

KEVIN ZILVERBERG

CULTIC VERBS IN *VETUS LATINA* DANIEL AND IN JEROME'S TRANSLATIONS OF THE GREEK ADDITIONS TO DANIEL¹

Summary: The *Vetus Latina* Bible includes a variety of vocabulary according to various translators' and revisers' milieus and intents as they worked from Greek originals. This study aims to analyze the use of

¹ This essay has been written within the framework of a research project entitled *Publication and Study of Biblical and Parabiblical Texts* (reference code FFI2017-86726-P), which is based at the Spanish National Research Council's (CSIC, Madrid) Institute of Languages and Cultures of the Mediterranean and Near East, with financial support from the Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness of the Government of Spain.

The Vetus Latina-Institut of Beuron, Germany, has established an abbreviation system for citing VL witnesses according to the best editions. For manuscripts, see GRYSO, R. – FREDE, H.: *Altlateinische Handschriften = Manuscrits vieux latins, répertoire descriptif. I: Mss 1–275. II: Mss 300–485 (manuscrits du Psautier)*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1999–2004. Their latest print edition for patristic witnesses, now slightly outdated, is FISCHER, B. – FREDE, H. – GRYSO, R.: *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut Moyen Âge*. Freiburg im Breisgau 2007², I–II. The online edition for patristic witnesses, last updated in 2013 and available by subscription only, is the most recent one; see 'Vetus Latina Database' of Vetus Latina-Institut (<http://apps.brepolis.net/vld/Default.aspx>). What follows is a list of the abbreviations used in the present study.

VL 176 = Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 1398b pp. 126–175; Zürich, Zentralbibliothek C 184 (389) Fragments 23 and 24 (= folios 24 and 25). For the edited text, divided over two publications, see DOLD, A.: *Konstanzer altlateinische Propheten- und Evangelien-Bruchstücke mit Glossen: Nebst zugehörigen Prophetentexten aus Zürich und St. Gallen*. Beuron in Hohenzollern – Leipzig 1923, 228–278; DOLD, A.: *Neue St. Galler vorhieronymianische Propheten-Fragmente: Der St. Galler Sammelhandschrift 1398b zugehörig*. Beuron in Hohenzollern 1940, 24–75.

ANT-M = Mozarabic Antiphonary; CY = Cyprian of Carthage, *ep* = *Epistularium*, *Fo* = *Ad Fortunatum*, or = *De dominica oratione*, *lap* = *De lapsis*, *te* = *Ad Quirinum (Testimoniorum libri 3)*; PS-CY = Pseudo-Cyprian, *Nov* = *Ad Novatianum*; IR = Irenaeus of Lyons, *Adversus haereses, seu Detectio et eversio falso cognominatae Gnoeos, libri 5*; LUC = Lucifer of Caralis, *Ath* = *De Athanasio libri 2*, *par* = *De non parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*; NIC = Nicetas of Remesiana, *ut* = *De utilitate hymnorum*; PAU-N = Paulinus of Nola, *ep* = *Epistulae*; RES-R = Roman Responsory; TE = Tertullian of Carthage, *cor* = *De corona*, *je* = *De ieiunio adversus psychicos*, [TE] *Jud* = *Adversus Iudaeos* (attributed to Tertullian), *Marc* = *Adversus Marcionem libri 5*, or = *De oratione*, *pae* = *De paenitentia*, *Pra* = *Adversus Praean*, *sco* = *Scorpiace*; ZE = Zeno of Verona, *Tractatus Sancti Zenonis Veronensis episcopi*. A preceding asterisk (*) indicates an allusion rather than a direct biblical citation.

cultic verbs in the *Vetus Latina* Book of Daniel in all its pluriformity, and in Jerome's translations of the Greek additions to this book.

In order to do so, I focus on key patristic witnesses to trace verbs denoting or connoting divine worship, from the time of Tertullian of Carthage, over Cyprian of Carthage and Lucifer of Caralis, to Jerome of Stridon. The expressions treated, each corresponding to a Greek verb, are: *seruio, colo, famulor, appareo, exomologesin facio, hymnum cano, sacrifico, timeo, benedico, adoro, laudo, confiteor*, and *primitiae*. They are analyzed in relation to their Greek *Vorlagen* and to the Latin context consisting in similar renderings by the same Fathers. The biblical book's fragmentary VL manuscript evidence and the wider patristic and liturgical tradition are also taken into account. This approach allows for a diachronic view marked sometimes by continuity, sometimes by change, for the Latin rendering of a Greek verb.

Key words: *Vetus Latina*, Old Latin Daniel, biblical Latin, patristic Latin, Latin translations from Greek, cultic verbs

The *Vetus Latina* (VL) Bible, whose North African origins date to the turn of the 3rd century, provides precious documentation of vocabulary chosen for use in the Latin-speaking Christian community. While it is true that this translation literature is conditioned by its Greek sources, one must also recognize the text's practical purpose: to make the sacred scriptures understandable to Latin speakers, many of whom belonged to the lower classes. This version, or rather these versions, provide a variety of vocabulary according to various translators' and revisers' milieus and intents. One finds in these texts both continuity with vocabulary from Latin's 'golden age' and words alien to the high literary register handed down through the classical canon.²

This study's objective is to analyze the use of cultic verbs in the VL Book of Daniel (Dn) in all its pluriformity, and in Jerome's translations of the Greek additions. This Old Testament book, transmitted along with the preceding story of Susanna (Sus), with additions to Chapter 3 absent from the Aramaic version, and with the concluding stories of Bel and the Dragon (Bel), exhibits a richness of language of the sort just described. There exists no complete copy of VL Sus-Dn-Bel, only fragmentary manuscripts and citations from patristic and liturgical sources. From these I have chosen four Latin Fathers for their relative abundance of material and chronological representation covering the 3rd and 4th centuries: Tertullian of Carthage, Cyprian of Carthage, Lucifer of Caralis in Sardinia (present-day *Cagliari*), and Jerome of Stridon. From their citations of VL Dn and, in Jerome's case, from his translations of Dn's Greek additions, I have (a) identified the verbs that denote or connote divine worship, and (b) contextualized their usage over the two centuries. To better explain these I have adduced manuscript, patristic, and liturgical sources.

Let us turn first to Tertullian (ca. 160–220), who has long been recognized as the pre-eminent witness to an emerging use of Latin to convey the Christian message and its sacred scriptures. It should be noted from the start that Tertullian tends to quote the same biblical passage differently on different occasions rather than adhering to a fixed Latin text.³ We also know that, at least some of the time, he had direct recourse

² Cf. VÄÄNÄNEN, V.: *Introduction au latin vulgaire*. Paris 1981³, §30 = 17–18.

³ For a brief, up-to-date introduction to the question of whether or not Tertullian used pre-existing Latin biblical texts, see GRAVES, M.: The Biblical Text as Attested in Ancient Literature: The Latin Fathers. In LANGE, A. – TOV, E. (eds): *Textual History of the Bible. I: The Hebrew Bible, C: Writings*.

to the Greek text when citing scriptural passages in Latin.⁴ For the purpose of this short study, we can set aside the question as to how much, if any, of the Bible existed in a written, Latin translation in Tertullian's day.

His translations of λατρεύω, a word fundamental to Judeo-Christian theology, serve as examples of Tertullian's willingness to employ multiple Latin terms for a single Greek lemma. Although his usual biblical translation for λατρεύω outside of Sus-Dn-Bel is *seruio*, in his citations of Dn he uses *colo* and *famulor* alongside it.⁵ The use of multiple translations suggests that transparency of the underlying Greek word was not of major concern here. For the present participle λατρεύουσα, Tertullian in one instance writes not the expected **seruiens* – as he does elsewhere in his *Adversus Marcionem* for the same passage – but rather *famulabunda*, a hapax legomenon in ancient Latin literature.⁶ Even Pseudo-Tertullian, author of at least the latter half of the *Adversus Iudaeos*,⁷ who copies so much material from the very chapter of the *Adversus Marcionem* where the hapax occurs, employs *seruiens* in his translation of the same passage.⁸

Tertullian writes *appareo* for λειτουργέω where the context is that of the heavenly hosts before the celestial throne.⁹ Λειτουργέω in this passage, like λατρεύω, will soon afterwards be translated *seruio* by another African Father.¹⁰ This use of *appareo* as a synonym to *seruio* mostly fell out of ecclesiastical use, although a vestige can be

Leiden–Boston 2017, 759–763, here 759. Thomas O'MALLEY provides a more detailed treatment in *Tertullian and the Bible: Language, Imagery, Exegesis*. Noviomagi 1967, 4–8.

⁴ CAPELLE, P.: *Le texte du Psautier latin en Afrique*. Rome 1913, 20; FREDE, H. (ed.): *Epistula ad Ephesios*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1962–1964, *30; GRYSOON, R. (ed.): *Esaias: [I. 1–39]*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1987–1993, 16.

⁵ The pairing λατρεύω | *seruio* in Tertullian's biblical citations (see n. 1 for patristic abbreviations): Ex 20:5 in TE *Marc* 2. 22. 1 (132. 4); Dt 11:28 in TE *sco* 2. 5 (1072); Dt 12:2 in TE *sco* 2. 6 (1072); Dt 13:3 in TE *sco* 2. 8 (1072); Dt 13:4 in TE *sco* 2. 8 (1072) (the latter instance may correspond to the variant δουλεύω rather than λατρεύω); Dt 13:6 in TE *sco* 2. 9 (1073); Mt 4:10 in TE *sco* 15. 6 (1097). Within Tertullian's Dn citations, λατρεύω | *colo* occurs at Dn 3:17 in TE *sco* 8. 6 (1083); λατρεύω | *famulor* occurs at Dn 3:18 in TE *sco* 8. 6 (1083). It should be noted that Tertullian's citations more often match the older, Septuagintal Dn than the Theodotionic Greek version. Nevertheless, at Dn 3:17 *colo* does seem to derive from Theodotionic λατρεύω rather than from Septuagintal φοβέομαι. Tertullian tends to translate φοβέομαι with *timeo* or *metuo*. For instance, one finds φοβέομαι | *timeo* at Lv 19:14, 32 in TE *Marc* 2. 13. 5 (491. 25); Dt 6:13 in TE *sco* 2. 3 (1072); Dt 13:4 in TE *sco* 2. 8 (1072). Φοβέομαι | *metuo* occurs at Is 50:10 in TE *Marc* 3. 17. 5 (531. 20) and 4. 22. 10 (603. 19); Mt 10:31 in TE *sco* 9. 8 (1085).

⁶ *Famulabunda* at Dn 7:14 in TE *Marc* 3. 7. 4 (88. 27); *seruiens* at Dn 7:14 in TE *Marc* 4. 39. 11 (486. 98).

⁷ That is to say, it is likely that at least the latter half of the work is inauthentic. The biblical citations are almost certainly inauthentic, as affirmed since the 3rd ed. of the VL-Institut's manual by FREDE, H.: *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1981³, 553; cf. BURKITT, F.: *The Old Latin and The Itala: With an appendix containing the text of the S. Gallen Palimpsest of Jeremiah*. Cambridge, England 1896, 29, n. 1; CAPELLE (n. 4) 6, n. 1.

⁸ Insofar as the latter half of the work is concerned, he cites Dn 7:14 in [TE] *Jud* 14. 4 (39. 3).

⁹ Dn 7:10 in TE *Pra* 3. 4 (148. 27). On the alignment of *appareo* with λειτουργέω rather than ἑθεράπευον, see ZIEGLER, J. – MUNNICH, O. – FRAENKEL D. (eds): *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*. Göttingen 1999², 96–97. On this point, MUNNICH corrects BURKITT (n. 7) 22, n. 1.

¹⁰ See n. 15.

found in the Vulgate's *apparitores* to describe Saul's servants as the messengers charged with accosting David (1Sm 19:14).

By contrast, for ἐξομολογέομαι we find the calque *exomologesisin facio*.¹¹ Apparently some early Latin-speaking Christians considered the available Latin equivalents insufficient to render this important Greek word. Over time, however, it gave way to *confiteor*, a frequent term already in Tertullian's writings. The translations that would later be called 'Vulgate' surely contributed to this shift by excluding *ex(h)omologesis* altogether.¹²

Let us now turn to Cyprian of Carthage (ca. 200–258), a trustworthy witness to the sacred scriptures that, by his day, had already been committed to writing in Latin and subjected to revision.¹³ Among his writings and the contemporary, Pseudo-Cyprianic work *Ad Novatianum*, one finds some of the same verses as those cited by Tertullian. In contrast to his Carthaginian predecessor, Cyprian tends to reproduce the same verse verbatim, or sometimes with quite minor modifications, when writing it multiple times and across multiple works. This implies that he cites carefully, probably from a text rather than from memory, and that he can be trusted to report a verse in one of the forms in which it was circulated in biblical manuscripts of mid-3rd century North Africa.

At Dn 3:17 he pairs λατρεύω | *seruio*, where Tertullian read *colo*; at Dn 3:18 one finds the same pairing, where Tertullian read *famulor*; and the same pairing occurs once again at Dn 7:14, in contrast to Tertullian's *famulabunda*.¹⁴ For λατρεύω, therefore, one finds in Cyprian a reduction of Latin vocabulary vis-à-vis Tertullian. This is not to say, however, that in Cyprian's time *seruio* provided a transparent equivalent to λατρεύω, for that would entail the reservation of *seruio* as the translation of λατρεύω alone. The work *Ad Novatianum* pairs λειτουργέω | *seruio* at Dn 7:10, in contrast to Tertullian's *appareo*.¹⁵ Furthermore, Cyprian's authentic works regularly employ the same word for δουλεύω.¹⁶ Neither is it the case that the translator or

¹¹ Tertullian uses the expression in allusion to Dn 9:4 in TE *je* 10. 13 (1269). Cf. *exomologesisin sciens... exomologesisin operatus* in allusion to Dn 4:34 in TE *pae* 12. 7 (188. 22). Elsewhere, he explains to his Latin readers what *exomologesis* means, although he uses it much more often without explanation. TE *pae* 9. 2 (180. 4): *Is actus, qui magis graeco uocabulo et exprimitur et frequentatur, exomologesis est, qua delictum nostrum Domino confitemur, non quidem ut ignaro, sed quatenus satisfactio confessione disponitur, confessione paenitentia nascitur, paenitentia Deus mitigatur.* TE or 7. 1 (261): *Exomologesis est petitio ueniae, quia qui petit ueniam, delictum confitetur.* On the use of *facio* and the like to calque Greek verbs in the VL, see BURTON, P.: *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language*. Oxford 2000, 93–94; cf. HOFMANN, J. – SZANTYR, A.: *Lateinische Grammatik. II: Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (verbesselter Nachdruck). München 1972, 754–756.

¹² See n. 37.

¹³ BOGAERT, P.-M.: *La Bible latine des origines au moyen âge: Aperçu historique, état des questions.* RThL 19 (1988) 137–159, here 145; GRYSON-FREDE (n. 1) I 19.

¹⁴ Λατρεύω | *seruio* at Dn 3:17 in CY *ep* 6. 3 (35. 78), CY *ep* 58. 5 (326. 109), CY *Fo* 11 (204. 77), and CY *te* 3. 10 (98. 15); at Dn 3:18 in CY *ep* 6. 3 (35. 80), CY *ep* 58. 5 (326. 111), and CY *Fo* 11 (204. 79), but *deseruio* in CY *te* 3. 10 (98. 17); *seruio* at Dn 7:14 in CY *te* 2. 26 (63. 6).

¹⁵ PS-CY *Nov* 17. 1 (151. 4). Cf. p. 447.

¹⁶ E.g. Gn 25:23 in CY *te* 1. 19 (19. 4); Gn 27:29 in CY *te* 1. 21 (21. 10); Ps 17:44 (Vulgate Ps 17:45) in CY *te* 1. 21 (22. 35).

reviser of Sus-Dn-Bel reduced all possible Greek equivalents to *seruio*, for he pairs σέβομαι | *colo* at Bel 5, where **seruio* would have sufficed.¹⁷

Cyprian perpetuates the use of *exomologesin facio* for ἐξομολογέομαι.¹⁸ Whereas Tertullian sometimes helps his reader by explaining the term, by the mid-3rd century Cyprian uses it without explanation. We encounter a similar translation technique with Cyprian's pairing ὑμνέω | *hymnum cano*; for ὑμνέω one often finds the VL alternate translation *hymnum dico* as well, which is attested already in Tertullian's citation of Ps 21:23 and which enjoys uninterrupted liturgical use to the present day.¹⁹ The liturgical context of ὑμνέω in Dn 3, in the Psalms, and elsewhere, no doubt encouraged the conservative translation. Small wonder that one finds such calques from a time when Latin was no match for the dominance of Greek in Mediterranean church affairs and liturgy.

Another challenging verb to render in Latin is καρπύω, related to καρπός, 'fruit' and meaning 'to offer (fruit)'. For this verb we find *sacrifico* in Cyprian's Dn;²⁰ the translator has opted for a Latinate approximation rather than forcing an expression that does justice to the verb's root. The contrast between calquing ἐξομολογέομαι on the one hand and, on the other, using a Latin approximation for καρπύω illustrates a more general characteristic of the VL: its translators often employ multiple translation techniques simultaneously. This combined approach allows flexibility within a usually literal translation. It is through this flexibility, especially for words and phrases difficult to render, that the translator's skill (or lack thereof) becomes best visible.

Other Cyprianic cultic vocabulary includes *timeo* for φοβέομαι, and *benedico* for εὐλογέω, followed by the accusative *Deum* (τὸν θεόν).²¹ Each of these verbs will remain firmly rooted in biblical Latin.

Lucifer of Caralis (ca. 320–370) relates extended citations from Sus (Dn 13) and Dn 7, but these contain only a few words that are of interest for this study. They are included (a) because Lucifer is known to handle his citations carefully,²² and

¹⁷ Bel 5 (Vulgate Dn 14:4) in CY *ep* 58. 5 (327. 129) and CY *Fo* 11 (204. 82).

¹⁸ Dn 3:25 in CY *lap* 31 (238. 615).

¹⁹ Ὑμνέω | *hymnum cano* at Dn 3:51 in CY *or* 8 (93. 115). *Hymnum dico* at Ps 21:23 in TE *Marc* 3. 22. 6 (539. 7). Other witnesses to *hymnum cano* / *hymnum dico* at Dn 3:51 include VL 176^{videtur}, ANTM 200r (332), NIC *ut* 13 (240. 17), *PAU-N *ep* 44. 6 (377. 6), *RES-R 4946 (482), and *ZE 1. 31 (82. 4). One still finds *hymnum dico* and the like throughout the modern divine office; see CONGREGATIO DE CULTU DIVINO ET DISCIPLINA SACRAMENTORUM: *Liturgia horarum iuxta ritum Romanum*. [Civitate Vaticana] 1985–1987, I–IV.

²⁰ Dn 3:38 in CY *te* 3. 20 (116. 66).

²¹ *Timeo* at Sus 2 in CY *te* 3. 20 (116. 62); *benedico* at Dn 3:51 in CY *or* 8 (93. 115). On the accusative object for *benedico*, see MOHRMANN, C.: Les éléments vulgaires du latin des chrétiens. *VChr* 2 (1948) 89–101, here 183; RÖNSCH, H.: *Itala und Vulgata: Das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata, unter Berücksichtigung der römischen Volkssprache*. Marburg 1875², 440.

²² He inserts long biblical passages into his writings, and this so frequently and so much in accordance with other VL witnesses that he is almost certainly copying the long passages, not citing them from memory. Cf. DIERCKS, G.: *Luciferi Calaritani opera quae supersunt: Ad fidem duorum codicum qui adhuc extant necnon adhibitis editionibus veteribus*. Turnholti 1978, cv–cxiii; PIRAS, A.: *Bibbia e sermo biblicus negli scritti luciferiani*. In LACONI, S. (ed.): *La figura e l'opera di Lucifero di Cagliari, una rivisitazione: Atti del I convegno internazionale, Cagliari, 5–7 dicembre 1996*. Roma 2001, 131–144.

(b) in order to include a textual witness from a different time and place than the others. *Seruiō* translates δουλεύω twice and λειτουργέω once.²³ Although Lucifer wrote a century after Cyprian and the Pseudo-Cyprianic *Ad Novatianum*, and hailed from Sardinia rather than North Africa, his use of *seruiō* is consistent with theirs. In both cases, *seruiō* dominates as the verb for divine worship and corresponds to multiple Greek terms. Lucifer also provides an example of the common Christian expression *benedico* (εὐλογέω) *Deum*, with the object in the accusative.²⁴

Jerome of Stridon (ca. 347–419) stands as a pre-eminent witness to and author of biblical Latin. By his time, the VL version(s) provided an abundant lexicon to be used by him in a new translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew and Aramaic. The Book of Dn is unique in that it compelled him to translate parts from Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, although he marked the latter with obeli and repeatedly questioned their place in the biblical canon.²⁵ He did this in the early 390s, when he translated the Prophets, to which Dn belongs.²⁶ This translation was perpetuated in the collection much later known as the Vulgate Bible.²⁷ In general it is not clear to what extent Jerome made use of pre-existing Latin translations for the Greek parts of the book. At least for Dn 13 (Sus) it is likely that he re-translated it, even though VL phrases are occasionally preserved.²⁸ In any case, the Greek additions (Dn 3:24–90, Dn 13 [Sus], and Dn 14 [Bel]) are of particular interest for this study, since they share the same source language as the other authors' citations. It is therefore from these sections that the examples have been drawn.²⁹

In Vulgate Dn 14 (Bel) Jerome consistently pairs σέβομαι | *colo* and προσκυνέω | *adoro*.³⁰ Even when the synonyms are used interchangeably in Greek, as in verses 3–4, their Latin equivalents are maintained. These verbal pairings seem to be the traditional language of the passage, retained by Jerome, in spite of the fact that

²³ Δουλεύω | *seruiō* at Dn 7:14 in LUC *par* 30 (253. 35); Dn 7:27 in LUC *par* 30 (254. 62). Cf. δουλεύω | *seruiō* at Mt 6:24 in TE *cor* 12. 4 (151). Λειτουργέω | *seruiō* at Dn 7:10 in LUC *par* 30 (253. 26).

²⁴ Cf. the literature in n. 21.

²⁵ It was especially Sus's status that caused him consternation. See ENGEL, H.: *Die Susanna-Erzählung: Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung*. Freiburg im Üechtland – Göttingen 1985, 24–26.

²⁶ On the dating, see TKACZ, C. B.: 'Labor Tam Utilis': The Creation of the Vulgate. *VChr* 50 (1996) 42–72, here 47 and 50; WILLIAMS, M. H.: *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship*. Chicago 2006, 282–283.

²⁷ For the sake of convenience I will refer to Jerome's translation of Dn as 'Vulgate', even though the term *vulgata* obviously did not apply at the time of composition.

²⁸ ZILVERBERG, K.: The Textual History of Old Latin Susanna (opusculum ad lectionem coram publico, Pontificium Institutum Biblicum). Romae 2017, 28–36; cf. HOBERG, G.: *De Sancti Hieronymi ratione interpretandi*. Friburgi Brisgoviae 1886, 38.

²⁹ I have consulted the two principal critical editions of Vulgate Dn-Sus-Bel. See MONACHI ABBA-TIAE PONTIFICIAE SANCTI HIERONYMI IN URBE (eds): *Liber Danihelis: Ex interpretatione sancti Hieronymi cum praefationibus et variis capitulorum seriebus*. Romae 1981; WEBER, R. – GRYSO, R. (eds): *Biblia sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem*. Stuttgart 2007⁵.

³⁰ Σέβομαι | *colo* at Dn 14:3–4 (Greek Bel 4–5); cf. Dn 14:26 (Greek Bel 27) τὰ σεβάσματα | *quae colebatis*. Προσκυνέω | *adoro* three times at Dn 14:3 (Greek Bel 4) and once per verse at Dn 14:23–24 (Greek Bel 24–25).

other Vulgate vocabulary in these verses departs from the extant VL versions.³¹ We find them in VL manuscript 176, Cyprian, and Irenaeus of Lyon.³²

Jerome employs the expected pairing εὐλογέω | *benedico*, although he combines it almost exclusively with the dative rather than the accusative, a choice in which he diverges from Cyprian and Lucifer.³³ He also follows tradition in pairing φοβέομαι | *timeo* at Dn 3:41 and 13:2, where it means 'to fear' in the Semitic sense, and might have been adapted as **colo* or similar.³⁴

Although we have just seen how Jerome sometimes maintained continuity with VL vocabulary, he elsewhere took the liberty of departing from it. Throughout Dn 3 he pairs ὑμνέω and *laudo*, whereas *hymnum dico* / *hymnum cano* is the VL translation and is rather well attested.³⁵ *Laudo*, it seems, is Jerome's innovation from a time when Latin was gaining in prominence and when one could start dispensing with the calque from Greek. It corresponds to his Vulgate pairing ὑμνητός | *laudabilis* in the same chapter.³⁶

Jerome likewise prefers *confiteor* over *exomologesisin facio*, and repeats this choice for its many occurrences in Dn 3. In fact, *exomologesis*, a well-established word in Christian literary Latin by Jerome's time, makes no appearance in his translations and revisions that make up most of the Vulgate.³⁷ Again, this must be due in part to the growth and the growing confidence of the Latin church, which would have included many faithful ignorant of Greek. Indeed, from the 5th century onward *exomologesis* is less frequently attested in Christian writings.

Let us consider one final Vulgate rendering: τόπος τοῦ καρπῶσαι | *locus primitiarum* (Dn 3:38). Whereas Cyprian's translation of *sacrifico* matched the Greek verb with a Latin one but lost the connotation of the 'fruits' offered, Jerome instead chooses to emphasize the notion of 'first fruits', thus foregoing a Latin verb altogether. In a verse charged with words for sacrifice, *holocaustum*, *sacrificium*, *oblatio*, and *incensum* – where *sacrificium* has already been used for θυσία (*hostia* for Cyprian) – Jerome is justified in drawing out the synonym implied by the Greek verb: *primitiae*. By adding to the list of synonyms he expands upon the rhetorical device already present.

³¹ The Vulgate is for instance less literal in its conjunctions and reads more smoothly than the extant VL versions of these verses.

³² Σέβομαι | *colo* and προσκυνέω | *adoro* at Bel 4–5 (Vulgate Dn 14:3–4) occur in VL 176, CY *ep* 58. 5 (327. 129), CY *Fo* 11 (204. 82), and IR 4. 5. 2 (428. 35).

³³ Dn 3:24, 26, 51–88, 90; 13:60 (Greek Sus 60). Dn 3:74 is an exception in its use of *benedico* with the accusative, according to the Stuttgart Vulgate; but the Roman edition has the dative (n. 29). On Cyprian and Lucifer, cf. pp. 449, 450.

³⁴ Cf. Tertullian's (n. 5) and Cyprian's (n. 21) rendering of φοβέομαι by *timeo*. One can find the same among Lucifer's biblical citations, e.g. Mal 3:16 in LUC *Ath* 1. 38 (65. 49); Dt 31:12 in LUC *Ath* 1. 9 (16. 9). All three Fathers pair φοβέομαι and *metuo* as well.

³⁵ Ὑμνέω | *laudo* at Dn 3:24, 51, 57–88, 90. On VL *hymnum dico* / *hymnum cano*, see n. 19.

³⁶ Dn 3:56. Cf. ὑπερυμνητός | *superlaudabilis* for Vulgate Dn 3:53–54 (Theodotonic Greek Dn 3:53, 55).

³⁷ Cf. FISCHER, B.: *Novae concordantiae Bibliorum sacrorum iuxta vulgatam versionem critice editam. II: D–G*. Stuttgart 1977.

Let us now take stock of the rich variety of verbs denoting or connoting divine worship, as attested by the four Fathers. Tertullian provided the widest variety, including terms like *appareo* and *famulor*, which are not present in Sus-Dn-Bel for the others. In a subsequent stage of the nascent Latin church we find Cyprian following Tertullian in his use of *exomologesin facio*, and we frequently encounter *seruio*. In the mid-4th century Lucifer writes *seruio* as the translation for two Greek verbs, and also *benedico Deum*, all in continuity with Cyprian. Toward the end of the century, Jerome both retains VL translations like *colo* and *adoro* of Dn 14 (Bel), and innovates by abandoning VL *hymnum dico* / *hymnum cano* in favor of a Latinate verb, *laudo*. The cultic verbs of Sus-Dn-Bel were in flux in the 3rd–4th centuries. At the end of that period Jerome staked out a course between continuity and innovation, which would eventually become the Latin church's standard and displace VL Sus-Dn-Bel. To some extent, however, the book's primitive Latin vocabulary lived on for many centuries in the Vulgate and in VL liturgical texts.

Kevin Zilverberg
University of Saint Thomas
The Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity
Saint Paul, Minnesota
USA
kjzilverberg@stthomas.edu