio comprehenditur', 140.14.2 'et cum pertransierit, inquit, omne, quod vivimus, subita morte dissolvimur', in Is. 14 pref. (CCSL 73A.552 = PL 24.477). This transitive usage is very rare; the verb is sometimes found in the passive (most often impersonally) (cf. e.g. Cic. Tusc. 3.49, Hor. carm. 2.16.13, Ov. met. 12.188), and there are a few instances of the phrase vivere vitam (cf. e.g. Plaut. Mil. 628, Persa 494, Apul. Plat. 2.16). Apart from these examples, however, and those by J. himself quoted above, I have noticed no cases of vivere & acc. object except for Boeth. cons. 4 pros. 3 'pavidus ac fugax non metuenda formidat? cervis similis habeatur. segnis ac stupidus torpit? asinum vivit', i.e. 'he lives an ass's life'.

quid te ... faeni. With the address to oratio cf. those to mors (2.2) and to J.'s own anima (5.1), both of which, however, are understandably represented in more vividly concrete terms, and belong to specific individual traditions of personification (see nn. ad. locc.).

For the notion of hesitation in coming to describe the death of the subject of the consolatio cf. epist. 79.6.1 'quid ultra differimus? omnis caro fenum et omnis gloria eius quasi flos feni. reversa est terra in terram suam: dormivit in domino', 108.27.1 'quid agimus, anima? cur ad mortem eius venire formidas? iam dudum prolixior liber cuditur, dum timemus ad ultima pervenire, quasi tacentibus nobis et in laudibus illius occupatis differri possit occubitus'. tergiversaris lends a very Ciceronian touch; cf. esp. Tusc. 3.41, Planc. 48.

omnis ... faeni comes from 1 Pet. 1.24 'omnis caro ut faenum, et omnis gloria eius tamquam flos faeni; exaruit faenum et flos decidit', and Isa. 40.6, from where Peter himself took the image: 'vox dicentis: clama. et dixit: quid clamabo? omnis caro faenum, et omnis gloria eius quasi flos agri'. By representing the inevitability of mortal death in these terms, J. calls to mind the other aspect of the situation too: both Isaiah and Peter are contrasting the corruptibility of the flesh with the eternal nature of God, and Heliodorus will naturally have thought that although Nepotianus could not avoid death it would not be the end.

13.2. marcescebat ... migrabat. For the image of the dying person as a flower cf. e.g. Hom. Il. 8.306-8, Virg. Aen. 9.433-7 'volvitur Euryalus leto, pulchrosque

per artus ¦ it cruor inque umeros cervix conlapsa recumbit: ¦ purpureus veluti cum flos succisus aratro ¦ languescit moriens, lassove papavera collo ¦ demisere caput pluvia cum forte gravantur', 11.67-70 'hic iuvenem agresti sublimem stramine ponunt: ¦ qualem virgineo demessum pollice florem ¦ seu mollis violae seu languentis hyacinthi, ¦ cui neque fulgor adhuc nec dum sua forma recessit'. In these instances, however, the flower is cut down rather than simply dried up; and in the third, the object of the comparison is already dead. J. could no doubt have produced a flower-image of this kind by suggesting that Nepotianus was cut off before reaching his prime, as he does with Paulina (cf. epist. 66.1.2 'quis parturientem rosam et papillatum corymbum, antequam in calathum fundatur orbis et tota rubentium foliorum pandatur ambitio, inmature demessum aequis oculis marcescere videat?'), but instead he represents him, with some accuracy, as gradually fading away.

The image has been prepared for by flos faeni above. It is, however, made more striking by the postponement of lilium to last word in the clause (where it achieves balance with purpura violae as migrabat does with marcescebat): to this point, even through flante austro, it has been natural to think of Nepotianus himself as subject of marcescebat. The colour-contrast in purpura and pallorem is especially appropriate to one who turns from health to sickness,

pallor regularly being used of a person's complexion; for the viola-pallor connection cf. perhaps Hor. carm. 3.10.14 'tinctus viola pallor amantium', though there is no obvious link between the two passages. migrare, which seems very grand, is quite appropriate to a colour change; cf. Lucr. 2.774-5 'caerula quae sint | numquam in marmoreum possunt migrare colorem'. Altogether the image is very successful.

For other cases of flower-imagery see on epist. 107.4.8, 9.1.

pro dolor. The interjection pro is often followed by the acc. of exclamation, generally in the expression pro fidem, but at other times it takes a vocative, acting like o; cf. K.-S. 1.273-4. The nom. and voc. forms are of course often indistinguishable, but instances such as Plaut. Poen. 1122 'pro supreme Iuppiter', rare though they are, make it clear that it is the vocative which is being used. pro dolor itself is not unusual (cf. e.g. Stat. Theb. 1.77, Paneg. 4 (Nazarius).12.2), and J. uses it elsewhere, e.g. at epist. 15.3.1.

flante austro. auster is the south wind (Greek νότος ; cf. e.g. Sen. nat. 5.16.6, Gell. 2.22.14). Often it is regarded as the bringer of rain; cf. e.g. Virg. georg. 1.462 'umidus auster', and many other examples (see TLL). Here, however, J. seems to consider it a drying,

withering wind, as at in Ezech. 27.26 (CCSL 75.379 = PL 25.261) 'ventus auster contrivit te in corde maris. omnes divitiae Tyri austro flante dispereunt, qui significantius hebraice cadim, graece κλύσων interpretatur, quem nos in ventum urentem transferre possumus ... hoc vento Iacob exustus erat et tamen non contritus, dum loquitur: fui per diem exustus aestu et gelu noctis [cf. Gen. 31.40, with LXX]'. The truth appears to be that at different seasons the wind had a different character (cf. Plin. nat. 2.127 'noxius auster et magis siccus, fortassis quia umidus frigidior est'); in either case it could be destructive to flowers (cf. - in contrast to the present instance - Isid. nat. 37 'tertius ventorum auster plagae meridianae cardinalis, qui et notus, ex humili flans tumidus calidus atque fulmineus, generans largas nubes et pluvias latissimas, solvens etiam flores'). Virgil too noted this damaging effect; cf. ecl. 2.58-9.

aestuaret ... anhelitu. aestuare/aestus and febris go together readily; cf. e.g. Cic. Catil. 1.31 'aestu febrique iactantur', Oros. hist. 6.12.2 'post illas ardentissimas febres internosque aestus' (metaphorically, in reference to Gaul), J. epist. 38.2.1 'Blesillam nostram vidimus ardore febrium ... aestuasse', 99.1.2 'febre aestuans'. The connections between aestuare, anhelitus, and lassus are also easily made; for parallels cf. e.g. Sen. Herc. O. 1339

'reclinis ecce corde anhelante aestuat', Colum. 6.13.3 'aestuantes anhelantesque', 6.38.4 'lassae et aestuanti mulae', Sen. epist. 11.2, nat. 6.14.2 'suspiria atque anhelitus laborantis ac fessi signa sunt'.

venarum ... calor: 'the heat was draining the founts of his veins', i.e. it was causing him to lose colour (cf. pallorem above); fontes hauriret also suggests dehydration. I have noticed no other instances where venae are regarded as fontes. ubera is used in this way, however (cf. Tert. anim. 56.5 'obiit verbi gratia infans sub uberum fontibus', resurr. 60.3); and fons can be used of the source of any liquid, including blood (cf. e.g. Lev. 20.18 'ipsa ... aperuerit fontem sanguinis sui' (concerning menstruation; the fons is not here conceived of as venae)).

avunculum consolabatur: a clever touch, to recall to Heliodorus how Nepotianus himself tried to console him. Statius employs the same technique at silv. 5.1.176-93. For other cases where a dying person consoles or encourages loved ones cf. Quint. inst. 6 pref. 11, Plin. epist. 5.16.4.

universis ... ridebat. The contrast with those around him weeping - emphasised by universis and solus - sets Nepotianus' faith in a very good light. It is not, however, a criticism of the faith of the others, of

whom some expression of grief was demanded by pietas (cf. on 7.2), but J. naturally ignores this aspect here.

proicere ... venientes. The string of historic infinitives contributes to the vividness of the picture; cf. on 10.5.

quasi in occursum: 'as though to meet them'. in occursum (often & gen. or dat.) is used almost exclusively in Christian Latin; ad occursum is much more common in Christian writers too.

intellegeres: cf. on 10.6.

non emori sed migrare. migrare, and similar words, such as proficisci, excedere, and praecedere, are sometimes used by pagan authors to express, or in expressing, the notion of dying; cf. e.g. Cic. Tusc. 1.97 'necesse est enim sit alterum de duobus, ut aut sensus omnino omnes mors auferat aut in alium quendam locum ex his locis morte migretur', Vell. 1.11.7 'hoc est nimirum magis feliciter de vita migrare quam mori', Sen. epist. 99.7 'quem putas perisse praemissus est', dial. 6.25.1 'integer ille nihilque in terris relinquens sui fugit et totus excessit'. Christian writers, believing firmly in an after-life, found it natural to adopt such expressions, and there are

numerous instances. Favez, Consolation, p. 156, collects a number in Christian consolation, where it was an obvious τόπος ; in J. cf. e.g. epist. 39.3.3 'de tenebris migravit ad lucem', 39.3.6, 79.1.3 'mortem iuvenis mariti ... sic tulit, ut eum profectum crederet, non amissum', 118.4.1. In Greek, words such as ἀπέρχεσθαι and προπέμπειν are used similarly; cf. e.g. Diog. Laert. 3.6, Plot. 4.7.15, John Chrys. epist. 197.

Closely connected is the idea that the dead are abroad, or merely absent; cf. e.g. Plut. ad Apoll. 12 (107C) ' Ὁ δὲ Σωκράτης παράπλουν ἔλεγεν εἶναι τὸν θάνατον ... ἀποδημίαν μακράν' , John Chrys. epist. 197 ' πρὸς οἴσεις τοῦ μακαρίου ἀδελφοῦ τῆς μεγαλοπρεπείας τῆς σῆς τὴν ἀποδημίαν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν αὐτὴν καλέσαιμι θάνατον' , J. epist. 75.1.3 (quoted at 5.1 Anaxagorae ... mortalem), 77.1.1 (peregrinatio), and c.14.6. For the euphemism of death as a sleep see on 2.1.

13.3. volvuntur ... patior: cf. epist. 108.27.2 'quis enim possit siccis oculis Paulam narrare morientem?'. For J.'s inability to restrain his grief cf. 2.2 invito et repugnanti per genas lacrimae fluunt; and for the exaggeration cf. 1.2 cui iam ... in funere sum and inplentur oculi with nn.

offirmare has an interesting history, occurring regularly in Comedy and in the Christian writers, but extremely rarely in between; firmare, by contrast, is

found consistently from the time of Cicero (it is rare earlier), and never loses currency. The decline and resurgence of offirmare may partially be explained by the general tendency of Silver Latin at least to prefer simple verbs. Both offirmare and firmare occur with animus and similar words as object; cf. e.g. (offirmare) Plaut. Amph. 646, Plin. epist. 7.27.8, Oros. hist. 5.5.15 (animus), Sen. epist. 98.7 (mens); (firmare) Cic. Tusc. 2.28, Ov. Pont. 1.3.27 (animus), Sen. Tro. 951 (spiritus).

in tali illum tempore. The odd placing of illum arises from the fact that it acts here as an enclitic, reverting to second position in the clause; cf. K.-S. 2.592-4, E. Fraenkel, 'Kolon und Satz: 2', NGG 1933, 319-54 (= Fraenkel, Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie (2 vols., Roma, 1964), 1.93-130).

luctante anima. TLL s.v. luctor gives several instances where luctari is used of the soul of someone on the point of death; cf. e.g. Virg. Aen. 4.693-5 'Iuno ... Irim demisit ... quae luctantem animam nexosque resolveret artus', Sen. Phoen. 141-3 'hoc animo sedet ¦ effundere hanc cum morte luctantem diu ¦ animam'. One might also compare Lucan. 3.578 'luctantem animam lenta cum morte trahentes', where 'animam' = 'breath' rather than 'soul'. The poetic colour of the phrase is not at all out of place in a

passage as stylistically elevated as the present.

studiorum. A reference to academic interests may seem odd in the context, and it is possible that J. was thinking simply of ties of affection between Nepotianus and himself; for studium in this kind of sense cf. e.g. Lucan. 2.377 'studiis odiisque carenti'. Labourt translates: 'l'amitié'. But Nepotianus may have associated his friendship with J. with theological study (cf. 10.9); and cf. Quint. inst. 6 pr. 11 'quam etiam deficiens iamque non noster ipsum illum alienatae mentis errorem circa scholas, litteras habuit'.

hanc ... defecit. J. records the last words of Blesilla, too; cf. epist. 39.1.4 'haec in extrema verba mandabat: orate dominum Iesum, ut mihi agnoscat, quia inplere non potui, quod volebam'. Whether J. was present at Blesilla's deathbed and heard these words for himself is not clear. In the present case J. may be quoting to Heliodorus words which Heliodorus himself had transmitted to J. in the first place; alternatively they may have been composed by J. on the basis of what he had been told of Nepotianus' last moments.

utebar: regularly used of clothing; cf. e.g. Caes. Gall. 6.21.5 'pellibus aut parvis renonum tegimentis utuntur magna corporis parte nuda'. uteretur at 12.4 should probably be understood in this sense.

ministerio Christi: 'the service of Christ', as a presbyter. ministerium was capable of being applied to all orders of the clergy (for which see on 10.3). For the use of the word, and its Greek equivalent, λειτουργία, in the early Church, see Dictionnaire de spiritualité, ascétique et mystique, doctrines et histoire, ed. M. Viller (10 vols. to date, Paris, 1932-), 10.1255-60, s.v. Ministères.

aetate ... collegio: cf. epist. 52.4.3 (J. to Nepotianus) 'audi fratrem collegio, patrem senio'; also epist. 105.5.2 'vale, mi amice carissime, aetate fili, dignitate parens', Aug. epist. 166.2 (= J. epist. 131.2.1) 'venit ad me religiosus iuvenis catholica pace frater, aetate filius, honore conpresbyter noster Orosius'.

collegio = (presumably) the priesthood.

in talia verba defecit. One might have expected an expression with the ablative, as at Suet. Aug. 99.1 'in hac voce defecit'; but the accusative is perfectly acceptable (cf. e.g. Apul. met. 1.26 'me ... sensit ... in verba media somnolentum desinere'). J. epist. 39.1.4 (quoted above at hanc ... defecit) is similar. The construction is closely akin to that where in & acc. expresses a point in time; cf. e.g. Liv. 29.23.3 'ex Hispania forte in idem tempus Scipio atque Hasdrubal convenerunt'.

avunculum ... contrectans: a good case of zeugma, contrectans being used in two senses at once. Literally contrectare = 'to touch, handle', but often = 'to contemplate, consider' (cf. e.g. Cic. Tusc. 3.33 'incitat ad conspiciendas totaque mente contrectandas varias voluptates'). On zeugma of this semantically complex kind see Lausberg, 1.351-3 (sects. 705-8).

c.14. Nepotianus' death occasioned much sorrow. His loss was mourned by Altinum and the whole of Italy, and in him the Church lost a priest who had the potential to succeed Heliodorus as bishop (14.1).

The rest of the c. is difficult. At the end (14.5-6) J. urges Heliodorus to control his grief for his nephew; as a bishop he is in the public eye, and should on no account give the impression that he lacks faith in God. This is not at all unexpected after the laudes Nepotiani and the account of his death, by which feelings of grief could easily be aroused. The intervening section (14.2-4), however, is less explicable. J. moves through a range of ideas which are quite in place in a consolatory context, but which are not presented in a specifically consolatory way, still less related directly to the case of Nepotianus. The overall impression is of a drift in his thought in the course of composing the passage, resulting in a lack of clarity and direction. The flow of thought is scrutinised more closely in the notes.

14.1. Scio ... prosperis. The sense demands that in the second part of the sentence the negative idea in nolueris disappears; J. no doubt forgot that he had wrapped up the notion of wishing in a verb of negative form.

The tense-variation in probare and quaesisse seems a little odd. quaesisse may possibly be a genuine perfect, i.e. 'you did not wish to prove the love of the citizens for you in this way, you wished rather that you had already gained expression of your country's affection under prosperous circumstances'. However, it is easy and natural to take it as equivalent to quaerere, the wish looking forward rather than back; the use of the perf. inf. where we should expect the pres. is not unusual after verbs of wishing and ability (cf. L.-H.-Sz. 2.351-2), and for combination of the two cf. Virg. georg. 3.435-6 'ne mihi tum mollis sub divo carpere somnos ¦ neu dorso nemoris libeat iacuisse per herbas'. I should prefer to understand quaesisse in this sense, though the fact that Virgil wrote iacuisse for the metre, and that quaerere would have given J. a better clausula than quaesisse, raises some doubts.

tota hunc ... Italia. For this exaggerated expression of public grief cf. Ambr. exc. Sat. 1.29 'illam ... Tabitham viduae, hunc tota civitas flevit'; for the same fundamental idea expressed rather differently cf.

Bas. epist. 5.1 'πάντες δὲ ἄνθρωποι, μεθ' ἡμῶν στένοντες, πεισθῶσι τῷ πάθει τὸν ὀδυρμὸν οὐ δυνήσονται· ἀλλὰ κἂν τὸ τῶν ποταμῶν ῥεῦμα δάκρυον γένηται, ἐκπλησθῶσι τῶν συμβάντων τὸν θρῆνον οὐκ ἐξικέσει' . Similar are J.'s descriptions of the funerals of Fabiola and Paula, though in the case of Paula at least, whose reputation was undoubtedly widespread, the exaggeration is likely to be less extreme; cf. epist. 77.1.2-3 (Fabiola) 'et iam fama volans, tanti praenuntia luctus, totius urbis populos exsequias congregabat ... tunc suos in unum populos Roma conspexit', 108.29.1 (Paula; quoted at epist. 1.7.1 totus ... densatur). By such passages the writer increases the stature of the deceased and comforts the bereaved by suggesting, or reminding him, that his grief is shared by many others.

For exaggeration of this kind in different contexts cf. e.g. Cic. p. red. in sen. 39 'Italia cuncta paene suis umeris reportarit [sc. me]', J. epist. 1.7.1 with n., 147.10.3 'noverat te [sc. Sabinianum diaconum] omnis Italia'. Sometimes the idea is pushed even further; cf. e.g. epist. 108.2.1, 130.6.2-5 (on Demetrias' adoption of the life of virginity) 'per omnes domos fervebat virginitatis professio ... cunctae per Africam ecclesiae quodam exultavere tripudio ... omnes inter Africam Italiamque insulae hoc rumore repletae sunt ... penetravit hic rumor orientis litora et in mediterraneis quoque urbibus Christianae gloriae triumphus auditus est ...

quam sponsam hominis una tantum provincia noverat, virginem Christi totus orbis audivit', and the examples relating to the spread of Christianity at n. on 4.2 totius ... est.

The careful verbal balance of the sentence is noteworthy. J. likes such features; cf. e.g. epist. 1.1 otium ... eloquii with n.

civitas: Altinum.

corpus ... tuus. The antithesis in these three short, asyndetic sentences is very marked, particularly in the last (though admittedly this is not antithesis proper, but a kind of word-play with antithesis built into it), which makes pointed the reversal of the natural order of things: for this cf. 1.3 rerum ... senes with n. Virtually the whole of 14.1, indeed, is built up by antitheses; there are contrasts in nolueris ... prosperis, in bonis ... gratius, quod tu ... merebatur, and in altero gratulatio ... teneret. On rhetorical antithesis generally see the evidence collected by Lausberg, 1.389-98 (sects. 787-807), esp. 1.389-92 (sects. 787-96).

At part. 21 Cicero considers antithesis to be a feature of the suave genus dicendi. It is interesting that this is not the only characteristic of the suave genus, as described by Cicero, present in 14.1; one might note particularly the combination of asyndeton and conjunction (cf. Cic. part. 21 'constructioque

verborum tum coniunctionibus copuletur tum dissolutionibus quasi relaxetur').

praecessit: exactly the sort of word used euphemistically of dying; see on 13.2 non emori sed migrare, and cf. epist. 66.15 'prima de vobis praecessit ad dominum', 77.10.1 'praecedit maritum, ut Christo famulum derelinquat'. The play with successor is thus easy.

quod tu eras: i.e. bishop, as the next sentence makes clear.

merebatur: sc. esse.

pontificatus: i.e. episcopate; see on 10.2 pontificem.

raptus sit, ne teneret. The sense of purpose in ne teneret is very slight - 'he was snatched away [by God, or fate] that he might not hold the episcopate'; J. does not intend to suggest a great design to prevent Nepotianus becoming bishop. In English one would be inclined to make the clause temporal, i.e. 'snatched away before he could hold the episcopate'.

14.2. Platonis ... mortis. At this point J. begins a new section, marked by the asyndetic opening; the direction he is taking is not immediately obvious, but

becomes clearer when he introduces the Pauline quotation just below.

The sententia occurs also at two other places in J.; cf. epist. 127.6.1 (quoted at 14.3 debemus ... non potest), adv. Rufin. 3.39-40 (PL 23.486) 'audi quid apud Graecos Pythagoras primus invenerit ... philosophiam meditationem esse mortis: quotidie de corporis carcere nitentem animae educere libertatem: μαθήσεις ἀναμνήσεις ; id est, discentias reminiscentias esse; et multa alia, quae Plato in libris suis, et maxime in Phaedone, Timaeoque prosequitur'. For the attribution of the sententia to Pythagoras see below; as far as Plato is concerned, it is derived from passages in the Phaedo (cf. 64A 'οὐδὲν ἄλλο αὐτοὶ [sc. φιλόσοφοι] ἐπιτηδεύουσιν ἢ ἀποθνήσκειν τε καὶ τεθνάναι', 67D 'τὸ μελέτημα αὐτὸ τοῦτό ἐστιν τῶν φιλοσόφων, λύσις καὶ χωρισμὸς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σώματος', 67E 'οἱ ὀρθῶς φιλοσοφοῦντες ἀποθνήσκειν μελετῶσι', 80E-81A). J.'s meditatio, which can denote practice as well as thought or study, represents Plato's ἐπιτηδεύειν and μελετᾶν . It is, however, doubtful whether J. had got at the sententia directly through the Phaedo. As in the case of other works of Plato (see on 5.2 Platonis ... percucurrimus), convincing evidence that he knew the dialogue at first hand is lacking. He knows about the debate on the immortality of the soul held by Socrates in prison, which is its subject (cf. 4.2 with n.), and the doctrine that learning is recollection, which forms

part of the debate (Phaedo 72E-78B; cf. Meno 80D-86C, Phaedr. 249E-250C) (cf. adv. Rufin. 3.39-40 (quoted above)), but this scarcely presupposes that he was personally acquainted with the Greek text; nor does his comment (ibid.) that it was in the Phaedo and Timaeus especially that Plato followed up Pythagorean ideas. At in Os. 1.2 (CCSL 76.9 = PL 25.823), where he again refers to the work by name, there is no indication that he had actually read it.

As for the sententia itself, J. never attributes it directly to the Phaedo, and it appears to have been well known. Seneca refers to it - 'inde est quod Platon clamat: sapientis animum totum in mortem prominere, hoc velle, hoc meditari' (dial. 6.23.2) - as do Clem. Alex. strom. 5.11 - a work parts of which at least were known to J.; cf. Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p. 99 - and Ambr. exc. Sat. 2.35 (both quoted in following nn.). Ambrose, however, is vague about its origin. If nowhere else, J. will have come across it at Cic. Tusc. 1.74 'tota enim philosophorum vita, ut ait idem [sc. Socrates], commentatio mortis est'; there is a close verbal similarity, and J. knew the work well (see on 12.3 nobilem ... invenit). The weight of evidence is very much in favour of the view that J. knew the maxim only at second hand.

The suggestion made at adv. Rufin. 3.39-40 (see above) that the sententia came originally from

Pythagoras is curious, but is plausibly explained by Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., pp. 138-9, who regards it as an inference from a passage in Porphyry's Vita Pythagorae, which J. knew, made in the light of Cic. Tusc. 1.74-5. A story about Pythagoras is also raised in connection with the idea at Clem. Alex. strom. 5.11.

multo ... ad gloriam. The quotation comes from 1 Cor. 15.31 'cotidie morior per vestram gloriam, fratres, quam habeo in Christo Iesu domino nostro'. In its Pauline context 'cotidie morior' seems primarily to mean 'every day I risk death' from external dangers (cf. A. Robertson and A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (2nd edn., Edinburgh, 1914), p. 361). If J. did understand the phrase to bear this meaning, however, he is not interested in it here, wishing to take it rather more literally. He is concerned to draw a comparison between the standpoint of the pagan philosopher, who only contemplates or practises dying, and that of Paul, the model for Christians, who actually does 'die'. aliud est conari, aliud agere makes the comparison clear. J. may have felt that Paul 'died' in the sense that he shared in the death of Jesus, an idea which occurs in 2 Cor. and Col. (cf. e.g. 2 Cor. 4.9-12, esp. 9-10 'persecutionem patimur, sed non derelinquimur, deicimur, sed non perimus, semper mortificationem Iesu in corpore nostro

circumferentes, ut et vita Iesu in corporibus nostris manifestetur', Col. 2.20 'si mortui estis cum Christo ab elementis mundi, quid adhuc tamquam viventes in mundo decernitis?'), or died to sin (cf. Rom. 6.10-11). The play on the senses of mori continues to the end of the section.

The statement of Paul is connected with the Platonic sententia also at Ambr. exc. Sat. 2.35 'cottidie morior, apostolus dicit, melius quam illi, qui meditationem mortis philosophiam esse dixerunt; illi enim studium praedicarunt, hic usum ipsum mortis exercuit' - the same comparison is drawn here - and at J. epist. 127.6.1-2, where they are not regarded as being in conflict (see on 14.3 debemus ... non potest).

per vestram gloriam is a translation of the Greek 'νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν', understood by Robertson and Plummer as an assurance given by Paul to the Corinthians for the truth of his statement 'cotidie morior'; i.e. 'by the glorying in you which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord (ἣν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν)'. In J.'s context the words have no real value, but he takes advantage of gloriam to play on the possibilities of that word just below. moriturus ex gloria and moritur ... ad gloriam, with an idea of motion contained in the verb, may seem a little odd, but J. may have felt the construction legitimate after per vestram gloriam, and cf. Col. 2.20 'mortui ... ab elementis mundi' (quoted in full above).

ille, iste: i.e. the pagan philosopher, the Christian.

14.3. debemus ... non potest. This sentence comes a little awkwardly after what has preceded. In the first place, in a letter of consolation of which the subject is Nepotianus, and in which J. has just described his death and the reaction it provoked, one might have expected a comment not about how 'we' should live, but how Nepotianus did so. Secondly, praemeditari recalls meditationem, and as J. has apparently rejected the Platonic maxim as insufficient, it is strange that he should now effectively set it up as a principle for himself, Heliodorus, and anyone else who may be included in et nos to follow. It is as though he has forgotten that he has criticised the sententia at all.

A different approach might have been employed with greater success. It would have made better sense to say that Nepotianus had lived his life (or that 'we' should live 'ours') in accordance with Paul's words, or to combine the idea of meditatio mortis with that of 'dying' in one's life without drawing a distinction between them: the idea of appropriate Christian action (seen in terms of 'dying') could then easily be understood to be implied by praemeditari. In itself the Platonic maxim does not necessarily conflict with the Christian position. Clement of Alexandria understands it to fall in easily with the way in which Christians should worship God; cf. strom. 5.11 θυσία δὲ ἡ τῷ θεῷ δεκτὴ σώματός τε καὶ τῶν τούτου παθῶν μετανοοῦντος

Χωρισμός· ἡ ἀληθὴς τῷ ὄντι θεοσέβεια λύτη. καὶ μήτε εἰκότως μελέτη θανάτου διὰ τοῦτο ἁρμόττει τῷ Σωκράτει ἡ φιλοσοφία;'.

Elsewhere J. does link, in a complementary way, the maxim with the words of Paul quoted here; cf. epist. 127.6, which is worth setting out in its entirety:

> annis igitur plurimis sic suam transegit aetatem [sc. Marcella], ut ante se vetulam cerneret, quam adulescentulam fuisse meminisset, laudans illud Platonicum, qui philosophiam meditationem mortis esse dixisset. unde et noster apostolus: cotidie morior per vestram salutem et dominus iuxta antiqua exemplaria: nisi quis tulerit crucem suam cotidie et secutus fuerit me, non potest meus esse discipulus [Luke 14.27] multoque ante per prophetam spiritus sanctus: propter te mortificamur tota die, aestimati sumus ut oves occisionis [Ps. 43.22] et post multas aetates illa sententia: memento semper diem mortis et numquam peccabis [Ecclus. 7.40] disertissimeque praeceptum satirici: vive memor leti, fugit hora, hoc, quod loquor, inde est [Pers. 5.153]. sic ergo - ut dicere coeperamus - aetatem duxit et vixit, ut semper se crederet esse morituram. sic induta est vestibus, ut meminisset sepulchri, offerens hostiam rationabilem, vivam, placentem deo.

The same point could have been made about Nepotianus. He, no less than Marcella, might have been said to have been mindful of death, and to have lived in an

appropriate way; it would have again set him in a favourable light, and been a comfort to Heliodorus. It is possible that J. originally intended to apply the sententia directly to the case of Nepotianus - i.e. he was mindful of death (and lived accordingly), he 'practised' death (in the sense of Christian preparation for the next world, which might be seen in terms of 'dying'); but, carried along by the drift of his thought, and failing to see the logical shortcomings in what he was saying, he ended up on a rather different course.

For the idea that one should reflect that one will eventually die, which is of course not necessarily a τόπος of consolation, cf. e.g. Sen. epist. 63.15 'itaque adsidue cogitemus tam de nostra quam omnium quos diligimus mortalitate ... nunc cogito omnia et mortalia esse et incerta lege mortalia', 93.6 'non enim ad eum diem me aptavi quem ultimum mihi spes avida promiserat, sed nullum non tamquam ultimum aspexi', Plut. ad Apoll. 6 (103F). The τόπος can have consolatory effect when combined with the idea that one's own death will reunite one with the deceased presently mourned. Seneca does this at epist. 63.15, and J. might have done it here, though there is no indication that he contemplated it.

For other examples in J. cf. epist. 54.18.3 'cogita te cottidie esse morituram, et numquam de secundis nuptiis cogitabis', 140.16.2-3 'numerum

annorum dierumque nostrorum, quos in hoc saeculo nos vivere decrevisti, ostende nobis, ut praeparemus nos adventui tuo ... nihil enim ita decipit humanum genus, quam, dum ignorant spatia vitae suae, longiorem sibi saeculi huius possessionem repromittunt. unde et egregie dictum est: nullum tam senem esse et sic decrepitae senectutis, ut non se adhuc uno plus anno vivere suspicetur. ad hunc sensum pertinet et illud, quod dicitur: memento mortis tuae et non peccabis. qui enim se recordatur cotidie esse moriturum, contemnit praesentia et ad futura festinat', (perhaps) 147.2.1.

For praemeditatio not of one's own death, but of ills which may befall one in the future, see on 5.1 Anaxagorae ... mortalem.

velimus nolimus: 'whether we wish it or not'; the subjunctives are jussive. There are numerous examples of this formula, going back to Cicero (cf. nat. deor. 1.17); many are collected by Otto, s.v. velle 1, and substantially added to in his Nachträge. Number and person are of course variable. J. uses the expression very frequently; cf. e.g. epist. 45.7 'saluta Paulam et Eustochium - velit nolit mundus, in Christo meae sunt', 112.15.2, 130.19.1, adv. Iovin. 1.12, 2.21 (PL 23.228, 316), in Zach. pref. (CCSL 76A.748 = PL 25.1418).

nam ... proficiscitur. J. now develops the idea, expressed in the last sentence, that death cannot be

far away. Everyone is bound to die, and ultimately it makes no difference whether one's life is long or short, except in so far as (a Christian point) the older a man is, the heavier his burden of sin. The implication is that it is better to die young and it is difficult not to associate Nepotianus with this idea, even though the point is not explicitly related to him. An early death might also be thought advantageous when death is seen as an escape from the miseries of human life (cf. on 14.4, 15.1).

The notion of inrecusabilis mortis necessitas, though not used here in a consolatory way, is nevertheless an obvious τόπος of consolation, and is connected more directly with the case of Nepotianus at 5.1, where see n.

For the idea that there is effectively no difference between long life and short cf. Cic. Tusc. 1.94, Sen. dial. 6.21.3 'cum ad omne tempus dimiseris animum, nulla erit illa brevissimi longissimique aevi differentia, si inspecto quanto quis vixerit spatio comparaveris quanto non vixerit', epist. 99.4, 99.31 'omnes, quantum ad brevitatem aevi, si universo compares, et iuvenes et senes, in aequo sumus', Plut. ad Apoll. 17 (111C). These passages are quoted by Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., pp. 139-40. All occur in conjunction with the consolatory idea that one should not grieve at someone's death on the ground that they died young, because to have lived longer would not

have benefited them at all. On the relativity of time cf. also Tac. dial. 16.6.

In a wholly different context cf. J. adv. Iovin. 1.13 (PL 23.230) 'etiamsi nongentis viveremus annis, ut antiqui homines, tamen breve putandum esset, quod haberet aliquando finem, et esse cessaret. nunc vero cum brevis sit non tam laetitia, quam tribulatio nuptiarum, quid accipimus uxores, quas cogemur cito amittere?'.

excederemus: not infrequently used of time; cf. e.g. Liv. 9.34.15 'ne excedas finitum tempus', Plin. epist. 2.1.4; also c.16.1 below.

Mathusalae ... donarentur: cf. Gen. 5.27 'et facti sunt omnes dies Mathusalae nongenti sexaginta novem anni, et mortuus est'.

For the position of nobis cf. 13.3 in tali illum tempore with n.

transactum ... tantundem est. There is a slight anacoluthon here. After inter eum ... et illum ... we should have expected a phrase such as nihil interest; J., however, writes 'everything that has been done is just as much', i.e. it all amounts to the same thing, as if ab eo ... and ab illo ..., in close conjunction with transactum omne, had preceded.

magis ... proficiscitur: cf. Ambr. bon. mort. 6-7 'quid igitur tantopere vitam istam desideramus, in qua quanto diutius quis fuerit tanto maiore oneratur sarcina? ... nullus enim dies sine nostro peccato praeterit'.

peccatorum fasce. In late Latin fascis is occasionally used to mean a metaphorical burden; cf. e.g. Symm. epist. 8.13 'praevenisse me arbitror famam, quae te absolutum non modo honoris verum etiam curarum fasce vulgavit', Ambr. Iob 1.3.7 'fasce delicti', Prud. ham. 551.

proficiscitur. For the use of words of this kind in describing death see on 13.2 non emori sed migrare.

14.4. optima ... mortis. Having just implied that it is better to die young (magis ... proficiscitur), J. now does so again; not, however, on the ground that the longer one lives, the more sin one accumulates, but because after youth is past, one becomes a prey to disease and the suffering which old age brings. Death, no doubt, is equally inclemens when it comes to someone young, but at least the intervening miseries are then avoided.

The vv. are a direct quotation of Virg. georg. 3.66-8. In their original context they occur in connection with the idea that cattle should be mated

while still young, but easily lend themselves to the interpretation imposed on them here.

The passage is again quoted, in part, and tailored grammatically to fit the context, at epist. 58.11.2 'praepara tibi divitias, quas cotidie eroges et numquam deficiant, dum viget aetas, dum adhuc canis spargitur caput, antequam subeant morbi tristisque senectus et labor et durae rapiat inclementia mortis'. The use made of the vv. here is of course quite different. Other cases of borrowing occur at Sen. epist. 108.24 (all three vv.; parts are quoted also at 108.26 and 29), dial. 10.9.2, ps. Acro Hor. carm. 2.11.5 (in part), Don. Ter. Phorm. 1.2.42 (in part). In none of these instances, either, are Virgil's words used, as here, to suggest that to die young is a good thing.

Naevius ... mala. Of the work of Cn. Naevius, poet of the third century BC - tragedies, comedies, and an epic called the Bellum Poenicum - only fragments survive. For his life and writing see the articles in RE supp. 6 and OCD, and the important works of E. V. Marmorale (ed.), Naevius poeta (2nd edn., Firenze, 1950), and M. Barchiesi, Nevio epico (Padova, 1962).

The senarius quoted by J. here (Naev. com. 106) is not recorded elsewhere and it is not known from what play it comes. It is most unlikely that J. was directly acquainted with a text of Naevius; the only other place where he refers to him is in his

translation of Eusebius' Chronicle (p. 217 Fotheringham = PL 27.495-6), in connection with the time and place of his death. It seems quite likely that he got at the line - and the Ennian vv. quoted below (see n. ad loc.) - through Cicero's Consolatio, his source for much of c.5 (where see nn.); cf. Luebeck, Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores, pp. 105-6, 157, Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 142.

unde ... antiquitas. The connection between the Naevius quotation, which links easily with the lines from the Georgics, and the present passage seems to be this: taking hold of the general human truth that every mortal must inevitably experience many ills, people in antiquity gave it a mythological extension, imagining those who suffered great evils and grieved accordingly undergoing some kind of metamorphosis. The case of Niobe, whose children were slain by Apollo and Artemis, is an obvious instance; for the story cf. e.g. Hom. Il. 24.602-17, Ov. met. 6.146-312. J. refers to the myth again, in a different context, at epist. 69.2.7.

The textual problem is a major one which has been much discussed, most recently by C. Vitelli, 'Nota a Gerolamo, Epist. 60.14', RFIC 101 (1973), 352-5. Almost all the MSS read in lapidem et in diversas bestias commutatam; two omit the second in, and one has commutatum. As there is no record elsewhere of Niobe

being changed in diversas bestias - and it is any case hard to see what the point of a multi-metamorphosis of this kind would be in the myth - something must be amiss with the text.

Vallarsi (PL 22.598 n.(d)) suggested the possibility that in diversas bestias was interpolated, presumably drawn in from a marginal comment in an early MS, where other cases of metamorphosis had been jotted down or alluded to. This is of course plausible; but it would have been quite natural for J. to have consolidated his point with further examples. Recognising this, Hilberg, following Buresch,'Cons. hist. crit.', p. 101, took his cue from Cic. Tusc. 3.63 'et Nioba fingitur lapidea propter aeternum, credo, in luctu silentium. Hecubam autem putant propter animi acerbitatem quandam et rabiem fingi in canem esse conversam'; Hecuba's rage is connected with her bitter grief at the deaths of her children. Hilberg's conjecture (in lapidem et in diversas bestias <conversas alias ut Hecubam in canem> commutatam) seems to assume this passage - or a similar one from Cicero's Consolatio (closely related to the Tusculans; see introduction) - to have been J.'s direct source here. Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 141, n. 5, adopts a similar line, and produces an ingenious explanation of how the lacuna arose; according to his reconstruction of the text, a copyist could easily have omitted a line by parablepsy.

One cannot, however, be sure that J. was following a specific source here. The story of Niobe was well known and used by consolers in various ways (see below); and by themselves words such as finxit and commutatam, which recall Cicero's 'fingitur', 'fingi', and 'conversam', are scarcely enough to clinch a connection. Given this, it is probably better to fill the lacuna in a more general way. As an alternative to the idea that in diversas bestias was an interpolation, Vallarsi offered in lapidem et <alios> in diversas bestias commutatos as a possible reconstruction. Vitelli's suggestion is along the same lines: Niobam ... in lapidem et <diversas> [or -os] in diversas bestias commutatas [or -os], the point being that the repetition of diversus in polyptoton is frequent in late Latin (he gives two further instances in J., including c.5.2 of this very letter).

None of the solutions presented is obviously superior to all the others. Vitelli's criticisms of the conjectures of Hilberg and Kunst are ill-founded, but his approach is safer and I suspect that what J. actually wrote was closer to his suggestion, or that of Vallarsi, than to theirs. The text would probably be best obelised, and possible solutions printed in the apparatus.

For the use of the story of Niobe in consolation cf. Cic. Tusc. 3.63 (quoted above), Sen. epist. 63.2 'duram tibi legem videor ponere, cum poetarum Graecarum

maximus ius flendi dederit in unam dumtaxat diem, cum dixerit etiam Niobam de cibo cogitasse?', Plut. ad Apoll. 28 (116B-C) 'ἒ χοῦν ἡ Νιόβη κατὲ̀ τοὺς μύθους πρόχειρον ἔ̀χε τὴν ὑπόλημψιν ταύτην ὅτι κὰι ἡ ... βλάστας ... τέκνων βριθομένη ... τελευτήσει, οὐκ ἂν οὕτως ἐδυσχέμινεν ὡς κὰι τὸ ζῆν ἐθέλειν ἐκλιπεῖν διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς συμφορᾶς'. It is noteworthy that the myth is used each time in a different context: Cicero introduces it in connection with his discussion of people who exaggerate their grief because they think they ought to show the deepest possible sorrow at the death of loved ones, Seneca uses it to fortify his exhortation to Lucilius not to weep too much, Plutarch links it with the idea that it is sensible to remember that people are mortal, for their deaths then occasion less grief and resentment. So J. here employs the myth in his own way, giving it as one case in which the ancients put into mythological terms the general truth that men must suffer many ills.

The commutati in diversas bestias will have included figures such as Alcyone, Cycnus, and Daedalion; cf. Buresch, 'Cons. hist. crit.', p. 101.

Hesiodus ... funere. A second conclusion is now drawn from the words of Naevius: as men are subject to mala, death must be a good thing and a matter for rejoicing. This point squares neatly with the implication of the quotation from the Georgics above and the sentence

which precedes it, that to die young is to avoid the accumulation of sin and the sufferings of old age. The passage about Niobe sits a little uncomfortably in the middle of all this.

For the notion that death should be an occasion for joy, and birth for sorrow, cf. Val. Max. 2.6.12 'Thraciae vero illa natio merito sibi sapientiae laudem vindicaverit, quae natales hominum flebiliter, exequias cum hilaritate celebrans sine ullis doctorum praeceptis verum condicionis nostrae habitum pervidit', Quint. inst. 5.11.38 'an vero me de incommodis vitae disserentem non adiuvabit earum persuasio nationum quae fletibus natos, laetitia defunctos prosecuntur?', Ambr. exc. Sat. 2.5 'fuisse etiam quidam feruntur populi, qui ortus hominum lugerent obitusque celebrarent; nec inprudenter enim eos, qui in hoc vitae salum venissent, maerendos putabant, eos vero, qui ex istius mundi procellis et fluctibus emersissent, non iniusto gaudio prosequendos arbitrabantur. nos quoque ipsi natales dies defunctorum obliviscimur et eum, quo obierunt, diem celebri sollemnitate renovamus'. See also on 15.1 ut ... evaserit.

All the MSS give the name of Hesiod in one form or another. Hilberg takes the allusion to refer to Op. 174-8 'μηκέτ' ἔπειτ' ὤφελλον ἐγὼ πέμπτοισι μετεῖναι | ἀνδράσιν, ἀλλ' ἢ πρόσθε θανεῖν ἢ ἔπειτα γενέσθαι. | νῦν γάρ δὴ γένος ἐστὶ σιδήρεον· οὐδέ ποτ' ἦμαρ | παύσονται κάματόν τε καὶ ὀϊζύος οὐδὲ τι νύκτωρ | φθειρόμενοι· χαλεπὰς δὲ θεοὶ δώσουσι

μεμίμνας' . But it is scarcely possible to see how these words could be summed up by natales ... funere, and Hilberg himself was forced to say 'Hesiodi versum male intellexit Hieronymus'. No other passage in the extant writings of Hesiod will fit the bill either. J. is most unlikely to have known Hesiod's work at first hand anyway. He mentions him in two other passages (epist. 52.3.5, in Is. 2.3 (CCSL 73.45 = PL 24.69)), but neither presupposes direct acquaintance with the Greek text: in the first Hesiod is merely mentioned in a list of Greek poets, in the second he is referred to simply as 'Graeci poetae' and the sententia attributed to him there may have reached J. through another such commentary on Isaiah (cf. Hagendahl, p. 229) or through Clem. Alex. paedag. 3.8 (cf. Luebeck, Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores, pp. 11-12, Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p. 61). It is quite possible that he did not even realise that the 'Graeci poetae' was Hesiod. Equally there appears to be no intermediate source, naming Hesiod, from which J. could have drawn the allusion in the present passage. These difficulties have given rise to much discussion whether Hesiodus should remain in the text, and what could replace it, the fullest treatment being that of Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., pp. 143-50.

Briefly, two possible corrections for Hesiodus have been proposed, on the assumption that the error was due to an early copyist or to J. himself in a

moment of forgetfulness:

(a) Euripides; the passage in question then being the fragment of Euripides' Cresphontes quoted in translation by Cicero at Tusc. 1.115: 'nam nos decebat coetus celebrantis domum ¦ lugere, ubi esset aliquis in lucem editus, ¦ humanae vitae varia reputantis mala; ¦ at qui labores morte finisset gravis, ¦ hunc omni amicos laude et laetitia exsequi'. natales ... funere would represent these vv. well, and they will have been familiar to J. through his reading of the Tusculans or Consolatio, where they are almost certain to have occurred; but a scribal error of this magnitude, at least, seems most unlikely;

(b) Herodotus; in which case a copyist, as long as he was familiar with the name of Hesiod, could more easily have misread the text from which he was working and blundered in the transcription. This emendation has been widely favoured (cf. Kunst, pp. 145-9, Courcelle, p. 9, Hagendahl, p. 204), and the allusion generally considered to refer to the story of Cleobis and Biton at Herod. 1.31, in which 'διέδεξε ... ὁ θεὸς, ὡς ἄμεινον εἴη ἀνθρώπῳ τεθνάναι μᾶλλον ἢ ζώειν'. J. will certainly have been familiar with the story, which is mentioned at Cic. Tusc. 1.113, and there declared to be well known, but natales ... funere does not represent it with great accuracy. As a second, rather better

possibility, Kunst, pp. 147-9, suggests Herod. 5.4 as the original source: 'Τρῶσοι ... πολεῖσι τοιάδε· τὸν μὲν γενόμενον περιεχόμενοι οὐ προσήκοντες ὀλοφύρονται, ὅσα μὲν δεῖ ἐπείτε ἐγένετο ἀναπλῆσαι κακά, ἀνηγεόμενοι τὰ ἀνθρωπήια πάντα πάθεα, τὸν δ' ἀπογενόμενον πεύθοντές τε καὶ ἥδομενοι γῇ κρύπτουσι, ἐπιλέγοντες ὅσων κακῶν ἐξαπέλυχθέν ἐστι ἐν πολλῇ εὐδαιμονίῃ', arguing with some cogency that J. got at this passage through Cicero's Consolatio.

Both conjectures are plausible; the second may have the edge, as allowing more easily the possibility of a mistake by a scribe, albeit one literate enough to know the name of Hesiod. It is, however, far from inconceivable that J.'s memory failed him at this point, or that Hesiodus simply represents a slip of the tongue or pen. As it is impossible to be sure what he intended to write, I would retain Hesiodus in the text, but mark it with an obelus.

prudenterque ... non licet. This Ennian fragment is somewhat loosely attached to what has preceded. It does not follow directly from the sententia of Naevius; it rather looks forward to the subsequent section, where J. turns again to the particular case of Heliodorus.

The trimeters are not found elsewhere. Editors from Columna on assigned them to Ennius' Iphigenia, on

the strength of their similarity to Eur. IA 446-9, but the caution of Jocelyn, Ennius, p. 323, that it is dangerous to assign to particular plays fragments which have the character of a sententia, is well founded. The fragment appears as no. 215 in Jocelyn's edition. J. is likely to have found it in Cicero's Consolatio; cf. Luebeck, Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores, pp. 109-10, 157, Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 142. Certainly the other lines of Ennius which he quotes could easily have been derived from Cicero.

The text and its punctuation present a problem. In the first line, the MSS are split between regi and regio. Hilberg prints regio; regi is adopted by I. Vahlen (ed.), Ennianae poesis reliquiae (Lipsiae, 1903), p. 158 (= Iphigenia, fr. 7), and Jocelyn. Jocelyn also punctuates the line differently from Hilberg:

> plebes in hoc regi antestat: loco licet
> lacrimare plebi, regi honeste non licet,

but without comment.

regio, if it is right, can go only with loco, and Hilberg's punctuation will follow; in hoc = 'in this respect'. Metrically this is acceptable, and the sense is adequate. But with plebes antistat one might expect regi rather than regio loco. loco must then be put on the other side of the colon; in hoc loco would make no sense here. Its natural meaning is then 'opportunely', 'at the right moment' (cf. OLD s.v. locus 21b), and it balances honeste. This arrangement seems to me

preferable, and I would print accordingly.

14.5. ut regi ... quam episcopo. At last J. gets back to the specific case of Heliodorus. In addition to all the other reasons why Heliodorus should not grieve for his nephew, some of which have just been hinted at obliquely - that death is an escape from mala, and so on - there is another of some importance: it is not honourable for him, as a bishop, to do so. In the rest of the c. J. elaborates on this point.

With minus ... episcopo the effective governing verb is still non licet: grief is less unlawful for a king than for a bishop.

servitute dominatur: the Christian paradox of mastery by service, rooted in the gospels; cf. e.g. John 13.4-10, where Christ washes the feet of his disciples, Mark 9.34 'ait [sc. Iesus] illis [sc. discipulis]: si quis vult primus esse, erit omnium novissimus et omnium minister'.

in te ... putant. Heliodorus' position as bishop marks him out as a man in the public eye; people look to him for an example, and he must be careful not to set a bad one.

Cicero writes to Brutus in similar vein after the death of the latter's wife Porcia: 'mihi tum, Brute, officio solum erat et naturae, tibi nunc populo et

scaenae, ut dicitur, serviendum est; nam cum in te non solum exercitus tui sed omnium civium ac paene gentium coniecti oculi sint, minime decet propter quem fortiores ceteri sumus eum ipsum animo debilitatum videri' (ad Brut. 17.2). Buresch, 'Cons. hist. crit.', pp. 103-4, and Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., pp. 150-1, argue plausibly that Cicero said something similar about himself in his Consolatio, comparing himself also with the king mentioned in the Ennian fragment, and that J. took over the idea directly from there. Seneca too makes the same sort of point at dial. 11.6.1 'potest et illa res a luctu te prohibere nimio, si tibi ipse renuntiaveris nihil horum quae facis posse subduci. magnam tibi personam hominum consensus inposuit: haec tibi tuenda est'.

constituta, magistra est: singular after domus tua et conversatio, which forms, effectively, a single subject.

14.6. cave ... delinquere: 'take care not to do anything which those who wish to find fault with you may seem to have been right in censuring, or which would force those who wish to imitate you to do wrong'. Labourt's understanding of delinquere, = 'y renoncer', is certainly wrong.

ubertim ... in deum: a τόπος of Christian consolation, albeit not a very common one; cf. epist. 39.6.1 'grandis in suos pietas inpietas in deum est', Paul. Nol. carm. 31.45-50, Cypr. mort. 20 'praedicarem ... occasionem dandam non esse gentilibus, ut nos merito ac iure reprehendant, quod quos vivere aput deum dicimus ut extinctos et perditos lugeamus et fidem quam sermone ac voce depromimus cordis et pectoris testimonio non probemus'. Such a τόπος must be essentially Christian; but the notion that one should cease grieving in order not to give a handle to those who may draw false conclusions from that grief is found occasionally in pagan consolations; cf. Cic. ad fam. 4.5.6 (Sulpicius) 'noli committere ut quisquam te putet non tam filiam quam reipublicae tempora et aliorum victoriam lugere', Sen. dial. 12.19.7 'huic parem virtutem exhibeas oportet et animum a luctu recipias et id agas ne quis te putet partus tui paenitere'.

In different circumstances - when she was leaving Rome for Palestine - Paula made sure that her pietas towards her children did not make her impia towards God: 'siccos oculos tendebat ad caelum pietatem in filios pietate in deum superans' (epist. 108.6.3).

On exercising restraint in grief generally see on 7.3 obsecro ... nimis.

incredulas mentes: for the phrase cf. e.g. Sen. Herc. O. 1979, (in a specifically Christian sense) Cypr.

eleem. 12 ('incredula cogitatio'), Arnob. nat. 1.51, J. epist. 148(spurious).23.1. See further on 2.2 credulam ... affectus.

desperatio ... deum. desperatio regularly takes the genitive of the thing despaired of, and I have noticed no other instances where it is followed by in & acc. J. presumably wrote in deum here to balance in nepotem, in & acc. being quite regular after pietas.

desiderandus ... videaris. For the notion that the dead are merely absent, and related ideas and expressions, see on 13.2 non emori sed migrare.

In saying desiderandus ... mortuus J. is of course encouraging Heliodorus not to weep: Nepotianus is simply absent, and he will see him again. He forgets, conveniently, that he has earlier (7.1) said that it is absence from the deceased itself which causes grief in the bereaved.

cc.15-16. J. now presents a fairly lengthy account of some of the disasters which have befallen the Roman world in recent years. Calamities have struck emperors and leading privati alike, and general havoc has been wrought by barbarian invasions throughout the Empire. How fortunate Nepotianus has been in dying and escaping from it all!

With this passage it is worth comparing particularly Cic. de orat. 3.8 and Tac. Agr. 45, where the deaths of L. Crassus and Agricola are seen as a happy avoidance of specific ills which subsequently afflicted the state; Q. Hortensius' death is regarded similarly at Cic. Brut. 329. Ambrose, too, represents his dead brother as having escaped impending disaster in the nick of time; cf. exc. Sat. 1.30-2 (quoted in part at 2.1 laeter ... illius?). J.'s passing comment on Olybrius - 'felix morte sua, qui non vidit patriam corruentem' (epist. 130.3.2) - is also relevant here. Nepotianus' case is slightly different, in as much as the evil situation from which he escapes is regarded as having already long been in existence when he dies; cf. Cypr. mort. 25 (quoted at 16.3 Romanus ... non flectitur).

W. Trillitzsch, 'Hieronymus und Seneca', MLatJb 2 (1965), 42-54, sees (p. 51) an 'unmistakeable' ('nicht zu verkennen') parallel between J.'s list of ill-fated emperors and other leaders and Sen. dial. 6.26.2, where Seneca, assuming the person of Cremutius Cordus, urges Marcia not to grieve for her son's early death: 'regesne tibi nominem felicissimos futuros si maturius illos mors instantibus subtraxisset malis? an Romanos duces, quorum nihil magnitudini deerit si aliquid aetati detraxeris?'. It may be that J. had this passage in mind when he wrote these cc., but the parallel does not seem to me to be especially close:

J. is talking of reges and duces, but he is not interested in the idea that they would have done better to have died sooner. For him, Constantius and the rest are not so much examples against which Nepotianus' good fortune in dying young is to be measured, as representative cases of the particular catastrophic situation from which he has escaped.

In a letter of consolation to a young widow John Chrysostom mentions that of the nine emperors ('τῶν βασιλευόντων') of his time - he is probably reckoning from Constantine to Valens and including the Caesar Gallus - only two died a natural death (vid. iun. 4). In the same c. he also gives cases of private citizens of recent times who died wretched deaths when they had attained high station. But despite the superficial similarity to the present passage Chrysostom's purpose is not to show from what a dreadful situation Therasius has escaped; rather, he wishes to suggest that he has done well for himself and his widow to die before reaching a higher position, such is the fate of those who gain it, and indeed of their wives.

15.1. quid ... sedatum. For the healing qualities of time and reason on dolor cf. e.g. Cic. ad fam. 4.5.6 (Sulpicius) 'nullus dolor est, quem non longinquitas temporis minuat ac molliat. hoc te exspectare tempus tibi turpe est ac non ei rei sapientia tua te occurrere', 5.16.6 'neque exspectare temporis medicinam

[sc. debemus], quam repraesentare ratione possimus', Tusc. 3.35, Ov. Pont. 4.11.13-14 'finitumque tuum, si non ratione, dolorem ¦ ipsa iam pridem suspicor esse mora', Sen. epist. 63.12 'finem dolendi etiam qui consilio non fecerat tempore invenit', dial. 6.1.6, 8.1 'dolorem dies longa consumit', Bas. epist. 269.1 'ἱκανὸς μὲν οὖν καὶ ὁ χρόνος μαλάξαι τὴν καρδίαν καὶ τὴν πληγὴν δοῦναι τοῖς λογισμοῖς', J. epist. 39.5.2 'quod tempore mitigandum est cur ratione non vincitur?', (in a quite different context) 97.2.1; also (on time) C. C. Grollios, Seneca's Ad Marciam: Tradition and Originality (Athens, 1956), pp. 22-3.

In the present passage the suggestion is that J.'s consolation is of little value, as Heliodorus' grief has already been assuaged; but although J. gives the appearance of going on to something quite different (cf. esp. non potius replico ...), it is another τόπος of consolation to which he proceeds in the second half of the sentence. At epist. 66.1.1 he again feels that he is offering his consolation late, and is afraid that he may even exacerbate a wound already healed: 'sanato vulneri et in cicatricem superinductae cuti si medicina colorem reddere voluerit, dum pulchritudinem corporis quaerit, plagam doloris instaurat. ita et ego, serus consolator, qui inportune per biennium tacui, vereor, ne nunc inportunius loquar et adtrectans vulnus pectoris tui, quod tempore et ratione curatum est, commemoratione exulcerem'. On ancient views of the

right time for offering consolation generally - it was normally held to be not too early, when the consolation might aggravate the fresh wound, nor too late, when the wound had become inveterate - see Johann, Trauer und Trost, pp. 36-40, and Gregg, Consolation Philosophy, pp. 136-9.

medens recalls 1.1 vulneratos, where see n.

non potius replico: i.e. quid non potius ...

ut ... evaserit. For other cases where death is seen as an escape from specific ills confronting the state see introductory n. to cc.15-16. Seneca points out how much better off Pompey, Cicero, and Cato would have been if they had died earlier, thus avoiding political troubles which affected them directly; cf. dial. 6.20.4-6. Equally, by dying one may escape more intimate calamities; cf. Virg. Aen. 11.158-9 'tuque, o sanctissima coniunx, ¦ felix morte tua neque in hunc servata dolorem' (Evander after the death of Pallas; there may be a reminiscence of this passage at epist. 130.3.2 (quoted in introductory n.)), Ov. trist. 4.10.81-2 'felices ambo tempestiveque sepulti, ¦ ante diem poenae quod periere meae!'.

Death was often regarded as a release from the mala of human life generally; cf. e.g. Herod. 7.46, ps. Plato Axioch. 366A-367C, Sen. dial. 6.19.5 'mors dolorum omnium exsolutio est', 11.9.4ff., Stat. silv.

2.1.220-2 'ast hic quem gemimus, felix hominesque deosque ¦ et dubios casus et caecae lubrica vitae ¦ effugit, immunis fatis', Sen. suas. 6.6, Plut. ad Apoll. 11 (107C) 'τοιούτου δὴ τοῦ βίου τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὄντος οἷον οὗτοί φασι, πῶς οὐκ εὐδαιμονίζειν μᾶλλον προσήκει τοὺς ἀπολυθέντας τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ λατρείας ἢ κατοικτείρειν τε καὶ θρηνεῖν, ὅπερ οἱ πολλοὶ ᾄδουσι δι' ἀμαθίαν;', 34 (119F) 'ἀλλ' ἄωρος ἐτελεύτησεν. οὐκοῦν εὐποτμότερος διὰ τοῦτο καὶ κακῶν ἀπείρατός ἐστιν', Fronto p. 233 Naber, Cypr. mort. 15 'multi ex nostris in hac mortalitate moriuntur, hoc est multi ex nostris de saeculo liberantur', Ambr. exc. Sat. 2.3 'nos saeculi huius absolvat aerumnis [sc. mors]', 21 'si mors carnis et saeculi nos absolvit aerumnis, utique malum non est, quae libertatem restituit, excludit dolorem', Greg. Naz. orat. 7.20 'μὴ τοίνυν πενθῶμεν κοσμίους, οἷων ἀπηλλάγη κακῶν εἰδότες', Greg. Nyss. Pulch. pp. 465-6 Jaeger, Theodoret epist. 14 'αὐτῷ μὲν συνησθῶμεν τῆς ἐκδημίας, καὶ τῆς ἐντεῦθεν ἀπαγωγῆς ὅτι τῶν ἀμφιβόλων ἠλευθερώθη πραγμάτων'. Plutarch similarly sees how to be confined on an island could be viewed as an escape from restless travels and dangers, a positive advantage (cf. exil. 11 (603E)); and J. regards it as a consolation to the blind that they are freed from at least one temptation (cf. epist. 76.2). By contrast, it is possible to regard death as a deprivation of suavitas vitae; cf. Ambr. exc. Sat. 2.14.

Christian writers sometimes present death not, or not merely, as an escape from ills, but as an advance to a better state; cf. e.g. Cypr. mort. 22, Ambr. obit. Valent. 46 'dolendum est, quod nobis cito raptus sit, consolandum, quod ad meliora transierit', epist. 39.3, Aug. serm. 172.3, John Chrys. epist. 192 'οὐ γάρ δὴ θάνατος τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἀποδημία καὶ μετάστασις ἀπὸ τῶν χειρόνων πρὸς τὰ βελτίω', J. epist. 39.3.6 'si viventem crederet filiam, numquam plangeres ad meliora migrasse', 78.33. This idea is, of course, virtually identical with the notion that Christians pass to heaven, to the presence of God and Christ, when they die; see on 7.1 Scimus ... dei nostri for its appearance in consolation. Cicero provides an interesting pagan parallel; cf. Tusc. 1.76 'tantum autem abest ab eo, ut malum mors sit ... ut verear, ne homini nihil sit non malum aliud, certe sit nihil bonum aliud potius, siquidem vel di ipsi vel cum dis futuri sumus'. Cf. also Sen. dial. 6.24.5-25.2.

For the simple idea that death is no evil cf. e.g. Lucr. 3.866-7, Cic. ad fam. 5.16.4 'nihil mali esse in morte [sc. legi et audivi], ex qua si resideat sensus, immortalitas illa potius quam mors ducenda sit, sin sit amissus, nulla videri miseria debeat quae non sentiatur', 6.3.3. Ambrose points out how much better off Christians are, if pagans can be consoled by thoughts such as this; cf. obit. Valent. 45 'si gentes, quae spem resurrectionis non habent, hoc uno se consolantur, quo dicant, quod nullus post mortem sensus

sit defunctorum ac per hoc nullus remaneat sensus doloris, quanto magis nos consolationem recipere debemus, quia mors metuenda non sit, eo quod finis sit peccatorum, vita autem desperanda non sit, quae resurrectione reparatur?'.

15.2. Constantius ... imperium. Flavius Iulius Constantius, born 317, Augustus 337-61, the third son of Constantine the Great, died of a fever in November 361, at Mopsucrenae (Mopsi), near Tarsus, while marching to suppress the rebellion of his cousin Julian (the inimicum referred to here). He had been one of the principal supporters of Arianism since his adoption of the doctrine soon after his accession. Julian was subsequently acknowledged as Augustus by the whole Empire. For full details and sources see PLRE 1.226 and RE s.n. Constantius 4.

There is no reason to suppose that J. is drawing on any source for the details he gives of Constantius and the rest. He had lived through the period, and the facts he presents are such as would have been widely known or rumoured.

Arrianae hereseos. For details of the Arian heresis, which denied the true divinity of Jesus Christ, see ODCC s.vv. Arianism, Arius, and the appended bibliographies.

h(a)eresis (gen. -eos or -is) is less emotive and pregnant a word than 'heresy'. The Greek αἵρεσις, = fundamentally 'choice', 'election', was used from the third century BC also to denote a set of philosophical principles, or a school adhering to a particular set; cf. e.g. Polystr. p. 20 Wilke, Polybius 5.93.8. It occurs also in reference to Jewish religious sects (cf. e.g. Joseph. bell. Iud. 2.8.1 (118) (Essenes), Acts 5.17 (Sadducees), 15.5 (Pharisees)), and indeed to the early Christians themselves, when regarded by others as a sect (cf. e.g. Acts 24.5).

In Latin the word was used in the sense of both 'doctrine' and 'sect' by the first century BC (cf. e.g. Laber. mim. 36, Cic. parad. 2), and was later applied to religious groups, as in Greek. It came to be used particularly in connection with schisms and non-Catholic doctrines in the Church; cf. e.g. Aug. anim. 1.19.34 'Pelagianam haeresim', c. Cresc. 2.15.18 'haeresis vel schismatis deposito errore'.

Iulianus ... propagatos. Flavius Claudius Iulianus, 'Julian the Apostate', born 332, Augustus 360-3, son of Iulius Constantius the half-brother of Constantine the Great, was killed in battle in Persia (Media) in June 363, while conducting a campaign to recover territory lost by Rome to the Persians and even to subdue Persia itself (hence Romanos propagare vult fines). perdidit propagatos may conceivably refer to the concession of

the five Roman provinces east of the Tigris made by Jovian in July 363, the final outcome of the expedition; but it seems more likely that J. means that by his death Julian lost (control over) the territories which had been extended as the Roman Empire had been built up over the course of time, in which Julian himself had played a part by driving the Alamanni and Franks out of Gaul and re-establishing the Rhine frontier (356-9).

perditor animae suae is of course an allusion to Julian's apostasy. He was in Gaul as Caesar from 355 to 360 and remained there as Augustus until well into 361, but his rejection of Christianity was not, as J.'s words (quem ... denegarat) might suggest, a sudden and clear-cut event which fell in that period. From his youth, well before he went to Gaul, Julian had been attracted to paganism, but he kept his practice of its rites long secret, while outwardly continuing to observe the Christian religion. He does not appear to have performed pagan sacrifices openly until late in 361, when he had left Gaul and was marching through Thrace to Constantinople after Constantius' death, though his true position may have become widely known earlier; Zos. 3.9 records that, while he was still in Gaul, in response to an angry message from Constantius he declared within public earshot that he would rather entrust himself to the gods than to Constantius' words. Whether this was true or not, J. may well have heard it

said, or inferred from Julian's later public stance, that he had been practising paganism while in Gaul, and assumed that he had turned from Christianity, in reality though not outwardly, during that time.

Christiani iugulator exercitus probably refers to the anti-Christian measures taken by Julian after becoming sole Emperor; it is hard to see how exercitus could mean anything other than the whole Christian body here (for the idea of Christians as soldiers in the army of Christ see on epist. 107.4.8). In fact it seems that at first he tolerated Christianity, later merely discouraged it, and only took a harder line after the burning of the temple of Apollo at Daphne in October 362. iugulator (which is extremely rare; TLL gives only four instances, including two in glossaries) is a stronger word than Julian's actions against the Christians may actually have warranted, though he threatened more severe measures once he had returned from the Persian campaign. For J.'s intense dislike of Julian see esp. epist. 70.3.2, where the language is very colourful.

The terms in which J. describes Julian's death - Christum sensit in Media (cf. epist. 70.3.2 'Nazareum nostrum ... statim in proelio senserit [sc. Iulianus]') - indicate that he regarded it as an act of retribution for Julian's apostasy. In the light of this it is a fair inference that he felt similarly about the death

of Constantius, Arrianae fautor hereseos. Equally, the barbarian incursions into the Empire and the Roman defeats at barbarian hands are seen as God's vengeance for general Roman sin; cf. c.17.1-2 with nn.

For full details and sources concerning Julian see PLRE 1.477-8 and RE s.n. Iulianos 26. R. Browning, The Emperor Julian (London, 1975), is a valuable and penetrating modern account of his life.

15.3. Iovianus ... potentia. Flavius Iovianus, born 331, Augustus 363-4, had reigned for less than eight months when suddenly he died. The sources are not unanimous, however, that the cause of his death was asphyxiation; some suggest that he may have died of food poisoning after a meal. It may be that even at the time of his death and among those in the imperial circle there was doubt as to what the true cause was. For full details and sources concerning his life and the manner of his death see PLRE 1.461 and RE s.n. Iovianus 1.

Valentinianus ... est. Flavius Valentinianus, born 321, Augustus 364-75 (Valentinian I), was a native of Cibalae in Pannonia (genitali solo, patriam). Pannonia was invaded and ravaged in 374 by the Quadi and Sarmatae, angry at Roman interference on the frontier and at the murder of Gabinius, King of the Quadi. The Romans suffered badly. In the following year

Valentinian made an expedition of revenge, but in the winter died suddenly, in the course of reviling ambassadors from the Quadi; from the sources it is clear that the cause was an apoplectic stroke (cf. R. S. O. Tomlin, 'The Emperor Valentinian the First', unpublished Oxford D.Phil. thesis 1973, Bodleian MS D. Phil. c. 1154, pp. 236 and 246; for vomitu sanguinis cf. J. chron. a Abr. p. 329 Fotheringham (= PL 27.697-8) 'Valentinianus subita sanguinis eruptione quod Graece apoplexis vocatur Brigitione moritur', epist. ad Praesidium p. 58.146-8 Morin 'Valentinianus cum adversus Sarmatos Quadosque ... in consistorio saevus infremeret ... sanguine erumpente discrepuit', ps. Aur. Vict. epit. 45.8 'impetu sanguinis voce amissa, sensu integer, exspiravit'). Pannonia was left inultam in the sense that Valentinian had not yet completed the destruction of the Quadi, which he had planned to do once the campaigning season had returned. For full details and sources see PLRE 1.933-4, RE s.n. Valentinianus 1, and Tomlin's thesis.

huius ... sepulchri. Flavius Valens, born c. 328, was proclaimed Augustus by his brother Valentinian in 364, the division of the Empire thus becoming complete, Valentinian ruling the West and Valens the East. The Gothic war here referred to was that occasioned by Roman maltreatment of the Goths after they had implored the protection of Valens against the Huns and been

taken across the Danube and into the Empire in 376; heavily oppressed by the leaders of the administration in Thrace, they revolted. Valens' death occurred at the battle of Hadrianople, a calamitous defeat for the Romans, in August 378. The sources present two accounts of the manner of his death: one, that he died in battle, his body never being recovered; the other, that he was taken by some of his own troops to a neighbouring village, or cottage, which was soon, however, surrrounded and set on fire by the enemy, Valens dying in the blaze. J. here gives no indication which of these reports he believes. For full details and sources see PLRE 1.930-1 and RE s.n. Valens 3.

Gratianus ... testantur. Flavius Gratianus, born 359, Augustus 367-83, was the son of Valentinian I. In 383 Magnus Maximus was hailed as Augustus by the troops in Britain, and on invading Gaul easily won over the armies there. Gratian, thus betrayed by his troops, fled from Paris towards Lugdunum (Lyons) (Zos. 4.35 alone says that his flight was to Sigidinum in Moesia), but was caught there by Andragathius, Maximus' cavalry commander, and put to death. One may readily believe that he was denied entry by the towns along the road, where he may have tried to find a refuge or an easier way through Gaul, even though no other authority directly substantiates the point. For details and sources see PLRE 1.401 and RE s.n. Gratianus 3.

It is not clear why J. apostrophises Lugdunum, unless it be for the rhythm: with the vocative, the sentence ends with a cretic-spondee; Lugduni testantur would have been less satisfactory.

15.4. adulescens ... suspendio. Flavius Valentinianus, born 371, Augustus 375-92 (Valentinian II), was the brother of Gratian. In 387 Maximus invaded Italy, driving Valentinian into exile at Thessalonica (cf. fugam, exilia). Theodosius, Emperor in the East, took up arms on the fugitive's behalf, routed the enemy near Siscia in Pannonia, and trapped Maximus himself in Aquileia, where he was then executed (summer 388). This civil war, of which details are scanty, was indeed bloody (cf. multo sanguine), if Pacatus' panegyric on Theodosius can be trusted (cf. Paneg. 2.34ff.), though it was concluded fairly easily and quickly. The rule of the West was restored to Valentinian, but his power gradually drifted into the hands of the Frankish general Arbogastes. In 392 friction between the two reached a peak, and in May Valentinian died suddenly at Vienne (not far from Lyons; cf. haut procul ... conscia) in shadowy circumstances. The accounts presented by the sources vary considerably; most suspect foul play with Arbogastes at the back of it, but a recent reappraisal by B. Croke, 'Arbogast and the Death of Valentinian II', Historia 25 (1976), 235-44, has demonstrated that

the probability of suicide is quite high. J. clearly believed that Valentinian was murdered, and his corpse hung after his death; this is substantially the same view as that of Orosius and Philostorgius, who report - Orosius with a little uncertainty - that he was strangled and then hung to give the impression of suicide (Oros. hist. 7.35.10, Philostorg. hist. eccl. 11.1). The truth could easily have been thus perverted by those wishing to bring discredit on Arbogastes. (Whether J. believed that the body was hung as an attempted cover-up for murder or simply to disgrace Valentinian is not clear.) For full details and sources concerning Valentinian's life see PLRE 1.934-5 and RE s.n. Valentinianus 3.

urbe ... conscia. The use of conscius referring to inanimate things is common in poetry and well attested in prose; cf. e.g. Cic. Verr. 2.5.160 'urbem ... flagitiorum omnium consciam', Virg. Aen. 4.519-20, Sen. epist. 101.15, ps. Quint. decl. mai. 13.4 p. 250.6-7 Lehnert 'conscios natalium parietes', Prud. cath. 6.83-4 'conscium futuri ¦ librum', J. epist. 22.7.3 'cellulam meam quasi cogitationum consciam'.

quid ... sunt. For praeteritio (quid loquar ...?) see on 4.2.

After his list of *bona fide* emperors J. now turns to the wretched ends of three usurpers.

Procopius, born *c.* 326, Augustus 365-6, had some degree of connection with Julian. After the deaths of Julian and Jovian he found himself a figure of suspicion to Valentinian I and Valens, and went into hiding. Eventually he came to Constantinople, and, finding conditions right for a rebellion, became master of the city and was proclaimed Emperor (September 365). At first successful, in the following year he lost the support he had acquired, and was eventually captured, brought before Valens, and executed. For further details and sources concerning his career see *PLRE* 1.742-3 and *RE* s.n. *Prokopios* 2.

For the career of Magnus Maximus, Augustus 383-8, see *PLRE* 1.588, *RE* s.n. *Maximus* 33, and nn. on 15.3 *Gratianus ... testantur* and 15.4 *adulescens ... suspendio*.

Flavius Eugenius, Augustus 392-4, was a grammarian and rhetorician elevated to the throne of the West by Arbogastes in August 392, three months after the death of Valentinian II. Theodosius subsequently went to war against them; in September Eugenius was defeated in battle, captured, and executed, and Arbogastes committed suicide soon afterwards. For details and sources concerning the career of Eugenius see *PLRE* 1.293, *RE* s.n. *Arbogastes* 1, and J. Straub, 'Eugenius', *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, edd. T. Klauser

et al. (11 vols. to date, Stuttgart, 1950-), 6.860-77.

J.'s comment that all three stood captive before their conquerors receives corroboration from other sources. As for saying that they were terrori gentibus, this may have been true of Maximus, if unfair (he found himself thrust into the position of emperor, and could not have maintained himself there, as he had to do, without use of arms; see the sympathetic judgement of Sulp. Sev. dial. 2.6.2), perhaps even of Procopius in the East (he easily subdued Asia and Bithynia), but hardly of Eugenius, if he was indeed a puppet emperor in the hands of Arbogastes, and none of them appears to have had the characteristics of a cruel tyrant. The rather exaggerated idea is probably introduced to make a strong contrast with their eventual fate.

dum ... potirentur. For the use of the subjunctive after dum = 'as long as' see K.-S. 2.374, L.-H.-Sz. 2.612.

16.1. Dicat aliquis. This kind of formula, involving an imaginary interlocutor, is often used to pose an objection or raise a question, which may then be answered; in J. cf. e.g. epist. 22.19.1, 100(tr. from Theophilus).3.1. Quintilian regards the figure as a sort of prosopopoeia; cf. inst. 9.2.36. Equally, the

raising of the objection or question may be attributed not to a third party but to the addressee, and J. does so frequently; cf. e.g. epist. 58.4.1, 84.9.1, 107.6.2 ('inquies'); 39.4.1, 51(tr. from Epiphanius).5.7 ('dicis'); 31.2.2, 120.1.11 ('respondebis'). For another approach cf. e.g. epist. 123.12.1 'at patriarchae non singulas habuerunt uxores', where the objection is expressed by 'at' (on which see K.-S. 2.85-6). The figure is called hypophora or subiectio; see Lausberg, 1.381-2 (sects. 771-2).

feriuntque ... montes: Hor. carm. 2.10.11-12 (montis in Klingner's edition). J. quotes the passage also at quaest. hebr. in Gen. pref. (CCSL 72.1 = PL 23.935) and epist. 108.18.1, in all three cases using the words as an illustration of the idea that those who stand on a pinnacle in some field or other are especially prone to danger. Paula's great virtue, for instance, makes her highly susceptible to men's envy (epist. 108.18.1). The passage has a similar function in its original context, where Horace is urging Licinius to keep to the golden mean in life, and not reach too high.

dignitates. In the Later Empire dignitas, in its technical sense, covered a wide range of military and civil offices, including at the top of the ranking order those held by Abundantius, Rufinus, and Timasius; cf. Jones, LRE, 1.377ff. For the metonymy see TLL,

which collects examples going back to Cic. orat. 89.

nec ... biennium: i.e. J. will take his examples from the events of the previous two years. The statement is curious, in that he does not in fact go back more than about six months; for discussion see introduction.

consularium. At this time consularis appears to have been, strictly, a title borne by provincial governors; cf. Jones, LRE, 1.379. Abundantius and the others ranked higher, but J. is not concerned to be precise.

Abundantius ... exulat. Flavius Abundantius, magister militum (East) 392-3, cos. 393, fell prey in 396 to the jealousy of Eutropius, the most influential figure in the East in the early years of the reign of the young Arcadius after the death of Rufinus, and was banished: to Pityus on the Black Sea, according to J., with some support from Aster. hom. 4 prope fin.; to Sidon, according to Zos. 5.10.5. He was perhaps exiled to the Euxine first, and later allowed to settle in the Phoenician city. For full details and sources see PLRE 1.3-4, RE s.n. Abundantius 1.

Rufini ... mendicavit. Flavius Rufinus, praefectus praetorio in the East 392-5, cos. 392, who was effectively in control of the Eastern Empire after the death of Theodosius in January 395, was murdered in

November of that year outside Constantinople, possibly, though not certainly, at the instigation of Stilicho, his counterpart in the West (cf. A. Cameron, Claudian: Poetry and Propaganda at the Court of Honorius (Oxford, 1970), pp. 90-2). The details of his head being impaled on a pike, and his avaricious hand carried around the city as though begging for alms, are presented by other authors too; cf. e.g. Philostorg. hist. eccl. 11.3, Zos. 5.7.6 (head merely severed), Claud. in Rufin. 2.433-9. Claudian also inveighs against his greed generally at in Rufin. 1.183ff. It has been suggested that in writing this passage J. is actually indebted to the lines of Claudian which deal with the same subject, and that other passages in this c. also betray direct influence of parts of in Rufin. 2, viz. 16.2 non calamitates ... statum, 16.4 quid putas ... barbari?, 16.4-5 quantae ... praeterfluunt (cf. in Rufin. 2.440-1, 187-91, 32-5); see H. L. Levy, 'Claudian's In Rufinum and an Epistle of St. Jerome', AJPh 69 (1948), 62-8. The argument, however, is not convincing; and in any case the likelihood is that the second book of In Rufinum was not written until summer 397, a year or so after the date of this letter (see introduction): see the sensible line taken by Cameron, Claudian, pp. 76-8.

J. seems to take great pleasure in the horrible end of Rufinus (cf. esp. the tone of dedecus insatiabilis avaritiae); this no doubt has something to

do with the fact that Rufinus was almost certainly instrumental in trying to procure the banishment of J. and his monks from Palestine in 395 (cf. Kelly, pp. 203-4, E. D. Hunt, 'St. Silvia of Aquitaine: the Role of a Theodosian Pilgrim in the Society of East and West', JThS 23 (1972), 357-8).

For further details and sources concerning the life and death of Rufinus see PLRE 1.778-81, RE s.n. Rufinus 23.

Constantinopolin. It is possible that J. wrote Constantinopoli, 'at Constantinople', the reading of several of the MSS; but Claud. in Rufin. 2.435 has the head carried to the city ('ad moenia'), and the accusative has more MS support (though the form -polim is better attested than -polin, and would be consistent with 16.2 Constantinopolim below).

ad dedecus insatiabilis avaritiae. This phrase perhaps bears a sense both of purpose and of result. It should certainly be taken with mendicavit rather than with abscissa (so Labourt).

Timasius ... inglorius. Flavius Timasius, magister equitum 386, magister equitum et peditum 388 - c. 395, cos. 389, was an outstanding general of Theodosius. After the latter's death Timasius, like Abundantius, fell victim to Eutropius; he was accused of aiming at

the throne, and was convicted and exiled (396).

Where Hilbert prints in Oase, the MSS present a variety of readings: osasae, ovasae, ovans, and most commonly asse. Earlier editors printed Assae, which might possibly represent a village in Scythia (cf. RE s.n. Assa 2; the only other Assa known to RE is a town in Chalcidice so called by Herodotus, and elsewhere otherwise named); but as Zos. 5.9.5 reads 'Τιμάσιος δὲ τῇ Ὀάσεως οἰκήσει παραδοθεὶς ἀπηλαύνετο', and Soz. hist. eccl. 8.7.2 says that Timasius was banished to 'τὴν κατ' Αἴγυπτον Ὄασιν', Hilberg's conjecture should stand. The place would be the great Oasis in the Libyan desert, about five days' march to the west of Abydus on the Nile; cf. E. Gibbon, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ed. J. B. Bury (7 vols., London, 1909-14), vol. 3, c. 32, p. 384, n. 14. Timasius' exile there appears to be recorded also by Aster. hom. 4 prope fin., though he is not named.

altissimo dignitatis gradu is accurate, Timasius having been mag. equ. et ped.; cf. Jones, LRE, 1.378. For the phrase praecipitatus ... gradu cf. Cic. dom. 98 'praecipitari ex altissimo dignitatis gradu'; also p. red. in sen. 2 'altissimo gradu dignitatis'.

For further details and sources concerning the career of Timasius see PLRE 1.914-5, RE s.n. Timasius 1.

Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 160, n. 2, suggests a possible pun in Timasius (Τίμη) and inglorius.

16.2. non calamitates ... statum. J. here moves into a wider context, going on to consider the troubles experienced by the Roman world at large in recent years. With the rest of the c. may be compared epist. 123.15-16 (AD 409): a similar account of recent devastation by barbarians, particularly in Gaul.

The passages in which J. refers to the barbarian invasions of this period have been discussed by J.-R. Palanque, 'St. Jerome and the Barbarians', in Murphy, Monument, pp. 171-99, and E. Coleiro, 'The Decay of the Empire and the Fall of Rome in St. Jerome's Letters and Lives of the Hermits', Journal of the Faculty of Arts, the Royal University of Malta 1 (1957), 48-57, but I have found neither article particularly helpful.

condicionis narro statum is a very unrhythmical ending, while condicionis statum narro would have been a good metrical clausula (cretic spondee). But J. is here prepared to sacrifice an easily-obtainable good rhythm for the sake of another stylistic feature: the clause fragilem ... statum is framed by adjective and noun in agreement, a verbal arrangement for which Virgil, in the construction of his hexameter, is rightly renowned (cf. e.g. E. Norden (ed.), P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis Buch 6 (4th edn., Stuttgart,

1957), pp. 391-2). For other cases where rhythmical considerations yield to a preferred word-order see general introduction, sect. 3.

horret ... prosequi. horrere is regularly found with animus, and may take a dependent infinitive; for the combination cf. e.g. Virg. Aen. 2.12 'animus meminisse horret', Liv. 28.29.4 'horret animus referre quid crediderint homines'.

viginti ... effunditur: 'for twenty years and more Roman blood has been spilt every day...'. cotidie is of course exaggeration, designed to make the state of the world seem as bad as possible. For the use of quod to introduce temporal clauses see E. Löfstedt, Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae (Uppsala and Leipzig, 1911), pp. 56-7. With the present case, where extent of time is being expressed, cf. (in J.) epist. 133.12.1 'multi anni sunt, quod ab adulescentia usque ad hanc aetatem diversa scripsi opuscula', pref. in Ezram (PL 28.1403) 'tertius annus est quod semper scribitis atque rescribitis, ut Ezrae librum vobis de Hebraeo transferam'; for a different use, where quod = ex quo, 'since', cf. epist. 77.1.1 'plures anni sunt, quod super dormitione Blesillae Paulam ... consolatus sum', adv. Iovin. 1.1 (PL 23.211) 'pauci admodum dies sunt, quod sancti ex urbe Roma fratres cuiusdam mihi Ioviniani Commentariolos

transmiserunt', epist. ad Praesidium p. 56.57-8 Morin.

eo amplius: i.e. eo numero amplius.

Alpes Iulias: the chain of mountains north of Istria, Aquileia to the south-west, Emona to the east. They were formerly called the Alpes Venetae; cf. Amm. 31.16.7.

Scythiam .. rapiunt. The main barbarian movements of which J. is thinking here are the invasion of Pannonia by the Quadi and Sarmatae in 374 (see on 15.3 Valentinianus ... est; this was not the first time in recent years that they had invaded Roman territory (cf. Amm. 16.10.20, 17.12, on events in 357-8)); the Gothic rebellion of 377-82, in which the Alani and Huns were implicated (cf. e.g. Amm. 31.16.3), and in the course of which the northern provinces of eastern Europe as far west as the Julian Alps were overrun (cf. e.g. Amm. 31.16.7); and the revolt of the Goths under Alaric in 395-6, when Macedonia and Thessaly were traversed and the whole of Greece occupied. For good narrative accounts one may still turn to Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ed. Bury (1909-14), vol. 3, cc. 25-6, 30.

Of the regions of the Empire here mentioned, Scythia and Thracia were at this time provinces in the diocese of Thracia; Macedonia was both a province and a diocese containing, among others, the provinces of Thessalia, Epirus Nova, and Epirus Vetus; Dacia was a diocese including, among others, the provinces of

Dardania, Dacia Ripensis, and Dacia Mediterranea; Dalmatia was a province of the diocese of Illyricum. cunctas Pannonias might include all the remaining provinces of Illyricum, viz. the two Pannonias, Savia, Valeria, Noricum Ripense, and Noricum Mediterraneum (so Labourt); or at least the first four, which were formed by the division of Pannonia Inferior and Pannonia Superior under Diocletian. See generally Jones, LRE, 3.384-6. However, J. is unlikely to have been interested in the precise administrative divisions which the names in the list represent; the picture painted by the sentence is broadly impressionistic, and the list may be taken more or less to represent the whole of south-eastern Europe.

It may be that the list should include Achaea, at this time a province in the diocese of Macedonia (cf. Jones, LRE, 3.386). The implication of Hilberg's apparatus is that it is not found in any of his MSS, but it is present in almost all those I have consulted, generally between Thessaliam (often Thessalonicam) and Epiros and in place of Dardaniam, Daciam.

The inclusion of the Vandals and Marcomanni in the list of barbarian tribes is odd, for they are not mentioned by other authorities in connection with the incursions of the previous twenty years or so; Ammianus, Orosius, Sozomen, Socrates, Zosimus, and Claudian too, are quite silent. The historians may be guilty of omission, but it seems more likely either

that J. was misinformed or that he was linking the Vandals and Marcomanni with the recent invasions on the strength of their actions against the Romans at earlier times, e.g. in the Marcomannic wars of the second century AD, when they seem to have been allied with the Quadi and Sarmatae (cf. e.g. Oros. hist. 7.15.8). (The Vandals, Quadi, and Sarmatae are again mentioned in the same breath, in a quite different context, at adv. Iovin. 2.7 (PL 23.295).) For the view that the Marcomanni were in fact involved in raids into the Danube provinces in 395 see L. Schmidt, Geschichte der deutschen Stämme (2 vols., Berlin, 1910-18), 1.117. Interestingly, the Vandals caused a lot of trouble ten years later, when they were involved with the Suebi and Alani in overrunning Gaul and Spain; cf. e.g. Oros. hist. 7.38.3, Soz. hist. eccl. 9.12.3.

With the list of tribes cf. epist. 123.15.2 'quicquid inter Alpes et Pyrenaeum est ... Quadus, Vandalus, Sarmata, Halani, Gypedes, Heruli, Saxones, Burgundiones, Alamanni et - o lugenda res publica! - hostes Pannonii vastaverunt'. In each case J. switches from singular to plural in the middle, and for no obvious reason.

vastant, trahunt, rapiunt. An asyndetic list of verbs like this can have great force; other good cases are epist. 24.2, 107.2.2 'specu [leg. specum; cf. n. ad loc.] Mithrae et omnia portentuosa simulacra ...

subvertit, fregit, exussit', and the famous instance at Cic. Catil. 2.1 'abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit' (quoted by J. at epist. 109.2.5). Quintilian says of asyndeton that it is 'apta cum quid instantius dicimus: nam et singula inculcantur et quasi plura fiunt' (inst. 9.3.50); certainly J. is speaking instantius here. On the figure generally see Lausberg, 1.353-5 (sects. 709-11).

16.3. virgines dei: see on epist. 107, esp. the introduction.

fuere ludibrio. By writing fuere for fuerunt J. achieves a greatly superior rhythm. For his attentions to prose-rhythm generally see general introduction, sect. 3.

diversorum officia clericorum: i.e. clerici diversorum officiorum, clerics of various ranks or orders, by a sort of hypallage with a transferred adjective involved. For grades of the clergy see on 10.3.

subversae ecclesiae: cf. epist. 128.5.1 'in cineres ac favillas sacrae quondam ecclesiae conciderunt' (after the sack of Rome in 410).

martyrum ... reliquiae. For the veneration of martyrs in the early Church, and J.'s attitude to it, see on

12.4 and epist. 107.9.2.

ubique luctus ... imago: cf. Virg. Aen. 2.368-9 'crudelis ubique ¦ luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago'. J.'s gemitus in place of Virgil's 'pavor' can hardly be a memory lapse, as it renders the v. unmetrical; he must have wished to strengthen the impression of grief at the expense of the notion of fear. Adaptation and alteration of quoted passages is not uncommon in J.; cf. Hagendahl, pp. 306-7.

The present quotation is particularly appropriate here because it comes from that part of the Aeneid dealing with the ruin of Troy, and it may be that in Romanus orbis ruit there is a reminiscence of Aen. 2. 363 'urbs antiqua ruit multos dominata per annos'. When Rome itself fell, Virgil's lines made an even better parallel, and at epist. 127.12.3, while telling of the capture of the city, J. quotes the whole of Aen. 2.361-4 followed by a combination of vv.365 and 369.

Aen. 2.368-9 ('crudelis ... imago') is also quoted illustratively by Lact. inst. 5.11.5 and Oros. hist. 2.5.10, though the contexts are different. For the use of the Aeneid to illustrate contemporary events at this period and later, particularly the barbarian incursions into the Roman world, see P. Courcelle, 'Les Lecteurs de l'Énéide devant les grandes invasions germaniques', Romanobarbarica 1 (1976), 25-56. In authors who draw on the Aeneid in this way - above all Claudian, J., and

Augustine - Courcelle detects an underlying conviction that the history of Troy and the history of Rome are identical, and that contemporary events form a part of this long history.

Romanus ... non flectitur. J. here hints that the ruin of the world has something to do with human sin, and that repentance is necessary; in the next c. this is made explicit. See on 17.1 olim ... exercitus. With the present sentence cf. epist. 128.5.1 'pro nefas, orbis terrarum ruit et in nobis peccata non corruunt', in Ezech. 8 pref. (CCSL 75.333 = PL 25.231) (AD 413) 'cadit mundus et cervix erecta non flectitur; pereunt divitiae et nequaquam cessat avaritia; congregare festinant, quae rursum ab aliis occupentur; aruerunt lacrimae, pietas omnis ablata est; multi qui petant, pauci qui tribuant. nec erubescimus, paupertatem vili palliolo praeferentes, Croesi opibus incubare, famemque et interitum plurimorum nostris custodire thesauris'.

A century and a half earlier Cyprian too had seen the world in a state of collapse, and pointed out how advantageous it was to die and be removed from it; cf. mort. 25 'mundus ecce nutat et labitur et ruinam sui non iam senectute rerum sed fine testatur: et tu non deo gratias agis, non tibi gratularis quod exitu maturiore subtractus ruinis et naufragiis et plagis imminentibus exuaris?'. J. has of course already made the point, in slightly different terms, at 15.1.

16.4. quid ... barbari? Alaric and the Goths overran Greece in 395. According to Zosimus, our main source for the invasion, peace terms were struck with Athens and no harm done to her (5.6); but Zosimus' account is open to suspicion on several grounds, and what J. says here squares with Claud. in Rufin. 2. 186-91 'si tunc his animis acies collata fuisset, ¦ prodita non tantas vidisset Graecia caedes, ¦ oppida semoto Pelopeia Marte vigerent, ¦ starent Arcadiae, starent Lacedaemonis arces; ¦ non mare fumasset geminum flagrante Corintho ¦ nec fera Cecropiae traxissent vincula matres' (the possibility that J. was influenced by these lines is very remote; see on 16.1 Rufini ... mendicavit). Philostorgius, too, declares that Athens was taken (hist. eccl. 12.2). Zosimus agrees that Corinth and Sparta suffered capture.

16.4-5. anno ... captivae. The invasion of the Huns into the Eastern provinces in 395 is described at greater length by J. at epist. 77.8; he records the rumour that they were making for Jerusalem, and tells of the precautionary measures taken by Antioch and Tyre. His description of the carnage wrought and fear inspired by the invasion (cf. epist. 77.8.1 '... Hunorum examina, quae pernicibus equis huc illucque volitantia caedis pariter ac terroris cuncta conplerent') may not be greatly exaggerated; cf. Claud. in Rufin. 2.28-35 'alii per Caspia claustra ¦

Armeniasque nives inopino tramite ducti ¦ invadunt orientis opes. iam pascua fumant ¦ Cappadocum volucrumque parens Argaeus equorum, ¦ iam rubet altus Halys nec se defendit iniquo ¦ monte Cilix. Syriae tractus vastantur amoeni ¦ assuetumque choris et laeta plebe canorum ¦ proterit imbellem sonipes hostilis Orontem' (see on 16.1 for the alleged influence of these lines on J.), in Eutrop. 2.569-74 'nuper ab extremo veniens equitatus Araxe ¦ terruit Antiochi muros ipsumque decorae ¦ paene caput Syriae flammis hostilibus arsit. ¦ utque gravis spoliis nulloque obstante profunda ¦ laetus caede redit, sequitur mucrone secundo ¦ continuum vulnus', Philostorg. hist. eccl. 11.8 'μέχρι τῆς κοίλης Συρίας ἦλασαν [sc. οἱ Οὖννοι], καὶ τὴν κλιτὺν κατοδράμοντες φόνον ἀνθρώπων εἰργάσαντο ἀνοσιώτατον'. Fear in the East would naturally have been increased by the absence of the Roman army (cf. epist. 77.8.2). The invasion is also mentioned in passing by Soz. hist. eccl. 8.1.2 and Socr. hist. eccl. 6.1.6-7.

16.4. Caucasi rupibus. The phrase recurs at epist. 77.8.1.

non Arabiae ... lupi. lupi is natural of attackers; cf. e.g. Virg. Aen. 2.355, where it is used in a simile in reference to Aeneas' men on the attack in Troy. However, Arabiae lupi calls to mind specifically a passage in Habakkuk concerning the Chaldaeans of

Babylonia: 'καὶ ἐξαλοῦνται ὑπὲρ παρδάλεις οἱ ἵπποι αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ τῶν Χαλδαίων ἔθνους] καὶ ὀξύτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς λύκους τῆς Ἀραβίας' (Hab. 1.8, LXX); = 'et exsilient super pardos equi eius, et velociores erunt lupis Arabiae' (J.'s translation at in Hab. 1.6-11 (CCSL 76A.584 = PL 25.1278)). The Vulgate text reads: 'leviores pardis equi eius et velociores lupis vespertinis'. It would not be an impossible leap from this to represent the Chaldaeans themselves as lupi; and they would form a good parallel to the Huns (the septentrionis lupi) in as much as they were used by God as an instrument of correction for his people (cf. c.17). But there is a clear risk of reading too much into a passing allusion, and it is quite likely that Arabiae is used merely for a simple geographical contrast with septentrionis, with little or no thought of the Biblical context. There is then no significance in the fact that the phrase occurs in this form only in the LXX version, at a time when J. had completed his translation of Habakkuk from the Hebrew (see general introduction, sect. 4).

tantas brevi provincias. The juxtaposition of tantas and brevi is meant to emphasise the speed and force of the invasion.

16.5. obsessa ... praeterfluunt. Antiochia is that Antioch in Syria (modern Antakya, in Turkey), on the Orontes; cf. the passages from Claudian quoted above at

16.4-5. anno ... captivae. It is not clear which other cities on the rivers named were besieged; perhaps such as Ancyra (near the Halys), Tarsus (on the Cydnus), and Circesium (on the Euphrates).

One might compare 123.15.3, where J. lists, at greater length than here, the cities, provinces, and peoples of Gaul which suffered in the raids of 406-9.

Arabia ... captivae. As at 16.2 Scythiam ... Pannonias J. is seeking to give an impression, and he will have had no thought of the particular provinces and dioceses covered by these names. Technically, Arabia, Phoenice, Phoenice Libani, and three provinces of Palaestina (1, 2, P. Salutaris) were at this time provinces of the diocese of Oriens, Aegyptus was the name of both a province and a diocese; cf. Jones, LRE, 3.389. Equally, oriens above (16.4) should naturally mean the East generally, not simply the diocese; the invasion in any case took in the diocese of Pontus (which included the Halys and Cydnus) too.

For the idea of fear generated in neighbouring areas cf. epist. 123.15.4 'ipsae Hispaniae iam iamque perituraе cotidie contremescunt recordantes inruptionis Cymbricae et, quicquid alii semel passi sunt, illae semper timore patiuntur'. In the present case at least, the statement is not likely to be a gross exaggeration; see on 16.4-5 anno ... captivae.

non ... possim: Virg. Aen. 6.625-7, with part of the second line omitted, i.e., after ferrea vox, 'omnis scelerum comprendere formas'. 'non, mihi ... vox' occurs also at Virg. georg. 2.43-4. In the Aeneid the vv. are uttered by the Sibyl and deal with the sufferings of sinners in Tartarus; they are thus very appropriate to the present context, as poenarum hints at the retributive character of the barbarian attacks (cf. c.17), though the Virgilian context is of no relevance when J. quotes from the passage elsewhere (see below).

The lines are derived originally from Hom. Il. 2. 488-90. After Virgil they gradually became a cliché, and were quoted, adapted, imitated, and echoed by writers deep into the Middle Ages; cf. P. Courcelle, 'Histoire du cliché virgilien des cent bouches', REL 33 (1955), 231-40, supplemented by A. Cameron, 'The Vergilian Cliché of the Hundred Mouths in Corippus', Philologus 111 (1967), 308-9; also R. G. Austin (ed.), P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus (Oxford, 1977), pp. 199-200. J. quotes from the passage again at three other places, viz. epist. 66.5.2, 77.6.4, 123.16.4: in the first 'poenarum' refers to the sufferings of the sick and maimed with whom Pammachius associated; in the second it is replaced by 'morborum', which refers to the illnesses of those looked after by Fabiola; in the third, where the context is similar to the present, 'poenarum' is supplanted by 'caesorum',

and 'omnes captorum dicere poenas' stands in place of 'omnis scelerum comprendere formas'. For J.'s adaptation of quoted passages see on 16.3 ubique luctus ... imago. Courcelle, art. cit., p. 236, notes also the adaptation of the cliché into prose at epist. 108.1.1 'si cuncta mei corporis membra verterentur in linguas et omnes artus humana voce resonarent, nihil dignum sanctae ac venerabilis Paulae virtutibus dicerem'.

neque ... miserias. The point of historiam seems to be simply to imply a long work, with which breviter then contrasts. For J.'s concern for epistolary brevity generally see on 5.2 vel libris vel epistulis.

enim = 'besides'; for this kind of usage see TLL 5.2.590-1.

alioquin ... sunt: i.e. even if J. had intended to write a history of these events, he could not have succeeded; the task would have been too great even for Thucydides and Sallust. In this way the seriousness of the troubles is emphasised. For the implicit self-depreciation cf. on 1.1 Grandes ... explicare.
alioquin = 'in any case', 'moreover', 'besides', as often in J.; cf. C. Paucker, 'De particularum quarundam in latinitate Hieronymi usu observationes', RhM 37 (1882), 556.

For the thought behind this sentence cf. epist. 130.6.1 'ad explicandam incredibilis gaudii magnitudinem et Tulliani fluvius siccaretur ingenii et contortae Demosthenis vibrataeque sententiae tardius languidiusque ferrentur', Sidon. epist. 5.13.3 'explicandae bestiae tali nec oratorum princeps Marcus Arpinas nec poetarum Publius Mantuanus sufficere possunt'.

J. certainly knew the works of Sallust; cf. Luebeck, Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores, pp. 117-21, and Hagendahl, with index. Sallust was highly regarded as a writer by others at this time, too; cf. Symm. epist. 5.68(66).2, Aug. civ. 7.3 'vir disertissimus Sallustius'. As for Thucydides, J. may very well not have known him at first hand. The only other place where he mentions him by name is epist. 58.5.2 'historici Thucydiden, Sallustium, Herodotum, Livium [sc. aemulentur]', and the only quotation is a Latin version of a maxim which is attributed merely to the Greeks, and which is also quoted (in Greek) by the younger Pliny, again without being attributed to Thucydides (cf. J. epist. 73.10.1, Plin. epist. 4.7.3); cf. Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, p. 79. Thucydides and Sallust were linked together also by earlier authors, generally because their styles were thought similar (cf. Vell. 2.36.2, Sen. contr. 9.1.13 'cum sit praecipua in Thucydide virtus brevitas, hac eum Sallustius vicit', suas. 6.21, Quint. inst. 10.1.101

'nec opponere Thucydidi Sallustium verear'), and J. probably thought of them naturally as a pair.

c.17. Nepotianus' death has happily released him from the troubles besetting the Roman world, and it is those who are left to suffer at the hands of the barbarians that are truly wretched. And yet their case is not hopeless. The ultimate cause of the disasters is sin, which has incurred God's displeasure; repentance would see a complete reversal of fortune.

17.1. Felix ... non audit. For the τόπος of death as an escape from ills see on 15.1 ut ... evaserit and introductory n. to cc. 15-16.

nos ... perspicimus: cf. epist. 75.2.1 'nos dolendi magis, qui cotidie stamus in proelio peccatorum, vitiis sordidamur, accipimus vulnera et de otioso verbo reddituri sumus rationem' (in contrast to Lucinus, who has died and gone to be with Christ), Greg. Naz. orat. 7.20.

eosque ... putamus: not strictly true: no-one would really believe that those whose death has been a happy escape from misery ought to be wept over; it is rather that it is impossible not to weep when a loved one dies (cf. 2.1-2, 7.1), and, no doubt, that the notion of death as an escape is often forgotten. But by putting

it in this way J. makes it seem absurd that Nepotianus should be wept for at all: a good consolatory point.

olim ... exercitus. J. now makes clear what he has already hinted at at 16.3 Romanus ... non flectitur: that the strength of the barbarians and the damage they are inflicting on the Roman world are the result of Roman sin. God is offended and angry (cf. 17.2 tantum ... desaeviat), and uses the barbarians as a means of punishment. At epist. 128.5.1, written after the sack of Rome, J. makes a similar connection between sin and the disastrous state of the world (see on 16.3 Romanus ... non flectitur); and at in Is. 7.21-5 (CCSL 73.109-10 = PL 24.113)(AD 408-10) barbarian tribes are again seen as the instrument of God's wrath: 'at nunc magna pars Romani orbis quondam Iudaeae similis est [i.e. in a state of devastation], quod absque ira dei factum non putamus, qui nequaquam contemptum sui per Assyrios ulciscitur et Chaldaeos, sed per feras gentes et quondam nobis incognitas, quarum et vultus et sermo terribilis est et <quae> femineas incisasque facies praeferentes, virorum (et bene barbatorum!) fugientia terga confodiunt'. For the attribution of disasters to offended deity one might compare Max. Taur. hom. 94 'omnipotens dominus iram flendae desolationis huic ecclesiae intulit' (after the capture and destruction of Milan by Attila in 452), and, in a pagan author, Liban. orat. 24.5 'δοκεῖ μοι θεῶν τις ἡμῖν ὀργιζόμενος

ἐκείνους συμπολεμεῖν'. In general the theme is familiar in authors such as Orosius and Salvian.

quasi ... cladibus: i.e. as if these disasters were not enough.

bella civilia: e.g. the revolts of Procopius and Maximus (see on 15.3-4). J. does not make it clear whether he saw Roman sin and the wrath of God at the back of these events too. The question had probably not formulated itself in his mind; from 16.2 to the end of c.17 his attention is focused almost entirely on the barbarian troubles, which are the immediate problem, and this comment about the civil wars reads very much like an afterthought to the previous statement.

17.2. miseri ... scribitur: cf. in Ier. 27.6-7 (CCSL 74.263 = PL 24.850) (not before AD 414) 'cuius infelicitatis est Israhel, quando conparatione eius Nabuchodonosor servus dei appellatur!', a comment on the text 'et nunc itaque ego [sc. deus] dedi omnes terras istas in manu Nabuchodonosor regis Babylonis servi mei ... et servient ei omnes gentes' (Jer. 27.6-7); also relevant is Jer. 25.8-9 (God addressing the people of Judah) 'pro eo quod non audistis verba mea, ecce ego mittam et adsumam universas cognationes aquilonis, ait dominus, et Nabuchodonosor regem Babylonis servum meum, et adducam eos super terram

istam et super habitatores eius'. God favours Nebuchadnezzar against his own people because of their offence. The parallel with the present situation is obvious. J. regards the Babylonian King in much the same light as the barbarians, as an instrument of punishment and correction; cf. in Ier. 25.8-9 (CCSL 74.239 = PL 24.835) 'quodque vocat servum suum Nabuchodonosor, non sic servus vocatur ut prophetae et omnes sancti, qui vere serviunt domino, sed quo in eversione Hierusalem domini serviat voluntati, secundum quod et apostolus loquitur: quos tradidi satanae, ut discant non blasphemare [1 Tim. 1.20]'.

Nebuchadnezzar is also referred to as God's servus at Jer. 43.10.

tantum ... desaeviat: see on 17.1 olim ... exercitus.

For ira desaeviat cf. e.g. Num. 16.22, J. in Is. 26.20-1 (CCSL 73.342 = PL 24.304) 'in peccatores et impios ira dei desaeviat'; (with desaevire in a different sense, = 'cease to rage') Lucan. 5.303-4 'nec dum desaeviat ira ¦ expectat'.

Ezechias ... pugnavit. By means of these three cases from the OT J. seeks to show that, by repentance and prayer, the barbarians may be overcome.

For the use of exempla in a group of three cf. epist. 1.9 with n.

Ezechias ... deleta sunt. For the destruction of the Assyrian army of Sennacherib cf. 2 Kgs. 19.35 'factum est igitur in nocte illa: venit angelus domini et percussit castra Assyriorum centum octoginta quinque milia', Isa. 37.36 'egressus est autem angelus domini et percussit in castris Assyriorum centum octoginta quinque milia', 2 Chr. 32.21 (where the figure is not given). The incident occurred in answer to Hezekiah's prayer to God to deliver Judah from the invading Assyrians. Although the Biblical accounts do not explicitly say that this was an act involving paenitentia, or that Hezekiah's troubles had come upon him as the consequence of sin (a situation which repentance would rectify), the Deuteronomic historian, especially for Samuel and Kings, always represents invasion as a punishment for sin, and 2 Kgs. 19 (to which Isa. 37 is parallel) should certainly be read as describing an act of penitence. J.'s comment at in Is. 37.1-7 (CCSL 73.435 = PL 24.383) clearly indicates how he understood the passage: 'scindit et ipse rex [sc. Ezechias] vestimenta sua, quia peccatorum suorum, et populi esse credebat, quod Rabsaces [the chief officer of the Assyrian army] usque ad portam Hierusalem venerit, et contra dominum talia sit locutus' (on Isa. 37.1; Hezekiah's prayer follows not long after).

Iosaphat ... superabat: cf. 2 Chr. 20.21-3 'statuit [sc. Iosaphat] cantores domini ut laudarent eum in

turmis suis et antecederent exercitum ac voce consona dicerent, confitemini domino quoniam in aeternum misericordia eius. cumque coepissent laudes canere vertit dominus insidias eorum in semet ipsos, filiorum scilicet Ammon et Moab et montis Seir qui egressi fuerant ut pugnarent contra Iudam et percussi sunt; namque filii Ammon et Moab consurrexerunt adversum habitatores montis Seir ut interficerent et delerent eos, cumque hoc opere perpetrassent etiam in semet ipsos versi mutuis concidere vulneribus'. Jehoshaphat had already, prior to this, prayed for Judah's deliverance and heard through Jahaziel that God would grant his prayer (cf vv.5-17). In this case too the invasion of Judah, by the Moabites and their allies, is presented as an expression of divine wrath; cf. 2 Chr. 19.2.

Moyses ... pugnavit: cf. Exod. 17.9-13, where Moses, holding the virga dei and raising his hands aloft (an attitude of prayer), enables Joshua and the Israelites to defeat Amalek. The exemplum is the weakest of the three: there is no suggestion in Exodus that Amalek's attack came as a punishment from God and that Moses' prayer was an act of penitence (though J. may have believed that it was so, in consequence, perhaps, of the Israelites' frequent complaints (cf. e.g. Exod. 16.2, 17.2-3)).

17.3. pro pudor et stolida ... mens!: cf. on 13.2 pro dolor.

incredulitas is usually found in a religious sense, but stolida ... incredulitatem must surely mean 'stupid to the point of disbelief', i.e. unbelievably stupid; not 'stupid to the point of unbelief', i.e. so stupid as not to believe in God.

Romanus ... cedere? The punctuation of this sentence is not without difficulties. It certainly begins as a statement (Romanus ... arbitrantur), but by the end, according to the way Hilberg punctuates, it has interrogative force, the question beginning, presumably, at non intellegimus. While non intellegimus ... persequente, however, is acceptable as a question in the context (the great Roman army is overcome by barbarians who are poor foot-soldiers; do we fail to grasp the meaning of the words in the prophets which suggest how we might reverse this situation? (see below on prophetarum ... persequente)), nec amputamus ... morbi makes very much better sense if regarded as a statement; indeed, the point of such a question would be quite unclear. Earlier editors saw this, and punctuated with a question-mark after persequente and not after cedere; but nec is connective, and it seems inconceivable that non intellegimus ... prosequente and nec amputamus ... morbi should be one a question and the other a

statement. I would expunge the question-mark altogether. The sentence follows quite easily after what has preceded, clearly showing up the stoliditas of the Roman mens.

Some uncertainty also attaches to cernimus. This reading is overwhelmingly favoured by the MSS, but earlier editions have cernamus, and it seems to accord better with the flow of the sentence to regard statimque ... cedere, like morbus ... auferatur, as dependent on amputamus ... ut. I would print cernamus.

In their translations Labourt and Wright agree with this interpretation on both counts; but of the two only Wright reads cernamus, and both inexplicably retain the question-mark in their Latin text.

ab his ... arbitrantur. qui ingredi ... arbitrantur makes it almost certain that J. is thinking particularly of the Huns, for him the most immediate of the barbarian invaders (cf. 16.4-5 with nn.); cf. Amm. 31.2.6 'eorumque [sc. Hunorum] calcei formulis nullis aptati vetant incedere gressibus liberis, qua causa ad pedestres parum adcommodati sunt pugnas, verum equis prope adfixi, duris quidem sed deformibus [cf. caballos below]', Zos. 4.20.4 'ἐπῆεσαν [sc. οἱ Οὖννοι] Σκύθαις, μάχην μὲν στασιάζειν οὔτε δυνάμενοι τὸ παράπαν οὔτε εἰδότες ἐπαγωγεῖν (πῶς γὰρ οἵ μήτε εἰς γῆν πήξαι τοὺς πόδας οἷοί τε ὄντες ἑδραίως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων καὶ διαιτώμενοι καὶ καθεύδοντες)', and the Suda s.v.

ἀκροσφάλεις, which describes them as 'ἄποδες' and 'ἀκροσφάλεις', and says also 'ἄνευ γὰρ ἵππων οὐ ῥᾳδίως ἂν Οὖννος τὴν γῆν πατήσειεν'. For the Huns' terrifying appearance (cf. horum terretur aspectu) cf. Amm. 31.2.2 'prodigiosae formae et pavendi [al. prodigiose deformes et pandi], ut bipedes existimes bestias', Claud. in Rufin. 1.325-6 'turpes habitus obscaenaque visu ¦ corpora', Iord. Get. 127 'quos bello forsitan minime superabant, vultus sui terrore nimium pavorem ingerentes, terribilitate fugabant'. It is plausible that in writing this description of the Huns J. was directly influenced by Ammianus, though the relative dating of the letter and Amm. 26-31 is unclear. O. J. Maenchen-Helfen, 'The Date of Ammianus Marcellinus' Last Books', AJPh 76 (1955), 384-99, who detects Ammianus' influence on later passages in J. which deal with the Huns, attempts to use this passage to set a terminus ante quem for the publication of the last part of Ammianus' history.

prophetarum ... persequente. J. has in mind Isa. 30.17, though fugient ... persequente does not represent at all closely either the text of the Vulgate (Isaiah completed by this time; see general introduction, sect. 4) or that of LXX; it looks like a memory lapse, or an unconcerned paraphrase. Reference to the full Biblical context is important for understanding the meaning of these words here: 'haec

dicit dominus deus sanctus Israel: si revertamini et quiescatis, salvi eritis; in silentio et in spe erit fortitudo vestra. et noluistis, [16] et dixistis: nequaquam, sed ad equos fugiemus. ideo fugietis. et: super veloces ascendemus. ideo veloces erunt qui persequentur vos. [17] mille homines a facie terroris unius, et a facie terroris quinque fugietis' (Isa. 30.15-17, Vulgate); 'haec dicit dominus deus sanctus Israel: cum reversus ingemueris, tunc salvus eris ... et noluistis audire. sed dixistis: super equos fugiemus; propterea fugietis; et super levibus ascensoribus erimus. ideo leves erunt qui persequentur vos. mille ad vocem unius fugient [δὶ φωνὴν ἑνὸς φεύξονται χίλιοι]; et ad vocem quinque fugient multi' (J.'s translation from LXX at in Is. 30.15-17 (CCSL 73.389 = PL 24.344) (AD 408-10)). J.'s comments on the passage are helpful: 'deus ... loquitur: si agatis paenitentiam, et vel vitia relinquatis vel errorem pravi consilii, et maneatis in Iudaea, non Babyloniorum impetum, sed mea praecepta metuentes, salvi eritis ... qui contemnentes praecepta vitalia, desperatione dixistis, nequaquam ita erit ut loqueris; sed ad equos confugiemus Aegyptios, et concito ad eos atque veloci pergemus gradu. quia igitur ista dixistis, fugietis quidem et pernici cursu intrabitis Aegyptum; sed velociores erunt Babylonii, qui vos usque ad Aegyptum persequentur, tantusque terror atque formido obtinebit Aegyptum, ut uni Chaldaeo mille Aegyptii resistere

nequeant' (ibid.). In the present situation the Romans may be viewed as standing in the same relation to the barbarians as the Israelites to the Babylonians: they are 'pursued' by the enemy because of their failure to turn from wickedness. The implication, given what J. has been saying in this c., must be that repentance will see the situation change.

Why J. chose to write prophetarum instead of prophetae is not clear.

amputamus ... morbi. A good parallel to the metaphor is Ambr. Noe 17.59 'causae aegritudinis debuerunt amputari' (of a sick soul); cf. also Cic. Phil. 8.15 'sic in rei publicae corpore ... quicquid est pestiferum amputetur'. The simple notion that a state can suffer sickness is of course an old one; cf. e.g. Herod. 5.28, Soph. Antig. 1015 'νοσεῖ πόλις', Dem. Phil. 3.39 'ἀπόλωλε καὶ νενοσήκεν ἡ Ἑλλάς', Cic. Catil. 1.31, ad Att. 2.20.3 'novo quodam morbo civitas moritur', Liv. 24.2.8 'unus velut morbus invaserat omnes Italiae civitates'.

For amputare used of causae in a quite different context cf. Sidon. epist. 2.14.2 'amputabuntur causae morarum'.

sagittas. Amm. 31.2.9 gives an interesting description of the long-range weapons of the Huns: 'missilibus telis, acutis ossibus pro spiculorum acumine arte mira

coagmentatis ... confligunt'.

tiaras: cf. Amm. 31.2.6 'galeris incurvis capita tegunt [sc. Huni]'. J. will have had in mind the sort of thing he describes at epist. 64.13, when discussing the priestly vestments prescribed in Exod. 28: 'quartum genus est vestimenti rotundum pilleolum, quale pictum in Ulixe conspicimus, quasi sphaera media sit divisa et pars una ponatur in capite; hoc Graeci et nostri tiaram, nonnulli galerum vocant. non habet acumen in summo nec totum usque ad comas caput tegit, sed tertiam partem a fronte inopertam relinquit atque ita in occipitio vittae constrictus est taenia, ut non facile labatur ex capite. est autem byssinum et sic fabre opertum lineolo, ut nulla acus vestigia forinsecus pareant'. For him the word tiara does not signify a type of headgear exclusive to the Persians, and Labourt's note - 'Il ne connaissait les Huns que par ses lectures; sinon comment leur eût-il attribué comme coiffure la tiare iranienne?' - is based on a false premise.

caballos equis. The antithesis is striking, and deliberate; but J. is not speaking pejoratively of the Huns' horses simply for effect. Ammianus characterises them as deformes (see above on ab his ... arbitrantur).

c.18. Recognising that he has already gone beyond the ordinary bounds of consolation, J. moves on from consideration of the barbarian invasions to take a broader view of the world. His vision, which has a timeless quality, is one of decay and transience; the earth lies in a state of ruin, and life passes inexorably into death, so that no matter what the various conditions of men, everyone who is now alive will soon be dead.

18.1. Excessimus ... planximus. The account of recent disasters begun in c.15 is undertaken primarily to console Heliodorus by showing him how fortunate Nepotianus has been to die at such a time. But not only is most of c.17 entirely without consolatory purpose or effect; the section as a whole has something of the character of a general lamentation over the state of the world, and to that extent goes well beyond consolation. The irony that in the process of urging Heliodorus not to weep for his nephew he himself has 'mourned the dead of the whole world' is not lost on J.

Xerxes ... esset. The story is told at Herod. 7.44-6; subvertit montes should refer to the canal dug through Mt. Athos (cf. Herod. 7.22-4), maria constravit to the bridge of boats built over the Hellespont (cf. Herod. 7.33-6). J. seems to have been directly acquainted with at least parts of Herodotus' history (cf.

Courcelle, Late Latin Writers, pp. 79-81), but the present anecdote had long ago been absorbed into the bloodstream of literature dealing with the brevity of life, and was well known (as dicitur may suggest); cf. Val. Max. 9.13.ext.1, Plin. epist. 3.7.13, and esp. Sen. dial. 10.17.2 'cum per magna camporum spatia porrigeret exercitum nec numerum eius sed mensuram comprehenderet Persarum rex insolentissimus, lacrimas profudit quod intra centum annos nemo ex tanta iuventute superfuturus esset', a passage sufficiently similar to the present to suggest the possibility of a direct debt, though even here it is not specifically mentioned, as it is by Herodotus and J., that Xerxes reviewed the army from an elevated position. The story may also have occurred in Cicero's Consolatio (cf. Buresch, 'Cons. hist. crit.', pp. 106-7, Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., pp. 155-6), presumably to illustrate the consolatory τόπος that death is inevitable, but even if this was so the Consolatio is hardly likely to have been J.'s only source.

The wording of subvertit montes, maria constravit appears to depend on Sall. Catil. 13.1 'quid ea memorem, quae nisi iis qui videre nemini credibilia sunt, a privatis compluribus subvorsos montis, maria constrata esse?' (Sallust is thinking particularly of Lucullus, the 'Xerxen togatum' of Vell. 2.33.4). For maria constravit cf. also e.g. Liv. 35.49.5 'consternit maria classibus', Curt. 9.6.7, Lact. inst. 3.24.8,

Auson. Mos. 289-90 (referring to Xerxes) 'Chalcedonio constratum ab litore pontum, ¦ regis opus magni'.

infinitam ... exercitum. The positioning of vidisset is important; it produces not only a fine clausula (double cretic; better than exercitum vidisset) but notable verbal balance.

18.2. o si ... defuturos. With this passage one might compare Sen. dial. 6.26.5-6 'tot saecula, tot aetatium contextum, seriem, quidquid annorum est, licet visere; licet surrectura, licet ruitura regna prospicere et magnarum urbium lapsus et maris novos cursus. nam si tibi potest solacio esse desideri tui commune fatum, nihil quo stat loco stabit, omnia sternet abducetque secum vetustas. nec hominibus solum ... sed locis, sed regionibus, sed mundi partibus ludet. totos supprimet montes et alibi rupes in altum novas exprimet; maria sorbebit, flumina avertet ... hiatibus vastis subducet urbes, tremoribus quatiet ... inundationibus quidquid habitatur obducet', 11.1.1-3 'nihil perpetuum, pauca diuturna sunt; aliud alio modo fragile est, rerum exitus variantur, ceterum quidquid coepit et desinet. mundo quidam minantur interitum et hoc universum quod omnia divina humanaque complectitur, si fas putas credere, dies aliquis dissipabit et in confusionem veterem tenebrasque demerget: eat nunc aliquis et singulas comploret animas, Carthaginis ac Numantiae

Corinthique cinerem et si quid aliud altius cecidit lamentetur, cum etiam hoc quod non habet quo cadat sit interiturum ... maximum ... solacium est cogitare id sibi accidisse quod omnes ante se passi sunt omnesque passuri; et ideo mihi videtur rerum natura quod gravissimum fecerat commune fecisse, ut crudelitatem fati consolaretur aequalitas'. In these extracts the notion that all things are subject to decay and that every human life will come to an end is presented for the distinct purpose of consolation. In this respect the present passage is different. There is no hint that J. is attempting to comfort Heliodorus. He has shelved the task of offering consolation and is simply confronting the question of the meaning of existence; and the picture, as so far painted, is bleak.

J. makes full use of rhetorical effects in this section - anaphora, antithesis, asyndeton in particular are very pronounced. The language is kept taut, the images change rapidly, and an increase in emotional tension seems to result.

For the τόπος of the inevitability of death see also on 5.1 and 14.3.

vincitur ... dicimus: an echo of the first sentence of the letter, where see n. By claiming to be unable to give adequate expression to his theme, J. makes the idea that all things will come to an end seem quite dizzying, and the more horrifying.

c.19. After the broad sweep of the last c. J. now focuses on the detail, and in a less emotionally-charged passage considers the particular case of Heliodorus and himself. Second by second their lives are ticking away. Where, then, is the meaning of life to be found? In Christ, whose love binds them to each other and to Nepotianus despite the great distance between them and the greater gulf which separates them from the younger man. The pessimistic picture of the world presented by c.18 gives way, and J. leaves Heliodorus with the highly comforting thought that in spite of death he and his nephew are still united. The letter ends with encouragement to the Bishop to be strong in his bereavement and ever to have Nepotianus in his thoughts and upon his lips.

19.1. quasi ... descendentes. The expression follows naturally after 18.2 o si ... speculam. J. comes down from the height from where he has contemplated the world to look at his own situation.

sentisne ... credimus. sentisne ... factus sis? = 'are you aware of the actual moment when ...?'. Gradually and almost imperceptibly we age, drifting towards ultimate death; dying is a process that continues throughout one's whole life. The idea is particularly common in Seneca, by whom J. may possibly have been influenced here; cf. esp. dial. 6.21.7 'in hoc omnes

errore versamur, ut non putemus ad mortem nisi senes inclinatosque iam vergere, cum illo infantia statim et iuventa, omnis aetas ferat. agunt opus suum fata: nobis sensum nostrae necis auferunt, quoque facilius obrepat, mors sub ipso vitae nomine latet: infantiam in se pueritia convertit, pueritiam pubertas, iuvenem senex abstulit. incrementa ipsa, si bene computes, damna sunt', epist. 24.20 'cotidie morimur; cotidie enim demitur aliqua pars vitae, et tunc quoque cum crescimus vita decrescit. infantiam amisimus, deinde pueritiam, deinde adulescentiam', and also epist. 4.9, 26.4, 58.23, 120.18.

It is most unlikely that in cotidie morimur there is a reminiscence of 1 Cor. 15.31 'cotidie morior per vestram gloriam', as Hilberg seems to think. Though the Pauline passage is susceptible of different interpretations (see on 14.2 multo ... ad gloriam), 'cotidie morior' cannot possibly be taken in the simple sense in which cotidie morimur is meant here. cotidie morimur is in any case a natural way to express the notion of gradual death - as Seneca found (see above).

aeternos ... credimus has no part in the argument; but it is a point which would readily have come to J.'s mind in the context. It was important to him that Christians should be aware that death was on its way, and live appropriately; see on 14.3 debemus ... non potest.

hoc ... trahitur: cf. in Gal. 6.10 (PL 26.433) (c. AD 387-8) 'hoc ipsum quod loquor, quod dicto, quod scribo [al. scribitur], quod emendo, quod relego, de tempore meo mihi aut crescit, aut deperit'. Although the context of this passage is quite different, the similarity of words and thought is so close that one may suppose that J. had recently been re-reading his Commentary on Galatians. Kunst, De s. Hier. stud. Cic., p. 157, notes the possible influence on these lines of Pers. 5.153 'vive memor leti, fugit hora, hoc quod loquor inde est', which J. quotes at epist. 127.6.2.

quod dicto ... quod emendo suggests that J.'s method of composition was to dictate to a secretary, read through what he had dictated, and make any corrections he thought necessary. Such a pattern is highly plausible and he may regularly have followed it; it is clear at least that he often used to dictate his compositions, rather than write them with his own hand (cf. A. Wikenhauser, 'Der heilige Hieronymus und die Kurzschrift', ThQ 29 (1910), 50-87, Arns, La Technique du livre, pp. 37-51, Bartelink, p. 31). In the text of in Gal. 6.10, 'scribitur' should certainly be the preferred reading, after 'dicto'; and one may at least question whether J. actually wrote 'emendo' and 'relego' in that order.

puncta notarii. puncta is the perfect word in the context, for it can denote not only marks made by a pen (as also at e.g. Auson. not. 5) but also (with or without a word such as temporis) moments of time (cf. e.g. Cic. dom. 115, Apul. met. 9.39).

19.2. transeunt ... minuuntur. J. likes sea-imagery; for his frequent metaphorical use of it see on epist. 1.2.1-2.

Christi ... sociamur: see below on ob hanc ... manu.

caritas patiens ... excidit. J. characterises the love of Christ which binds together Nepotianus, Heliodorus, and himself by quoting the words of Paul at 1 Cor. 13.4 and 7-8 (Vulg.: '[4] caritas patiens est, benigna est; caritas non aemulatur, non agit perperam, non inflatur ... [7] omnia suffert, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet. [8] caritas numquam excidit ...').

agit perperam = 'περπερεύεσθαι', 'vaunt itself', 'act boastfully, ostentatiously'. The Greek verb occurs in the NT only here; and there is no other instance of perperam in the Vulgate. Oddly, perperam does not seem to bear this sense elsewhere; it regularly means 'wrongly', in the moral sense (cf. e.g. Cic. Quinct. 31 'seu recte seu perperam facere coeperunt'), or 'incorrectly' (cf. e.g. Sen. epist. 9.13 'hoc ... plerique perperam interpretantur'), and at ad Att.

1.14.4, when Cicero wants a word for 'show off' in the sense of 'make a rhetorical display', he uses the Greek 'ἐνεπερπερεύσασθαι', not a Latinised phrase. A possible explanation is that agit perperam may have been used in an early Latin version of the Bible as a literal rendering of the Greek (which may have been imperfectly understood), and stuck firmly in the text thereafter.

ob hanc ... manu. For the notions of 'absent in body, present in spirit' and 'united in love (particularly the love of Christ)' in early Christian epistolography see Thraede, Brieftopik, pp. 109 ff., 125 ff.

For the oxymoron in absens praesens cf. Ter. Eun. 192, Cic. amicit. 23 'absentes adsunt' (of friends).

divisos, sc. nos.

19.3. habemus ... caritatis: 'we have in him a pledge of our mutual love' (Wright). The meaning seems to be that their love for Nepotianus is the guarantee of their love for each other.

papa Chromatius: Bishop of Aquileia, 387-407, and a friend of J. for many years. He and his brother Eusebius, to whose death J. is presumably referring (nothing more is known about it), appear to have been very close; cf. epist. 7.1.1, 8.1.2. See generally RE s.n. Chromatios 2, Dict. Christ. Biog. s.nn. Chromatius, Eusebius 4.

papa is used of bishops generally at this time - it was not until the sixth century that the term began to be reserved exclusively for the Bishop of Rome; cf. J. P. Krebs and J. H. Schmalz, Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache (7th edn., 2 vols., Basel, 1905-7), 2.239, Bartelink, p. 28.

filio. In various ways Nepotianus is filius to both Heliodorus and J.; see on 7.3, 13.3.

illum nostra pagella ... desinamus. For similar ideas cf. Sen. dial. 6.3.2 'non desiit denique Drusi sui celebrare nomen, ubique illum sibi privatim publiceque repraesentare, libentissime de illo loqui, de illo audire' (an example presented in recommendation of such action), 11.18.7-8 'effice ut frequenter fratris tui memoriam tibi velis occurrere, ut illum et sermonibus celebres et adsidua recordatione repraesentes tibi, quod ita demum consequi poteris, si tibi memoriam eius iucundam magis quam flebilem feceris ... omnia dicta eius ac facta et aliis expone et tibimet ipse commemora', Plin. epist. 2.1.12 'Verginium cogito, Verginium video, Verginium iam vanis imaginibus, recentibus tamen, audio adloquor teneo', J. epist. 39.8.1-2 'illam mea lingua resonabit, illi mei dedicabuntur labores, illi sudabit ingenium. nulla erit pagina, quae non Blesillam sonet. quocumque sermonis nostri monumenta pervenerint, illa cum meis

opusculis peregrinabitur. hanc in meam mentem defixam legent virgines, viduae, monachi, sacerdotes. breve vitae spatium aeterna memoria pensabit'. The anaphora putting the emphasis very much on the deceased in almost all these passages is noteworthy. Plutarch points out that the remembrance of happy times shared with someone whose death one is now grieving can have a therapeutic effect; cf. ad uxor. 8 (610E-F).

pagella. The diminutive is rare; I have noticed only Cic. ad fam. 2.13.3 and 11.25.2, Jer. 36.23, and J. epist. 73.1.3.

quem ... desinamus: two good antitheses with which to end.