

<b>Zeitschrift:</b>	Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica
<b>Herausgeber:</b>	Schweizerische Vereinigung für Altertumswissenschaft
<b>Band:</b>	13 (1956)
<b>Heft:</b>	1
<b>Artikel:</b>	Neglected Evidence for Civero's De re publica
<b>Autor:</b>	Solmsen, Friedrich
<b>DOI:</b>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-13998">https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-13998</a>

### Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

### Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

### Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

**Download PDF:** 08.01.2026

**ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>**

## Neglected Evidence for Cicero's *De re publica*

By Friedrich Solmsen, Ithaca N.Y. (USA)

Our editions of Cicero's *De re publica* incorporate among the fragments of Book IV a passage from a letter of St. Augustine to Nectarius<sup>1</sup>. The passage which we shall presently quote in full begins with an explicit request of St. Augustine that his correspondent look up *ipso de re publica libros*. For this request St. Augustine had very good reasons. The most specific of them will very soon become apparent; but before we come to it we may for a moment consider the personality and interests of Nectarius, to whom St. Augustine's letter is addressed.

Nectarius had in a letter which is likewise preserved asked St. Augustine to use his influence to mitigate the punishment of the inhabitants of Calama who in contravention of the laws had celebrated a pagan festival and on this occasion committed very serious outrages against their Christian fellow citizens. This letter and another which Nectarius later wrote for the same purpose<sup>2</sup> enable us to form an opinion about his political outlook and his cultural aspirations. He is clearly a minor yet nevertheless typical representative of those pagan diehards who looked to the Roman classics and their message of eternal Rome as a source of moral strength in their last-ditch fight against the enemies outside and inside the crumbling Empire. If we were to ask what works in particular had acquired such new authority, or even sanctity, the answer would probably be: Virgil's *Aeneid* and Livy's panorama of Roman history<sup>3</sup>. That Cicero's *De re publica* enjoyed a similarly authoritative position cannot be taken as established. Yet when St. Augustine in the *De civitate Dei* joined issue with the outlook of these circles he did so through a critical scrutiny of the *Aeneid* and the *De re publica*<sup>4</sup>. His two letters to Nectarius, written barely two years before the sack of Rome brought this issue to a head<sup>5</sup>, are a modest and relatively mild prelude to that gigantic battle; yet

<sup>1</sup> *De re publica* IV 7. For recent editions see below, page 44 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Epist.* 90 and 103 embody Nectarius' request; 91 and 104 are St. Augustine's answers.

<sup>3</sup> See Fritz Klingner, *Vom Geistesleben im Rom des ausgehenden Altertums* (Frankfurt 1941), *passim*, esp. 19 f. The nostalgic outlook of these circles has often been described; I content myself with referring to P. de Labriolle, *La réaction païenne* (Paris 1934) 348 ff.; H. Bloch, *HTR* 38 (1945) 199 ff.; A. Alföldi, *A Conflict of Ideas in the late Roman Empire* (Engl. transl., Oxford 1952) 35 ff. and *pass.*; also his *Die Kontorniaten* (Festschrift d. ungar. numismat. Gesellsch. 1943); J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang d. griech.-röm. Heidentums* (Heidelberg 1920) 172 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Especially in the polemic of Books I-V, yet he returns to the *De re publ.* in XIX. For the possibility of recovering additional fragments of this work from Book XIX see Cl. Phil. 35 (1940) 423.

<sup>5</sup> For the date of *Epist.* 91 (shortly after June 1, 408) see the edition of the Maurini as reprinted in Migne *P. L.* XXIII 30ff.

in them too St. Augustine has occasion to speak of the opposition between *haec patria* and the *caelestis patria*<sup>6</sup>.

The passage in St. Augustine's letter which should serve us as a starting point runs as follows: *intuere paululum ipsos de re publica libros unde illum affectum amantissimi civis ebibisti quod nullus sit patriae consulendi modus aut finis bonis, intuere obsecro te et cerne quantis ibi laudibus frugalitas et continentia praedicetur, et erga coniugale vinculum fides castique honesti ac probi mores.* While the editors of *De re publica* accept the second half of the sentence as a welcome summary of Book IV (or part of it) they are uncertain about the words *quod nullus sit patriae consulendi modus aut finis bonis* in the first half<sup>7</sup>. None as far as I can see treats them as a verbatim quotation<sup>8</sup>. In fact none puts the readers in a position of judging for themselves, i.e., finds it necessary to mention that two paragraphs earlier, at the beginning of his letter, St. Augustine says: *teque non tantum tenere memoriter verum etiam vita ac moribus demonstrare quod nullus sit patriae consulendi modus aut finis bonis non invitus immo etiam libens accipio*<sup>9</sup>. The *memoriter tenere* of this sentence establishes a strong presumption for a verbatim quotation. Yet let us also look at Nectarius' own letter which begins as follows: *quanta sit caritas patriae, quoniam nosti praetereo. sola est enim quae parentum iure vincat affectum. cui si ullus esset consulendi modus aut finis bonis, digne iam ab eius muneribus meruimus excusari*<sup>10</sup>.

Nectarius' letter includes no mention of Cicero or of any of his writings. How then can St. Augustine maintain that Nectarius has "imbibed" the "sentiment of

<sup>6</sup> See esp. *Epist. 91, 1*, where we read of *eius* (i.e., *supernaे cuiusdam patriae*) *portiunculae in hac terra peregrinanti*); 91, 2. 3. 6; 104, 16f. The letters are not mentioned by H. Scholz, *Glaube und Unglaube i. d. Weltgeschichte. Ein Kommentar zu Aug. De civ. dei* (Leipzig 1911) 80, where an attempt is made to trace the idea of the two cities in the writings of St. Augustine that precede the *De civitate Dei*.— Nectarius in his reply, taking up the motif of the *caelestis patria*, says that *omnes leges diversis viis et tramitibus (eam) appetunt* (*Ep. 103, 2*). This recalls Symmachus' statement in the famous *Relatio* about the altar of Victoria (*Rel. 3, 10*): *uno itinere non potest veniri ad tam grande secretum*.

<sup>7</sup> Of the editions known to me (see below Notes 29ff.), only that of Castiglioni and Galbati sets these words by different type apart from the surrounding clauses, yet it still does not present them in the same type as verbatim quotations. Moreover the editors do not regard the word *bonis* as forming a part of the original (Ciceronian) sentiment. Yet *bonis* appears also in 90, 1 and 91, 1 as an integral part of the thought. The *boni* (i.e., the conservatives and patriots) of St. Augustine's day did not make the sentiment their own by adding the word. The sentence is likely to have been bandied about a good deal in their circles; hence St. Augustine's ready identification of its source.

<sup>8</sup> The words fare better at the hands of J. H. Baxter in the Loeb edition (St. Augustine, *Select Letters*, London-New York 1930), who puts his English translation of *nullus ... bonis* between quotation marks and states that Nectarius has quoted the *De re publica*. Baxter does not indicate that this is a "new" fragment, nor has he in any way followed up his observation.

<sup>9</sup> *Epist. 91, 1.* In the next sentence St. Augustine urges his correspondent to transfer the sentiment to the *superna patria*.

<sup>10</sup> 90, 1. St. Augustine keeps so close to Nectarius' letter that in one instance his sentence confirms an emendation in that letter. Nectarius puts his request in these words: *deposito ut si defendenda res est [in]noxius defendatur, ab innocentibus molestia separetur* (CSEL 34, 2; 427, 2). Cf. St. Aug. 91, 8 *accipe, quae commissa sint, et noxios ab innocentibus ipse discerne* (see also 91, 9; 103, 4; 104, 17).

a most devoted citizen" *quod nullus* etc. from the books *De re publica* and with what right can he speak of a *memoriter tenere* of the same phrase? Unless we suppose that St. Augustine had independent knowledge of his correspondent's favorite book or that the messenger who delivered the letter gave him a clue to its opening words—surely very far-fetched assumptions—we must conclude that St. Augustine recognized the quotation when he read the letter. He did so, even though the quotation is garbled, for Nectarius puts in a conditional affirmative way what in Cicero is a negative statement.

Now if we read once more the opening words of Nectarius' letter, we begin to appreciate the force of *quoniam nosti* in the first sentence. Contrary to what one might at first glance think, it is not an appeal to general human knowledge of what is right and what is wrong conduct but a reference—brief but *sapienti sat*—to the standard authorities. A few sentences later Nectarius expresses his satisfaction that he is speaking to a man who is *instructus disciplinis omnibus*. It is evident that he makes it a point to begin the conversation on a literary level—and St. Augustine forthwith joins him on that level. The word *nosti* indicates the key in which the conversation is to be conducted<sup>11</sup>. Once this is realized it becomes difficult to regard the thought *caritas patriae sola est quae parentum iure vincat affectum* as an expression of Nectarius' own untutored opinion. For it is after all this thought to which the *nosti* primarily applies and refers. The fact that St. Augustine preferred to use the next sentence—i.e., the second after the *nosti*—as a peg for his own thoughts should not influence us unduly. *Caritas patriae* was a familiar phrase and topic in Cicero's days<sup>12</sup>; he himself uses the phrase and he also knows in his philosophical writing different forms and, what is more to the point, different *gradus* of *caritas*. In the *De officiis* he teaches *cari sunt parentes, cari liberi, propinqui, familiares, sed omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est*, and speaks in another connection of the *res publica quae debet esse carissima*<sup>13</sup>. It is not the first time that an identical or closely similar thought has been found in the *De re publica* and the

<sup>11</sup> It may, as my colleague Theodor E. Mommsen points out to me, in some regard be compared to the *frequentatum in litteris nosti* of Nectarius' second letter (103, 3) which St. Augustine likewise takes up (104, 2, 3). In this second letter Nectarius' enthusiasm for Cicero is less restrained. No longer content with discrete allusions, he at once remarks that St. Augustine's arguments are worthy of Cicero and soon counteracts St. Augustine's references to the *caelestis patria* by paraphrasing passages of the *Somnium Scipionis*, i.e. of the *De re publica* (103, 2; cf. Note 66). Quite apart from the philological arguments, it would be a grave psychological error to think that a man like Nectarius could be satisfied with an appeal to established moral notions. If the first letter does not show it clearly enough, the second certainly leaves no doubt that he is living in an intellectual atmosphere so rarefied that the modern reader can hardly breathe in it. What has turned his head is not so much his reading of Cicero as his own "cultural" ambition; in addition, when writing to a bishop who had a great reputation for learning he feels that he must make a fine show of his own knowledge. Had St. Augustine missed the allusion to Cicero in the first letter Nectarius would probably have even been much more offended than by an outright rejection of the plea for the citizens of Calama. Fortunately—for him and for us—St. Augustine did not miss it.

<sup>12</sup> See Note 13.

<sup>13</sup> I 57; III 95, see also *Tusc. Disp.* I 90, *De fin.* III 64.

*De officiis*<sup>14</sup>, two works that are strongly, if perhaps not equally strongly, indebted to Panaetius. Future editions of the *De re publica* will do well to incorporate the first sentences of Nectarius' letter and to indicate the words in them that go back to Cicero.

One more word about the *caritas* fragment. We have no right to assume that in the *De re publica* too Cicero led the readers through the various *gradus societatum* and *caritatis*. A different and grimmer context for our fragment is suggested by an allusion to Cicero's work which Harald Fuchs in his book *Augustin und der Antike Friedensgedanke*<sup>15</sup> discovered in Rufinus of Atina's *De bono pacis*. Here we read *cum pax domestica membrum sit civilis pacis, si pax domestica a domesticis violanda sit, ne civilis pereat, erit tunc pax domestica inter patrem et filium distrahenda, quemadmodum eos scripsisse legimus qui de statu rei publicae facundius disputaverunt*. This sentiment, which points to the hard realities of Roman politics in the 50s and to the experience of the civil wars rather than to philosophical disputations, lends a good deal of color—rather sombre color—to the *iure vincat* in our fragment. These words point to a conflict between the two *caritates*; Cicero does not merely repeat the conviction which had found expression in Lucilius' *commoda praeterea patriai prima putare, deinde parentum ...* Still, these lines (1337/8 Marx), of which Professor H. Fuchs has kindly reminded me, show that a comparable patriotic attitude had even before Cicero's days become included in the conception of Roman *virtus*<sup>16</sup>.

We now return once more to the sentences in St. Augustine's letter which have served us as starting point. Having mentioned that *frugalitas, continentia*, and similar virtues or *mores* are extolled in Cicero's treatise, St. Augustine proceeds to assure his correspondent that the Church is fostering them and that only the Christian God can help man to live up to them. After this he continues: *denique illi doctissimi viri, qui rem publicam ciuitatemque terrenam, qualis eis esse debere uidebatur, magis domesticis disputationibus requirebant uel etiam describebant quam publicis actionibus instituebant atque formabant, egregios atque laudabiles, quos putabant, homines potius quam deos suos imitandos proponebant erudienda in doli iuuentutis. et re uera Terentianus ille aduescens, qui spectans tabulam pictam in pariete, ubi pictura inerat de adulterio regis deorum, libidinem, qua rapiebatur, stimulis etiam tantae auctoritatis accendit, nullo modo in illud flagitium uel concupiscendo laberetur uel perpetrandu in mergeretur, si Catonem maluisset imitari quam Iouem; sed quo pacto id faceret, cum in templis adorare cogeretur Iouem potius quam Catonem? uerum*

<sup>14</sup> See, e.g., Pohlenz, *Cicero De officiis* (Leipzig-Berlin 1934) 46f.; *Die Stoa* (Göttingen 1948) II 102.

<sup>15</sup> Neue philolog. Untersuchungen. Herausgeg. von W. Jaeger, vol. III (Berlin 1926) 243 n. 1. The new fragment confirms Fuchs' in any case highly probable identification of the *De re publ.* as the source of the Rufinus passage (see also Fuchs 238 n. 4), just as John of Salisbury's familiarity with the work (see below, page 44) provides a parallel to its existence in Monte Cassino at the end of the 12th century (Fuchs *ibid.*).

<sup>16</sup> Marx in his commentary (Leipzig 1904) ad loc. argues that Lucilius too is indebted to Panaetius.

*haec ex comoedia, quibus impiorum luxus et sacrilega supersticio conuinceretur, proferre forsitan non debemus. lege uel recole, in eisdem libris quam prudenter disseratur nullo modo potuisse scriptiones et actiones recipi comoediarum, nisi mores recipientium consonarent. ita clarissimorum virorum in re publica excellentium et de re publica disputantium auctoritate firmatur nequissimos homines fieri deorum imitatione peiores non sane uerorum sed falsorum atque fectorum*<sup>17</sup>.

Who are these *doctissimi viri* engaged in disputationes about the ideal *res publica* to whom St. Augustine sees fit to refer Nectarius—immediately after he has discussed some tenets of Cicero's treatise? It is hard to believe that the priceless statement about their educational principles which the first sentence presents has never been incorporated in the *testimonia* of the *De re publica*. Moreover, it takes but little reflection to realize how central a place this view about the right objects of imitation must have held in Cicero's discussion of Roman educational ideals. What *homines laudabiles et egregii* Cicero had in mind—or, rather, specified—could hardly be a matter for doubt even if St. Augustine did not in the next sentence agree that it would indeed have been better if the young man in Terence's *Eunuchus* had taken Cato as his model (*si Catonem maluisset imitari*) instead of Jupiter. It is the great figures of the past whom Cicero recommends as the appropriate *exemplum* in moulding the *indoles* of Roman youth<sup>18</sup>. Nothing could typify the difference between Cicero's educational ideals and Plato's as effectively as this proposal. In Plato's *Republic* we have an elaborate scheme which leads carefully selected groups towards grasping the norms first in the medium of poetry and music and later if they are capable of it, also by way of mathematics and dialectic. In its place Cicero puts Roman History which educates through *exempla*. Yet in other ways too Cicero's postulate is very significant. For it defines the place of the *exemplum Romanum* and the *maiores* in the ideal order of Roman life and thereby throws light, even if perhaps not entirely new light, on the position of the *exempla maiorum* in Roman literature. I speak of not entirely new light, because I believe that contemporary scholarship appreciates this significance of the *maiores* in the work of Virgil, Horace, Livy, to mention only these—like so many other ideas embodied in the *De re publica*, this one too is prophetic of the spirit and the tendencies of Augustan literature and Augustan reforms<sup>19</sup>. Still it is well to have something like an authoritative sanction for this appreciation<sup>20</sup>. To sum up,

<sup>17</sup> *Epist. 91, 4.*

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *De re publ. V 1 and 10.*

<sup>19</sup> This point of view was put forward by R. Reitzenstein in a well-known article *Gött. Nachr.* 1917, 379ff., which may have gone somewhat too far. For a recent discussion which moves in the same direction see Mason Hammond, *City State and World State* (Cambridge, Mass., 1951) 141ff.; cf. also U. Knoche, *Das neue Bild der Antike* (2 vols., Leipzig 1941) II 200ff., and H. Volkmann *ibid.* II 246ff. For Augustus' interest in historical (Roman) *exempla* see Suet. *Vita* 31,5; 89, 2; cf. Volkmann 256ff.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *Pro P. Sestio* 143, where the enumeration of Roman *exempla* is introduced by the words *quare imitemur nostros (Brutos ...)*; see also *ibid.* 101f. The use of historical *exempla* in Cicero and the Augustans is a topic which transcends the scope of a footnote. The *Regulus exemplum* as employed by Cicero *De off.* III 99ff. and Horace *C.* III 5, 13ff. may here do

Cicero in the *De re publica* created or expressed—one might perhaps even say, canonized—a new attitude to History which was destined to have a profound and far reaching effect. Moreover, the position which Cicero here takes may help us to view the so-called rhetorical use of the *exemplum maiorum* in a better perspective, for much that is *prima facie* rhetorical or even “purely rhetorical” is in its basic intention educational<sup>21</sup>.

Does our section throw still further light on Cicero's great work? We see St. Augustine making use of Terence's *Eunuchus* to show the sad state of Roman morals<sup>22</sup>. At this point he seemingly interrupts his argument to take care of a possible objection: may comedy be treated as a fair representation of the prevailing religious opinions and morals? In the *De civitate Dei*, where he formulates the same objection in the course of a very similar argument, a special chapter is put in to dispose of it; what it says is briefly that the Roman *ludi*, including the *ludi scaenici*, were instituted with divine sanction and at the express command of the gods<sup>23</sup>. After this chapter, St. Augustine returns to the *De re publica* and finds here too a justification for the use which he has made of a comedy. He refers to a passage *ubi Scipio disputans ait “nunquam comoediae, nisi consuetudo vitae pateretur, probare sua theatris flagitia potuissent”*. The movement of thought in our section of the *Epistula* is to an astonishing degree parallel (it is interesting to see how St. Augustine in his great treatise goes over the same ground which he had a few years earlier traversed in private correspondence). The sentence in the *Epistula* which corresponds to the words just quoted from the *De civitate Dei* runs: *lege vel recole in eisdem libris quam prudenter disseratur nullo modo potuisse scriptiones et actiones recipi comoediarum, nisi mores recipientium consonarent*<sup>24</sup>. Our editions of *De re publica* are at one in incorporating the passage in the *De civitate Dei* and ignoring the passage in the Letter. Indeed, at first sight the latter passage might merely seem to confirm the former. Still there is a difference. What we find in the *De civitate Dei* is a verbatim quotation; the passage in the Letter, on the other hand, gives us the summary of a perhaps rather extended discussion. Nor does the verb *pati* which occurs in the quotation in the *De civitate Dei* suggest the same idea as *consonare* in the *Epistula*. The latter verb points to the essential similarity between the *mores* prevailing in the society for which the plays are produced and

duty for countless others. See also Livy I *Praef.* 10, 11. Of scholarly studies relating to the use of national *exempla* in Roman literature I mention only the two most recent: Michael Ramsaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire Rom.* (Paris 1953), who on pp. 27ff. gives a full list of the *exempla* in Cicero's writings and on pp. 139f. a bibliography of earlier studies; and S. E. Smethurst, *Cicero and Isocrates*, Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. 84 (1953) 298ff.

<sup>21</sup> See e.g. Quint. *Inst.* XII 2, 29ff. In his philosophical writings Cicero is anxious to show that there is agreement between the *doctrinae Graecorum* and the *domestica exempla*. Thus he establishes the fundamental identity of the Greek and Roman moral tradition. I have noticed one instance—and believe it is the only one—in which Cicero actually decides a philosophical issue by appealing to the *exempla* of Roman history, without recourse to arguments (*De fin.* II 60ff.).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Ter. *Eun.* 584ff.

<sup>23</sup> II 8. For the argument cf. Tert. *De spect.* 5ff. 10ff.

<sup>24</sup> *De civ.* II 9 init. (*De re publ.* IV 11); *Epist.* 91, 4 fin.

the *mores* depicted in the plays (we shall presently meet a Ciceronian illustration of this *consonare*); and while the *pati* prepares the discussion on whether or not the license of comedy and especially its attack on outstanding citizens should be tolerated in a state<sup>25</sup>—which has nothing to do with *consonare*—the discussion about *consonare* probably included the famous definition which Donatus quotes from Book IV of *De re publica*: *comoediam esse Cicero ait imitationem vitae, speculum consuetudinis, imaginem veritatis*<sup>26</sup>.

Between this explicit reference (*in eisdem libris*) to the *De re publica* and the “reference by description” (which we have already discussed), St. Augustine speaks of the *Terentianus ille adulescens* (Chaerea) in the Eunuchus whose lust is inflamed by a picture of Jupiter’s adultery with Danae. This is an instance of *deos (sibi) imitandos proponere*, and as we have noticed, St. Augustine has some words of recommendation for the interlocutors of the *De re publica* who *egregios et laudabiles homines potius quam deos suos proponebant erudienda indoli iuventutis*. This may well lead us to wonder whether the comments on the Eunuchus passage which reappear in similar wording and similar context—and again in close neighborhood to a reference to *De re publica*—in the *De civitate Dei*<sup>27</sup> do not also go back to Cicero’s own discussion. Anyhow, what are we to think about the preference *egregios ... homines potius quam deos proponebant* which St. Augustine seems to attest for Cicero’s work? Does it mean that the speakers there actually compared the gods of mythology and the men of Roman history and while disqualifying the former recommended the latter for educational purposes? Or were the gods simply *not* proposed, i.e., ignored, not mentioned—a negative fact and in no way a gain for our knowledge of the dialogue? Or, again, should we suppose that St. Augustine “over-exploited” an incidental reference to the gods in the *De re publica*?

We are in the position to answer these questions; for we have Cicero’s opinion of the Eunuchus episode in his own words, although this is far from universally admitted. I am alluding to two lengthy quotations from Cicero in John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus*<sup>28</sup>. The authenticity of these quotations is still *sub iudice*. They were spurned by Angelo Mai<sup>29</sup>, vindicated for Cicero by C. C. Webb<sup>30</sup>, ignored by the editors of Cicero, including the four most recent ones, Ziegler<sup>31</sup>, Castiglioni-

<sup>25</sup> Note the recurrence of the *pati* motif in Scipio’s elaboration of his point: *patiamur, inquit* (scil. Scipio; the object is attacks like those indulged in by Greek Old Comedy) *etsi eius modi cives a censore melius est quam a poeta notari* (*De civ.* II 9; *De re publ.* IV 11).

<sup>26</sup> *De re publ.* IV 13 (Donat. *De com.*, CGF p. 67). On the Greek background of this definition see Eduard Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (Berlin 1922) 388, and *Aeschylus Agamemnon* (3 vols. Oxford 1950) II 386.

<sup>27</sup> II 7 fin.

<sup>28</sup> VII 9, 655ff. (vol. II 126ff. in C. C. I. Webb, *Ioannis Saresberiensis Policratici Libri VIII* [Oxford 1909]).

<sup>29</sup> In the *editio princeps* (Rome 1823) p. 286ff. The cardinal humanist refused *duodecimi saeculi sordes cum auro Tulliano miscere* (*ibid.* 288).

<sup>30</sup> In his note ad loc. (see Note 28).

<sup>31</sup> 2nd ed., Leipzig 1929.

Galbati<sup>32</sup>, Keyes<sup>33</sup>, and Büchner<sup>34</sup>, partly incorporated by Sabine and Smith in their translation<sup>35</sup>, and once more claimed for Cicero, though with a certain caution and reserve ("selbstverständlich freies Zitat"), by Pöschl<sup>36</sup>. In view of the great length of these fragments I will here content myself with giving the text only of the first, since this alone is in a strict sense relevant to our purpose<sup>37</sup>.

*Unde Cicero, cum de poetis ageret, ut diligentius audiretur, exclamat: clamor et approbatio populi, quasi magni cuiusdam et sapientis magistri et qui ad commendationem sufficiat, plausu suo quos uult facit autenticos. at illi qui tantis laudibus efferuntur quantas obducunt tenebras, quos inuehunt metus, quas inflammat cupiditates! hi stupra adulteriaque conciliant, uarias doli reparant artes, furtu rapinas incendia docent, quae sunt aut fuerunt, immo quae fingi possunt, malorum exempla proponunt oculis multitudinis imperitae. quae incendia celi succensi aut maris inundatio aut terrae hiatus tantas fecit populorum strages quantas isti faciunt morum? comicus qui prae ceteris placet in Eunucho refert adolescentis libidinem inflamatam, cum tabulam pictura uideret continentem quo pacto deus, qui celi templa sonitu concutit, per impluuium auro misso inclusam turre et septam custodibus corruperit Danaen (Danem John). similes in singulis <tabulis><sup>38</sup> picturas uidet, miratur et laudat multitudo. nam quae uirtutis incitamenta sunt, rarus spectator attendit:*

*here, quae res in se neque consilium neque modum  
habet ullum, eam consilio regere non potes.  
in amore haec omnia insunt uitia: iniuriae ...*

[Here follow 11 more lines from Ter. Eun. 60ff.]

*ad depellendum meretricum contumelias ratio euidens est quam seruus inducit; sed  
quicquid in hanc partem loquuntur, ita accipitur ac si insanum amatorem reuocet seruus.*

<sup>32</sup> Torino 1937.

<sup>33</sup> London and New York 1928 (Loeb edition).

<sup>34</sup> Zurich 1952.

<sup>35</sup> *Marcus Tullius Cicero on the Commonwealth*, Translated with Notes and Introduction by G. H. Sabine and S. B. Smith (Columbus, Ohio, 1929); see the thoroughly sound comments p. 238 n. 40.

<sup>36</sup> Viktor Pöschl, *Röm. Staat u. griech. Staatsdenken bei Cicero* (Berlin 1936) 137. Another statement of his opinion (ibid.) is that the section "wenigstens zum Teil zweifellos aus Ciceros *De re publ.* stammt". I owe my knowledge of the passage to Pöschl who incidentally shows very well that its content confirms the impressions which other sections of the *De re publ.* give us of Cicero's relation to Plato's *Republic*.

<sup>37</sup> The case for the Ciceronian provenance of the second quotation (II 127, 16ff. Webb) seems to me no less strong. It begins with the words *eos* (scil. *poetas*) *tamen alibi commendat plurimum idem Cicero dicens*. One sentence is strikingly parallel to Horace's *aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae* (*Ars poet.* 333): *aut utilitatis causa grata sunt aut voluptatis* (the grammatical subject of the sentence is missing but should be a word like *carmina* or *poemata*; John's copy of Cicero may here have been defective, or he himself may have shortened his text). The larger part of this quotation presents a moral interpretation of the *Odyssey* with which we may compare *Hor. Epist.* I 2, 18ff. and 7, 63f. John's *alibi* need not indicate that he found this passage in another work of Cicero (also lost to us), but may refer to another part of the *De re publ.*, in which poetry and its good or bad effect appear to have been discussed at length; cf. Pöschl 139.

<sup>38</sup> I have added this word to indicate that in Cicero's text *singulis* was followed by a noun. John himself may have failed to copy it; yet if *tabulis* is the right noun, the homoeoteleuton would suggest that it was missing in the Ms. which he copied.

This fragment does give a satisfactory answer to the question with which we approached it. The comments on the Eunuchus show why St. Augustine could say that in Cicero's dialogue the gods were considered less suitable models for the education of the young (*egregios ... homines potius proponebant quam deos erudiendae indoli iuventutis*). In addition, the fragment makes clear why St. Augustine concludes this part of his argument with the words *ita clarissimorum virorum in re publica excellentium et de re publica disputationum auctoritate firmatur nequissimos homines fieri deorum imitatione peiores*. What the *auctoritas* of these men confirms is after all a point which St. Augustine himself, three sentences before this, has made about the *Terentianus adulescens*; the *adulescens* becomes *peior* by deciding to imitate Jupiter. We now see that St. Augustine in making this point was reproducing Cicero's. If this were not so he could hardly, in the sentence just quoted, appeal to the *auctoritas* of the characters in the *De re publica*. Thus the fragment in John helps us not a little in the interpretation of the *Epistula*, while the *Epistula* in turn furnishes an additional proof for the genuineness of the fragment preserved by John. In the *De civitate Dei* (II 7) St. Augustine speaks of the Eunuchus episode in a similar vein of strong moral disapproval. That passage, however, embodies no definite indication that he is following Cicero, and only if we compare it with the "parallel" argument in the *Epistula* does the indebtedness also of *De civitate Dei* II 7 to Cicero become evident—one more proof that St. Augustine in this work keeps close to the *De re publica* even in passages where he does not indicate it.

It may not be out of place to add a few comments on the fragment in John of Salisbury. As has been said, Pöschl has the great merit of having rescued it from oblivion; yet he doubts whether it reproduces Cicero's words faithfully. It is certainly well to be cautious, yet there are after all two obvious procedures for arriving at a somewhat better founded opinion. Seeing that much of John's large work has the character of a mosaic constructed from ancient authors, we can check any number of passages against the text of these authors to find out with what degree of fidelity he incorporates them. And as we have many hundreds of pages of John's literary output and many thousands of Cicero's, we surely know the style of both authors sufficiently well to decide whose wording we have before us in our passage.

Fortunately it is not necessary to discourse at length about the style of the two authors when one of them is so familiar to our readers that they will hardly hesitate to recognize his own authentic diction in our passage. Let us give all proper admiration to the elegance of the 12th century humanist; let us recognize his mastery in neatly constructed, carefully balanced sentence periods, his cultivated choice of words and phrases, his epigrammatic art and the light touch of his hand by which he turns a graceful or clever point; there is one quality which his sentences lack. They do not flow. I am anxious to be as fair as possible to his diction; let us sample it where we know a cultivated stylist to be at his best, in the Prolo-

gus. Listen to this: *nam et artes perierant, evanuerant iura, fidei et totius religionis officia quaeque corruerant, ipseque recti defecerat usus eloquii, nisi in remedium infirmitatis humanae litterarum usum mortalibus divina misericordia procurasset*. Or again: *et te quidem* (he is addressing Thomas Becket) *sentio in eadem condicione versari, nisi quia rectior et prudentior, si facis quod expedit, stas semper immotus in solidae virtutis fundamento, nec agitaris arundinea levitate, nec deliciarum sectaris mollia sed ipsi quae mundo imperat imperas vanitati. unde cum tibi diversae provinciae congestis meritarum laudum paeconii quasi arcum erigant triumphalem, ego vir plebeius stridente fistula inculti eloquii librum hunc ad honorem tuum velut lapillum in acervo paeconiorum tuorum conieci*<sup>39</sup>. I am ready to grant that this very *cultum eloquium* has more Ciceronian features than a Cicero passage chosen at random, but it has none of the Ciceronian dynamic which we find in *at illi qui tantis laudibus efferuntur quantas obducunt tenebras, quos invehunt metus, quas inflammant cupiditates! hi supra adulteriaque conciliant, varias doli reparant artes, furta rapinas incendia docent, quae sunt aut fuerunt, immo quae fangi possunt* (John's breath and courage would have failed him here) *malorum exempla proponunt oculis multitudinis imperitiae*. Is it still necessary to ask whether the extravagant hyperbole of the next sentence can be paralleled anywhere in John<sup>40</sup>—if he had ever let himself go like that he would certainly have found it necessary to use the customary apologetic particles for this stylistic *audacia*—or to point to the effortless mastery with which Cicero gets every relevant piece of detail into his description of the Eunuchus episode<sup>41</sup>? Surely there is a world of difference between Cicero's power and John's refinement.

The methods employed by John in reproducing his authorities might well be the topic of a larger study. We must discount some divergences from our texts as due to his use of different and not always good manuscripts<sup>42</sup>. Yet there is no doubt that he at times shortens and in such cases allows himself to make the minimum of changes in the text that are necessary to render the shortened text intelligible<sup>43</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> 385a; 386b.

<sup>40</sup> A parallel in Cicero is noted by Pöschl, op. cit. 139; *cave putas aut mare ullum aut flam-mam esse tantam quam non facilius sit sedare quam effrenatam insolentia multitudinem (De re publ. I 65)*.

<sup>41</sup> I am saying this deliberately, even though I realize that this impression must be balanced against other possibilities and considerations that will be presently expounded.

<sup>42</sup> Sometimes, to be sure, his Ms. had better readings than those on which our texts are based. A case in point is 715b (II 234, 29 Webb) = Cic. *De off.* II 56 (lavish displays and donations are condemned by Aristotle) *cum praesertim neque necessitati subveniatur neque dignitas augeatur ipsaque illa delectatio delenitiae (delenitiae John, om. codd. Ciceronis) multitudinis ad breve exiguumque tempus (sit add. John) eaque a levissimo quoque*. To say nothing of the homoeoarcton, which is the obvious reason for the omission of *delenitiae* in our Mss., John's reading is here vindicated by the occurrence of *ad multitudinem deleniendam* seven lines earlier in a corresponding context. On the other hand, John's *sit* (his own venture?) is not the solution of the crux, i.e., the missing verb, for which other and perhaps better remedies have since been proposed.

<sup>43</sup> Availing myself of Webb's Index and notes, I have checked a large number of extracts from Cicero, Quintilian, Valerius Maximus, Gellius, Macrobius, St. Augustine and Justinus. The changes go relatively far in 679a ff. = Aug. *De civ. Dei* V 19, where John at the very beginning has replaced *enim* by *autem*. *To sunt multa in moribus bona de quibus multi bene*

Possibilities of this kind should indeed not be ruled out for our passage. For the rest, it makes a good deal of difference what expressions he uses in introducing a quotation—or, indeed, whether he at all intends, and indicates an intention, to quote. In this respect we are fortunate; for our passage is introduced with the words *unde Cicero ... ut diligentius audiatur exclamat*. And yet the first sentence has its serious problems. Pöschl does not mention what Webb had correctly observed<sup>44</sup>, namely that the first sentences are close to a passage in St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei* which is commonly and with fundamental justification included in the fragments of *De re publica*: (The gods wish their own misdeeds to become known through the medium of the theatre and thus sanction men's passions by their *auctoritas*) *frustra hoc exclamante Cicerone qui cum de poetis ageret: "ad quos cum accessit, inquit, clamor et adprobatio populi quasi cuiusdam magni et sapientis magistri, quas illi obducunt tenebras, quos invehunt metus, quas inflammant cupiditates"*<sup>45</sup>. Webb's own comment is: "verba quae non refert Augustinus (i. e., the additional words in John) ex Ciceronis libro *de re publica* provenire nulla causa est cur dubitemus". Fundamentally this is correct; it would as far as I can see be unparalleled that John should have allowed himself to introduce so considerable alterations and expansions into a passage which he explicitly ascribes to Cicero. He has a much greater tendency to shorten his original than to expand it. St. Augustine on the other hand admits in a slightly earlier chapter of the *De civitate Dei* that he has reproduced the sentences of the *De re publica* *nonnullis propter faciliorem intellectum vel praetermissis vel paululum commutatis*<sup>46</sup>. In all probability he has here done the same. So far, then, every argument favors John. In fact I should not hesitate to regard John's first two sentences as faithfully copied, if it were not for the fatal word *autenticos* at the end of the former. It is true, as Webb points out, that Cicero uses the adverb *αὐθεντικῶς* more than once in his Letters<sup>47</sup>. Yet Professor M. L. W. Laistner, who has kindly discussed this paper with me, reminds me that such use of a Greek word would run counter to the stylistic principles which guide Cicero in his philosophical works. It certainly would be quite exceptional and we have no right to carry our confidence in John to such length.

*iudicant quamvis ea multi non habeant* he has the additional words *et quo rariora eo praeclariora sunt*. In the next sentence the MSS. have *per ea bona morum nituntur ad gloriam et imperium et dominationem de quibus ait Sallustius* while John offers *per ea ergo nituntur quidam ad gloriam, ad imperium, ad dominationem*. He has made stylistic changes and since he intends to omit the quotation from Sallust has also dropped the relative clause and put in the new subject *quidam*. In what follows he has again left out a few sentences and indeed this time even put in two of his own (II 330, 18–22), a fact which may deceive the unwary since it is hard to know whether the words *teste magno patre Augustino* which occur before the insertion refer to what goes before or to what follows.

<sup>44</sup> See Note 28.

<sup>45</sup> II 14 fin.

<sup>46</sup> II 9 (I 63, 24ff. Dombart-Kalb). In our passage (II 14 fin.) St. Augustine gains something for his argument by reducing the importance which Cicero's speaker gave to the judgment of the audience. For St. Augustine not the audience is responsible for the morally bad effect of stage plays but the pagan gods *sua facta ... populis innotescere cupientes* (70, 32 Dombart-Kalb).

<sup>47</sup> See *Ad Att. IX* 14, 2; X 9, 1 (Webb ad loc. Note 28).

Thus our examination of this passage—the first two sentences—remains unfortunately inconclusive, though my personal inclination would still be to regard as genuine everything except the last two—or possibly last four—words of the first sentence; for some reason, which we cannot guess, John has here seen fit to depart from his original<sup>48</sup>.

Uncertainties remain also at the end of our fragment. I should not even regard it as completely impossible that John himself added the passage *Eunuchus* 57ff. (*here, quae ...*) and the comment which follows it. His own great admiration of the *Eunuchus* which he elsewhere records (in *Eunuchus comicus fere omnium vitam expressit*<sup>49</sup>) may have led him to supplement Cicero's argument in such fashion. In the last sentence two linguistic features arouse suspicion: the gerund is used where Cicero (as again Laistner has pointed out to me) would have preferred a gerundive construction, and *evidens*—whatever we may make of it—can hardly have its Ciceronian meaning (“clearly visible”, “manifest”). As for the two sentences which precede the *Eunuchus* passage, I should like to ask: Where did the *multitudo* in the middle of the 12th century see pictures embodying such mythological representations? Its chances for such enjoyments were certainly far from good. On the other hand, is it not obvious that the sentence *similes in singulis ...* illustrates the *mores recipientium consonare*, i.e., the thought which, with the help of St. Augustine's letter, we have just recovered for the *De re publica*?

Finally, in considering the sentence: *comicus qui prae ceteris placet ...*<sup>50</sup> it will be well to remember John's inclination to shorten and contract his originals<sup>51</sup>.

<sup>48</sup> I think the two sentences in John are considerably better and more effective as well as somewhat clearer than the one sentence in St. Augustine. This does not exclude the possibility—or indeed probability—that *ad quos cum accessit* were a part of Cicero's text, even though there is no telling what *praetermittere* and *paululum commutare* St. Augustine may have allowed himself here (cf. Cic. *Tusc. Disp.* II 27 and esp. III 3; see Sabine and Smith, loc. cit.). As for the remarkable agreement in the words which introduce the quotation (both authors have *cum de poetis ageret* and forms of *exclamare*), it is best explained by assuming that John was aware of the passage in St. Augustine—an assumption which may be made without fear that it will lead to the extreme conclusions of Angelo Mai, who considered the entire passage in John as an expansion of what he found in St. Augustine.

<sup>49</sup> VIII 1, 711b (II 228, 7 Webb).

<sup>50</sup> As regards these words as such, it may be noted that the only other comedy which John knew was the *Querulus* which he regarded as Plautine (see Webb's Index s.v. *Plautus*). Terence he mentions or quotes frequently, sometimes referring to him as *comicus* (e.g. II 250, 13) or as *noster* (I 46, 13; on this indication of familiarity see H. Liebeschütz, *Mediaeval Humanism in ... John of Salisbury* [London 1950] 63); but it would be an odd coincidence if the only instance in which he resorted to the more elaborate characterization *comicus qui prae ceteris placet* would be this passage where the words are so extremely appropriate in the mouth of a member of the Scipionic circle. If Cicero deemed it necessary that a member of this circle should select an episode in Terence as target of his criticism it was almost necessary for him to put in a phrase which indicated that this criticism did not conflict with the well-known admiration of the circle for this poet (cf. *Ad Att.* VII 3, 10; *Lael.* 89).

<sup>51</sup> See e.g. the section introduced: *refert Trogus quod* (610b; II 39, 28 Webb) which is on the whole an accurate copy of Just. I 3, 1; yet when Justin says *fit igitur coniuratio; bellum infertur Sardanapallo quo ille audito* John has omitted *bellum infertur Sardanapallo* and changed *quo-auditio* to *qua-audita*. In the sentence thus beginning he has allowed himself even longer omissions. This instance may be contrasted with the longish Varro passage which John 733a (II 266, 1ff. Webb) has copied from Macr. *Sat.* III 16, 12ff. and in which only a few words are left out. A study of a larger number of quotations in John leads to the

The words *quo pacto deus, qui celi templu sonitu concutit* are a direct quotation of Terence (Eun. 584). Did Cicero content himself with this, and did he not go on to quote at least the following line in which the *adolescens* draws a lesson from Jupiter's conduct for his own (*ego homuncio id non facerem...*)? This line is twice quoted by St. Augustine in his discussion of the Eunuchus episode; and when we presently come to assessing St. Augustine's debt to Cicero's criticism of this episode, it will be better not to proceed on the assumption that St. Augustine found in his Cicero text precisely what we read in John and nothing more<sup>52</sup>.

In the meantime it is well to sum up our lengthy discussion of the passage in John. John must indeed have had access to a manuscript of the *De re publica*<sup>53</sup>. Pöschl is right in speaking of a "free" quotation—provided we circumscribe the "freedom" closely enough. I should rather say first that the passage is taken from Cicero's work and then (as it has here been attempted) indicate the extent and limits of the liberty that John has allowed himself to take with Cicero's words. In the second, third, fourth and sixth sentences the accuracy of his copying is hardly open to doubt. John's quotation and St. Augustine's *Epistula 91* supplement one another in throwing light on the discussion of poetry in Cicero's *De re publica*. Using the—presumably Hellenistic—definition of comedy as *speculum consuetudinis*, Cicero repudiates comedy because it "mirrors" the bad habits of life; further grounds for condemnation are that it stirs the emotions and that it gives undignified accounts of the gods. These are Platonic arguments; Cicero has transferred and adapted to comedy what in Plato had been a criticism of tragedy<sup>54</sup>. (stepping outside the Platonic tradition, Cicero added the indictment against Greek comedy that it directs vicious attacks at leading statesmen). Yet in all probability Cicero balanced this condemnation of some forms of poetry by a vindication of another: the *Odyssey*, which in an early stage of Greek literary criticism had been described as a "mirror of life"<sup>55</sup>, is now considered as a semi-philosophical tale full of moral meaning and moral lessons<sup>56</sup>. Here, we are again on Hellen-

---

conclusion that he often shortens and in such cases makes the changes necessary to establish continuity and smooth connection between the sentences he retains.

<sup>52</sup> One would like to see the passage which Cicero quoted as illustration of poetry's potentially good influence balanced by the actual quotation of that selected as specimen of the opposite effect. Also Cicero may well have discussed the strong and therefore particularly bad influence which the representation of divine immorality in poetry was bound to have, since for this topic he had a Platonic precedent (*Rep. II* 377e ff.; esp. 378b; cf. Pöschl).

<sup>53</sup> There is reason for thinking that at 508b (I 225 Webb) John likewise went from the *De civ. Dei* (IV 4) to the *De re publ.* to get a fuller version of the story. See Webb ad loc. See further Webb to 500a (I 210, 4) for the valuable observation that John may have found the words *optimum vectigal parsimonia* in Cicero's own work (IV 7) rather than in Nonius; this has the more force since this would otherwise be the only passage where John is indebted to Nonius. On 619c (II 52, 39) I prefer to suspend judgment; here too it is noteworthy that John knows more about the *De re publ.* than his immediate source (Macrob. *In Somn. Scip. I* 1) told him.

<sup>54</sup> Plato *Rep. II* 377e ff.; III 386a ff.; X 569d ff. 603c ff.

<sup>55</sup> See Alcidamas in Arist. *Rhet. III* 3, 1406b 12.

<sup>56</sup> (*poetae*) *philosophandi* *materiam* *praebent*; *notant enim, non docent* *vitia ... sic per morum discrimina transeunt ut virtuti faciant locum* (656c = II 127, 20 Webb).

istic ground and the juxtaposition and occasional blending of Platonic and Hellenistic motifs is perhaps the most remarkable feature in Cicero's critical approach to literature.

St. Augustine refers to this passage of the *Eunuchus* and comments on its pernicious influence three times: in the First Book of the *Confessions*, in our letter to Nectarius, and finally in the Second Book of the *De civitate Dei*<sup>57</sup>, which includes his most vehement castigation of the immorality inherent in pagan religion. This in itself shows the important place which this passage had acquired in his mind; it clearly was for him a particularly significant illustration of the immoral quality which he associated with pagan literature. We have already seen that in two of the three instances Cicero's *De re publica* is in his thoughts: in the earlier of the two he has just referred to the work and will do so again in a moment<sup>58</sup>; in the later—later by only a few years—he is on the point of making contact with and quoting from it. Yet if, as it now appears, the *Terentianus adulescens* and his admiration for the picture representing Jupiter's adultery were mentioned and criticized in Cicero's dialogue, we must conclude that even St. Augustine's first reference to this episode, in the *Confessions*, is not independent of Cicero. Though speaking out of the fullness of his heart, he selects for his criticism a passage which a great pagan authority has selected before him. His indignation is less spontaneous than it might seem; it is not a primary experience but has characteristics of a "Bildungs-erlebnis"<sup>59</sup>. Even in this section which is devoted to the exposure of pagan education St. Augustine is not as free from its influence as he would like to be.

To state this is not the same as to question or minimize the originality of St. Augustine's thoughts and comments. In fact, it is likely that the comments in the *Confessions*, while in the last analysis prompted by Cicero's strictures of the same episode, are more original in content than either of the two others. It was probably something new to turn the criticism not only against poetic passages of this kind but at the same time against the doctrine that the study of the poetic classics was necessary in order to acquire a good vocabulary and the desirable eloquence. St. Augustine's opposition to this view culminates in the sentence: *non omnino, non omnino per hanc turpitudinem verba ista commodius discuntur, sed per haec verba turpitudine ista confidentius perpetratur*<sup>60</sup>. In the letter to Nectarius the Ciceronian motif of the *libido inflammata* (*se concitat ad libidinem*: *Confess.*; *libidinem accedit*: *Epist.*) recurs and in the *De civitate Dei* we also read *mox ut eos libido perpulerit ferventi ut ait Persius tincta veneno, magis intuentur quid Jupiter fecerit quam quid docuerit Plato vel censuerit Cato*<sup>61</sup>. However, the two later

<sup>57</sup> *Confess.* I 16; *Epist.* 91, 4; *De civ. Dei* II 7 fin.

<sup>58</sup> *Epist.* 91, 4. See above pages 41ff.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Friedrich Gundolf, *Goethe* (Berlin 1920) 27. Ilse Freyer's book *Erlebte und systematische Gestaltung in Augustins Konfessionen* (Berlin 1937) does not include an analysis of this section.

<sup>60</sup> Loc. cit. (Note 57) where these words follow immediately upon the quotation of *Ter. Eun.* 585. 589.

<sup>61</sup> II 7; I 61 Dombart-Kalb.

works make the additional point that the gods on account of their *auctoritas* offer themselves as an obvious and in this case also attractive example for an *imitari* on the part of the believers<sup>62</sup>. Cicero too alludes to this motif; though, if John has given us the full text of the relevant section, Cicero makes of it hardly more, and perhaps even less than Terence, and only St. Augustine restores this Platonic conception<sup>63</sup> to its full significance. After what has been said before, the possibility that John here shortened remains open.

We return once more to St. Augustine's correspondence with Nectarius. In his second letter St. Augustine, while remaining firm on the point that the inhabitants of Calama must be punished, protests that it is not his intention *eos ad aratrum Quintii et ad Fabricii focum ... perduci, qua paupertate illi Romanae rei publicae principes non solum non viluerunt civibus suis, sed ob eam fuerunt praecipue cariores et patriae gubernandae aptiores*. He continues: *ne illud quidem optamus aut agimus ut patriae tuae divitibus illius Rufini bis consulis argenti solum decem pondo remaneant, quod tunc laudabiliter severa censura adhuc resecandum tamquam vitium iudicavit*<sup>64</sup>. Has St. Augustine here again played off against his pagan correspondent matters that were recorded in the treatise to whose authority Nectarius himself had appealed? One may favor this idea because in this second exchange of letters Cicero quite obviously plays a role similar to that in the first. Nectarius parades his knowledge of him (and exposes his ignorance of Greek philosophers) in turgid phrases which, if they mean anything at all, set him up as a model of human wisdom, and St. Augustine repeatedly mentions his opinions and dicta with a view to bringing his correspondent to reason<sup>65</sup>. One of these references may well be to the *De re publica* and is in fact commonly included among the fragments of this work<sup>66</sup>. As regards the sentences quoted it is noteworthy that Cincinnatus and Fabricius are described as *rei publicae principes*. The *focus Fabricii* is independently attested for Cicero's work<sup>67</sup>, and of the two other *exempla* Cincinnatus would certainly be *imitandus iuventuti* while the punishment of Rufinus would

<sup>62</sup> *atque ab hac tanta auctoritate adhibet patrocinium turpitudini suae cum in ea se iactat imitari deum.* Cf. *stimulis tantae auctoritatis* and *si Catonem maluisset imitari quam Iovem* in the passage of the *Epistle* written out above, page 41.

<sup>63</sup> *Rep.* II 378b and passim; cf. St. Aug. *De civ. Dei* II 14, esp. 70, 14ff. Dombart-Kalb.

<sup>64</sup> *Epist.* 104, 6.

<sup>65</sup> 103, 1; 104, 3. 7. 16. The *paradoxa Stoicorum* are discussed (103, 3; 104, 13ff.), yet without any definite echo of Cicero's treatise.

<sup>66</sup> 104, 7 fin.: *ubi est quod et vestrae litterae illum laudant patriae rectorem qui populi utilitati magis consulat quam voluntati* (*De re publ.* V 8). Goldbacher ad loc. (CSEL 34, 2, 587) refers to *Pro Sulla* 25, where the words of the *qui* clause are found in a discussion of the duties and attitudes of a true *rex*. This makes the attribution to the *De re publica* less than certain and it would indeed be well if the editors of this work had a reference to the passage in *Pro Sulla* in their apparatus.—Nectarius has the *Somnium Scipionis* in mind when he says (103, 2) *post obitum corporis in caelo domicilium praeparari, ut ... hi magis cum deo habitent qui salutem dedisse aut consiliis aut operibus patriae doceantur* (*De re publ.* VI 13. 16; Nectarius admits that he owes this belief to *doctissimi homines*).

<sup>67</sup> *De re publ.* III 40 (Non. p. 522, 26 and perhaps also 68, 13). Cincinnatus is mentioned in a fragment commonly assigned to Book II (63); yet this can hardly be the passage which St. Augustine has in mind.

illustrate the *severitas* of the *mores antiqui*. What keeps me from regarding the attribution as certain is that we know—or if we did not know have learnt from H. J. Marrou's fundamental work<sup>68</sup>—how large a place such historical *exempla* held in the education of St. Augustine's contemporaries. We have seen that in cultivating the use of such *exempla* they remained faithful to the letter of Cicero's *De re publica*. By bringing in *exempla* which every educated person knew<sup>69</sup> St. Augustine is complying with this fashion; still in view of Nectarius' almost ecstatic admiration for Cicero it seems reasonable to suppose that in choosing his *exempla* he was mindful of the *De re publica*.

In conclusion, we may with greater confidence repeat our suggestion that the *De re publica* was among the “classical” works to which the followers of Symmachus and Nicomachus looked for inspiration. If it were otherwise, how could a man like Nectarius—hardly one of the “leading lights”—quote from it and expect the quotation to be recognized, even though he does not mention the work by title? In the *De civitate Dei* Cicero's treatise is again and again the immediate target for St. Augustine's merciless attacks. One reason—and perhaps the most obvious—for this is that the work was the classical formulation of the values and aspirations realized by the Roman state<sup>70</sup>. Theoretically this might suffice. Still it will help our understanding if we bear in mind that the *De re publica* actually enjoyed an authoritative position in the circles whose outlook St. Augustine is anxious to discredit<sup>71</sup>.

This paper owes much to the helpful advice and criticism of friends. My debt to suggestions made by Harald Fuchs, M. L. W. Laistner, and Theodor E. Mommsen is not confined to the points in connection with which their names have been mentioned. I also wish to thank Harry Caplan, Günther Jachmann, and Luitpold Wallach.

<sup>68</sup> *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (2nd ed., Paris 1949) 133ff.; see also M. L. Carlson, *Cl. Phil.* 43 (1948) 93ff.

<sup>69</sup> For the Rufinus *exemplum* Goldbacher (CSEL ad loc.) refers to *Val. Max.* II 9, 4; *Gell.* IV 8, 7.

<sup>70</sup> For the history of the pagan ideology of *Roma aeterna* see Fritz Klingner, *Rom als Idee* in *Die Antike* 3 (1927) 17ff. (reprinted in the first edition of his *Römische Geisteswelt*).

<sup>71</sup> Palæographers now incline to assign the Vatican Ms. to the fourth or early fifth century. See e.g. A. E. Loewe, *Codices Lat. Antiq.* I (Oxford 1933) 12 and Giov. Mercati in the Prolegomena to the Vatican publication of the palimpsest (*M. Tulli Ciceronis De re publ. libri e codice rescripto Vat. Lat. 5757 phototypice expressi* (Rome 1934, 204ff.) where the codex is described as “esemplare di lusso commesso da qualche ricco bibliofilo ammiratore di Cicerone litterato e politico”.