

HORACE, *CARM.* 2.17.5 AND QUINTILIAN, *INST.* 6 *PROOEM.*
IN JEROME

In *Ode* 2.17.5-6^{*} Horace addresses Maecenas thus: *a! te meae si partem animae rapit / maturior vis*. No echo of this passage whatsoever is registered in Luebeck's trail-blazing survey of Jerome's debt to the classics¹. The critical edition of Jerome's correspondence by Isidor Hilberg then posited a single reminiscence of Horace's l. 5 (*meae... partem animae*) in the important letter (17) which marks Jerome's abandonment of the life of the hermit². Here (*epist.* 17.3.2) Jerome yammers that indigenous heresy-hunters have shooed away his boon companions: *abruperunt a me partem animae meae, carissimos fratres*. In a review of this Hilbergian edition Weyman then pointed out that the same Hieronymian phrase (*partem animae meae*) is also found in the loved-up letter (3) that Jerome addressed to the later-to-be-loathed Rufinus³. The pertinent passage (*epist.* 3.3.1) reads: *Innocentium enim, partem animae meae, repentinus febrium ardor abstraxit*⁴. This Weymanian linkage of *Letter* 3 as well as 17 to *Ode* 2.17.5 is then repeated in Hagendahl's pandect, but without discussion⁵.

When Weyman compared Jerome's *Letter* 3.3.1 with Horace's *Ode* 2.17.5, he did so by referring to the mention of this Horatian text in Otto's collection of proverbs⁶. Otto's treatment of the same "proverb" also adduces another passage from Horace's *Odes*: 1.3.8. Here Horace apostrophizes the ship that carries Virgil: *serves animae dimidium meae*⁷. It is in fact this

^{*} Texts are cited according to *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig 1990²), and its online *Addenda* at <http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/pdf/addenda.pdf>.

¹ A. Luebeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit*, Leipzig 1872.

² I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, I (CSEL 54), Vienna-Leipzig 1910, 72. The *soi-disant* "second edition" (Vienna 1996) has no bearing on the matter currently at issue.

³ C. Weyman, "WKPh" 27, 1910, 1004. The letter in question (3) is one of Jerome's "most beautiful and emotionally uninhibited" (so J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*, London 1975, 45).

⁴ This Innocentius, the addressee of Jerome's first work (*epist.* 1), was the mutual friend of Jerome himself and of Evagrius, Jerome's patron and later Bishop of Antioch.

⁵ H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers* (Acta Univ. Gothob. 64.2), Göteborg 1958, 102, n. 1 and 282. Nothing whatever is said about Horace in Hagendahl's *Nachlese: Jerome and the Latin Classics*, "VChr" 28, 1974, 216-227.

⁶ Viz. A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig 1890, 25-26 (no. 111; s.v. *animus* 1). Further instances of this "proverbial" expression are to be found in R. Häussler, *Nachträge zu A. Otto, Sprichwörter und sprichwörtliche Redensarten der Römer*, Hildesheim 1968, 133-134.

⁷ Otto's discussion (*op. cit.* [n. 6] 26) wrongly reports that this phrase denotes Maecenas, not Virgil.

Horatian text (*carm.* 1.3.8) that is cited in the note on this *Letter* 3.3.1 in the canonical English translation of Jerome's correspondence⁸. On the other hand the canonical French translation cites neither *Ode* 1.3.8 nor 2.17.5 on either *Letter* 3.3.1 or 17.3.2⁹. It is true that the idea in question here is a "proverb". It can however be shown that when Jerome employs such a "proverbial" sentiment, he has recourse to the particular wording in which the idea is formulated by a canonical author whom he knows thoroughly¹⁰. Jerome knows Horace intimately¹¹.

It would appear possible to show that Horace's wording in *Ode* 2.17.5-6 (*te meae si partem animae rapit / maturior vis*) is the direct source of Jerome's own in *Letter* 3.3.1 (*Innocentium enim, partem animae meae, repentinus febrium ardor abstraxit*). Horace's medial *meae... partem animae* is streamlined by Jerome into similarly central *partem animae meae*, where transference of *meae* from beginning to end eliminates the Horatian hyperbaton that meets the exigencies of Alcaic metre¹². This medial phrase is in each text immediately preceded by the personal object in first position (*te / Innocentium*), to which said phrase then stands in apposition. At the other end of this same syntagm come the synonymous verbs (*rapit / abstraxit*)¹³, which in each case are put last¹⁴. These verbs are on each occasion directly juxtaposed with their respective subjects (*maturior vis / repentinus... ardor*), where the nouns both denote "vehemence", while their prefixed epithets both connote "unexpectedness"¹⁵.

When Jerome streamlines a borrowed phrase, as he does here in *Letter* 3

⁸ C. C. Mierow and T. C. Lawler, *The Letters of St. Jerome*, I (ACW 33), London-Westminster, Md. 1963, 193, n. 11. *Ode* 1.3.8 is likewise the only text to be adduced in the note on *Letter* 3.3.1 by W. H. Fremantle et al., *The Principal Works of St. Jerome* (NPNF 2.6), Oxford 1893, 5, n. 5.

⁹ J. Labourt, *S. Jérôme: Lettres*, I, Paris 1949, 12 and 53. Similarly no text whatever is adduced for either Hieronymian passage in the standard Spanish translation: J. B. Valero, *S. Jerónimo: Epistolario*, I (BAC 530), Madrid 1993, 83 and 135.

¹⁰ Cf. N. Adkin, '*Istae sunt, quae solent dicere*': *Three Roman Vignettes in Jerome's 'Libellus de virginitate servanda'* (*Epist.* 22), "MH" 49, 1992, 139.

¹¹ Cf. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 5) 408 for Jerome's familiarity with Horace in general and with the *Odes* in particular. For an addition to the dossier cf. N. Adkin, *Hier. Epist.* 53.1.2-3: *Cyprian, Horace, Virgil*, "Sileno" 23, 1997, 91-92.

¹² Porphyrio's paraphrase of Horace's language here is similarly non-hyperbatic: *animae meae*.

¹³ For Hieronymian *abstrahere* as a synonym of Horatian (*ab*)*ripere* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 1 col. 203.38-39 (s.v. *abstraho*).

¹⁴ Horace's *rapit* occupies final *sedes* in the line.

¹⁵ If then the wording of *Ode* 2.17.5-6 exactly matches that of Jerome's *Letter* 3.3.1, the phrasing of *Ode* 1.3.8 is by contrast quite different: *serves animae dimidium meae*.

with the *meae... partem animae* of *Ode* 2.17.5, he can be shown to cite it thereafter in his own refurbished version¹⁶. This is what Jerome does in *Letter* 17.3.2, where *partem animae meae* is accordingly a *Selbstzitat* from *Letter* 3. The rest of Jerome's wording in this passage of *Letter* 17 (*abruperunt a me partem animae meae, carissimos fratres*) likewise differs significantly from that of *Ode* 2.17.5-6 (*te meae si partem animae rapit / maturior vis*). In Jerome the verb (*abruperunt*) is put first (unlike Horace's final *rapit*)¹⁷, while the subject of this Jeromian verb ("they") is a personal plural (unlike Horace's impersonal singular: *vis*). Finally the object of Jerome's verb (*carissimos fratres*) is firstly an epitheted plural (unlike Horace's unepitheted singular: *te*), secondly is put last (unlike Horace's initial position), and thirdly is apposition to *partem...* (not the other way round, as in Horace). *Letter* 17.3.2 should accordingly be regarded primarily as self-imitation rather than direct *imitatio* of *Ode* 2.17.5-6. Hilberg is therefore incorrect to take the latter view. Those translators who follow him are likewise off base¹⁸.

The same self-imitation (*pars animae meae*) that is due ultimately to *Ode* 2.17.5 is employed by Jerome on one further occasion. The dedicatory epistle to his *Chronicle* addresses the work's dedicatees thus: *mi Vincenti carissime et tu Galliene, pars animae meae* (*chron. epist. p. 2.16-17 H.*). This passage is overlooked by Hagendahl, though he does refer to the occurrence of the same syntagm (*pars animae meae*) in *Letter* 3.3.1 and 17.3.2¹⁹. Since this *Chronicle* was written shortly after these *Letters*²⁰, Jerome significantly employs the phrase at issue (*pars animae meae*) no fewer than three times in the first few years of his literary activity, but never again in the remaining forty²¹. Degórski's recent study of this dedicatory epistle to Jerome's *Chronicle* identifies the source of his *pars animae meae*

¹⁶ Cf. N. Adkin, *Tertullian's 'De idololatria' and Jerome Again*, "Mnemosyne" n.s. 49, 1996, 48.

¹⁷ Jerome also adds *a me*.

¹⁸ So (e.g.) the standard translations in German (L. Schade, *Des hl. Kirchenvaters Eusebius Hieronymus ausgewählte Briefe*, II. Briefband [BKV 2.18], Munich 1937, 93, n. 4) and in Italian (S. Cola, *S. Girolamo: Le Lettere*, I, Rome 1996, 116, n. 6). Neither of these scholars adduces any text whatever on *Letter* 3.3.1 (Schade, *op. cit.*, I. Briefband [BKV 2.16], Munich 1936, 6; Cola, *op. cit.* 59).

¹⁹ Cf. n. 5 above.

²⁰ The *Chronicle* is dated to 379/380 by B. Jeanjean and B. Lançon, *S. Jérôme, Chronique: Continuation de la Chronique d'Eusèbe, années 326-378*, Rennes 2004, 19-26. These *Letters* belong to the mid-370's.

²¹ No further patristic instance of this phrase whatsoever is to be found in the online *Library of Latin Texts*.

as *Ode* 1.3.8²²: it has however been shown above that the Horatian text which lies behind this Hieronymian *Selbstzitat* is in fact *Ode* 2.17.5. Brugnoli's detailed commentary on this same dedication-letter to the *Chronicle* fails to recognize any source at all for *pars animae meae*²³. If however Brugnoli's *Quellenforschung* cops out on *pars animae meae*, he does supply two *Quellen* for the words that follow immediately: *quidquid hoc tumultuarii operis est* (p. 2.17-18 H.). Firstly Brugnoli affirms that *quidquid hoc...* "reproduce Catull. 1.8: *quidquid hoc libelli*"²⁴. Such a borrowing is however unlikely, since Jerome evinces no debt to Catullus whatsoever²⁵. Secondly Brugnoli states that Jerome's *tumultuarium opus* "riecheggia" Fronto's *tumultuaria studiorum solacia* (p. 144.18-19 v. d. H.)²⁶. Again such an echo is implausible²⁷.

If then one must dismiss these Brugnolian attempts to identify sources in Jerome's wording adjacent to the *pars animae meae* of the *Chronicle*, his language adjoining the same syntagm in *Letter* 3 and 17 can be shown to contain unidentified echoes of two pagan prosaists²⁸. In *Letter* 3 the full context reads: *ubi* (sc. Syria) *ego quicquid morborum esse poterat expertus e duobus oculis unum perdiidi; Innocentium enim, partem animae meae, repentinus febrium ardor abstraxit. nunc uno et toto mihi lumine Evagrio nostro fruor* (3.3.1-2). The striking language of *e duobus oculis unum perdiidi* merits a note in Mierow and Lawler: here Jerome "is not to be taken literally"²⁹. Kelly's canonical biography affirms that this same language has been "borrowed" from a play of Plautus: *ubi isti sunt quibu' vos oculi estis?*

²² B. Degórski, *La prefazione di S. Girolamo alla continuazione della Cronaca di Eusebio di Cesarea*, "VoxP" 34, 2014, 116, n. 13. *Ode* 1.3.8 is also given as Jerome's source in the note on this passage in V. Bejarano, *S. Jerónimo: Obras completas*, II (BAC 624), Madrid 2002, 525, n. 15.

²³ G. Brugnoli, *Curiosissimus Excerptor: Gli Additamenta di Girolamo ai Chronica di Eusebio* (Test. Stud. Cult. Class. 12), Pisa 1995, 113. Similarly no source is adduced in the substantial annotation on this *Widmungsbrief* by S. Rebenich, *Jerome*, London-New York 2002, 183.

²⁴ Brugnoli, *op. cit.* (n. 23) 113.

²⁵ Cf. N. Adkin, *Catullus in Jerome? Notes on the 'Cohortatoria de paenitentia ad Sabinianum' (Epist. 147)*, "VChr" 65, 2011, 408-424.

²⁶ Brugnoli, *op. cit.* (n. 23) 113.

²⁷ No debt to Fronto on Jerome's part is registered by Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 5) 401. *Tumultuarius* is in any case used regularly with such reference to literary production; cf. E. Forcellini, *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*, IV, Padua 1940, 828 (s.v.: "de oratione"). For Jerome's own use of the word in this sense cf. P. Lardet, *L'Apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin: Un commentaire* (Suppl. Vig. Chr. 15), Leiden-Cologne-New York 1993, 267.

²⁸ Such use of multiple sources is typical of Jerome's compositional technique cf. N. Adkin, *Jerome as Centoist: Epist. 22.38.7*, "RSLR" 28, 1992, 461-471.

²⁹ Mierow and Lawler, *op. cit.* (n. 8) 193, n. 10.

(*Pseud.* 179)³⁰. Such a presupposition is however improbable, since Jerome's acquaintance with Plautus is in fact very slight³¹.

If Jerome's debt to Plautus is lilliputian, his indebtedness to Quintilian is by contrast brobdingnagian³². Book 6 of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* is evidently the unidentified source of the passage currently at issue in Jerome's *Letter* 3³³. In the proem to this sixth book³⁴ Quintilian states: *mihi filius minor quintum egressus annum prior alterum ex duobus eruit lumen* (*inst.* 6 *proem.* 6). This Quintilianic *alterum ex duobus eruit lumen* has evidently inspired the Jeromian *e duobus oculis unum peridi* of *Letter* 3: both texts describe the loss of a loved-one as the loss of one of the one-loving's two eyes. The lexical correlations between Quintilian and Jerome may be set out schematically: *alterum* / *unum*; *ex duobus* / *e duobus*; *eruit* / *peridi*³⁵; *lumen* / *oculis*³⁶.

This Quintilianic echo is then followed by Jerome's aforesaid echo of Horace, which is in turn followed by what is evidently a further unidentified echo of this same proem to *Institutio* 6. The Jeromian words at issue this time are the following: *nunc uno et toto mihi lumine Evagrio nostro fruor* (*epist.* 3.3.2). This wording has evidently been suggested by what Quintilian says shortly after his above-mentioned dictum. This time he is speaking about his other child: *una post haec Quintiliani mei spe ac voluptate nitebar* (*inst.* 6 *proem.* 9). Here Jeromian and Quintilianic texts both describe how after the death of one loved-one the other loved-one is the speaker's one gratification. Again the verbal correspondences between Quintilian and Jerome may be presented in tabular form: *una* / *uno*; *post haec* / *nunc*; *Quintiliani mei* / *Evagrio nostro*³⁷; *voluptate* / *fruor*³⁸.

³⁰ Kelly, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 40 with n. 23.

³¹ Cf. N. Adkin, *Plato or Plautus?* (*Jerome, Epist.* 22.30.2), "Emerita" 62, 1994, 43-56.

³² Cf. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 5) 412; id., *art. cit.* (n. 5) 216 and 225-226.

³³ This is the first Hieronymian borrowing to be identified from the *Institutio*'s sixth book. It is also Jerome's earliest imitation of Quintilian to be spotted *tout court*. For the first Jeromian reminiscences to be detected from books 9 and 11 respectively cf. N. Adkin, *The Ninth Book of Quintilian's 'Institutio oratoria' and Jerome*, "Arctos" 32, 1998, 13-25; id., *The Eleventh Book of Quintilian's 'Institutio oratoria' and Jerome*, "Eos" 89, 2002, 315-319.

³⁴ It is precisely such initial passages that "restent le mieux gravés dans la mémoire" (P. Petitmengin, *S. Jérôme et Tertullien*, in Y.-M. Duval [ed.], *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris 1988, 50).

³⁵ The two verbs are linked conceptually.

³⁶ *Lumina* is regularly glossed as *oculi*; cf. G. Goetz and G. Loewe, *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, VI, Leipzig 1899, 660. Both texts are also prefaced by a participial phrase: Quintilian's *egressus* matches Jerome's *expertus*.

³⁷ In both texts a *nomen proprium* is qualified by an ensuing 1st-person possessive adjective. Jerome's *Evagrio nostro* is moreover qualified by *lumine*, which exactly matches

The final point may be made in connection with this *Letter* 3 that Jerome's description here of his friends Evagrius and Innocentius in language borrowed from Quintilian entails an infelicity. Quintilian's use of the image of his "two eyes" to describe his "two sons" is apt: he has only these two children. In Jerome's case on the other hand the same image is less appropriate. If Quintilian has only two sons, Jerome does not have only two friends. In this same *Letter* 3 Jerome in fact speaks of numerous friends: Evagrius and Innocentius are far from being a solitary pair. Jerome's very next sentence is devoted to his friend Hylas. His very next paragraph is all about his friend Bonosus. His friend Rufinus is the addressee of this whole letter. Such inconcinnity is characteristic of Jerome's centonical method of composition³⁹. Jerome's prose often resembles a bargain-basement toupée: you can see the join.

If then in this *Letter* 3 Jerome's Horatian *partem animae meae* is juxtaposed with a debt to Quintilian, in *Letter* 17 this same Horace-inspired syntagm is juxtaposed with a similarly unidentified borrowing from Cicero. Here Jeromian *abruperunt... partem animae meae, carissimos fratres* (*epist.* 17.3.2) continues with the following description of his companions' departure from the desert: *discedunt melius esse dicentes inter feras habitare quam cum talibus Christianis*⁴⁰. Jerome's unrecognized source here is evidently Cicero's *Pro Sexto Roscio* (150)⁴¹: *inter feras satius est*⁴² *aetatem degere quam in hac tanta immanitate*⁴³ *versari*. It is proposed to postpone detailed discussion of this particular borrowing to a future article which will deal fully with Jerome's debt to Cicero's *Pro S. Roscio* as a whole. By way of sneak peek the final point may however be made that the present clone is again marked by another give-away inconcinnity: if Cicero's sarcastic preference for life *inter feras* had suited unferal Rome, in Jerome the same sarky

Quintilian's above-cited *lumen* (*inst.* 6 *prooem.* 6).

³⁸ *Voluptatem rapere ex* is a synonym of *frui* (so *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 6.1 col. 1428.66-67 [s.v. *frui*]).

³⁹ Cf. N. Adkin, *Tertullian's 'De ieiunio' and Jerome's 'Libellus de virginitate servanda'* (*Epist.* 22), "WS" 104, 1991, 149-160.

⁴⁰ These important words end the penultimate sentence of the chapter entitled "The Desert: Joys and Trials" in Kelly, *op. cit.* (n. 3) 56: here this doyen of Jeromian Boswells does not realize he is dealing with a mere quote.

⁴¹ This speech "was a staple of the rhetorical schools" (A. R. Dyck, *Cicero: Pro Sexto Roscio*, Cambridge 2010, 19).

⁴² For *satius est* (which Jerome himself nowhere uses) as a synonym of *melius est* (which he does use here) cf. Goetz and Loewe, *op. cit.* (n. 36), IV, Leipzig 1889, 463.13.

⁴³ *Abstr. pro concr.*: the phrase in question is rendered in G. Landgraf's canonical *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (Leipzig-Berlin 1914², 273) as "unter solchen Unmenschen", which matches Jerome's *cum talibus Christianis*.

preference now does not fit the Syrian desert, since desert-dwellers already *do live inter feras*⁴⁴.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

NEIL ADKIN

ABSTRACT:

The present article endeavours to show that Jerome imitates Horace's *Ode* 2.17.5-6 in *Letter* 3.3.1. This Jeromian fine-tuning of Horace is then imitated in turn by Jerome himself on two later occasions (*epist.* 17.3.2 and *chron. epist.* p. 2.17 H.). Jerome's original imitation of this Horatian text in *Letter* 3.3.1 is also combined with a hitherto unidentified imitation of Quintilian (*inst.* 6 *prooem.* 6 and 9).

KEYWORDS:

Horace, Jerome, *Quellenforschung*, Quintilian.

⁴⁴ Cf. Jerome's classic description of the desert-dweller (*epist.* 22.7.2): *socius...ferarum*.