

Cicero's Pro Sexto Roscio and Jerome

Autor(en): **Adkin, Neil**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica**

Band (Jahr): **76 (2019)**

Heft 1

PDF erstellt am: **30.06.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-846872>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

Cicero's *Pro Sexto Roscio* and Jerome

Neil Adkin, Chapel Hill

Abstract: Hitherto only one echo of Cicero's early *Pro S. Roscio* has been identified in Jerome's entire *oeuvre*. Since the Ciceronian passage at issue here is a celebrated anecdote, this reminiscence is unsurprising. More significant are two unidentified imitations that can be shown to occur in Hieronymian works written some thirty years earlier. These borrowings also shed important light on Jerome's compositional method in general.

Keywords: Cicero, inconcinnity, Jerome, *Pro Sexto Roscio*, Quellenforschung, Virgil.

Cicero's *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*, his first major case and the maker of his career, was a speech of which the orator was justly proud.¹ In Jerome's own day Ciceronian oratory was the basis of the first-rate rhetorical education he had himself enjoyed: the *Pro S. Roscio* was "a staple" of these schools of rhetoric.² It is therefore surprising that only one reminiscence of the *Pro S. Roscio* should have been so far detected in the vast corpus of Jerome's writings.³ The text of the *Pro S. Roscio* in question here reads thus (70): *ne non tam prohibere quam admonere videretur* (sc. Solon, who is here justifying his failure to legislate on the never-yet-seen crime of parricide). This Ciceronian passage is copied by Jerome in the late *Letter* 121 (8.7): *Tullius de parricidarum suppliciiis apud Athenienses Solonem scripsisse negat, ne non tam prohibere quam commone-re videretur*. This explicit Hieronymian reprise of the *Pro S. Roscio* was duly registered in Luebeck's now nearly sesquicentenary survey of Jerome's debt to the classics.⁴ This same borrowing was then recorded in Hagendahl's *pan-dect*.⁵ Neither Luebeck nor Hagendahl devotes any discussion whatsoever to this *imitatio*.

This Jeromian imitation of this passage of the *Pro S. Roscio* is no surprise. The anecdote in question "était célèbre dans l'antiquité".⁶ Since moreover this

* Texts are cited according to *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptio-num* (Leipzig 21990) and its online *Addenda* at <http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/pdf/addenda.pdf>.

1 Cf. *Brut.* 312; *Off.* 2.51.

2 So A. R. Dyck, *Cicero: Pro Sexto Roscio* (Cambridge 2010) 19.

3 No trace whatever of the *Pro S. Roscio* has been identified in the vastly bigger *oeuvre* of Jerome's contemporary, Augustine, a *ci-devant* rhetor; cf. M. Testard, *S. Augustin et Cicéron I–II* (Paris 1958); H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics I–II*, *Stud. Graec. Lat. Gothob.* 20 (Göteborg 1967).

4 A. Luebeck, *Hieronymus quos noverit scriptores et ex quibus hauserit* (Leipzig 1872) 135.

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) 246.

6 So F. Hinard/Y. Benferhat, *Cicéron, Discours I.2: Pour Sextus Roscius* (Paris 2006) 87.

particular anecdote combines a *sententia* with a *persona*, it constitutes a *chria*:⁷ such a rhetorical goody is especially memorable. This *chria*'s final words (afore-said *ne non tam prohibere* ...) are furthermore separated by just 16 lines in both *OCT* and *Teubner* from "the most famous passage of the speech".⁸ If then there were good reasons for Jerome to remember this "law-making" passage, there was an equally good one for him to deploy it here: Moses-made "law" and its gentile analogues are the topic of this Jeromian context.⁹ Cicero's specific language (*ne non tam prohibere quam admonere videretur*)¹⁰ is subjected by Jerome to minor modification: Ciceronian *admonere* is tweaked to *commonere*. The result is to eliminate the slightly inconcinuous *ecthlipsis* entailed by Cicero's *quam admonere*.¹¹ Such stylistic improvement of material Jerome has borrowed is typical of his compositional technique.¹² It is also Jerome's practice to redeploy such an enhanced form of the borrowed wording on subsequent occasions.¹³ This is what Jerome does in the present case not long afterwards at *Epist.* 130.16.6: *ne non tam prohibuisse videar quam commonuisse*. Here we accordingly have self-imitation rather than direct *imitatio* of the *Pro S. Roscio*.

More significant than Jerome's donnishly platitudinous reference to Solonic law-giving in *Pro S. Roscio* 70 is a hitherto unidentified echo of the antepenultimate paragraph of this speech.¹⁴ Here Cicero states (150): *inter feras satius est aetatem degere quam in hac tanta immanitate versari*.¹⁵ This Ciceronian phrase-

7 Cf. (e.g.) Isid., *Orig.* 2.11.2: *si sententiae persona adiciatur, fit chria*.

8 So Dyck, *loc. cit.* (n. 2) 137. The passage at issue (72: *etenim quid tam est commune ... conquiescant*) is quoted numerous times: Cic., *Orat.* 107 (for Jerome's familiarity with this work cf. Neil Adkin, "Cicero's *Orator* and Jerome", *VChr* 51 [1997] 25–39); Sen., *Contr.* 7.2.3; Quint., *Inst.* 12.6.4; Serv. auct., *Aen.* 1.540 (Donatus, who evidently lies behind DS, was Jerome's own *grammaticus*); Arus., *Gramm.* 118; Mart. Cap. 5.522 (quoting this passage as the go-to text for illustrating the clausal possibilities of final trisyllables).

9 Throughout this 121st *Letter* Jerome is in any case keen to advertise his erudition. In particular he refers in 6.6 to Cicero's translation of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*.

10 Cicero himself employs similar wording in non-Solonic contexts at *Tull.* 9 (*non tam prohibere videretur quam admonere*) and *Dom.* 127 (*prohibendo non tam detertere videretur quam admonere*). The latter passage is quoted at *Avell.* 100.20 (*non tam detertere quam admonere ... videantur*). Jerome was clearly not alone in being impressed by such language.

11 For *ecthlipsis* cf. (e.g.) Don., *Gramm. mai.* 3.4 p. 662.11–13 H.: *ecthlipsis est consonantium cum vocalibus aspere concurrentium quaedam difficilis ac dura conlisis, ut "multum ille"*. Jerome's substitutive *commonere* finds a parallel in the similar antithesis earlier in the same speech (*S. Rosc.* 45: *non ... exprobrandi causa sed commonendi gratia dicam*). This noteworthy passage of the speech is quoted as an example of the figure of *correctio* at *Schem. dian.* ll. 14–16 S.

12 Cf. Neil Adkin, "Tertullian's *De idololatria* and Jerome Again", *Mnemosyne* n.s. 49 (1996) 47f. (in n. 9 further articles by the present writer are adduced which document the same phenomenon).

13 Cf. Neil Adkin, *loc. cit.* (n. 12) 48.

14 It is precisely such passages from the end of a work 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).

15 This sentence is highlighted by the immediately preceding and brusquely apodotic *actum est* that is a hapax in Cicero's speeches.

ology has evidently inspired Jerome's description of his eremitic confrères' flight from the Syrian desert (*Epist.* 17.3.2): *melius esse dicentes inter feras habitare quam cum talibus Christianis*. The verbal correspondences between Cicero and Jerome may be set out schematically: *inter feras* / *inter feras*; *satius est* / *melius esse*;¹⁶ *degere* / *habitare*;¹⁷ *quam* / *quam*; *tanta immanitate*¹⁸ / *talibus*¹⁹ *Christianis*. Again Jerome has improved his source stylistically. This time the enhancement takes the form of compression.²⁰ Cicero's two-word *aetatem degere* is reduced to one-word *habitare*, while Cicero's pair of synonymous infinitives (*aetatem degere* / *versari*)²¹ is likewise condensed into Jerome's aforesaid single *habitare*.²² If however Jerome has thus enhanced the formal polish of his Ciceronian source, his borrowing also entails a contentual flaw that was absent from his model.²³ If in Cicero's cityishly un-"wild" Rome the litch for life *inter feras* is antithetically apt, this same antipodean yen is no longer *à propos* in Jerome's wilderness: dwellers of such "wilds" do already dwell "among 'wild' beasts".²⁴ This inconcinnity corroborates Jerome's debt here to *Pro S. Roscio*.

Identification of this echo is important for a number of reasons: four may be adduced here. Firstly, Jerome's letter in question (17) is itself important, since it marks his life-transforming renunciation of the eremitic life-style. Secondly, the particular Jeromian words at issue (*melius ... inter feras ...*) cap the last sentence but one in the chapter on "The Desert: Joys and Trials" in Kelly's canonical biography:²⁵ here Kelly fails to perceive that this Jeromian *ipse-dixit* to which he gives such prominence is nothing but a *réchauffé* of Cicero. Thirdly, since this Jeromian echo of the *Pro S. Roscio* belongs to the end of his sojourn in the desert during the mid-370's, it noteworthyly antedates by more than thirty years Jerome's only debt to this speech to have been identified so far:²⁶ hence the *Pro S.*

16 Jerome never employs *satius*, which is synonymous with his *melius*; cf. *Gloss.* IV 463.13 (*satius est: melius est*).

17 Cf. *Gloss.* IV 225.40: *degit: habitat*.

18 This *abstractum pro concreto* is translated as "unter solchen Unmenschen" in G. Landgraf's canonical *Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (Leipzig/Berlin 1914) 273: it accordingly parallels Jeromian *cum talibus Christianis*.

19 Matching Cicero's similarly deictic *tanta*.

20 For such streamlining of borrowed material as characteristic of Jeromian method cf. Neil Adkin, "Some Features of Jerome's Compositional Technique in the *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Epist.* 22)", *Philologus* 136 (1992) 235f.

21 For *degere* and *versari* as synonyms cf. *Gloss.* IV 48.51 (*degunt: ... versantur*).

22 Cicero's *immanitate versari* had generated a cretic spondee clausula, which Jerome replaces with a very elegant cretic dichoree (*talibus Christianis*) that corresponds accentually to *cursus velox* with coincidence of metrical ictus and word accent.

23 For such infelicity resulting from Jerome's failure to integrate fully the material he appropriates from others cf. Neil Adkin, "Tertullian in Jerome (*Epist.* 22.37.1f.)", *SOslo* 68 (1993) 129–143.

24 Cf. Jerome's own iconic write-up of the wilderness-dwelling eremite at *Epist.* 22.7.2: *socius ... ferarum*.

25 J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings and Controversies* (London 1975) 56.

26 Viz. above-discussed *Epist.* 121, which was written in 407.

Roscio can now be shown to have influenced the beginning of Jerome's literary career as well as the end. Fourthly and finally, since in all of Jerome's earliest letters (1–17), which were written in the East in the 370's, Hagendahl was able to identify only one reminiscence of the entire corpus of Cicero's speeches,²⁷ the present *imitatio* is particularly significant as doubling the number at one stroke.

This imitation of the *Pro S. Roscio* in Jerome's *Letter* 17 belongs to the period just after his famous "dream",²⁸ in which he famously vowed to stop reading the classics. Jerome's lead-in to the account of this dream lists three pagan authors as being incompatible with Christianity (*Epist.* 22.29.7): Virgil, Horace and Cicero. Virgil is quoted at the start of this *Letter* 17 (2.1). Horace is echoed in the sentence immediately preceding this same letter's aforesaid borrowing from the *Pro S. Roscio*.²⁹ The identification of this Ciceronian *imitatio* here accordingly completes the triad of ironic echoes of the very same three authors tabooed in the dream. The text that imposes this Ciceronian taboo (*Epist.* 22.29.7) reads thus: *quid facit ... cum apostolo Cicero?* It is therefore ironical that in *Letter* 17 Jerome's reprise of the *Pro S. Roscio* should be juxtaposed with two quotations of "the apostle" himself: I Cor. 10.26 and Gal. 6.14 (*Epist.* 17.3.3). The ironicalness of this Jeromian clone of Cicero is exacerbated by the fact that here this pagan text is placed in the mouths of Christian monks speaking of fellow-monks, who are explicitly qualified as *Christiani*.³⁰ Notwithstanding his dream, Jerome thus remained a "Ciceronian".³¹

The afore-mentioned quotation of Virgil at the beginning of this *Letter* 17 (2.1) calls for closer inspection. In the first place attention may be drawn to a number of points of contrast which distinguish this Virgilian quote at the start of the letter from the echo of Cicero's *Pro S. Roscio* at the end: while the words taken from Virgil are equipped with an apology (*ethnico*), are expressly identified (*poeta*), and are famous (*vulgato*),³² the borrowing from Cicero is none of the above. In the second place it would seem possible to show that this same Virgilian text has influenced Jerome's choice of this same Ciceronian text. The Virgilian words at issue (*Aen.* 1.540: *hospitio prohibemur arenae*) are glossed by DS

27 Cf. Hagendahl, *loc. cit.* (n. 5) 103f. The Ciceronian text in question (*Flacc. frag.* 2 M.: *ingenita levitas et erudita vanitas*) is marked by a flashiness which was naturally irresistible to Jerome's magpie mind. Hence he unsurprisingly cites this text again at *In Gal.* 3.1a ll. 12f. R.

28 On attempts to date the dream cf. Neil Adkin, *Jerome on Virginitate: A Commentary on the Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Letter* 22), Arca 42 (Cambridge 2003) 285f.

29 On this Horatian reminiscence cf. Neil Adkin, "Horace, *carm.* 2.17.5 and Quintilian, *inst.* 6 *proem.* in Jerome", *Prometheus* 44 (2018) 202–208.

30 For such characteristic indifference to context in Jeromian borrowings cf. Neil Adkin, "Tertullian's *De ieiunio* and Jerome's *Libellus de virginitate servanda* (*Epist.* 22)", *WSt* 104 (1991) 149–160.

31 Cf. *Epist.* 22.30.4 (divine rebuke to dreaming Jerome): "*Ciceronianus es, non Christianus*".

32 The Virgilian words in question come from the *Aeneid's* first book (1.539–541), which Jerome cites the most; cf. Hagendahl, *loc. cit.* (n. 5) 413–415.

with *Pro S. Roscio* 72, which is next to the other passage of this speech (70) to have been identified as the source of a Jeromian echo. Since this Danieline gloss presumably goes back to Jerome's own *grammaticus* Donatus, it may be supposed to have played a role in Jerome's linkage here of this same Virgilian text with a text of this same *Pro S. Roscio*.³³

This text of the *Aeneid* (1.540) would appear to do more than just supply such a tip for imitating the *Pro S. Roscio* shortly afterwards in the same *Letter* 17. In addition these words of Virgil have evidently influenced the phraseology of the very next sentence after this same Ciceronian reminiscence. Here Jerome says (*Epist.* 17.3.2): *heremi concedatur hospitium*. The text of *Aen.* 1.540 reads: *hospitio prohibemur arenae*. The lexeme *hospitium*, which is common to both passages, is respectively juxtaposed with twinly central *concedatur* and *prohibemur*, which are exact antonyms.³⁴ On each occasion this same medial verb separates hyperbat-ically this same term *hospitium* from a matchingly defining and paronomastic genitive: (*h*)*erem-* / (*h*)*aren-*.³⁵ Jerome has merely moved this *hospitium* from beginning to end for the sake of the elegant cretic tribrach clausula, which corresponds to *cursus tardus* with concord between verse rhythm and linguistic accent.³⁶

If *Aen.* 1.540 has thus influenced Jerome's phraseology in the vicinity of his echo of *Pro S. Roscio* 150, it would seem that a similarly vicinal influence on his wording has been exercised by a slightly earlier passage of this same speech. Two Jeromian texts are at issue here. The first is the start of the sentence that continues with afore-discussed *melius esse ...* (*Epist.* 17.3.2): *ecce discedere cupiunt, immo discedunt melius esse dicentes* The same collocation *discedere cupiunt* had occurred in the *Pro S. Roscio* (144):³⁷ *cupit a vobis discedere*. Only two further pre-Jeromian instances of this *iunctura* are provided by the online *Library of Latin Texts*.³⁸ Ample synonyms for both *cupio* and *discedo* were at Je-

33 If Jerome received a prod here from his *grammaticus*, he may also have been influenced by more subjective factors in his use here of the *Pro S. Roscio*. Jerome will have noticed that his situation at the time of his 17th *Letter* resembled Cicero's own when he wrote *Pro S. Roscio*. On the one hand Cicero wrote this speech in his later 20's, which evidently was likewise Jerome's own age when he wrote *Letter* 17. On the other hand Cicero's *Pro S. Roscio* was followed by his "exile" from Rome (cf. Jerome's *Chron. a. Abr.* 1938), just as Jerome's *Letter* 17 was likewise followed by his own "exile" from the desert. Moreover Jerome's situation was matched not only by that of this speech's author, Cicero, but also by that of this same speech's subject, Roscius: like Jerome, Roscius was "hounded".

34 Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* IV 18.42f. (s.v. *concedo*).

35 These two genitives are also linked semantically; for the "sandy" desert cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* V.2 747.81–83 (s.v. *eremus*: "i. ... harenas").

36 In both authors the wording at issue occupies the same final position.

37 Thus the paragraph-numeration of the *Teubner*, whose punctuation is also followed here. The paragraph currently at issue (144) is close to the one (150) containing above-treated *inter feras satius est ...*

38 Viz. Cic., *Att.* 9.7.5 and Verg., *Aen.* 2.108f. Cicero's *Letters to Atticus* have left no trace whatsoever on Jerome's *oeuvre* (cf. Hagendahl, *loc. cit.* [n. 5] 399), while in the Virgilian passage (*saepe*

rome's disposal.³⁹ This passage of the *Pro S. Roscio* (144) is moreover highlighted by the context: on the one hand these words are placed in the can't-miss-it sentence that opens the *peroratio*, while on the other they are separated by a single line from an *exemplum* (*rogat ... te, Chrysogone*) near to the heart of rhetoricians.⁴⁰ A final observation may be permitted. Once again Jerome has subjected his source to stylistic enhancement. Here two points may be made. Firstly Jerome's conflation of Ciceronian *cupit ... discedere* and *inter feras satius est ...* is a further instance of his propensity to compress the material he borrows: this time the compression is on the grand scale.⁴¹ Secondly Jerome peeps up Cicero's language with an auxetic *correctio*:⁴² *ecce discedere cupiunt, immo discedunt*.⁴³

Jerome's other debt to the *Pro S. Roscio* in the vicinity of his reminiscence of *inter feras satius est ...* (*S. Rosc.* 150) occurs shortly afterwards. Here (*Epist.* 17.3.3) Jerome speaks of his hounders and harassers thus: *ascendant soli caelum, propter illos tantum Christus mortuus sit, habeant, possideant, gloriantur*. Final *gloriantur* is due to the *gloriar* of ensuing Gal. 6.14. However the two previous words (*habeant, possideant*) are somewhat surprising: what is the reference of these verbs? The problem is pointed up by the puzzlement of the translators. The object governed by these verbs is variously given as "la contrée",⁴⁴ "ihn" (sc. Christus),⁴⁵ "all things"⁴⁶ and "it"⁴⁷ (but what is "it"?). This nebulosity would seem to be due to the influence of the *Pro S. Roscio*. The point was made earlier that Roscius resembled Jerome in being "hounded".⁴⁸ In particular Roscius was being stripped of all his property. The sentence of *Pro S. Roscio* containing the *cupit ... discedere* that was imitated by Jerome continues thus (144):⁴⁹ *si tibi* (sc. *Chrysogono*) ... *sua omnia concessit* (sc. *Roscius*), *adnumeravit, adpendit*. Cicero's expropriatory language here would seem to have exercised a subconscious influence

fugam Danai Troia cupiere relicta / moliri et longo fessi discedere bello) *discedere* is un-eye-catchingly tacked on to (perfective) *cupiere* as a mere afterthought after a considerable gap (cf. Claud. Don., *Aen.* 2.105 p. 162.4f. G.: *addidit causam*).

39 Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* IV 1435.62–64 (s.v. *cupio*); V.1.2 1289.75–1290.4 (s.v. *discedo*).

40 Cf. Aquila, *Rhet.* 9 p. 17.11 E.; Iul. Ruf., *Rhet.* 16 p. 43.8f. H.

41 For such large-scale streamlining of Jerome's source cf. Neil Adkin, *loc. cit.* (n. 20) 246.

42 For the figure of *correctio* ("die Verbesserung einer eigenen Äusserung") cf. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik* (Stuttgart 2008) 386–389.

43 For the vivific effect of *ecce* cf. Serv. auct., *Aen.* 10.133: "*ecce*" *pro admiratione et demonstratione*.

44 So J. Labourt, *S. Jérôme: Lettres I* (Paris 1949) 53.

45 So L. Schade, *Des hl. Kirchenvaters Eusebius Hieronymus ausgewählte Briefe*, II. Briefband, *Bibl. Kirchenv.* 2.18 (Munich 1937) 94.

46 So W. H. Fremantle et al., *The Principal Works of St. Jerome*, Sel. Libr. Nic. Post-Nic. Fath. 2.6 (Oxford 1893) 21.

47 So C. C. Mierow/T. C. Lawler, *The Letters of St. Jerome I*, *Anc. Chr. Wr.* 33 (Westminster, Md./London 1963) 78.

48 Cf. n. 33 above.

49 This is also the sentence containing the afore-mentioned rhetorical *exemplum* (cf. n. 40 above), which is separated by just one line from the words now at issue.

on Jerome's choice of similarly grabby *habeant, possideant*. The slight inconcinnity is typical of Jerome's borrowings.⁵⁰

The other Jeromian debt to *Pro S. Roscio* that needs to be added to the dossier of his borrowings from this speech significantly belongs to the same period as his *Letter 17*. During his stay in the desert Jerome produced the first and most famous of his monastic biographies, the *Life of Paul the First Hermit*, which is also the first-fruit of this monacho-biographical genre in Latin.⁵¹ Near the start of this *Life* Jerome describes how during the Decian and Valerianic persecutions his hero Paul was nearly betrayed by his own sister's husband. Here Jerome expresses himself as follows (*Vita Pauli* 4.2): *non illum (sc. sororis maritum) uxoris lacrimae, non communio sanguinis, non exspectans cuncta ex alto Deus, a scelere revocaverunt*. Attention has recently been drawn to a number of unidentified echoes of the classics in the passages that are located both directly before and directly after this text.⁵² The detection of a similar echo in this text itself would accordingly be no surprise.

One such echo of the classics has in fact been detected already in these words of the *Life of Paul*. Here the recent commentary by Leclerc and Morales posits a debt to Cicero's *Pro Cluentio* 12:⁵³ *ut eam (sc. Cluentius' mother) non pudor, non pietas, non macula familiae, non hominum fama, non filii dolor, non filiae maeror a cupiditate revocaret*. Similarly the two commentaries of Degórski on this *Life* had referred only to this text of the *Pro Cluentio* in dealing with the question of the *Quelle* of this Jeromian passage.⁵⁴ Such an assumption of a borrowing here from the *Pro Cluentio* would however appear to be in fact unwarranted. Here Jerome does not employ the *a cupiditate* of the *Pro Cluentio*, but instead *a scelere*. This phrase *a scelere revocare* is used on a number of occasions in Cicero: *Phil.* 13.4; *Leg.* 2.16;⁵⁵ *Catil.* 3.10; *Verr.* II 5.108. The last of these passages shares with Jerome and the *Pro Cluentio* a foregoing anaphora of *non*.⁵⁶ There would accordingly seem to be no reason to posit a specific Jeromian debt here to the *Pro Cluentio*.

50 Cf. n. 23 above.

51 On the date of Jerome's *Life of Paul* cf. A. de Vogüé, "La *Vita Pauli* de S. Jérôme et sa datation: Examen d'un passage-clé (ch. 6)", in G. J. M. Bartelink/A. Hilhorst/C. H. Kneepkens (edd.), *Eulogia: Mélanges offerts à Antoon A. R. Bastiaansen*, Instr. Patr. 24 (Steenbrugge 1991) 395–406.

52 Cf. Neil Adkin, "Hieronymus Sallustianus", *GrazBeitr* 24 (2005) 102–107.

53 P. Leclerc/E. M. Morales/A. de Vogüé, *Jérôme: Trois vies de moines (Paul, Malchus, Hilarion)*, Sourc. Chr. 508 (Paris 2007) 152.

54 B. R. Degórski, "Commento alla *Vita S. Pauli Monachi Thebaei* di S. Girolamo", *Dissertationes Paulinorum* 8 (1995) 20; id., *Girolamo: Vite degli eremiti Paolo, Ilarione e Malco*, Coll. Test. Patr. 126 (Rome 1996) 71.

55 In both of these passages the phrase is placed at the end of the clause, as in Jerome.

56 This text of the *Verrines* reads: *non te eius lacrimae, non senectus, non hospiti ius atque nomen a scelere aliquam ad partem humanitatis revocare potuit?* As in Jerome, the first element in the anaphora is *lacrimae*.

The text to which this passage of the *Life of Paul* does evince a specific indebtedness can on the other hand be shown to be a further sentence of the *Pro S. Roscio* (63): *multum valet communio sanguinis*. Cicero's *communio sanguinis* has inspired Jerome's use here of exactly the same *iunctura*.⁵⁷ No other comparable example of this syntagm (*communio sanguinis*) is provided by *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.⁵⁸ In both Cicero and Jerome the context in which the phrase is used is the same: *communio sanguinis* should restrain from crime. This section of the *Pro S. Roscio* was moreover well-known: on the one hand the very next words are quoted by Jerome's older contemporary Marius Victorinus (*Rhet.* 2.14 p. 269.39f. H.) as a school-book specimen of an *argumenti genus commune* (i.e. a *locus communis*), while on the other hand Cicero's *communio sanguinis* is preceded by just three lines by a phrase (*expressa ... vestigia*) which had been imitated by Cyprian.⁵⁹ Once again Jerome's borrowing is marked by a slight inconcinnity, which once again corroborates the debt: Paul is not linked to his sister's non-con-sanguineous husband by "common blood".⁶⁰ By way of conclusion it may be said that this echo of the *Pro S. Roscio* in Jerome's *Life of Paul* together with the above-identified echoes of the same speech in his *Letter 17* show that contrary to scholarly belief this work of the tiro Cicero exercised a significant influence on the similarly tironic Jerome.

Correspondence:

Neil Adkin

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

200 Barnes St., Apt. D 17

Carrboro

NC 27510

USA

nadkin3489@aol.com

⁵⁷ The never-published and now well over threescore-year-old dissertation of P. C. Hoelle, *Commentary on the Vita Pauli of St. Jerome* (unpubl. Ohio State diss. 1953) 107 (*ad loc.*) did mention *S. Rosc.* 63, but along with three other texts that contain the word *communio* (or *consortium*): he made no case for a direct debt.

⁵⁸ III 1960.28f. (cf. 1962.53; s.v. 1. *communio*). At 1965.34f. (*sanguinis ... communione*) *communio* means "eucharistia", while *sanguinis* is qualified as *fili tui*.

⁵⁹ Cf. Neil Adkin, "Cicero's *Pro Sexto Roscio* and Cyprian", *Helmántica* 68 (2017) 9–13.

⁶⁰ *Communio sanguinis* is tellingly omitted altogether in the Greek version of the *Life of Paul* on p. 188 in W. A. Oldfather (ed.), *Studies in the Text Tradition of St. Jerome's Vitae Patrum* (Urbana 1943) 188, although the other two elements of this Jeromian tricolon (*uxoris lacrimae / expectans ... Deus*) are translated dutifully.