

Cicero's *Academica* and Jerome¹

Neil ADKIN

Cicero's plan to present the Latin-speaking public with a comprehensive survey of philosophical thought was inaugurated by the lost *Hortensius*, which constituted an exhortation to the subject. This work was then followed by the *Academica*, in which Cicero dealt with epistemology. The treatise circulated in two recensions. The first consisted of two books, entitled *Catulus* and *Lucullus* respectively, of which only the latter survives; besides the name *Lucullus* it also bears the designation *Academica Priora*. In the second recension, to which the title *Academica Posteriora* is assigned, the work was divided into four books; on the whole the wording of the first edition was reproduced faithfully². Most writers of late antiquity utilized this second recension³. The same is evidently true of Jerome himself⁴. However the extant text of the second recension breaks off before the end of book 1; it is accordingly necessary to have recourse to the *Lucullus* or *Academica Priora* in order to identify borrowings from the remainder of the work. The present article is

¹ Citation of classical and patristic works follows the method of *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index Librorum Scriptorum Inscriptionum*, Leipzig, 1990².

² Cf. J. S. Reid, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Academica*, London, 1885 (repr. Hildesheim, 1966), pp. 164-167.

³ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 38.

⁴ He quotes from the prologue; cf. H. Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers (Acta Univ. Gothoburg., 64.2)*, Göteborg, 1958, p. 174. In the words at issue Varro refers specifically to his own publications. He was introduced as an interlocutor only in the second edition; cf. J. S. Reid, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-35.

concerned with Jerome's debt to this portion of the *Academica*. Since he possessed no aptitude for philosophy⁵, the material Jerome appropriates is restricted to superficial items of striking phraseology⁶.

Lübeck began by registering two cases of imitation⁷. He identified the source of the first in *Academica Priora* 74: *...quin Socrati nihil sit visum sciri posse; exceptit unum tantum, scire se nihil se scire, nihil amplius*⁸. The following passages of Jerome were assumed by Lübeck to be indebted to this text: *Epist.* 53,9,1 (*socraticum illud inpletur in nobis: «hoc tantum scio, quod nescio»*); *In Is.* 4,10,5 l. 83 (*scio quod nesciam*); *In Ezech.* 42,1 ll. 128-130 (*socraticum illud assumens: «scio quid nesciam», pars enim scientiae est, scire quid nescias*)⁹; *In Abd. prol.* ll. 51-52 (*socraticum illud habeo: «scio, quod nesciam»*). Kunst then adduced three additional texts from the letters¹⁰: 53,7,3 (*nec hoc quidem scire, quod nescias*); 57,12,4 (*utinam socraticum illud haberemus: «scio, quod nescio»*)¹¹; 61,3 (*non parum est scire, quod nescias*). Finally Bartelink added three further passages from Jerome's other works¹²: *Adv. Rufin.* 1,17 (*ne illud quidem socraticum nosse debuerat: «scio quod nescio?»*)¹³; *Tract. in psalm.* II p. 427 l. 82 (*hoc scito, quod nescias*); *ibid.* p. 427 ll. 87-88 (*si scias hoc ipsum, quod nescias, nonne magis tibi plus videris scire?*).

⁵ Cf. the present writer, «Some Features of Jerome's Compositional Technique in the *Libellus de Virginitate Servanda* (*Epist.* 22)», in *Philologus*, 136, 1992, 234-255, pp. 252-253.

⁶ For the same phenomenon elsewhere cf. the present writer, «Tertullian's *De Ieiunio* and Jerome's *Libellus de Virginitate Servanda* (*Epist.* 22)», in *Wien. Stud.*, 104, 1991, 149-160, pp. 159-160.

⁷ E. Lübeck, *Hieronymus Quos Noverit Scriptores et ex Quibus Hauserit*, Leipzig, 1872, pp. 140-141.

⁸ Lübeck also refers in a footnote (for «4» read «1») to *Academica Posteriora* 16, which he does not regard as worthy of quotation: *ita disputat (sc. Socrates) ut...nihil se scire dicat nisi id ipsum, eoque praestare ceteris, quod illi quae nesciant scire se putent, ipse se nihil scire id unum sciat.*

⁹ *quid* is the reading adopted by F. Glorie, *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentariorum in Hiezechielem Libri XIV* (CC, 75), Turnhout, 1964, p. 609. It would seem however that *quod* should be preferred in both places; cf. P. Lardet, *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri...Contra Rufinum* (CC, 79), Turnhout, 1982, p. 136.

¹⁰ C. Kunst, *De S. Hieronymi Studiis Ciceronianis* (*Diss. Philol. Vindob.*, 12), Vienna-Leipzig, 1918, pp. 192-193.

¹¹ Here an echo had already been posited by I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, I (CSEL, 54), Vienna-Leipzig, 1910, p. 525.

¹² G. J. M. Bartelink, *Hieronymus: Liber de Optimo Genere Interpretandi* (*Epistula* 57): *Ein Kommentar* (*Mnem. Suppl.*, 61), Leiden, 1980, pp. 115-116.

¹³ This text had already been adduced by H. Hagendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 176 and 288.

Kunst observed that this formulation goes back ultimately to Plato (*Apol.* 21b; 21d; 23b); however he dismissed the possibility that Jerome was drawing directly on these Platonic texts¹⁴. Kunst accordingly followed Lübeck in positing a debt to both *Academica Priora* 74 and *Academica Posteriora* 16. The same pair of texts was also adduced by Bartelink. Hilberg on the other hand compared only the first of these passages, which is the one Lübeck had actually quoted in the body of his text, while relegating the other to a mere reference in a footnote¹⁵. Similarly *Academica Priora* 74 is the only passage cited in this connection in Hagendahl's comprehensive study of Jerome's borrowings from the classics¹⁶. This text alone is also adduced regularly in the annotated translations of *Epist.* 53,9,1 and 57,12,4¹⁷.

More recently however Perrin has maintained that in these passages Jerome is in fact borrowing from Lactantius: altogether six Lactantian texts are assembled¹⁸. Most recently of all Lardet has presented a whole array of passages from a number of writers to whom Jerome is supposed to be indebted for this formulation: while in his edition of the *Adversus Rufinum* Lardet had still been content to refer merely to *Academica Priora* 74¹⁹, in his recent

¹⁴ The reason Kunst gave was the following: «Hieronymum autem ipsum Platonem non legisse cum norimus» (p. 192). Such an assumption would seem however to be unwarranted; cf. the present writer, «Plato or Plautus? (Jerome, *Epist.* 22,30,2)», in *Emerita*, 62, 1994, 43-56. On the other hand Plato's formulations in the passages at issue here do not match Jerome's own; direct borrowing can therefore be discounted.

¹⁵ I. Hilberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 462 and 525 (on *Epist.* 53,9,1 and 57,12,4 respectively).

¹⁶ H. Hagendahl, *op. cit.*, pp. 176 and 288.

¹⁷ So L. Schade, *Des hl. Kirchenväters Eusebius Hieronymus ausgewählte Briefe*, II (*Bibl. d. Kirchenväter*, 2.18), Munich, 1937 (repr. Nendeln, 1968), pp. 259 (n. 2) and 286 (n. 2); J. Labourt, *Saint Jérôme: Lettres*, III, Paris, 1953, pp. 22 (n. 2) and 72; S. Cola, *San Girolamo: Le lettere*, II, Rome, 1962, pp. 31 (n. 68) and 91 (n. 53). Reference is also made only to *Academica Priora* 74 by M. Adriaen, *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri...Commentarii in Prophetas Minores* (CC, 76), Turnhout, 1969, p. 350 (on *In Abd. prol.* ll. 51-52).

¹⁸ M. Perrin, «Jérôme lecteur de Lactance», in Y.-M. Duval (ed.), *Jérôme entre l'Occident et l'Orient*, Paris, 1988, 99-114, p. 112 with n. 74. The passages of Lactantius in question are *Inst.* 3,28,17 (*confessio illa Socratis...qua se nihil scire dixit nisi hoc unum, quod nihil sciat*); 3,30,6 (*an expectabimus, donec Socrates aliquid sciat?*); *Epit.* 32,1 (*se fatebatur [sc. Socrates] unum scire, quod nihil sciret*); 35,3 (*mitto Socraten, cuius est nota sententia*); *Ira* 1,6 (*Socrates...ait se nihil scire nisi unum, quod nihil sciret*); 1,8 (*si ergo nulla est sapientia humana, ut Socrates docuit*). Perrin might have added *Epit.* 32,5: *pronuntiavit (sc. Socrates) quod nihil scierit*.

¹⁹ P. Lardet, *op. cit.*, p. 15 (on 1,17). This Ciceronian passage had also been the only one cited in the same author's dissertation, *S. Jérôme: Apologie contre Rufin; Commentaire du livre premier*, II, Paris, 1980, p. 240 (*ad loc.*).

commentary on the same work he adduces no fewer than four texts of Cicero together with passages of Lactantius and Minucius Felix²⁰. Besides *Academica Priora* 74 and *Academica Posteriora* 16 reference is now made as well to section 44 of the latter treatise and to *Laelius* 7²¹. While the Lactantian texts in question are those already quoted by Perrin, Lardet is the first to cite Minucius Felix 13,2 (*quod nihil se scire didicisset* [sc. *Socrates*]). He might have added 38,5: *Socrates...nihil se scire confessus*²².

The accumulation of so many passages in an attempt to account for Jerome's formulation is however unnecessary. It would appear possible to show that he has in fact been inspired by just one specific text. Here the point may be made that all the passages so far adduced from Cicero, Lactantius and Minucius Felix employ the phrase *nihil scire*²³. Jerome on the other hand invariably uses the verb *nescire* instead: *scio quod nescio*. The passage of *Academica Posteriora* 16 which Lübeck dismissed in a footnote continues as follows: *ob eamque rem se arbitrari ab Apolline omnium sapientissimum esse dictum, quod haec esset una hominis sapientia, non arbitrarari sese scire quod nesciat*. Here the collocation *scire quod nesciat* stands conspicuously at the end of a very long period. The locution is further highlighted by the striking

²⁰ P. Lardet, *L'Apologie de Jérôme contre Rufin: Un commentaire* (Suppl. to *Vig. Christ.*, 15), Leiden, 1993, p. 86 (on 1,17).

²¹ *Academica Posteriora* 44 runs: *quae (sc. res) ad confessionem ignorationis adduxerant Socratem et iam ante Socratem...omnes paene veteres, qui...nihil sciri posse dixerunt*. It would have been more pertinent to cite the next section of this work (45), which reads: *ne illud quidem ipsum quod Socrates sibi reliquisset, ut nihil scire se sciret*. The words *ut...sciret* are omitted by some MSS and the older editions; cf. O. Plasberg, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Paradoxa Stoicorum, Academicorum Reliquiae cum Lucullo, Timaeus, De Natura Deorum, De Divinatione, De Fato*, 1, Leipzig, 1908, p. 56 (*ad loc.*). The passage of the *Laelius* to which Lardet refers is scarcely germane: *eum (sc. Socratem) quidem etiam Apollinis oraculo sapientissimum iudicatum*.

²² Mention might also have been made of Hilary, *In psalm.* 61,2, where a survey of pagan philosophy had concluded as follows: *postremo cum...maxime...prudentes unum hoc se scire, id est, nihil horum hominem scire docuissent*. Jerome was certainly familiar with this text, since he had copied Hilary's commentary on the Psalms with his own hand (cf. *Epist.* 5,2,3), while Psalm 61 formed part of the truncated version of the commentary known to him (cf. *Vir. ill.* 100). Finally attention may also be drawn to an occurrence of the same dictum in a work somewhat later than Jerome: Paschasius of Dume, *Verb. patr. praef.* (*scire enim me quod nihil sciam non audeo dicere, ne verbum hoc, propter hoc verbum, sapientissimo Socrati subripiam*).

²³ The same is also true of the texts from Hilary and Paschasius cited in the previous note.

adnominatio (*scire/nescire*). It was precisely such arresting phrases which stuck in Jerome's retentive mind for later redeployment in his own works²⁴. Cicero's impressive formulation at the end of this sentence in *Academica Posteriora* 16 would accordingly appear to have prompted Jerome's own use of precisely the same wording throughout his *oeuvre*²⁵.

Lübeck's second instance of imitation occurs in Jerome's commentary on Ezekiel at 9,9 ll. 617-619: *ex quo discimus, non, ut plerique aestimant et maxime Stoici, paria esse peccata*. Here Lübeck asserted that Jerome was indebted to *Academica Priora* 133: *placet Stoicis omnia peccata esse paria*. Hagendahl does not register this passage of the Ezekiel commentary as a borrowing from Cicero; however in discussing another text of Jerome (*Adv. Pelag.* 1,20: *paria contententes esse peccata [sc. Stoici]*), Hagendahl does refer to the same sentence of *Academica Priora*²⁶. Moreover this Ciceronian passage is explicitly identified by Hagendahl as the source of no fewer than five statements of the same idea in Augustine²⁷. Testard has expressed misgivings about tracing all these Augustinian passages back to *Academica Priora* 133²⁸; yet while alleging the banality of the concept as his reason for scepticism, Testard failed to adduce any further instances of it in support. However reference can now be made to Keudel's article on *peccatum* in the *Thesaurus*, which offers exemplification from Horace and one of his commentators as well as from other works of Cicero²⁹. In the light of this

²⁴ Cf. the present writer, *artt. citt.* (nn. 5 and 6), *passim*. It is immaterial that in Cicero the *quod* is a relative pronoun, while in Jerome the same word serves as a conjunction: for such syntactic modification of Ciceronian phraseology by Jerome cf. the present writer, «*Hieronymus Ciceronianus: The Catilinarians in Jerome*», in *Latomus*, 51, 1992, 408-420, pp. 419-420.

²⁵ On Jerome's partiality for *Selbstzitate* in which the phraseology at issue has in the first instance been appropriated from elsewhere cf. the present writer, «*Falling Asleep over a Book: Jerome, Letter 60,11,2*», in *Eos*, 81, 1993, 227-230.

²⁶ H. Hagendahl, *op. cit.*, p. 262 with n. 2.

²⁷ H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics*, I (*Stud. Graec. Lat. Gothoburg.*, 20.1), Göteborg, 1967, pp. 68-69. The texts of Augustine are *Epist.* 104,13; 104,14; 104,15; 104,17; *C. mend.* 15,31.

²⁸ M. Testard, «*Saint Augustin et Cicéron: A propos d'un ouvrage récent*», in *Rev. Et. Aug.*, 14, 1968, 47-67, p. 55. In particular he objected to Hagendahl's identification of this passage of *Academica Priora* as the inspiration for *C. mend.* 15,31.

²⁹ U. Keudel, art. *pecco (peccatum)*, in *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, 10.1, fasc. 6 (1991), 885,5 - 901,8, col. 894,5-21. Though mentioning Augustine, she does not adduce any text of Jerome; to the two passages discussed above can be added *Adv. Iovin.* 2,21 (*omnia peccata sunt paria [ibid. Stoicus]*).

additional evidence there would accordingly appear to be no grounds for supposing that Jerome is specifically indebted to *Academica Priora* 133 after all.

If then it turns out that Jerome is not in fact borrowing from either of the two passages in the *Academica Priora* to which Lübeck posited a debt, evidence can be adduced to show that he has appropriated material from other sections of this work. Plasberg was the next scholar to suggest a specific imitation³⁰. This time the text in question is Jerome's letter to Oceanus, which recalls the writer's involvement in a quibbling disceptation at Rome. Here his opponent's reaction is described as follows: *primum spinosulus noster obmutuit* (*Epist.* 69,2,5). Plasberg maintained that Jerome's use of the term *spinosulus* had been inspired by *Academica Priora* 143: *quid duo vel principes dialecticorum Antipater et Archidemus spinosissimi homines nonne multis in rebus dissentiunt?* Plasberg's view has been ignored by all subsequent investigators.

The reading *spinosissimi* in the Ciceronian text is Hermann's conjecture for the *opinosissimi* or *opinosissimi* of the MSS³¹. Though *opinosus* is attested in Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4,35 p. 540,22), its employment here appears to be at odds with the context: *dissentio* among *opinosissimi* is unremarkable. Hermann's emendation has been rejected by Halm³² and Reid³³; only Plasberg adopts it. Kunst then proceeded to note in connection with the epistle to Oceanus that Jerome's use of *spinosulus* could be paralleled from several passages of Cicero³⁴. On the other hand it may be

³⁰ O. Plasberg, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

³¹ K. F. Hermann, «Beiträge zur Kritik von Cicero's *Lucullus*», in *Philologus*, 7, 1852, 466-476, p. 475.

³² C. Halm in J. C. Orelli, J. G. Baiter, C. Halm, *M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera*, IV, Zurich, 1861, p. 54. He proposed instead *ingeniosissimi*.

³³ J. S. Reid, *op. cit.*, p. 344. While finding *spinosissimi* plausible, he preferred to defend the reading of the MSS. *copiosissimi* was then suggested by H. Deiter, «Kritische Bemerkungen zu Ciceros philosophischen Schriften», in *Philologus*, 46, 1888, 174-177, p. 176.

³⁴ C. Kunst, *op. cit.*, p. 198. The texts at issue are *Fin.* 3,3 (*quam sit subtile vel spinosum potius disserendi genus*); *Tusc.* 1,16 (*haec enim spinosiora, prius ut confitear me cogunt quam ut adsentiar*); *De orat.* 1,83 (*haec erat spinosa quaedam et exilis oratio*); *Orat.* 114 (*qui dialectici dicuntur spinosiora multa pepererunt*). Kunst does not mention Hermann's conjecture at *Academica Priora* 143. In his discussion of this passage J. S. Reid, *op. cit.*, p. 344, had referred as well to *Fin.* 4,6 (*hominum non spinas vellentium, ut Stoici*); 4,79 (*disserendi spinas*); *Tusc.* 4,9 (*spinis partiendi et definiendi*).

observed that none of the texts adduced in this regard applies the term *spinosus* to a person; this point had been noted by Hermann as a possible obstacle to his emendation. The objection is however invalidated by the letter to Oceanus, which employs the adjective in exactly the same way. This particular usage would appear to be unattested elsewhere³⁵. It may accordingly be concluded that Jerome's *spinosulus* is likely to have been suggested by *Academica Priora* 143³⁶.

In Jerome's account of the same logomachic disputation at Rome in the epistle to Oceanus he speaks of himself in the following terms: *recordatus Chrysippeï sophismatis: «si mentiris idque verum dicis, mentiris»* (*Epist.* 69,2,4). In a review of the first volume of Hilberg's edition Weyman identified Jerome's source as *Academica Priora* 95: «*si te mentiri dicis idque verum dicis, mentiris*»³⁷. More recently however Hagendahl has referred instead to *Academica Priora* 96: «*si dicis te mentiri verumque dicis, mentiris; dicis autem te mentiri verumque dicis; mentiris igitur*»...*haec Chrysippea sunt*³⁸. It would appear possible to show that in fact Jerome had both passages in mind. On the one hand his formulation of the second clause of the sophism itself exactly matches that of *Academica Priora* 95: *idque verum dicis*³⁹. On the other Jerome's use of the adjective *Chrysippeus* in the prefatory phrase has evidently been inspired by the occurrence of the same term in ch. 96: only one other instance of this word is attested⁴⁰.

³⁵ Other Fathers apply *spinosus* to persons, but without reference to dialectics. The earliest instances of this quite different use of the word would seem to be Augustine, *Serm.* 137,13 (*sic ergo illi spinosi sunt*; *ibid.* Mt. 7,16 *numquid colligunt de spinis uvas*) and Cassian, *C. Nest.* 7,21,4 (*Pelagianae haereseos spinosa suboles*; here too there is an antecedent allusion to Mt. 7,16). Both are later than the epistle to Oceanus.

³⁶ Two further points may be made. In the first place Cicero employs the adjective very near the conclusion of the treatise; for Jerome's habit of appropriating impressive phraseology from the closing sections of a work cf. P. Petitmengin, «Saint Jérôme et Tertullien», in Y.-M. Duval, *op. cit.*, 43-59, p. 50 («c'est-à-dire aux passages qui restent le mieux graves dans la mémoire»). Secondly another borrowing from the *Academica Priora* occurs within a mere ten lines of the present passage of the letter to Oceanus; it will be discussed next.

³⁷ C. Weyman, rev. of I. Hilberg, *op. cit.*, in *Wochenschr. f. Klass. Philol.*, 27, 1910, 1003-1013, col. 1012.

³⁸ H. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 185 (n. 2), 214 and 288.

³⁹ *Academica Priora* 96 has merely *verumque dicis*. The wording of ch. 95 supplies corroboration for Hilberg's choice of *W*'s reading *idque*.

⁴⁰ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, *Onomasticon*, 2, col. 422,67-70. The passage in question is Maximus of Madaura, *Aug. epist.* 16,3.

Hagendahl also noted the presence of the same sophistical argument in another passage of Jerome: *Tract. in psalm.* I p. 241 ll. 45-46 (*si mentiris, et verum dicis quod mentiris: ergo mentiris*). He did not observe that Jerome repeats this quibble shortly afterwards: *si mentiris, et verum dicis hoc ipsum quod mentiris: ergo mentiris* (*ibid.* p. 241 ll. 47-48). Hagendahl also fails to elucidate the interrelationship between the imitation he identifies in the tractates on the Psalms and the other occurrences of the same sophism in Jerome and Cicero. These tractates are later than the epistle to Oceanus⁴¹. While chapters 95 and 96 of *Academica Priora* both employ an indirect statement in the conditional clause⁴², each passage of the tractates follows Jerome's letter in saying simply *si mentiris*⁴³. It would accordingly appear that here we have another instance of self-imitation in which the idea has come initially from a different author⁴⁴. Hagendahl is therefore wrong to imply that in the tractates on the Psalms Jerome is borrowing directly from the *Academica Priora*.

The second volume of Hilberg's edition of Jerome's letters pointed to the last passage of *Academica Priora* that has so far been identified as leaving its trace on his *oeuvre*. In epistle 84,4,1 Jerome remarks: *iurem? ridebunt et dicent: «domi nobis ista nascuntur»*. Here Hilberg refers to *Academica Priora* 80, *Ad Familiares* 9,3,2 and Tacitus, *Dialogus* 9,3⁴⁵. All three passages contain the phrase *domi nasci*; Hofmann's article on *domus* in the *Thesaurus* adds two more⁴⁶. However only *Academica Priora* 80 offers

⁴¹ The letter was written between 397 and 400; cf. F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme: Sa vie et son oeuvre*, I.2 (*Spic. Sacr. Lovan.*, 2), Louvain-Paris, 1922, p. 159. The tractates belong «entre 401 et 410» according to G. Morin, *Etudes, textes, découvertes*, Maredsous-Paris, 1913, p. 234.

⁴² Ch. 95: *si te mentiri dicis*; ch. 96: *si dicis te mentiri*.

⁴³ In the tractates the second half of the formulation undergoes a slight expansion. Whereas the epistle to Oceanus had continued with the succinct statement *idque verum dicis, mentiris*, the tractates adopt a more ample form of expression: *et verum dicis quod mentiris: ergo mentiris* / *et verum dicis hoc ipsum quod mentiris: ergo mentiris*. The addition of [*hoc ipsum*] *quod mentiris* and *ergo* is evidently intended to facilitate understanding by the popular audience to which the tractates were addressed; on its make-up cf. P. Jay, «Jérôme à Bethléem: Les *Tractatus in psalmos*», in Y.-M. Duval, *op. cit.*, 367-380, p. 379 («ce public disparate de moines et de paysans»).

⁴⁴ Cf. n. 25 above. For further exemplification in the tractates cf. the present writer, «Tertullian's *De Idololatria* and Jerome Again», in *Mnemosyne*, 49, 1996, 46-52.

⁴⁵ I. Hilberg, *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, II (CSEL, 55), Vienna-Leipzig, 1912, p. 125.

⁴⁶ J.-B. Hofmann, art. *domus*, in *Thes. Ling. Lat.*, 5, 1949, 20 - 1988, 29, col. 1957, 33-39. The additional texts are Seneca, *Epist.* 23,3 and Cicero, *Att.* 1,19,3. The *Thesaurus* article on *nasci* has not yet appeared.

exactly the same wording as Jerome's letter: *domi nobis ista nascuntur*⁴⁷. It is accordingly clear that Jerome is directly indebted to this text of the *Academica Priora*: the other passages adduced by Hilberg in his *apparatus fontium* can be discounted.

Hagendahl was again able to cite further evidence; this time he added two passages⁴⁸. The first was *Adversus Pelagianos* 1,15, where Jerome declares: *verum audi quid idem dicat orator tuus: «desine communibus locis: domi nobis ista nascuntur»*⁴⁹. Hagendahl's second text of Jerome is *Contra Luciferianos* 4, which reproduces only the first half of the formulation at *Academica Priora* 80: the Ciceronian *et desine quaeso communibus locis* is cited here with slight modification as *verum desine quaeso a communibus locis*. Once again Hagendahl's material can be supplemented. In his study of Augustine's debt to the classics he failed to register the echo of these same words at *Epist.* 87,10: *desine ergo locis communibus exaggerare facta hominum*⁵⁰. The addressee of this letter had enjoyed a liberal education⁵¹: evidently therefore Augustine's correspondent was meant to recognize the allusion. It would accordingly appear that this text of the *Academica Priora* was more widely current than has been hitherto supposed.

One further passage can be identified in which Jerome borrows from Cicero's *Academica Priora*: it has so far escaped notice. At the start of his *Vita Hilarionis* Jerome makes the following statement: *porro mihi tanti ac talis viri conversatio vitaeque dicenda est, ut Homerus quoque, si adesset, vel invideret materiae vel succumberet* (1,4). The idea to which Jerome gives

⁴⁷ All the other passages are rather different: Cic., *Fam.* 9,3,2 (*cuius domi nascuntur*); Tac., *Dial.* 9,3 (*hi enim Basso domi nascuntur*); Sen., *Epist.* 23,3 (*volo illam [sc. laetitiam] tibi domi nasci*); Cic., *Att.* 1,19,3 (*cum haec domi nascantur*).

⁴⁸ H. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 106, 170 (n. 3), 262-263 and 288.

⁴⁹ Hagendahl fails to record that this echo had already been identified by O. Plasberg, *op. cit.*, p. 111 (on *Acad. ad loc.*). In addition Hagendahl variously misquotes *Adv. Pelag.* 1,15 as «1,14» and «1,17»; in referring to «1,14» he has evidently been misled by *PL* 23 (1845), col. 506, which erroneously gives two consecutive ch. 14's, of which the latter is really ch. 15.

⁵⁰ H. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 27). The imitation is also overlooked by M. Testard, *Saint Augustin et Cicéron*, II, Paris, 1958.

⁵¹ Augustine stresses the point at both the beginning and end of the epistle: 87,1 (*ego cum audio quemquam bono ingenio praeditum doctrinisque liberalibus eruditum*); 87,10 (*quem auidivi...bonum et liberaliter instructum*). The second passage occurs immediately before the citation of Cicero.

expression here is a commonplace. He employs it elsewhere in his own *oeuvre*⁵². Several medieval examples had already been adduced by Pannenberg⁵³. Their number was then augmented by Curtius in a series of studies⁵⁴. However it is possible to assemble a considerable number of additional instances⁵⁵.

⁵² Cf. *Epist.* 60,16,5 (*alioquin ad haec merito explicanda et Thucydides et Sallustius muti sunt*); 130,6,1 (*ad explicandam incredibilis gaudii magnitudinem et Tulliani fluvius siccaretur ingenii et contortae Demosthenis vibrataeque sententiae tardius languidiusque ferrentur*). On the first of these passages J. H. D. Scourfield, *Consoling Heliodorus: A Commentary on Jerome, Letter 60*, Oxford, 1993, p. 216, compares only one other author: Sidonius, *Epist.* 5,13,3 (*sed explicandae bestiae tali nec oratorum princeps Marcus Arpinas nec poetarum Publius Mantuanus sufficere possunt*). For the source of Jerome's wording in the second cf. the present writer, «Cicero's *Orator* and Jerome», in *Vig. Christ.*, 51, 1997, 25-39, p. 27.

⁵³ A. Pannenberg, «Über den *Ligurinus*», in *Forsch. z. deutsch. Gesch.*, 11, 1871, 161-300, pp. 199-200.

⁵⁴ E. R. Curtius, «Dichtung und Rhetorik im Mittelalter», in *Deutsch. Vierteljahrsschr.*, 16, 1938, 435-475, pp. 471-472; *id.*, «Zur Literarästhetik des Mittelalters II», in *Zeitschr. f. roman. Philol.*, 58, 1938, 129-232, p. 165; *id.*, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern-Munich, 1967⁶, p. 168 with n. 7. In the last of these passages Curtius is wrong to state that «Benzo von Alba...bietet die reichste Ausgestaltung des topos durch Häufung von Autoren, die versagt haben würden». More writers are enumerated by Ermoldus Nigellus, *In hon. Hludowici* 1,17-22, ed. E. Dümmler (*MGH Poet.*, 2), p. 5; reference had already been made to this text by A. Pannenberg, *art. cit.*, p. 199.

⁵⁵ *Viz.* Ovid, *Trist.* 1,1,47-48 (*da mihi Maeoniden et tot circumspice casus, ingenium tantis excidet omne malis*); Statius, *Silv.* 4,2,8-10 (*non si pariter mihi vertice laeto nectat odoratas et Zmyrna et Mantua lauros, digna loquar*); Silius Italicus 4,525-527 (*non, mihi Maeoniae redeat si gloria linguae...tot caedes proferre queam*); Sulpicius Severus, *Mart.* 26,2-3 (*illam scilicet perseverantiam...non si ipse, ut aiunt, ab inferis Homerus emergeret, posset exponere*); Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epist.* 5,17,1 (*mihi assignas quae vix Maroni aut Homero competenter accommodarentur*); Alcimus Avitus, *Carm.* 3,335-337 (*non cui...ferrea vox est, enumerare queat, nec si, quem Mantua misit, Maeoniusve canant diversa voce poetae*); *Epistulae Austrasicae* 13,5 (*in cuius laudem vix sufficere poterat eloquentia Maroniana*); Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm.* 8,18,5 (*munificumque patrem aequaret nec musa Maronis*); Ps. Venantius Fortunatus, *Carm. app.* 3,8-10 (*Tullius atque Maro veniant, sit lingua facunda...non tua...poterunt depromere gesta*); Aldhelm, *Virginit.* 29, ed. R. Ehwald (*MGH Auct. Ant.*, 15), p. 266,5-6 (*ut Homerum quoque, si ab inferis emergeret, vel invidere materiae dicat [sc. Hieronymus] vel succumbere*); Thegan of Trier, *Vita Hludowici* 44, ed. G. H. Pertz (*MGH Script.*, 2), p. 600,13-15 (*si aliquis fuisset, qui poetico carmine omnia facinora tua rimari voluisset, forsitan Smirnamum [sic] vatem, vetustum Homerum, Mincianumque Maronem cum Ovidio superare potuisset*); Lupus of Ferrières, *Epist.* 44, ed. E. Dümmler (*MGH Epist.*, 6), p. 52,15-18 (*nisi...comperissem, etiamsi Virgilius revivisceret et totas tripartiti operis vires movendis quorundam cordibus expenderet, nec lectionem quidem praesentium adepturum*);

It is highly significant that in this very extensive assemblage of material there is not a single passage which follows Jerome in speaking of the poet's «presence»; the avoidance of this notion is all the more remarkable, since several of the texts are evidently borrowing directly from the *Vita Hilarionis*⁵⁶. Such imitation of Jerome's wording is especially pronounced in

Odilo of Soissons, *Transl. Sebastiani praef.*, ed. O. Holder-Egger (*MGH Script.*, 15.1), p. 379,21-22 (*quod quidem nec ipse, si, vulgo ut aiunt, Homerus emergeret, explere posset*); Flodoard of Reims, *De triumph. Christi et ss. Palaest.* 1,19 (*PL*, 135), coll. 499^c-500^c (*quae Maeonium valeant evincere vatem materia, quin et nostrum superare Maronem*); Widukind of Corvey, *Res gestae Saxon.* 3,74, edd. P. Hirsch and H.-E. Lohmann (*MGH Script. Rer. Germ.*), p. 151,9-10 (*facundia Homeri vel Maronis michi si adesset, non sufficeret*); Adso of Montier-en-Der, *Vita Basoli praef.* 1 (*PL*, 137), col. 643^B (*cui etiamsi, ut gentilium figmenta referunt, Homerus aut Tullius Cicero rediret ab inferis, non posset verbis includere omne...opus divinae virtutis*); Gerhardus Sevensis, ed. P. Jaffé (*Bibl. rer. Germ.*, 5), p. 483 ll. 52-54 (*non Maro cum lepidus nec dicax posset Homerus texere multiplices laudabilis urbis honores, horum si vita potuisset surgere tanta*); Ps. Hildebert of Lavardin, *Carm.* (*PL*, 171), col. 1452^C (*alter Homerus ero, vel eodem maior Homero, tot classes numero scribere si potero*); *id.*, *De invent. s. crucis* (*PL*, 171), col. 1321^A (*quantis mereatur laudibus efferi dubitat Maro posse referri*); *ibid.* coll. 1321^C-1322^A (*vim penetrare crucis Socratem si forte reducis, non poterit Socrates, sed nec Maro pandere vates*); Radulf of Caen, *Gesta Tancredi praef.* (*RHC Occid.*, 3), p. 604 (*quippe quum huc vix Maronis pertingant vertices*); *Historia Compostellana* 2,42,7, ed. E. Falque Rey (*CC CM*, 70), p. 292 ll. 214-215 (*quanta letitia in universis fuerit, Maronis facundia referendo subcumberet*); *ibid.* 2,68,1 p. 364 ll. 11-12 (*si Maronica vel Tulliana facundia mihi inesset, minime ad id sufficere posset*); William of Malmesbury, *Gest. reg. Angl.* 5 *praef.*, ed. W. Stubbs (*RS*, 90.2), p. 465 (*vix haec auderet vel Cicero in prosa...vel si quis versuum favore Mantuanum lacessit poetam*); Gilo of Paris, *Hist. Hierosol.* 2,374-375 (*RHC Occid.*, 5), p. 748 (*non Maro, non Macer quid ibi Tancretius acer fecerit exprimerent*); Suger, *Vita Ludovici VI. Grossi* 32, ed. H. Waquet (*CHF*, 11), p. 266 (*quantus...dolor...patrem...affecerit, nec ipse Omerus elicere sufficeret*); Balderich of Trier, *Gesta Alberonis* 16, ed. G. Waitz (*MGH Script.*, 8), p. 252,42-43 (*haec viribus Homeri sufficiens esset materia, si tamen ipse materiae sufficeret*); *Analecta Hymnica* 21 no. 87 st. 1,9-10, ed. G. M. Dreves, p. 59 (*nec si Maro viveret, digno referret ore*); Aelred of Rievaulx, *Geneal. reg. Angl.* (*PL*, 195), col. 731^A (*cum...et Virgilianus vel etiam Homericus sub tanta materia sensus deficeret*); Stephen of Tournai, *Epist.* 273, ed. J. Desilve, p. 343 (*cui [sc. oneri] non sufficeret Virgiliana gravitas aut levitas Ovidiana*); Peter of Blois, *Epist.* 66 (*PL*, 207), col. 197^A (*ad hoc enim satis insufficiens videretur Mantuani vena ingenii*); *ibid.* col. 202^A (*crederemque sub tanta sudare materia Tullium aut Maronem*); Gilbert of Gembloux, *Epist.* 48, ed. A. Derolez (*CC CM*, 66A), p. 468 ll. 203-205 (*nec, si ipse, inquit [sc. Sulpicius Severus], ut aiunt, ab inferis Homerus emergeret, posset exponere*); Ricardus, *Pass. s. Kat.* 4,331-332, ed. A. P. Orbán (*CC CM*, 119), p. 214 (*quis satis exploret, faciem qua luce coloret...? nec Homerus, sed neque Maro*).

⁵⁶ The passage of Aldhelm cited in the previous note reproduces Jerome's wording *verbatim* except for the expression *si adesset*, which is replaced by the phrase *si ab inferis*

the case of Sulpicius Severus himself⁵⁷. Despite their substantial debt to the *Vita Hilarionis* all these authors had very good reason for avoiding Jerome's *Homerus...si adesset*. In the first place Homer's «presence» is hardly *ad rem*:

emergeret of Sulpicius Severus' *Vita Martini*. Widukind does employ the *si adesset* of the *Vita Hilarionis*; however it is noteworthy that Jerome's *Homerus* at the beginning of the clause is changed to *facundia Homeri*. Though Adso would also seem to be echoing Jerome's *materiae...succumberet* in the words immediately preceding his mention of Homer (*materiae...succumbimus*), he too appears to be drawing instead on Sulpicius for the description of the poet himself: *etiamsi...Homerus...rediret ab inferis*. Finally it may be observed that the references to Homer in Odilo, Gilbert and Walafrid Strabo all make use of Sulpicius' formulation, not Jerome's; for Walafrid cf. E. R. Curtius, *art. cit.* («Literarästhetik»), p. 165.

⁵⁷ The borrowings can be shown to be far more extensive than has hitherto been assumed. Both passages may be cited in full. Jerome expresses himself as follows:

Scripturus vitam beati Hilarionis habitatorem eius invoco
spiritum sanctum, ut qui illi virtutes largitus est, mihi ad
narrandas eas sermonem tribuat, ut facta dictis exaequantur.
eorum enim, qui fecere, virtus, ut ait Crispus, tanta habetur
5 quantum eam verbis potuere extollere praeclara ingenia.
Alexander Magnus Macedo, quem vel aes vel pardum vel hircum
caprarum Daniel vocat, cum ad Achillis tumulum pervenisset:
«felicem te», ait, «o juvenis, qui magno frueris praecone
meritorum», Homerum videlicet significans. Porro mihi tanti ac
10 talis viri conversatio vitaeque dicenda est, ut Homerus quoque,
si adesset, vel invideret materiae vel succumberet. (1,1-4)

Sulpicius' *Vita Martini* runs:

sed iam finem liber postulat...quia nos, ut inertes poetae
extremo in opere neglegentes, victi materiae mole succumbimus.
nam etsi facta illius explicari verbis utcumque potuerunt,
interiorem vitam illius et conversationem cotidianam et animum
5 caelo semper intentum nulla umquam, vere profiteor, nulla
explicabit oratio. illam scilicet perseverantiam et
temperamentum in abstinentia et in ieiuniis, potentiam in
vigiliis et orationibus, noctesque ab eo perinde ac dies
actas, nullumque vacuum ab opere dei tempus, quo vel otio
10 indulserit vel negotio, sed ne cibo quidem aut somno, nisi
quantum naturae necessitas coegit, vere fatebor, non si ipse,
ut aiunt, ab inferis Homerus emergeret, posset exponere; adeo
omnia maiora in Martino sunt, quam ut verbis concipi queant.
(26,1-3)

he had not witnessed in person the events of the Trojan war either. Secondly the context calls instead for mention of the poet's revivescence; such a reference occurs frequently elsewhere⁵⁸. Why then should Jerome have chosen to employ such an unnatural form of expression as *Homerus...si adesset?*

An echo of the *Vita Hilarionis* in Sulpicius' specific reference to Homer is posited with some circumspection by J. Fontaine, *Sulpice Sévère: Vie de S. Martin*, III (SC, 135), Paris, 1969, p. 1090 («il paraît difficile de ne pas voir ici un hommage au maître de Bethléem»). In his note on the same Sulpician passage Smit merely observes non-committally that «è un motivo che ricorre anche in Girolamo, *VHil. praef.*» (C. Mohrmann, A. A. R. Bastiaensen, J. W. Smit, L. Canali and C. Moreschini, *Vita di Martino, Vita di Ilarione, In memoria di Paola [Vite dei Santi, 4]*, Milan, 1975, p. 286), while the relevant text of the *Vita Hilarionis* is completely ignored by Bastiaensen's commentary in the same volume (p. 291). Fontaine is correct (p. 1080 with n. 1) to detect in ll. 1-2 of the *Vita Martini* (*inertes poetae...neglegentes*) an allusion to Cic., *Cato* 5; however he is wrong to suggest that the end of l. 2 (*victi materiae mole succumbimus*) contains an echo of Verg., *Aen.* 6,727 (*mens agitat molem*). Fontaine and the other scholars mentioned above have failed to notice that here and throughout the following sentences Sulpicius is heavily indebted to the *Vita Hilarionis*. The Sulpician *victi materiae mole succumbimus* in fact reproduces Jerome's *materiae...succumberet* (l. 11); in both cases the subject of *succumbere* is a «poet» (*poetae* / *Homerus*). The very next words of the *Vita Martini* (l. 3: *facta...explicari verbis*) likewise imitate Jerome's use of exactly the same antithesis (l. 3: *ut facta dictis exaequantur*; ll. 4-5: *fecere...verbis*); this terminology is repeated by Sulpicius in l. 13 (*ut verbis concipi queant*), where Fontaine sees merely «le topos d'incapacité» (p. 1090, n. 3). The Sulpician *facta...explicari verbis* is in turn succeeded by the phrase *vitam...et conversationem* (l. 4), which has again been inspired by the same collocation in Jerome: *conversatio vitaeque* (l. 10). Finally it may be observed that the emphatic phraseology introducing Sulpicius' mention of Homer (ll. 11-12: *si ipse...Homerus...*) would also seem to have been suggested by the *Vita Hilarionis* (ll. 10-11: *Homerus quoque si...*). The full extent of Sulpicius' indebtedness is masked by the interjacement of a substantial section of text in both *Vitae* which contains no borrowings: while Jerome's third sentence dealing with Alexander (ll. 6-9) is ignored by Sulpicius as irrelevant, the *Vita Martini* interposes a lengthy string of accusatives which merely catalogue the saint's virtues (ll. 6-11). The passages on either side of this enumeration are however carefully linked by the use of cognate diction (l. 5: *vere profiteor*; l. 11: *vere fatebor*), which on each occasion is employed in conjunction with the *Unsagbarkeitstopos*.

⁵⁸ Cf. the passages of Sulpicius, Aldhelm, Lupus, Odilo, Adso, Gerhardus, Ps. Hildebert, *Analecta Hymnica* and Gilbert cited in n. 55 as well as the texts of Donizo and Gilo of Paris adduced by A. Pannenberg, *art. cit.*, pp. 199-200 and of Walafrid Strabo quoted by E. R. Curtius, *art. cit.* («Literarästhetik»), p. 165. Significantly C. Moreschini, *op. cit.*, p. 73, tries to resolve the problem by rendering Jeromé's *si adesset* as «se fosse qui vivo»; however the very full treatment of this verb in *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*, pp. 53-54, which identifies some 21 main senses as well as 18 subordinate ones, does not register the meaning «to be here alive».

In the course of his exposition of Antiochus' dogmatic position in the *Academica Priora* Cicero has occasion to speak of dreams. Here he mentions the dream recounted by Ennius at the start of the *Annales*: in it Ennius had been visited by Homer. Cicero quotes a half-line of the poem describing this dream at *Academica Priora* 51: *visus Homerus adesse poeta*⁵⁹. A quotation from another author necessarily stands out: it accordingly stamps itself more clearly on the mind. Such memorization is particularly easy when the phrase in question evinces the metrical form of a hexameter verse. Here the formulation is also very brief: only four words are involved. In the centre *Homerus* and *adesse* are juxtaposed: these are the two terms which recur in the *Vita Hilarionis*. Moreover Jerome employs them in the same order and with the same verbal stem: morphologically his *adasset* is virtually identical with the *adesse* found in Cicero. It may accordingly be concluded that here we have a further borrowing from the *Academica Priora*⁶⁰.

Two final points may be made. Firstly the verb *adesse* is the *mot juste* for Homer's appearance in a dream; this word is therefore perfectly *a propos* in the context of the *Academica Priora*. However a term appropriate to such an epiphany is far less suitable for the topos that the greatest poet of antiquity would be unequal to the task of describing a saint's virtues: hence the inconcinnity of Jerome's wording in the *Vita Hilarionis*. This kind of infelicity arising from the importation of phraseology borrowed from other authors is not infrequent in Jerome's *oeuvre*⁶¹. The second point similarly concerns his derivative technique of composition. It has been argued elsewhere that in this passage of the *Vita Hilarionis* Jerome is also borrowing from the prologue to

⁵⁹ Cicero alludes to this verse again at *Academica Priora* 88: *quia...Ennius non diceret se vidisse Homerum sed visum esse*; here O. Plasberg, *op. cit.*, p. 115, suggests adding *adesse* after *visum esse*. *Verbatim* citation of the Ennian line such as Cicero gives in ch. 51 is not found elsewhere; cf. J. Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, Leipzig, 1928, p. 2; O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford, 1985, pp. 153-154.

⁶⁰ The echo is overlooked in Vahlen's and Skutsch's commentaries on Ennius' *Annales* and in Bastiaensen's on the *Vita Hilarionis* (*loc. cit.*) as well as by the investigators of Jerome's debt to the classics that were discussed above. No further imitation of the *Academica Priora* is recorded in the appendical study by H. Hagendahl, «Jerome and the Latin Classics», in *Vig. Christ.*, 28, 1974, 216-227. Jerome of course had no first-hand knowledge of Ennius; cf. H. Hagendahl, *op. cit.* (n. 4), p. 274.

⁶¹ Cf. the present writer, *art. cit.* (nn. 5 and 6), *passim*.

«Vopiscus'» *Vita Probi* in the *Historia Augusta*⁶². Such simultaneous use of multiple sources is a further characteristic of Jerome's compositional method⁶³.

⁶² Cf. the present writer, «The *Historia Augusta* and Jerome Again», in *Klio*, 79, 1997, 459-467.

⁶³ Cf. the present writer, «*Oras: loqueris ad sponsum; legis: ille tibi loquitur* (Jerome, *Epist.* 22,25,1)», in *Vig. Christ.* 46, 1992, 141-150, pp. 149-150 (n. 44).