

QVID ERGO ATHENIS ET HIEROSOLYMIS?,
QVID MIHI TECVM EST?
AND TI EMOI KAI ΣΟΙ;

In his *de praescriptione haereticorum* (7. 9) Tertullian demands:
*Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? quid academiae et ecclesiae?
quid haereticis et christianis?*

Tertullian has been arguing that heresies are inevitable and must be guarded against; Christ and the apostles warned their followers of the nature of heresies. He goes on to claim that heresies have borrowed their doctrines from pagan philosophers and to make the above assertion that the church and philosophical schools are irreconcilable. Similar assertions are made by Tertullian elsewhere. In *apologeticum* 46. 18 he says, in connection with men who depart from the *regula disciplinae* and are no longer considered Christians: *Adeo quid simile philosophus et christianus, Graeciae discipulus et caeli, ...?* In *praes. haer.* 14. 10 he refuses to let heretics be called Christians: *cum autem nondum crediderunt non sunt christiani* (cf. 16. 2, 37. 2).

The ideas expressed so forcefully by Tertullian in *praes. haer.* 7. 9 have often been discussed¹⁾, but not the syntax of the passage. What one would expect is the syntax of another famous remark, that of Donatus quoted by Optatus of Milevis: *Quid est imperatori cum ecclesia?*²⁾ This challenge was made by Donatus, bishop of Carthage, to Paul and Macarius who had been sent to Africa by the emperor Constans in A.D. 347³⁾.

1) For example, T. H. Bindley, *Tertulliani de praescriptione haereticorum, ad martyras, ad Scapulam* (Oxford, 1893) 40; A.-J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* 1³ (Paris, 1950) 65-66; A. Labhardt, *Museum Helveticum* 7 (1950) 171-174; R. F. Refoulé, *Tertullien: Traité de la prescription contre les hérétiques* (Paris, 1957) 98; H. Chadwick, *Early Christian thought and the classical tradition: studies in Justin, Clement and Origen* (Oxford, 1966) 1-3; L. G. Patterson, *God and History in early Christian thought: a study of themes from Justin Martyr to Gregory the Great* (London, 1967) 63-65.

2) Optatus, *de schismate Donatistarum* 3. 3 (Migne, PL 11. 999A).

3) For the background see O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* 3 (Berlin, 1909) 336-338; W. H. C. Frend, *The Donatist Church: a movement of protest in Roman North Africa* (Oxford, 1952) 177-179; S. L. Greenslade, *Schism in the early Church* (London, 1953) 59-61; J.-P. Brisson, *Autonomisme et Christianisme dans l'Afrique romaine* (Paris, 1958) 201-202; E. L. Grasmück, *Coercitio: Staat und Kirche im Donatistenstreit* [Bonner historische Forschungen, 22] (Bonn, 1964) 112-115.

The construction attributed to Donatus is of a type well established in the classical period. For example, Plautus makes Menaechmus II say to the *senex* (*Men.* 826): *quaeso, quid mihi tecum est?* Cicero in the *pro Quinctio* (17. 55) imputes the following words to the mind of Naevius: *quid mihi ... cum ista summa sanctimonia ac diligentia?* Propertius (3. 3. 15) depicts Apollo asking him:

quid tibi cum tali, demens, est flumine?

Ovid invokes warlike Mars at the beginning of book III of the *Fasti* and suggests a response (*Fast.* 3. 3):

forsitan ipse roges, quid sit cum Marte poetae.

This idiom is a common one in Ovid's poetry. Another example is *Heroides* 6. 47-48:

*quid mihi cum Minyis, quid cum Dodonide pinu?
quid tibi cum patria, nauita Tiphys, mea?⁴⁾*

Seneca imagines Lucilius commenting on a piece of advice (*Ep.* 12. 11): *Epicurus ... dixit. quid tibi cum alieno?⁵⁾* Later, in the *declamationes* falsely attributed to Quintilian, we find (*Decl.* 383): *quid mihi ... cum pecunia est?* In most of these passages there is a conversational tone.

Much the same effect as is suggested by the question *quid mihi tecum est?* is obtained by assertions in which the two parties are said to have no business (*nihil*) with one another. Thus Terence makes Phormio tell Demipho (*Phorm.* 421):

postremo tecum nil rei nobis, Demipho, est⁶⁾.

In his *praefatio* (19) Aulus Gellius quotes a *vetus adagium* in verse:

nil cum fidibus graculost, nihil cum amaracino sui.

In the *Philippica Secunda* (31. 77) Cicero mentions the substance of Antony's letter to Fulvia: *sibi cum illa mimis posthac nihil futurum.* Horace quotes a certain Marsaeus (*Sat.* 1. 2. 57-58):

*'nil fuerit mi ... cum uxoribus umquam alienis.'
uerum est cum mimis, est cum meretricibus, ...*

4) See also *Am.* 1. 7. 27, 3. 8. 49; *Her.* 14. 65, 15. 52; *Met.* 1. 456; *Fast.* 4. 3; *Tr.* 3. 11. 55.

5) Cf. *Ep.* 15. 10; *quid tibi cum ceteris?*

6) Similarly in *Ad.* 177 Aeschinus answers *nil* to Sannio's question quoted below: *quid tibi rei mecumst?*

There are other cases in which the nature of the connection between the two parties is not specified, but its degree is indicated. For example, in a letter to C. Marcellus, early in the latter's consulship of 50 B. C., Cicero writes (*Fam.* 15. 10. 2): *si mihi tecum minus esset quam est cum tuis omnibus, ...*⁷) Seneca writes of those who are inexperienced at enduring suffering (*Ep.* 78. 10): *multum illis cum corpore fuit*. By contrast he claims with respect to his old age (*Ep.* 26. 2): *uiget animus et gaudet non multum sibi esse cum corpore*.

Then there are the cases where the connection between the two parties is specified only by *res*. Terence has Sannio ask Aeschinus (*Ad.* 177):

quid tibi rei mecumst?

Cicero, in the *pro Roscio Amerino* (30. 84) turns to accuse T. Roscius who, Cicero claims, has a credible motive for the murder – unlike the defendant, Sex. Roscius: *tecum enim mihi res est, T. Rosci, ...* In the *Academica* (2. 35. 112) Cicero says: *si enim mihi cum Peripatetico res esset, ...* Cornelius Nepos refers to rivalry between Sparta and Thebes after the Peloponnesian war and the defeat of Athens (*Pel.* 1. 3): *cum Thebanis sibi rem esse existimabant*. Livy has C. Mucius saying to the Etruscan king (2. 12. 11): *uni tibi et cum singulis res erit*⁸).

The nature of the relationship is made a little clearer by the use of *commercium* or *commercium*, as in Plautus' plays (*Aul.* 631; *Bac.* 117; *Rud.* 724–725; *St.* 519; *Truc.* 94), or by the use of *negotium* (Caelius in Cic. *Fam.* 8. 8. 9; Nep. *Dat.* 7. 1; Liv. 2. 43. 6). The nature of the relationship is indicated explicitly by *amicitia* (*Rhet. Her.* 4. 37. 49), *societas* (Cic. *Off.* 1. 17. 57), *hospitium* (Liv. 37. 54. 5; cf. *disceptatio* in 37. 54. 4) and *sermo* (Juv. 8. 39: *tecum est mihi sermo, Rubelli | Blande*). Finally there are the cases in which *communis* is used. For example, in the preface to book III of the *de finibus* (3. 2. 6) Cicero says to Brutus: *te habeo aequissimum eorum studiorum quae mihi communia tecum sunt existimatorem et iudicem*. Here what the two parties have in common is specified by *studia* and *communia*⁹). Now these later examples, in

7) Cf. *Fam.* 13. 1. 2: *cum Patrone Epicurio mihi omnia sunt, ...*

8) Another example is Tibullus 1. 6. 3, if one emends the text, with J. P. Postgate, to read: *quid tibi, saene, rei mecum est?*

9) Cf. Cic. *Att.* 11. 1. 1: *haec pericula quae mihi communia sunt cum ceteris fortius feram*; Sall. *Cat.* 1. 2: *alterum nobis cum dis, alterum cum beluis commune est*; Liv. 30. 17. 12: *... communem sibi cum rege gratulationem esse*; Ov. *Tr.* 5. 6. 29: *hoc est cum miseris solum commune beatis, ...*

which the parties are linked by a subject which is specified are not very different from passages where possession is expressed by the dative with *esse*. For example, Livy reports one of the leaders of the Latins, L. Annius Setinus, as saying (Liv. 8. 4. 5): *nobis ... concedentibus Romam caput Latio esse*.

The interesting cases are those where no subject is expressed, as in *quid mihi tecum est?* However, this formula does not explain the syntax of Tertullian's question, *quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis?* This phraseology is closer to the Greek *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; It is possible that Terence, in presenting the *Phormio* in 161 B. C., used *tecum nil rei nobis* to represent the idea of *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; in the *Epidicaζomenos* of Apollodorus, a third-century dramatist from Carystus in Euboea¹⁰).

Questions of the form *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί*; occur very rarely before the development of koine Greek. In a dialogue reported by Herodotus (5. 33. 4) Aristagoras tells Megabates that punishment of a captain is none of his business: *σοὶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτοιςι τοῖσι πρήγμασι τί ἐστι*; Aristophanes has Demus raise this objection to an oracle (*Eq.* 1022):

τί γὰρ ἐστ' Ἐρεχθεὶ καὶ κολοιοῖς καὶ κννί;

Demosthenes asks the rhetorical question, what has the law on the responsibility of guardians to do with the interrogation of a slave (29. 36): *ὥστε τί τῷ νόμῳ καὶ τῇ βασάνῳ*¹¹); Later, in the third or second century B. C., Lycophron asks in his learned manner, what has Asia to do with Europe (*Alex.* 1283–1284):

*τί γὰρ ταλαίηνι μητρὶ τῇ Προμηθέως
ξυνὸν πέφυκε καὶ τροφῷ Σαρπηδόνος, ...*;

In the fourth ode of the *Anacreonteia*, written by the middle of the second century A. D. (it is quoted by Aulus Gellius, *NA* 19. 9. 6), the question is asked (4. 4):

τί γὰρ μάχαισι κάμοι;

This type of phrase occurs several times in the discourses of Epictetus. He imagines people using the following questions: *τί ἡμῖν καὶ αὐτῷ*; (1. 1. 16) *τί μοι καὶ αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐ δύναται μοι βοηθῆσαι*; (1. 22. 15) *τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, ἄνθρωπε*; (2. 19. 16) *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ*

10) Cf. J. Bond and A. S. Walpole, *The Phormio of Terence* (London, 1889) 115.

11) L. Gernet in his edition (Paris, 1954) deletes *τῷ νόμῳ* and translates: *Alors, pourquoi la torture?*

σοί, ἀνθρώπε; (2. 19. 19). He dismisses the traditional gods with the question (1. 27. 13): *εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐπιστρέφονται μου, τί ἐμοὶ καὶ αὐτοῖς;*

The point of the question is made clearer by such combinations as *τί κοινόν*, *τί προᾶγμα* and *τί σύνθημα*. Thus Euripides has Ion asking Creusa what connection she has with Apollo (*Ion* 1284):

τί δ' ἐστὶ Φοῖβω σοὶ τε κοινόν ἐν μέσῳ;

In a fragment of Nicomachus, a poet of the New Comedy, someone asks the cook (*fr.* 1. 24):

γεωμετρικῆ δὲ καὶ σοὶ προᾶγμα τί;

In another comic fragment, of unknown authorship, the question is asked (*fr. adesp.* 486):

τί γὰρ ἀσπίδι ξύνθημα καὶ βακτηρία;

Much later, in the novel by Achilles Tatius, Sosthenes is tempting Leucippe with the thought of marriage to Thersander. She bursts out (6. 12. 3): *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ Θερσάνδρῳ κοινόν;*

Much the same effect as is suggested by the question *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;* is obtained by negative statements that there is no common business between two parties. *οὐδὲν προᾶγμα* is used in this way. Thus Herodotus reports the Aeginetan reply to the Athenian demand that statues be returned (5. 84. 2): *οἱ δὲ Αἰγινῆται ἔφασαν σφίσι τε καὶ Ἀθηναίοισι εἶναι οὐδὲν προᾶγμα*. In the *de corona* Demosthenes refers to Aeschines' assurances during the war that he had nothing to do with Philip (18. 283): *καταρώμενος καὶ διομνύμενος μηδὲν εἶναι σοὶ καὶ Φιλίππῳ προᾶγμα, . . .* In *oratio* 29 Themistius says (345b): *ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ καὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ οὐδὲν προᾶγμά ἐστι*. *οὐδὲν κοινόν* is used by Herodotus (2. 18. 2) when he says that some Libyans sent to the oracle claiming that they had nothing in common with the Egyptians and thus were not bound by Egyptian custom: *ἐπεμψαν ἐς Ἀμμωνα φάμενοι οὐδὲν σφίσι τε καὶ Αἰγυπτίοισι κοινόν εἶναι*. *οὐδὲν ἐν μέσῳ* is used by Euripides (*Heracl.* 184) when he makes Iolaus tell Demophon that he (Iolaus) and the Argive messenger from Eurystheus have nothing in common:

*ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ τῷδ' οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐν μέσῳ*¹²).

12) *ἐν μέσῳ* is Valckenaer's correction of *ἐν μέρει* in the MSS.

While the treatment of the formula *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;* by R. Kühner and B. Gerth is unsatisfactory, because it fails to make distinctions among the limited examples given, their treatment of the formula *τί ἐμοὶ τοῦτο;* is more complete¹³). Appropriate examples are cited from the works of Aristophanes (*Eq.* 1198; *Lys.* 514; *Eccl.* 520–521), Demosthenes (54. 17) and Diphilus (*fr.* 32. 18). Xen. *Oec.* 18. 5 should not, however, be cited as an example, since a quite different construction is involved if one supplies *ἐπιμελητέον, ἴσασιν* or *προσῆκει* to fill the lacuna which many scholars assume in the text. To the examples given by Kühner-Gerth may be added further examples by the same authors (*Ar. Thesm.* 498; *Dem.* 20. 20) and by other authors (*fr. com. adesp.* 105. 7; *Theoc.* 15. 89). The degree of concern is expressed by such formulae as *τί πλέον ἐστὶν ἐμοί;* for which Kühner-Gerth cite apt examples in Xen. *Cyr.* 5. 5. 34, Isocr. 15. 28, Pl. *Symp.* 217c, 222d, 222e and *Leg.* 697d. There are, of course, formulae quite different from *τί σοὶ τοῦτο;* which express much the same idea. In comedy, for example, we find *τί τοῦτο πρὸς σέ;* (Diphil. 17. 3–4; Apollod. *Car. or Gel. fr.* 4. 3; Straton, *fr.* 1. 28) and *τί δέ σοι μέλει τοῦτο;* (*fr. adesp.* 114. 2).

There are, then, examples of the formula *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;* in Greek literature, particularly in the koine period. When Tertullian wrote *quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis?* he may have been aware of this usage, but one can point to a more direct source of influence, the New Testament. Tertullian knew the New Testament thoroughly, as is demonstrated by virtually every one of his works. In the well-known account of the Gerasene demoniac given by the synoptic gospels, the demoniac cries out (Mk. 5. 7; Lk. 8. 28): *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ Ὑψίστου;* In Matthew's version there are two demoniacs who cry out (Mt. 8. 29): *τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ;* There is another example of such a cry in the account of Jesus in the synagogue at Capernaum (Mk. 1. 24; Lk. 4. 34): *τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρητέ;*

Now the reason why this phrase recurs is that Semitic speakers are writing their account in Greek. *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί;* is a literal translation of the Hebrew *mabīl-wālākēb*. Thus in the story about Elijah and the widow of Zarephath *mab-lī wālākēb 'īsh hā'elōhīm* (1 Kings 17. 18) is rendered by the Septuagint translators: *τί*

¹³) R. Kühner and B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache* 2. 1³ (Hannover, 1898) 417.

ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, ἀνθρώπω τοῦ Θεοῦ¹⁴); The Semitic construction has influenced not only the Greek text of the synoptic gospels but also the Old-Latin version. For we find in the Itala account of the Gerasene demoniac the following questions: *quid mihi et tibi, Iesu, fili Dei altissimi?* (Mk. 5. 7; Lk. 8. 28) *quid nobis et tibi, Iesu, fili Dei?* (Mt. 8. 29). In the account of Jesus at Capernaum the Itala has: *quid nobis et tibi, Iesu Nazarene?* (Mk. 1. 24; Lk. 4. 34).

Thus when Tertullian wrote, in *praes. haer.* 7. 9, *quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis?* in such a striking way that Jerome followed it (*quid Aristoteli et Paulo? quid Platoni et Petro?*¹⁵) and modern writers frequently refer to it, he may well have been influenced by τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; or *quid mihi et tibi?* in the New Testament. It could have been the Greek as easily as the Old-Latin version since Tertullian used Greek philosophical sources in the *de anima*¹⁶) and Greek Christian sources in many passages¹⁷). Indeed, when he wrote *quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis?* he had offered an explanation of the Greek term αἰρεσις in the previous chapter.

University of New England
(Australia)

G. R. Stanton

14) Luke's gospel refers to this story only a paragraph before the use of τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί; in 4. 34. Other passages in which τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; is used to translate *mah-li wālākāh* are Judges 11. 12; 2 Kingdoms 16. 10 and 19. 23 (ὅμῳ); 4 Kingdoms 3. 13; 2 Chronicles 35. 21.

15) *Dial. adu. Pelag.* 1. 14 (Migne, *PL* 23. 529A). See R. F. Re foulé, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 98.

16) See J. H. Waszink, *Tertulliani de anima* (Amsterdam, 1947) 21*-48*.

17) See, for example, L. G. Patterson, *op. cit.* (n. 1) 63-67. Tertullian's works in Greek are mentioned by S. L. Greenslade, *Early Latin Theology* [The Library of Christian Classics, 5] (London, 1956) 22 and H. Chadwick, *op. cit.* (n. 1) 2.