6) Vol. 2, pp. 686-7. The author p. 687 n. 10 observes that the text is “difficile, forse corrotto”. She follows the text of H.S. Long and refers to a paper by Gigante. Here the addition of ‘without dialectic’ is implicit.

7) He has a note explaining that he sticks to the text as transmitted and that he rejects the emendation νομοθέται, but he too in fact adds ανευ αυτής.

8) Cf. above, n. 3, n. 7.

9) Cf. again above, n. 3, n. 7.

10) Sull. 36.3, Cic. 26.9, Mor. 271E.

11) For this use of εἰς cf. e.g. Eurip. fr. 336.1, εἰς δ’ εὐγένειαν ὀλίγ’ ἔχω φρά-σαι καλά. In Diogenes Laertius’ text one may mentally supply ἀποβλέποντες, cf. Plato, Prot. 354c, Arist., EE 1223b22-5 (~ Heradcl. fr. 70 (b) Marc.), Luc., Philops. 1.7. For the formula τί δεῖ λέγειν; see e.g. Eur., Andr. 920, Plato, Symp. 217c, Xenoph., Cyr. 5.2.28.1-2, Demosth., G. Pan. 12.2, C. Eub. 33.6, Gal., Meth. med. X p. 842.2 K., περὶ δὲ πόνον τί δεῖ λέγειν; ὁπως ἀνείλον μέν κτλ. (note the ὁπως).


13) For ἔργα in a Stoic context cf. Aurius Didymus (?) at Stob. p. 2.93.2 and 4, 2.105.3 and 27, 2.116.9 W.

14) This is not meant to deny the importance of cosmic law or of the cosmic city in Stoic philosophy, for which see esp. Schofield (1991). For the Chrysippus fragment from his On Law at SVF 3.314 see Schofield, op. cit., pp. 70-2.

15) See Diogenianus at Eus., PE 6.8.14 (~ SVF 3.324). But all existing constitutions or states are bad in the same sense as according to orthodox Stoic theory all men except the Wise Man are evil.


17) Schofield, op. cit., p. 131, excises κατασκεύασμα ... λαβεῖν as a gloss, thus abolishing the law-courts. Sen. Ot. 4.1 (Long & Sedley 67K) states that there are two sorts of ‘republics’, viz. the common one and the one into which we happen to be born. Stoic philosophers residing in Athens proudly remained citizens of their native city. For Zeno’s patriotism see a reliable witness, Antigonus of Carystus fr. 30 Dorandi at D.L. 7.12 (~ SVF 1.3). Conditions permitting, the Wise Man will engage in politics in his πατρίς, see Aurius Didymus (?) at Stob. 2.11m., p. 111.5-9 W. (~ SVF 3.690), and he will commit suicide for his πατρίς if this turns out to be what is wanted (D.L. 7.130 ~ SVF 3.757).


AN ALLEGED ECHO OF TERTULLIAN’S DE IDOLOLATRIA IN JEROME’S COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH

The quest for echoes of the Fathers in Jerome’s oeuvre continues apace. Such investigation is however fraught with danger.1) A case in point is the extent of Jerome’s indebtedness to Tertullian’s De idololatria: while a number of recent papers have endeavoured to identify borrowings made from the treatise at various stages of Jerome’s career,2) in the latest contribution to the debate Petitmengin has now posited an imitation of this work in Jerome’s Commentary on Jeremiah,3) which is the very last of his many exegetical productions.4) Chapter six of the De idololatria dismisses the claim
of the idol maker that he can ply his trade without worshipping his handiwork: *negas te quod facis colere?* sed illi non negant, quibus hanc saginatiorem et auratiorem et maiorem hostiam caedis, salutem tuam, tota die (6,3). The second of these two sentences has unquestionably inspired Jerome’s phrasing in one of his earlier works. According to Petitmengin’s most recent statement on the subject a reminiscence of the first sentence as well (*negas te quod facis colere* [sc. idolum]) is to be found in the following words of the Jeremiah commentary: *impudenter negas te coluisse idolum Bahalim* (1,31,1). It would seem however that such a view is inadmissible.

Here three points may be made. The first is of a general nature: whereas the phrase *saginatior hostia*, which Jerome certainly does imitate, is extremely striking, the words *negas te . . . colere* are on the other hand unremarkable. There was accordingly no reason why Jerome should commit this particular locution to memory for subsequent redeployment: it is arresting phraseology which Jerome appropriates from others. The remaining points concern the specific wording of the Commentary on Jeremiah. Here Jerome’s employment of *idolum* is due simply to the lemma, which contains the term *Bahalim*: it is Jerome’s custom to gloss this word by the addition of *idolum*. The phrase *negas te coluisse*, which is specially highlighted by Petitmengin, would also appear to be explicable in the same terms. The scriptural lemma reads in full: *quomodo dicis: ‘non sum polluta, post Bahalim non abii’? vide vias tuas in convalle* (Jer. 2,23). This verse is then paraphrased by Jerome as follows: ‘frustra’, inquit, ‘non vis confiteri scelera tua et iactas munditiam, quae idololatriae polluta es sordibus et impudenter negas te coluisse idolum Bahalim. respice convalle filiorum Ennom . . .’ While Jerome’s prefatory clause (*non vis confiteri scelera tua*) merely offers a summary of the whole, his two statements . . . *polluta es . . . and respice convalle . . .*, which together enclose the rest, clearly match the bible’s similarly circumjacent *sum polluta* and *vide . . . in convalle* respectively. It would therefore be no surprise if the same correlation were to mark the intervenient words as well. Such can in fact be demonstrated to be the case. On the one hand the combination of the bible’s preludial *dicis* with the *non in non abii* has given rise to Jerome’s *negas*. On the other the commentary’s *coluisse idolum Bahalim* is directly due to the scriptural *post Bahalim . . . abii*: here Jerome has simply replaced the bizarrely biblical idiom *abire post* with the more conventional *colere*. If then the wording of the Commentary on Jeremiah is nothing more than a paraphrase of the biblical lemma, Petitmengin’s case for an echo of Tertullian’s *De idololatria* in Jerome’s very last work must be rejected.

Lincoln, University of Nebraska

Neil Adkin

2) Cf. the present writer, *Tertullian’s De idololatria and Jerome*, Augustinianum 33 (1993), 11-30; id., *Tertullian’s De idololatria and Jerome Again*, Mnemosyne 49 (1996),