

Gauls—were pivotal figures in the expansion and redefinition of the Roman, the Greco-Roman, cultural and political hegemony. Who was the barbarian now?

Lucretius and Ovid confirm that for the Romans, as for the Greeks, Iphigenia and the sacrifices (particularly, but not only, the unfulfilled sacrifice of Orestes and Pylades) that Tauric Diana demanded at her temple had by their very nature a troubling double significance. These sacrifices signalled barbaric rites, conducted among barbarians; but the goddess was *not* a barbarian goddess, while her priestess—Iphigenia—was also her most famous victim, whose sacrifice had both epic and tragic consequences, as the *Iliad* and the *Oresteia* remind us. Thus the temple of the Greek goddess in the barbarian land of the Taurians, the priesthood of Iphigenia, human sacrifice, the purification of Orestes (and through him the house of Atreus) of the crime of murder, all these became, individually and together, literary tropes through which an author could explore the half-buried barbarism (abuse of the innocent, violent madness, and murder) in supposedly civilized—indeed, given Iphigenia and Orestes' connections, in supposedly heroic—societies. That Lucan should use this rhetorical trope is not surprising, particularly in a passage where he is clearly painting barbarian Gallic warriors as the new heroes of new epics. The inherent point is the same: in a world that has been confounded—Euripides' by the conflict between Sparta and Athens, Ovid's by exile, Lucan's by civil war—the barbarian will be more civilized than the Roman.

Ollfors demonstrated that the syntax of the line was not too harsh to be acceptable. Getty was, however, troubled as much by the meaning, as he saw it, as the syntax. Now we can see that the meaning, admittedly very harsh, is deliberately so, and is consistent not only with Lucan's intentions, but is completely in accordance with his inherited Greco-Roman literary tradition. The meaning of the comparison of Taranis' altar to Diana's, no less than the syntax of the comparison, must be recognized as a deliberate poetic device—savage methods for savage matters.

To read *quo mitior* is to destroy Lucan's careful construction that leads, resolutely, from the barbarous Gallic gods to the altar where human victims placate a Greco-Roman goddess. Lucan flatters his epic audience's self-regard and their literary and linguistic sophistication, guiding them from the anticipated *immitis* to *non mitior*, where, in a harsh, elliptical construction, he confronts them with a divine barbarism that is inescapably and unexpectedly their own. If we accept Cato's judgement—*immites Romana piacula divi / plena ferant, nullo fraudemus sanguine bellum* (2.304–5)—this divine barbarism is, in fact, the very subject of Lucan's epic. On artistic, no less than linguistic, grounds the MS reading, *et Taranis Scythicae non mitior ara Dianae*, is correct and must stand—*haud absurde id quidem*.

C. M. C. GREEN
University of Iowa

JUVENAL AND JEROME

The fourth century witnessed a renewed interest in Juvenal after a long period of neglect.¹ Here however the position of Jerome is somewhat anomalous. His own

1. Cf. G. Highet, *Juvenal the Satirist: A Study* (Oxford, 1954), pp. 180–90.

satirical talent was very considerable.² It is therefore no surprise that he should show an intimate acquaintance with the satires of both Horace and Persius; they are cited repeatedly in his works.³ With Juvenal on the other hand the situation is quite different: it is still an open question whether Jerome knew him at all. The aim of the present note is to draw attention to a new piece of evidence that has so far been overlooked.

Scholarship began early with the task of identifying putative echoes of Juvenal in Jerome's *oeuvre*.⁴ However when Hagendahl's magisterial study subjected Jerome's borrowings from classical literature to a rigorous scrutiny, only a single formulation was accorded recognition as a genuine echo of Juvenal: this was the phrase from *Satire* 1.15 (*manum ferulae subduximus*).⁵ All other alleged imitations were discounted: either they were accidental or the wording in question was proverbial.⁶

Following Hagendahl's investigation three further attempts have been made to augment the dossier of Jerome's borrowings from Juvenal; they may be briefly reviewed. The first came from Wiesen: he noted that the phrase *bipes asellus* occurs in both Juvenal (9.92) and Jerome (*Ep.* 27.3.1).⁷ Since this locution would not appear to be attested elsewhere,⁸ Jerome has evidently taken it from the satirist.

Godel then adduced three new passages.⁹ His first suggestion¹⁰ has already been rebutted by Cameron.¹¹ Godel's other parallels on the other hand have so far gone

2. Cf. D. S. Wiesen, *St. Jerome as a Satirist: A Study in Christian Latin Thought and Letters*, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vol. 34 (Ithaca, 1964), *passim*.

3. Cf. H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, vol. 64.2 (Göteborg, 1958), index on pp. 408, 410–11. Jerome is also known to have studied Horace and Persius at school; cf. *Adv. Rufin.* 1.16.

4. Cf. E. Lübeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Leipzig, 1872), pp. 198–99 (Juv. 1.15 [*et nos ergo manum ferulae subduximus*] = Hieron. *Ep.* 50.5.2 [*et nos saepe manum ferulae subtraximus*], 57.12.2 [*saepe manum ferulae subduximus*], *Adv. Rufin.* 1.17 [*ferulae manum subtrahere*]; Juv. 14.60 [*verre pavimentum*] = Hieron. *Ep.* 66.13.2 [*pavimenta verrunt*], *Adv. Helvid.* 20 [*si pavimenta verrent*]); A. S. Pease, "The Attitude of Jerome towards Pagan Literature," *TAPA* 50 (1919): 166, n. 117 (Juv. 10.22 [*cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator*] = Hieron. *Vit. Hilar.* 6.3 [Bastiaensen: *nudus latrones non timet*]; Juv. 13.242 [*atritra . . . fronte*] = Hieron. *Ep.* 52.5.4 [*adtrita frons*]); Highet, *Juvenal*, p. 298, n. 11 (Juv. 11.35 [*nosceda est mensura sui*] = Hieron. *Ep.* 61.3.1 [*nosse mensuram suam*]).

5. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers*, pp. 181, 284. It may be noted that at least by the fifth century even this formulation would seem to have become more or less proverbial; cf. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), p. 135 (no. 658); R. Häussler, *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer* (Hildesheim, 1968), p. 307 (no. 658). The works in which Jerome employs it span the period 394–401.

6. In this connection the parallel pointed out by Highet (above, n. 4; *nosse mensuram suam*) might seem to merit closer consideration. The idea at issue was certainly proverbial; cf. Otto, *Sprichwörter*, p. 221 (no. 1107); Häussler, *Nachträge*, p. 313 (no. 1107). It may however be noted that the particular phrasing with which Juvenal and Jerome invest this traditional concept shows an exact correspondence: *nosceda . . . mensura sui* / *nosse mensuram suam*. This wording is found in none of the other passages adduced by Otto and Häussler. When Jerome makes use of "proverbial" material he does in fact display a tendency to take over the specific formulation that had been employed by a canonical author; cf. N. Adkin, "*Istae sunt, quae solent dicere*: Three Roman Vignettes in Jerome's *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Epist.* 22)," *MH* 49 (1992): 139 with n. 49. In the present case however there is evidence that Juvenal's wording was in fact conventional; cf. *Vitae patr.* 5.15.51 (*PL* 73.963A: *noverit mensuras suas*), Pallad. *hist. mon.* 1.36 (*PL* 74.323A: *volueritque mensuram sui cognoscere*).

7. Wiesen, *Jerome*, p. 10, n. 44.

8. No other example of the formulation is recorded by *TLL* s.vv., *Packard Humanities Institute CD ROM* #5.3 (1991) or *CETEDOC Library of Christian Latin Texts* (Turnhout, 1991).

9. R. Godel, "Réminiscences de poètes profanes dans les Lettres de St. Jérôme," *MH* 21 (1964): 69–70.

10. Juv. 6.259–60 ("hae sunt quae tenui sudant in cyclade, quarum / delicias et panniculus bombycinus urit") = Hieron. *Ep.* 66.13.2 ("quibus [sc. Paula and Eustochium] serica vestis oneri erat et solis calor incendium").

11. A. Cameron, "St. Jerome and Claudian," *VChr* 19 (1965): 111–13. He shows that here Jerome is in fact echoing Claud. *Eutrop.* 2.335–38.

unchallenged; however they too can be eliminated from the dossier. The second concerns a point of lexicography. Godel notes Jerome's use of *referre* at *Epistle* 50.2.1: "dicitur . . . Carneadeum aliquid referens in utramque partem . . . disputare."¹² With this particular usage he compares *Satire* 1.66–67: "et multum referens de Maecenate supino / signator falsi." According to Godel this application of the verb is otherwise unattested; he therefore suggests that here Jerome may be echoing Juvenal. It would seem however that in these two passages the sense of *referre* is really quite distinct. In Jerome the word signifies "to bring back into use, revive, repeat."¹³ Juvenal on the other hand uses it with the meaning "to call to mind by similarity, suggest, resemble."¹⁴

For his last echo Godel refers to *Satire* 6.511, where Juvenal describes a wife who "grève lourdement le budget de la maison": *gravis est rationibus*. Godel surmises that these words may have inspired Jerome's statement at *Epistle* 130.5.4: "pretiosa monilia et graves censibus uniones ardentesque gemmae redduntur scriniis." Again however the meaning of *gravis* would appear to be different in each of the two passages that Godel adduces. In Jerome the adjective does not mean "grievous to," but rather "heavy with": *los collares que valían fortuna*.¹⁵

If then Godel's alleged echoes can be shown to be illusory, the third new addition to the dossier is highly plausible: it comes from Courtney.¹⁶ At *Satire* 6.304 Juvenal had used the phrase *bibitur conchā*. His scholiast explains it with the gloss *non calicibus*. Here Courtney points to Jerome *Epistle* 52.12.2 *non calice sorbere, sed conca*. In view of this similarity Courtney "cannot but suspect that Jerome has read Juvenal with glosses."¹⁷

There is a further piece of evidence that would seem to indicate that Jerome had in fact read Juvenal; it has hitherto been overlooked. Jerome produced his *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Ep.* 22) in the spring of 384 during his sojourn in Rome;¹⁸ it is therefore an early work. In the middle of chapter twenty-nine he has occasion to warn against worldly virgins and widows. This particular passage is unusually dense in borrowings from other authors. Within the space of five lines¹⁹ Jerome appropriates phrases from no fewer than three different works of Tertullian.²⁰ Two sentences later he echoes a line of Persius.²¹ It would accordingly be no surprise if the same passage were also to contain an echo of Juvenal.

Jerome opens this section of the chapter with the following statement: "eas autem virgines viduasque . . . , quae rubore frontis adtrito parasitos vicere mimorum,

12. Godel also adduces *Ep.* 117.1.2 *Lucilianum quippiam rettulisti*.

13. So *OLD*, s.v. (section 16).

14. So *OLD*, s.v. (section 19). Both shades of meaning are of course attested elsewhere.

15. The rendering of D. Ruiz Bueno, *Cartas de San Jerónimo: Edición bilingüe*, vol. 2, Biblioteca de autores cristianos, vol. 220 (Madrid, 1962), p. 666.

16. E. Courtney, "The Interpolations in Juvenal," *BICS* 22 (1975): 162, n. 4.

17. The resemblance had also been noted by H. Spelthahn in *TLL* 4:28.58–60. Again the collocation would not seem to occur elsewhere.

18. Cf. F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son oeuvre*, pt. 1, vol. 2, *Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense*, vol. 2 (Louvain–Paris, 1922), pp. 24–25.

19. In the edition of I. Hilberg, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi epistulae*, vol. 1, Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat., vol. 54 (Vienna–Leipzig, 1910), p. 188, lines 4–8.

20. Cf. N. Adkin, "Some Features of Jerome's Compositional Technique in the *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Epist.* 22)," *Philologus* 136 (1992): 245–46; idem, "*Istae sunt*," pp. 137–39. From one of the works in question (*Ad Uxor.*) Jerome has incorporated two separate phrases into this passage.

21. Cf. Lübeck, *Hieronymus*, p. 196.

quasi quasdam pestes abice” (29.4).²² In *Satire* 13.241–42 Juvenal had asked: “quando recepit / eiectionem semel attrita de fronte ruborem?” The terms *attritus* and *frons* are juxtaposed elsewhere.²³ On the other hand no further instance of the collocation of *rubor*, *frons*, and *attritus* is attested.²⁴ Juvenal’s striking phrase occurs near the end of the satire: it is particularly from the beginning and end of a work that Jerome was accustomed to take over such arresting formulations.²⁵ It would accordingly appear that here we have some further evidence for a knowledge of Juvenal on Jerome’s part.

NEIL ADKIN
University of Nebraska,
Lincoln

22. H. Reich, *Der Mimus: Eine litterar-entwicklungs geschichtlicher Versuch*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1903), p. 766, misinterprets: “Diese Jungfrauen und Matronen . . . haben sich so dicke, rote Schminke aufgelegt, dass ihre Stirne noch röter ist wie die der Parasiten im Mimus.” The reference in *rubore frontis adtrito* is of course to shamelessness.

23. Cf. *TLL* 2:1127.57–60 (s.v. *attero*); 6.1:1358.23–25 (s.v. *frons*).

24. Cf. *TLL*, s.vv. *frons* and *attero* (*rubor* has not yet appeared); also the data bases mentioned above, n. 8. Of these *CETEDOC* also lists *Polythecon* 7.476. The work is a medieval cento; here it is simply reproducing a substantial excerpt from *Satire* 13.

25. Cf. P. Petitmengin, “Saint Jérôme et Tertullien,” in *Jérôme entre l’Occident et l’Orient: XVI^e centenaire du départ de saint Jérôme de Rome et de son installation à Bethléem*, ed. Y.-M. Duval (Paris, 1988), p. 50 (“c’est-à-dire aux passages qui restent le mieux gravés dans la mémoire”).